EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CLEVELAND HILL MIDDLE SCHOOL REQUESTS APRIL 30 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO OUR FLAG DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, another school in the 39th Congressional District, the Cleveland Hill Middle School of Cheektowaga, N.Y., has indicated its support of the resolution I recently introduced which would authorize the President to proclaim April 30, 1971, as Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag Day. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following letter and proclamation I have received from a Cleveland Hill Middle School student, Ray Siskai, urging that appropriate action be taken in order that this proclamation may be made:

CLEVELAND HILL MIDDLE SCHOOL,
Cheektowaga, N.Y.

Hon. JACK F. KEMP,
U.S. Representative, House of Representatives Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We would like you to help make April 30th Pledge of Allegiance Day for all children in all schools in the United States. Please read the attached proclamation. We know that after reading it, will want to help us in our patriotic endeavor.

Yours truly,

RAY SISKAI.

PROCLAMATION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas, on April 30, 1789 George Washington took the oath of office and was inaugurated as the first President of the United States.

Whereas, George Washington was the only President of the United States of America inaugurated on April 30th.

Whereas, April 30, 1802 Congress passed the first enabling act authorizing the people of the eastern division of the Northwest Territory to hold a convention and frame a constitution in order to become a state, and a precedent was set in helping Ohio's gaining its statehood, followed by the same, set for the rest of the states in this territory.

Whereas, on April 30, 1803 the United States of America, under the leadership of President Thomas Jefferson, made its first territorial expansion by purchasing 828,000 square miles of land (doubling the size of the United States by peaceful means) known as the Louisiana Purchase, which land eventually was divided into the states of Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa, Arkansas, North Dakota, South Dakota, most of Louisiana, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Wyoming and parts of Colorado and Oklahoma.

Whereas, on April 30, 1812, the state of Louisiana was admitted into the Union.

Whereas, on April 30, 1889 Congress fixed this date of April 30th as a national holiday to celebrate the inauguration of George Washintgon as the first President of the United States of America.

Whereas, on April 30, 1970 the proclamation sent by Mrs. Irene Priore's Third Graders of Cheektowaga, New York, requesting that April 30, 1970 be proclaimed as Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag Day in the United States of America for all school children in all schools of our nation, was read in Congress.

Whereas, schools, community leaders and citizens in all 50 states of our nation responded by letter, telephone and telegram to the Cheektowaga, New York Third Graders that they wished to participate in this unified promise of loyalty at 1:30 P.M. Eastern Savings Time so children's voices might echo throughout the land.

Therefore, We, the boys and girls of Cleveland Hill Middle School do hereby ask the Hon. Jack Kemp to proclaim each April 30th as an annual special school day to honor our nation *and its flag in school* by song, speech and activities planned by the faculty and students of each individual school.

We request that this proclamation be made known to all the schools of our nation so that all the school children may have the pride and honor to help plan a dignified program for their own schools. We believe that by encouraging children to have the pleasure of involvement in planning a program for April 30th each year that we are taking a positive approach toward building better attitudes in school children and planning for better citizens and leaders of the future.

ALBERT N. JACKSON

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday we were all shocked at the sudden death of Albert N. Jackson. Always a civic leader in Dallas, his death marks a real loss to our city.

Albert was my good friend. I liked him because he was genuine, knowledgeable, and always working to help us build a better community.

You will be interested in this fine editorial of the Dallas Times Herald of April 2, 1971:

ALBERT N. JACKSON

There are many ways and of varying degree in which a man can serve his fellow man. We believe one of the best is in the capacity of an able, conscientious, dedicated professional journalist.

It was in that capacity that Albert N. Jackson chose to serve his fellowmen. And Albert Jackson served them thus in the highest degree.

At the time of his death Thursday, Mr. Jackson held the position of vice chairman of the board of The Times Herald Printing Company. But he had reached that position through nearly half a century of service with The Times Herald as a reporter, as an editor and then as a company executive.

But we who knew him best remember him best for his work as a reporter and political writer. And of all his positions, he was proudest of having been a good reporter. The fact is that he was more than just a good reporter. As the publisher of this newspaper, James F. Chambers, Jr., a long-time personal friend, said "Albert was the most professional journalist I've ever known. He was a meticulous reporter—the smallest details were all there in his stories"

Mr. Jackson spent some 15 years of his career as a journalist reporting Dallas municipal affairs. And it was there that he made probably his greatest contribution to the people of this city.

Mr. Jackson came into this field of journalism at the time the City of Dallas was beginning its transition from a comparatively small city to a great metropolis. And through his scrupulously honest reporting and more, through his campaigning for good government, through his advice and consultation with civic leaders of the city, Albert Jackson had a major hand in helping fashion and encourage the excellent city government Dallas has enjoyed for so many years.

But Albert Jackson's influence for good in government went far beyond the city limits of Dallas. Over the years he became the friend of governors and other state officials, of congressional leaders and of presidents. All of them sought his advice and counsel, not only on political matters but in the broader matters of state, at all levels of government, from the lowest to the highest.

For they recognized in Albert Jackson, as did all of his legion of friends, a man not only of consummate political acumen but of fundamental wisdom as well, a wisdom which grew out of a deep understanding of, and a deep sympathy for, people.

These characteristics were manifest in the great host of persons who knew him as a friend. Indeed, hundreds upon hundreds of persons, from the lowest rank to the highest, will mourn his passing.

This city, this state, the nation, and most of all, this newspaper, will miss him. All of these and all of the multitude of people who were his friends are better for his having lived among us.

UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN INDOCHINA HAS BECOME AMERICA'S MALEDICTION

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, no one would question the national malaise over this war. It is evident in every corner of the Nation and every segment of society. The extent of despair knows no boundaries. It transcends all vocations, the rich, the poor, black and white.

It was the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg who once commented:

It is easier to be critical than to be correct.

His statement of more than 20 years ago is most appropriate today.

During the 91st Congress this body initiated its long overdue concern and desire for a larger role with greater responsibility for the conduct of our international affairs. Subsequently, a multitude of proposals for the disengagement of American forces from Indochina have been put forth in an attempt to affect a change in our involvement in this conflict. It is disquieting and disturbing that recent public discussion has to a major degree, been simplified to a polarized position presenting only an early and specific deadline for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops and suggesting that subsequently without any additional effort all other problems would somehow be resolved. Unfortunately no such simple panacea will work.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The purpose of this discussion is to delineate the many variables affecting the situation, and to suggest a more systematic approach leading to the disengagement of armies, the cessation of hostilities, the exchange of prisoners, the placement of refugees, and the rehabilitation of the countryside in Indochina.

Unquestionably President Nixon inherited a tremendous burden when he assumed the Presidency. How to deal with a cruel and senseless Asian war that has taken 45,000 American dead, wounded another 290,000 Americans and cost our Nation $100 billion, is a subject that has demanded and received much of his attention. The Nixon administration has had many successes in respect to ending our involvement. I say this not because the President is a Republican, and we are of the same party, but because he has succeeded where his predecessor failed. The only American President to start to bring boys back from Vietnam is Richard Nixon. Today troop levels are at one-half of what they were when he took office. This is a major achievement. He deserves our congratulations—not our continued criticism.

The President is about to make a major announcement on his Indochina policies. It is my fervent hope that it will be one of substantial deescalation and withdrawal. I know this is the prayer of each and every American. For too long we have been told of the light at the end of the tunnel, but it is always shrouded in fog.

There will undoubtedly be many who disagree with the approach which the President will announce. But it is the responsibility of those who disagree to put their critique and criticism in constructive form, rather than simply to condemn. The country has had its fill of demagoguery and handwringing on Vietnam. What the Congress and the President must provide is partnership, not competition. The responsibility for getting out of Vietnam is ours to share. With this in mind, we can and must work toward emphasizing the opportunities for peace and deemphasize the divisive rhetoric.

New initiatives for peace must be taken. I believe it is appropriate for Congress to participate in exploring these new avenues for peace. It may well be presumptuous to put forth yet one more "peace proposal," but I strongly feel my responsibility to discuss some of the issues in Vietnam which have all too frequently been forgotten in the massive public rhetoric. The "initiative" I am proposing here not put forth as any "sure cure" or as a simple answer to a complicated war—it is meant to be a preliminary systematic approach on which a stable peace can be built.

I am therefore today introducing the following resolution:

Whereas, The House of Representatives believes that each Member of Congress shares with the President the responsibility for continued military involvement in Indochina and for ending it. Therefore we propose:

That it is the sense of this Congress that a date certain of June 30, 1972 be established for the withdrawal of all U.S. forces in Indochina provided that in the intervening time: (a) immediate steps be initiated through the United Nations Human Rights Commission for the identification and exchange of all prisoners of war held in Indochina, (b) that through a United Nations Special Commission, or a group of neutral nations, a cease fire be established between the parties involved, (c) that this government working through the United Nations or a group of neutral nations, seek a free and independent election in the Republic of Vietnam in October, 1971, (d) that immediate steps be taken through the United Nations Office of High Commissioner for Refugees, for the immediate placement of refugees in Indochina, (e) that immediate steps be initiated to re-activate the United Nations Rehabilitation and Relief Association in order that an extensive program of rebuilding Indochina be started upon the cessation of hostilities, and that the Congress of the United States state its intention to appropriate funds to the United Nations to be used specifically for the rehabilitation of Indochina.

The essence of this proposal is not only in setting a date certain for withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, but in relating that withdrawal to the tangential but essential issues which must be involved if a stable peace is to follow. The date itself is less important than the relationship between all the many factors. Indeed, it should be noted that last week I indicated my willingness to work for withdrawal by the end of this calendar year. This resolution sets a time 6 months later in June of next year. Like all Americans, I hope that the former date can be met and will work with that goal in mind. However, practical advice and briefings have indicated some doubt as to the logistic possibilities for the earlier time. My resolution therefore states June 30, 1972, as the absolute, outside acceptable time limit for our withdrawal. I am personally convinced that if the other sections of my resolution are implemented, the much earlier withdrawal can be achieved.

Any peace initiative must, in my view, follow three guidelines if it is to be successful.

First, and most important, it must be flexible. Rigid guidelines are rarely amenable to negotiation and frequently result in a hardening of position on both sides rather than reaching any agreement. Second, negotiations must appear to have been initiated by both sides. To end any limited war, especially the one in Indochina, it is essential that the adversaries be able convincingly to claim that their own initiatives were responsible for the cessation of hostilities. Additionally, each must be able to make a convincing argument to its people that the results of the negotiated settlement are to its advantage and, that it has, in fact, gained what it has been fighting for. Third, each side must be able to have confidence in the word of the other side. Despite 2 years at the peace table in Paris, it is clear that such mutual confidence has yet to be achieved. In my view this confidence can best be built through a series of small, readily identifiable steps, each agreed upon in advance, and each leading to further negotiations.

As indicated above I propose that the President of the United States and the Congress jointly declare that it is the intention of the United States to withdraw all ground, sea, and air forces from Indochina on or before June 30, 1972. The announcement of a date certain for withdrawal is, in my opinion, the single necessary step on the part of the United States, to initiate full and fruitful discussions in Paris on the many other vital issues affecting the future of this war-torn section of the world.

Although I favor announcing a date certain, there need not be a prior public announcement in the manner in which troops are to be withdrawn. This, as well as so many other questions involving the American commitment, should immediately become part of the negotiation process. For example, 50,000 troops might leave by x date, in exchange for an agreement by North Vietnam to cease using certain portions of the Ho Chi Minh trail. Or 75,000 troops might be withdrawn for the release of American prisoners. All prisoners held by the South Vietnamese might be released upon the acceptance by both adversaries of a full cease-fire. The date for complete withdrawal might be advanced considerably by agreement on the part of the North to both a cease-fire, and the release of all prisoners on both sides. The combinations are endless. Each can be taken in small or large steps and be quickly verified by both governments.

In every case, the "concessions" can be claimed as peace initiatives, by all affected governments. Since the combination of concessions are extensive, the proposal is flexible in allowing concessions at any point of negotiations, and as they appear appropriate.

My proposal, however, does not end with the military questions of withdrawal. It also addresses itself to the issues remaining when the last American soldier leaves Indochina. For the most part, my resolution calls for additional actions to be taken by the United Nations or a "group of neutral nations" to aid in resolution of several difficult problems. It may well be that some of these questions can be settled among the parties at the Paris talks among themselves. But history has indicated that outside forces are frequently most helpful in reaching agreement.

Three immediate issues fall into the category of those which can be solved by mutually agreed upon action as part of the Paris talks, or issues which the outside world can assist in solving. The first, and probably most obvious of these, is the identification and exchange of prisoners of war which are held by both sides. As indicated above, we would be well advised not to put preconditions on this—but to make it a part of the negotiation process—a step which can be taken to prove the good faith of all involved. Because the efforts of the International Red Cross have been rejected out of hand, I have suggested the United Nations Human Rights Commission as one possible intermediary. Also, appropriate might be neutral nations, or allied nations which are not directly involved in the fighting—such as Britain and Yugoslavia—who might agree to accept interim responsibility for the welfare of the prisoners.

Second, an early cease-fire would obviously be helpful to both sides in bringing the war to an earlier end. The experience of outside influence in the Middle East in bringing about a cease-fire, even though an uneasy one, might well be a useful guide and again either the United Nations or a group of nations could help reach an agreement. The other nations of the "big four" might well work constructively in this role since Britain has generally supported the United States, Russia has generally supported the North Vietnamese and the French have generally been critical of both sides.

Third, there is a broad commitment to free and independent elections in the Republic of Vietnam this fall. My proposal would urge that outside observers be intimately involved in the election process in order to verify its validity. I do not propose that an outside force actually conduct the elections, but that worldwide scrutiny of the election process might limit both politically motivated charges of bias and actual practice of bias in the election process.

The final two steps of my proposal are written to specifically involve the United Nations. I do not choose the U.N. for these heavy responsibilities on the basis of intuitive judgment, but rather after a careful examination of the record. The accomplishments of the U.N. in humanitarian, social and economic restoration are abundant and impressive. Anyone who has ever analyzed or researched the work of the United Nations, particularly after World War II or Korea, will find a surfeit of facts to substantiate this.

Once hostilities have ceased, I believe it is the U.N. that can sucessfully lead the struggle to promote order, health, justice and prosperity in Indochina. If we are to replace the helicopter with the housing development as a symbol of power, the job can be done most efficiently and effectively by the United Nations.

It was the late Ambassador to the U.N., Adlai Stevenson, who once observed:

If the UN did not exist it would have to be invented.

At this particular moment in history, I believe this to be an extremely apt statement.

A full year and a half before Germany surrendered but with ultimate victory in sight, 44 nations signed an agreement at the White House, establishing the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

It became commonly known thereafter as UNRRA. Its specific purpose was to bring aid and relief to the inhabitants of those countries that were overrun by the enemies of the United Nations. The mission then was to end famine, pestilence, devastation and disease in these nations.

At the peak of UNRRA operations, there were five types of offices and missions and a staff of nearly 25,000, as follows.

1. Washington Headquarters. This was the administrative center for the organization.

2. European Regional Office, in London. Supervised all offices, missions, and displaced persons operations in both the Middle East and Europe.

3. Servicing Offices and Missions. Twenty-nine of these around the globe engaged in recruiting personnel, processing supplies, expediting the shipment of goods, providing to the various governments health and welfare services.

4. Missions to Receiving Countries. Sixteen of these advising governments on the preparation of requests to UNRRA for supplies and their use and distribution thereof within the Nation. Gave technical advice on health, welfare, and both industrial and agricultural rehabilitation.

5. Displaced Persons Operation in Germany, under ERO Supervision. Dealing in repatriation and care of displaced persons in cooperation with the military command.

One of the spin-offs of UNRRA, was its assistance to refugees. Help for the refugee, under international sponsorship dates back much further. It can be traced to the League of Nations, in 1921. The pattern established then has been followed for decades. For the most part, we have seen nonpermanent international and intergovernmental agencies solve each problem as it arose. However, since 1951, the United Nations Office of High Commissioner for Refugees has been continuously operating under a mandate which is purely humanitarian, and exclusively nonpolitical. I believe its praiseworthy accomplishments should continue after Vietnam. The high commissioner has become the international protector of refugees. The refugee problem was large scale after World War II, and Korea. There is no reason to believe it will be any different this time. It makes sense that this office of the U.N. carry on its work and assist those who have become displaced as a result of the fighting in Indochina.

Mr. Speaker, there is no panacea for Vietnam. The proposal I offer is not put forth as one. Without a doubt it can be improved. Nor is it offered as a complete solution to our present situation. It does offer a more comprehensive approach than which has been presented in many current proposals.

It answers the problem regarding withdrawal by setting a fixed date certain.

It deals with the prisoners of war, those held by all parties.

It meets the problem of the placement of refugees.

And it gets to the task of rebuilding these war-devastated countries.

Hopefully, it is a proposal with a firm foundation on which to build.

I believe the time is here when we need to get back on that road toward an unalterable exit from Indochina. We need not have a crescendoing political challenge to the President's war power. We need not underscore devisiveness. We must come up with a plan that will end this war, return the prisoners to their loved ones, find solutions for the homeless refugee, and rehabilitate these nations.

If this be our mission, we will be dealing honorably with the damage a great country has caused in a tragic conflict.

This then is our challenge.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE "ESCH INITIATIVE"

Q. Isn't the fact that you are setting a "date certain" of June 30, 1972 in direct conflict with Presidential policy?

A. Not necessarily so. The President has indicated his intention to continue to withdraw troops so that troop levels, barring unforeseen circumstances, will be at a minimum level. This concept behind the ESCH INITIATIVE proposes that we set a date *now* so that negotiations can begin *now* and we can start to exchange prisoners, arrange for free elections, place refugees, and rehabilitate.

Q. Hasn't this been tried before?

A. Not directly in this context. This proposal says "we are getting out of Vietnam by June 30, 1972." Now we are asking other nations to accept responsibility to become involved in the other substantive and equally vital issues. For too long we've had a hang-up with the date, and have failed to talk about equally great issues.

Q. What makes you think the North Vietnamese will respond?

A. For the first time we are giving a definite timetable on withdrawal.

Q. Is UNRRA the most effective method of rehabilitation?

A. In my opinion, an unequivocal yes. It has a proven track record. The machinery is there. It only must be re-activated. UNRRA tested the capacity of the United Nations in Europe. A new UNRRA can test the capacity of the UN in Indo-China.

Addressing himself to the UNRRA challenge back in those dark days of the Second World War, Dean Acheson observed:

It is a great task—one worthy of a great organization.

The UNRRA concept has worked in the past, for the common good, it can again.

Q. How do you re-activate UNRRA?

A. I intend to explore this in the next few weeks with Ambassador Bush.

Q. How would it be financed?

A. By member nations of the UN, with major contributions from the United States. After World War II, UNRRA contributions totalled $3.8 billion. The greatest amounts came from the United States, Britain, and Canada. The U.S. bears great responsibilities in this part of the world and my resolution would pledge full U.S. appropriations.

Q. Who would have the responsibility for the cease-fire?

A. Either a Commission of the United Nations or a group of Nations.

Q. What about free elections?

A. This is very important. The United States must do all it can to assure open, fair, and free elections in October 1971. We cannot afford anything less. Outside observers should be encouraged from nations throughout the world.

Q. Is the withdrawal of troops by the United States contingent upon the release of prisoners?

A. Absolutely, and it is so stated within the resolution itself.

What I am proposing is an announcement by our Government that we are going to withdraw by June 30, 1972, and I have incorporated the precondition that steps be taken to initiate the release of prisoners of war on both sides prior to that date.

CONCERNS ABOUT FAMILY ASSISTANCE FROM A STATE WELFARE DIRECTOR

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is now considering welfare reform legislation which would establish a Federal assistance payment of $2,400 for a family of four.

Recently, the welfare director for the State of Minnesota, Morris Hursh, contacted me to express concern about the bill as it is now taking shape in committee. Mr. Hursh is particularly disturbed about the proposed elimination of Federal support for State supplemental payments. A copy of his letter follows:

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,
St. Paul, Minn., April 2, 1971.

Representative DONALD FRASER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FRASER: This is a follow-up on our conversation of a few days ago regarding the bill now coming out of Ways and Means with reference to Family Assistance and the Adult Categories of Assistance.

I was in Washington recently with a few other state welfare administrators and we discussed the bill at great length with the top officials of HEW. So I have a general idea of its provisions, but not having the actual text makes it difficult for us to estimate the fiscal effect on Minnesota.

In a recent N.Y. Times story there was a Table of estimated state savings, and Minnesota was listed as saving $17.3 million. On the basis of what we know about the proposal, our Research department believes this is approximately correct, although perhaps $1 million high.

I might say that we have some concerns about the Family Assistance part of the bill, as follows:

The federal government will pay a guaranteed minimum of $2400 to a family of four, but anything the state wishes to pay above that amount is entirely from state funds. This is fine for the southern states and other low-grant states, but it doesn't do too much for the high-grant states, such as Minnesota, New York, Massachusetts, etc. There is also the temptation for states with a budget above $2400 to come down to that level, and thus avoid any state payment whatever. This could be rough on the recipients.

Food stamps are cashed out, and that is O.K. But with a level as low as $2400 per year for a family of four, it would be a big help to the recipients if they could get this additional break. For example, in Minnesota our budget is about $3500 for a family of four. We will have to supplement the difference between $2400 and $3500—or lower our standard—and the $1100 is less than we have to pay now in a similar case, but the recipient will be getting the same $3500 he now gets, but with no bonus food stamps—which amounts to about $30 per month.

Our big objection to the Family Assistance Plan—in the form now taking shape—is the same one we had to the Plan considered in the last Congress: It sets up administrative machinery that seems unnecessarily complicated and cumbersome, as well as expensive. FAP will make the $2400 payments; the states will have to supplement where they wish a higher standard of assistance; and now it is proposed to turn over all employable persons [working poor, unemployed fathers and AFDC mothers] to the Department of Labor. DOL will not only handle training and employment, but also determine suitability for T & E, and will make the assistance payments [supplemental] to all the families enrolled with DOL. To carry out this function, we were told that the plan is for DOL to establish offices all over the country, just as FAP will do. So then we will have a client dealing with the county welfare office, the FAP office and the Employment Office. This doesn't make sense to me.

I could write at greater length, but would prefer to do so after we have seen the bill, and can assess its effects on Minnesota. Will you please provide me with a copy as soon as it is introduced?

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS HURSH,
Commissioner.

UNION CARBIDE CORP. AND MARIETTA, OHIO, PLANT

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, I submitted to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement by Mr. R. L. Osborn of the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers Union concerning the activities of the Union Carbide Corp. in dealing with Federal pollution directives at ITS Marietta, Ohio, plant. The corporation's Washington representative has since then forwarded to me a statement by Perry Wilson, the corporation's president defending the Union Carbide actions in Marietta. In the interest of fairness, I feel that I should present the corporation's defense to my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY PERRY WILSON

First, let me assure you that we did not, and will never, engage in any economic or environmental blackmail, and we regret that our January 18, 1971 letter was so interpreted. Our letter to EPA Administrator William D. Ruckelshaus indicated our intention to come into compliance, as soon as possible, with the air pollution abatement recommendations of the Parkersburg, West Virginia-Marietta, Ohio Conference.

We pointed out that we do not now have at hand the capability to meet certain of the intermediate, short-term abatement recommendations. We tried to make it clear that if all other efforts failed, we would regretfully have to shut down parts of the operation temporarily in order to comply. This would be not only unfortunate from the point of view of our employees and the community, but also the most costly course of action to Union Carbide.

Therefore, we are exerting and will continue to exert every effort to avoid this solution to our problem. In this endeavor we welcome your concern and that of all other interested persons.

In order to respond fully to your request, I am attaching a detailed memorandum reviewing all of the factors involved in air pollution control at our Marietta facilities. Should you, or your staff, have further questions, we shall be glad to respond to the best of our ability. We will also plan to keep you informed of the progress of our efforts.

Let me assure you that Union Carbide Corporation, including its officers and Directors, is fully committed to effective and constructive action to improve the environment. As individuals and as a corporation we are prepared to act, at Marietta and elsewhere, to the limit of our capabilities.

MISLEADING THE CONSUMER

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Morton Mintz, who is among the best of a growing number of journalists who specialize in consumer reporting, has written a perceptive commentary on President Nixon's February 1971 consumer message. In the April issue of the Progressive, Mr. Mintz concludes that the most recent consumer message is a retreat from relatively weak positions the President had taken in his first consumer message in 1969.

I share Mr. Mintz' conclusions and concerns. Immediately after the President sent his latest consumer message to Congress, I said that "Congress will respond, but not as he anticipates or hopes. Full measures, not half measures, will be coming very soon from Congress on the consumer's behalf. The days of indecision, confusion, and misguided goals are ended. This will be a consumer's Congress despite the President and not, I am sorry to say, because of him."

Mr. Mintz' article, entitled "Misleading the Consumer," follows:

MISLEADING THE CONSUMER

"This is by far the greatest, most important consumer message that any President has released." Virginia H. Knauer, Mr. Nixon's consumer affairs adviser, told a news conference. The message demonstrates, she continued, the President's "commitment to a better world, a world where quality, justice, compassion, and understanding are key elements in the marketplace." If the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act applied to political bombast, Mrs. Knauer surely would be no less deserving of prosecution than Attorney General John N. Mitchell, who, it will be recalled, earlier described the President's State of the Union Message as nothing less than "the most important document since they wrote the Constitution."

At least in Mrs. Knauer's case one must suspect that the purity of her adulation of the President is not unalloyed by self-delusion. She is, after all, a woman who once accounted for her first twenty months of Federal service with such weights and measures as the number of consumer bills pending in Congress, her 154,980 miles of travel ("I think we can round that out to 155,000"), and her five scrapbooks of clippings ("which are five inches high"). And it may be that no one told her that the consumer message made good sense only if seen as a Presidential instrument to maintain the flow of campaign contributions from the business world by using the rhetoric of consumer reforms to abort those reforms.

In significant respects the President retreated even from positions he had taken in his first consumer message in October, 1969. At that time—sixteen months more remote in time from the 1972 Presidential election—he rightly pointed out that existing Federal laws give private citizens no standing to bring suits as a class against those who defraud them in consumer transactions. He proposed legislation to permit class-action suits, with the proviso that either the Justice Department or the Federal Trade Commission first had completed a prosecution. Leaving aside the fight made against the proviso by Representative Bob Eckhardt, Texas Democrat, and others on the ground that it would impede citizen suits, Mr. Nixon in his new message does not even use the phrase "class action." He proposes a "Consumer

Fraud Prevention Act" which, however, would permit such litigation "where appropriate"—an obviously rubbery qualifier. Further, only the Justice Department, which he controls through his closest adviser, John Mitchell, could "trigger" a class action suit by completing a prosecution; the FTC could not.

Also in 1969, Mr. Nixon spoke of the need for legislation to assure the efficacy, reliability, and safety of some 5,000 types of medical devices—everything from emergency respirators to bone pins, heart pacemakers, and intrauterine devices for birth control. His 1971 message made no reference to the subject. However, aides have said a bill would be forthcoming.

In numerous other ways this "greatest, most important consumer message" resembled a modern breakfast cereal—over-advertised, sugar-coated, and low in nutrition. As Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Washington Democrat, pointed out, Mr. Nixon somehow managed to ignore "the one area of perhaps the greatest consumed frustration and inequity: auto insurance abuses."

To his credit, or, possibly, because he bowed to political necessity, the President proposed legislation to fix minimum safety standards for consumer products used in and around households. But again he wants crucial authority vested in one of his own appointees—in this case, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; under this arrangement actual and potential campaign contributors would not find it difficult to apply heat to HEW through the White House. This approach was *not* the one urged by the National Commission on Product Safety before it went out of business last summer; it asked for an *independent* commission to set and enforce product-safety standards.

When the President made a bitter-end fight to put G. Harrold Carswell on the Supreme Court, he lost—but won support from white Southerners. When he approved the raid on Sontay, he failed to free any POWs—but profitably identified himself with their cause. And when in his consumer message he continued to resist creation of an independent consumer protection agency, he presumably knew he would lose, because on Capitol Hill there is massive bipartisan support for such an agency—but presumably he also knew that grateful businessmen would express their appreciation in the form of campaign contributions.

It would be erroneous and unfair to suggest that there are no worthwhile proposals in the message; there are. One would strengthen the Federal Trade Commission's power to act against deceptive practices. Even here, however, Mr. Nixon would deny the agency power to impose criminal penalties for willful fraud and to require compensation of defrauded consumers. The forward steps in the message, as Representative Benjamin S. Rosenthal, New York Democrat, justly said, "are outweighed by half-steps, side-steps, and back-steps to confuse and mislead the consumer."

JUDGE KETTMANN HONORED IN FIGHT AGAINST EYE DISEASE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that I can have the pleasure of pointing out to my colleagues and the American people selfless and humane activities such as those carried on by Judge Gerard J. Kettmann of the San Jose-Milpitas-Alviso Municipal Court in California. Judge Kettmann, who was recently awarded the fourth annual Genevieve Mettelstaedt Carbert Award for distinguished service to ophthalmology, has been instrumental in the fight against blinding glaucoma, diabetes, and amblyopia. He has been active in the program in San Jose, Calif., to provide free tests for these horrible diseases so they can be treated in time to prevent blindness. The Federal Government has been trying, more and more so over the past few years, to improve the medical care available to the American people, and especially to make necessary treatment available to people who cannot afford it. However, we have seen that the care provided to Americans is not always adequate. Some people are not covered under any program. Some kinds of preventive, but absolutely necessary, medical services are not available to all, and perhaps even most, people who need it. We owe our sincere thanks to individuals like Judge Kettmann who have worked vigorously to bridge this gap. Let him be an example to the rest of the Nation for what can be accomplished through dedicated and unselfish efforts.

A LETTER FROM ATHENS

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, in February I proposed the issuance of a commemorative stamp to honor the 150th anniversary of Greek independence. In this regard, I received a letter from Athens, Greece, which is deeply appreciated. It is a pleasure to insert this letter into the RECORD:

ATHENS, GREECE, *March 5, 1971.*

DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.

HONORABLE FRIEND AND CONGRESSMAN MR. CARNEY: Your proposal in the United States Congress that a special (commemorative) stamp be issued on the occasion of the Anniversary Year of Greek National Freedom, as well as your speech which followed that proposal, deeply moved the Greek People and their Government.

The Central Government Committee in charge of the Program of Celebration, during its meeting of March 3, 1971, under my chairmanship, unanimously decided that we express to you our warmest thanks for your kind sentiments inspired by philhellenic ideals, and for your constructive participation in the celebrations of our Country.

The Greek Nation taught freedom and has been its defender for thousands of years, having repeatedly been consumed in fire and having risen from its own ashes like the phoenix. It remains now and it will remain forever on the ramparts as the champion of Freedom. Today it (the Greek Nation) is doing nothing more than working creatively towards substantiation in depth of its Freedom and fortification of its eternal ideas and of its way of Life, which it taught (to humanity).

With our friendliest sentiments,

STYL. PATTAKOS,

Deputy Prime Minister of the Greek Government, Chairman of the Central Government Committee on the Program of Celebration of the Sesquicentennial of (the Greek Revolution of) 1821.

KERNERSVILLE, N.C., CELEBRATES BICENTENNIAL

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call my colleagues' attention to a great celebration in Kernersville, N.C., on the occasion of that community's 200th birthday.

This bicentennial celebration has been the object of a great deal of attention throughout North Carolina, and a great deal of justifiable pride to the people of Kernersville, for several weeks.

President Nixon has sent a letter to the citizens of Kernersville expressing his congratulations. The North Carolina General Assembly has honored the community, and other leaders of government and the private sector have sent personal messages of praise for the people of this community, which is older than this Nation's independence.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in some of the proceedings that have marked this wonderful celebration. A great deal of credit goes to Mr. John M. Pinnix III, chairman of the celebration, and to a large number of Kernersville citizens who made the celebration a time to remember.

It was my pleasure to attend the opening festivities of the bicentennial celebration, and I only hope that when the United States reaches its 200th birthday 5 years from now, the national celebration will be as spirited as the one in Kernersville was last week.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two articles from the March 28, 1971, edition of the Winston-Salem Sunday Journal and Sentinel, chronicling the events and the pageantry that made the Kernersville celebration a success.

TWO HUNDRED YEARS PARADE THROUGH KERNERSVILLE

KERNERSVILLE.—Mixing past with present and a look into the future, the town of Kernersville opened yesterday a week-long celebration of its 200th birthday.

Several thousand people—the actual number was estimated at anywhere from 4,000 to 8,000—turned out yesterday morning to watch a parade of costumed marchers, bands, horses, oxen and old cars roll down Main Street.

The celebration had its formal opening at a ceremony in Harmon Park, just west of the town center, at noon. The ceremony was attended by three congressmen and more than a dozen other office-holders.

The first performance of a historical drama, "In His Hand," was staged last night at Kernersville Elementary School. It will be repeated Thursday, Friday, and Saturday nights.

The one thing that had worried the celebration's planners, the weather, was no problem as the bicentennial started.

The day was bright and clear, and by midafternoon the three inches of snow that fell Friday had either melted or been turned into snowballs and snowmen. The temperatures rose to the 50's, and overcoats were rapidly shed.

The only irritation was the snow that remained on sloping store roofs and awnings during the parade, dripping incessantly onto onlookers. But it was of little consequence.

The procession of buckboards, bands, buggies—every one surrey with fringe on top—enchanted children. In addition, it seemed to bring out every old car buff in the county.

Mixed in with the horses and oxen was everything from a 1913 electric car to a 1960 Rolls Royce. One entry, Hubert Foltz' 1949 Dodge, even won the entry prize for the period 1927–1951.

The bicentennial is essentially a commemoration of the past. One of its high points is a 200-year exhibition of tools and handicrafts which opened yesterday afternoon in Paddison Memorial Library.

The exhibit contains old uniforms, lingerie, a copy of an 1831 newspaper, farm implements, glassware, something called a "left-handed pitcher," pictures, maps and quilts.

Yet there was ample attention to the present and future in the bicentennial. Yesterday afternoon, that meant a band from East Forsyth High School which staged an impromptu rock concert on the deserted parade rostrum.

The town will bury a time capsule Wednesday in front of the library containing everything from phone books to mail order catalogs. The town fathers are to open it in 2021.

Both Mayor Roger Swisher of Kernersville and John Wolfe, parade chairman, said they were highly pleased with the parade and ceremony.

Swisher declined to make a precise estimate of the crowd. "But I think we had more people than we do residents," he said. "It's working out splendid."

After the parade and opening ceremony, more than 1,000 of the participants and onlookers crowded into the fellowship room of the United Methodist Church for a four-hour barbecue.

The luncheon included a number of former residents returning for the celebration.

Homecoming will be today in all the town's churches, and a lantern vesper service will be tonight at 7:30 at the United Methodist Church. The library exhibition will be open from 3 p.m. to 5 p.m. today.

COSTUMES VARY IN AGE, STYLE

"Watch what you say today," advised a woman in the exhibition room at Kernersville's library. "You'll tell your age in a hurry."

She was looking over a collection of old lingerie and other sartorial knick-knacks put together as part of the town's 200th anniversary celebration. And her words expressed well the diversity of clothing.

Cedar chests from Old Salem to Kernersville and back again popped open for the celebration—some probably for the first time since the centennial.

There were ruffles, frills, maxi-skirts (at least today they would be called that), high button shoes, derbies, and countless other things so old that many of them are back in style.

For the most part, the participants in the festivities wore them pretty well.

Mayor Roger Swisher said he was comfortable with his beard, and doesn't plan to shave it off until the Wednesday after the celebration, 10 days away.

Some of those people who couldn't bring themselves to grow something purchased false beards or mustaches for the occasion.

Several people were wearing knickers they rented for the week from Old Salem. One boy wore a pair of knickers his mother had put together from a pair of regular pants.

(Cut off about the last 18 inches, hem them up, and insert a piece of elastic through the hem, or something like that, he said.)

"They say they're coming back," said one man who rented knickers from Old Salem. "They're okay for this. But if they show up on the golf course I'm going to give up golf."

There were several oddities. Miss Betty Ann Korner, who won the best-dressed-child award, was dressed in Revolutionary war clothing, but dressed as a boy.

So many men were wearing black beards, derbies and dark suits that after a while it became difficult to tell them apart.

The dress produced various opinions. W. O. Barrett told Rep. Wilmer Mizell that "some of those old gentlemen look pretty well."

"I wish we could turn the whole thing back 200 years," he said.

A 9-year-old boy munching barbecue looked at it differently. "In another 100 years they'll be having a tricentennial," he told his mother. "Do you think they'll be wearing clothes like us?"

VETERANS' REACTION TO CALLEY VERDICT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, letters and telegrams not only from my constituents but from all sections of the Nation continue flowing into my offices in large numbers. Without exception they are vehement in their disgust with and denunciation of the Calley verdict. The messages come from mothers, fathers, wives of servicemen, veterans, teachers, civics classes, public officials, laborers, and various other groups. I have even received mail and telephone calls from people who told me they had never before contacted a Congressman.

The consensus of the feeling of most veterans is that the verdict could result in complete demoralization of the Armed Forces and that if Calley is not exonerated, every bombardier in the Air Force and every naval gunner who ever bombarded populated areas should have to stand trial. Veterans have also expressed condemnation of persons of high positions in Washington, D.C. who have allowed the court martial and of the national news media for the "un-American" manner in which the activities of the case were presented to the public.

I insert in the RECORD a few of the messages typical of those received from veterans, an editorial from "The News" of Lynchburg, Va., and an article entitled "A Veteran's Opinion" from the Austin Statesman:

[Telegram]

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
March 30, 1971.

Congressman JOHN R. RARICK,
Washington, D.C.:

The 2,800 members of Nicholson Post No. 38, the American Legion, urge you to contact the President and ask that he reverse the decision of the trial jury of Lt. William L. Calley as we feel that the decision could result in complete demoralization of those now in uniform.

WADE M. LEMOINE,
Commander,
Nicholson Post No. 38.

[Protest]

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
March 31, 1971.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
U.S. Congressman,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: Please afford me this opportunity to utilize your services as my representative in Congress to protest the unbelievably wretched treatment of Lt. Wm. Calley, United States Army.

I lodge protest not only as an American citizen, but also as a Vietnam casualty and as a present member of the United States Army Reserve.

Two years past this month, I was medivaced from RVN after having served as an infantryman with the Fourth Division. Should I tomorrow receive a call to active duty, in light of Calley's crucifixion, I would have serious reservations about complying.

I hold in contempt not primarily the callousness of six jurors, but rather the un-American activities of the national news media as well as those persons of high position in Washington, D.C. who have allowed the court martial.

Enclosed is a letter sent this day to the President of the United States.

Thanking you in advance for standing up for the American soldier, I am

Respectfully yours,

CHARLES S. KOON.

[Protest]

BATON ROUGE, LA.,
March 31, 1971.

RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: May I introduce myself: I am an American citizen. I am a veteran of Vietnam (Fourth Division, Nov. 68–Mar. 69). I am disabled from wounds received in Vietnam March 11, 1969 from hostile mortar fire.

I wish to use this means to protest the treatment of Lt. William Calley, United States Army.

I wish to call upon *you* to stand-up for the American soldier. *I* stood up against the NVA while you were behind safe doors in Washington. Is this not a reasonable request?

If Calley is to be punished for serving his country in the most demanding sense, then I hereby call upon you to prosecute me also, for I am indeed guilty of that same "crime".

CHARLES S. KOON.

MARCH 31, 1971.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: The trial of Lt. Calley is a disgrace to our country. As a former infantryman and infantry officer, I believe he is being made a scapegoat. You as our Congressman must do all in your power to stop this miscarriage of justice. John, as you know I am a veteran of both WW II and Korea conflict.

How can you as our representative ask us to be good Americans and send our sons to fight. I have always been proud of my Army record but after today I am ashamed to say I served in the same Army that court martialed this live officer for doing his duty by following orders.

John, do what you can to help this poor man.

Yours very truly,

LEON S. "BUBBER" GEISWAR.

P.S. I will make a motion at the next School Board Meeting to stop all Army Recruiting in our school until Lt. Calley is free.

COVINGTON, LA.,
March 31, 1971.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
Member of Congress, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RARICK: The verdict of guilty for Lt. Calley came to me and the members of my family like a bombshell. This is a most stunning, numbing and unbelievable edict.

True, Lt. Calley no doubt had his faults in his conduct under fire. But where is the justice of it all?

The United States is fighting an illegal, undeclared war, but does anyone face trial

for the murder of our own troops who were committed to death by an unauthorized action?

Sir, if Lt. Calley's verdict sticks, then every bombardier in the Air Force and every naval gunner who bombarded populated areas will have to stand trial. There would have to be civilian casualties during mass bombings and naval bombardments; all premeditated, as the air and naval strikes were pre-planned.

As an Army veteran, and as the father of a son in the Marine Corps, I vociferously denounce this injustice born of an illegal war and killing perpetuated through Presidential commitments of prior administrations.

I urge you, sir, to do all in your power to aid this young man. There must be a way!

My wife, Verna, joins me in sending our warmest regards to you, Weetsie and family.

Very truly yours,

JAMES O. JOHNSON.

[From the Lynchburg (Va.) News, Apr. 2, 1971]

THE DAMAGE DONE—

The view that the My Lai killings were unjustifiable and indefensible is itself unjustifiable and indefensible. Since when have normal codes of conduct applied to men fighting for their lives in the heat of battle?

In World War Two towns with civilian populations were levelled by artillery to remove the menace of German troops fighting from within the walls. And American pilots were decorated for devastating cities—including residential blocks, hospitals, schools, et cetera—with bombs. There were many, many instances when American troops did not bother to take prisoners, nor give the enemy—in Europe and the Pacific—an opportunity to surrender.

But the people generally approved that war. Massacres committed in a war the people approve, evidently, are viewed as justifiable. When committed in a war the people do not approve, they are abhorred, and someone has to pay.

In war, the individual is trained and ordered to kill. And the line between when to kill and whom to kill is mighty fine, indeed.

We, along with most Americans, are appalled by what happened at My Lai. But we can't escape the obligation that we have to the men committed to the battle in the name of all Americans. In that sense, the conviction of Lt. William Calley, Jr., applies to all of us. If we condemn him, we condemn ourselves—through our elected officials—for ordering him into battle, for putting a gun into his hand and giving him command of men similarly trained and armed, and placing him in situations where massacres are possible.

During the Tet offensive, the North Vietnamese massacred many thousands of human beings in Hue, but no hue and cry was raised in this country. Those massacres were viewed as inevitable in war. Nor have we as a people condemned the Communist for a relentless campaign of murder and terror in South Vietnam.

We have sent our men into battles which they have not been permitted to win, and forced them to fight under rules the enemy does not observe. Even while drafting and sending them to that war, we have condemned them and the war.

The verdict of the Calley trial was anticlimatic. It is important now only on an individual level, to the man convicted. The damage has been done. Morale and discipline in the American armed forces have suffered a serious set-back. Already troops are questioning the orders of their officers, and some officers are hesitant to issue orders even when necessary to protect their men because they fear reprisals and possible court-martial.

The following excerpts from a letter written by a Marine to his Congressman, document the effect this trial has had upon our men in the field:

"The reason I am writing to you is because of the way things are going since this Lt. Calley incident. The Marine Corps is afraid to fight because of it. It's gotten so bad that the hierarchy is afraid to allow us to fight back for fear of hurting an innocent civilian. For instance, last week we were catching sniper fire. We spoted the sniper and we radioed COC to get permission to shoot. Our request was denied. One of the men from the 106 platoon requested most. He was told that we couldn't get permission to shoot because the hierarchy was afraid of another My Lai incident.

"* * * Back in December, while I was on watch, myself and the people in my hole spotted some gooks about 200 meters outside our wire, after curfew. They had rifles but they weren't going to attack us. They were just checking out our area to more or less see how alert we were. Well, the officer of the day wouldn't allow us to shoot at them because they weren't inside our wire. Am I supposed to wait until I see the slant in their eyes?"

This is the legacy of My Lai. It has corroded the will of the individual soldier and officer in the field, and the corrosion will continue. Right now there is a serious question, indeed, whether Americans will consent to fight even in defense of their country. The public has taken the view, if the polls can be believed, that defeat is preferable to sacrifice, that there is no disgrace in a surrender thinly disguised as "withdrawal."

We have been beaten in Vietnam, not by the enemy, but by our lack of will to win. And only a fool would expect that we can resurrect that will even to survive. Mr. Nixon may have been ominously right in his recent statement that there will be no more wars—because we may refuse to fight them.

Why should men consent to sacrifice their lives in war when they can't trust the people, in whose place they fight, to support them?

[From the Austin (Tex.) Statesman, Mar. 31, 1971]

A VETERAN'S OPINION

OBITUARY—U.S. ARMY

The U.S. Army, mortally wounded at My Lai on March 16, 1968, died Monday at the age of more than 194 years at Ft. Benning, Ga.

Survivors include three brothers, the U.S. Air Force, the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps. However, all may be suffering from the same affliction to which the Army succumbed.

The mother also survives, but she is left without visible means of support.

The Army was preceded in death by Discipline, Obedience, Pride, Honor, Sacrifice and Patriotism.

They have been succeeded by Anarchy, Civil Disobedience, Shame, Defeat, Selfishness and Apathy.

The death was announced by a general court martial of six men. Funeral rites apparently will be pending for a number of months while relatives are being returned from Vietnam for the final interment.

Pallbearers will include Senators ——, —— and ——.

Officiating at the funeral rites will be recent justices of the U.S. Supreme Court and the heads of state of the Soviet Union, North Vietnam and Red China.

All members of the funeral procession have not been determined, but honorary pallbearers will include moratorium marchers.

In lieu of flowers, mourners may send old campaign ribbons and victory medals from the Korean Conflict, the Berlin Airlift, World Wars I and II, the Spanish American War and other skirmishes which the nation attempted to win.

Burial will be in the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

NAT HENDERSON.

THE UNITED STATES NAVY—AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union is engaged in developing a naval and maritime program designed to make the USSR number one. In an era of "nuclear parity" between the United States and the Soviet Union, it is essential that we be assured of our ability to respond to limited conventional aggression in meeting our foreign commitments and in aiding our allies as implied in the Nixon doctrine.

The United States must, therefore, replace our aging ships with the most modern fleet, both convention and nuclear, that our technology can provide.

Adm. Arleigh Burke, writing in the editorial opinion page of the New York Times, March 2, 1971, discusses the unique role naval power can provide in contributing to peace and security as our ground troops are withdrawn from South Vietnam as well as in other parts of the world.

Admiral Burke served as Chief of Naval Operations from 1955 to 1961 and is currently chairman of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Washington, D.C. Admiral Burke's statement follows:

THE UNITED STATES NAVY—AND SOUTHEAST ASIA

(By Admiral Arleigh Burke)

The United States is now withdrawing its ground forces from Vietnam—all critics to the contrary notwithstanding. But this withdrawal will not reduce the requirement for an American strategy offering some hope to the nations of Asia that the United States has an interest in their future.

This hope is implied strongly in the Nixon Doctrine, which, despite all its ambiguities, means in essence that the United States will meet its commitments and aid its allies and others wishing our support by supplying weapons and material for indigenous forces and also be assisting their ground troops with our air power, fire power, and logistics.

The only way this Doctrine can be fulfilled is through a strong maritime strategy. The strategy will require a hard-hitting modern naval force in readiness, not only in Vietnam, but in other parts of the world as well. The strategy will be effective only if it is implemented with the appropriate combat ready capabilities able to undertake the necessary operations promptly, as well as "show the flag" in all the oceans of the world.

The final control of an area in any post-Vietnam war will, as always, be determined by the foot soldiers, but in the future, given the changed political and military environment, the United States will expect the foot soldiers to be supplied by the indigenous powers. America cannot lend its support to such indigenous powers, let alone conduct any of its own military operations overseas, unless it has the naval power to maintain control of the seas in the area of conflict, as well as the sea lines of communication between the war threater and the United States. As the United States reduces its combat forces on the ground in Vietnam the South Vietnamese are doing a splendid job in developing a ground warfare capability. Yet even after they take full responsibility for all ground combat it is still possible that they may some day need quick fire power support and, if such is the case, it will be

necessary for the United States Navy and Marine Corps to provide it. Beyond this, assuming the South Vietnamese hold their own and bring the war to an end, the United States must continue to have adequate Marine forces afloat to deter potential reemergence of the conflict in Vietnam or to assist the Vietnamese in dealing with aggression, should deterrence fail. These forces should be capable of intervening quickly and being withdrawn quickly once they have made their contribution to the restoration of peace and stability in the area—much like they were able to do so successfully in the Lebanon in 1958. This ability to engage decisively and disengage quickly is the inherent strength of a maritime strategy. It has been neglected or ignored by most post-World War II administrations in the United States, even those committed to a strategy of maximizing military flexibility.

While the United States has been historically considered a sea power and the Soviet Union a land power, it is the Soviets who recently have been making the greatest effort to bolster their sea power, as we can see in the Mediterranean, east of Suez, and now it would appear even in the Caribbean. Significantly, they have placed equal emphasis on building both nuclear and conventional naval capabilities.

The Soviets have already had success in reorienting political thinking in the Mediterranean. This is particularly noticeable in the changed policies of Turkey and Iran, who have adopted more neutral policies as they see signs provided by the ample presence of the Soviet Navy to the south of them that the Soviet Union will eventually dominate this area.

This changing attitude in such countries as Iran and Turkey may well be duplicated in other areas of the world, and particularly in the area east of Suez, including southeast Asia. If there is no U.S. military presence to give these indigenous nations confidence, inevitably they will feel the necessity of adjusting their policies to accommodate the only other major powers in the region, which in the near future will be the Soviet Union, and at some later date possibly communist China.

In conclusion, the United States has left only the option of a maritime strategy and its implementation. This will require a very large and modern navy capable of "showing the flag" and conducting the necessary supporting military operations in all areas of the world. The question is rapidly arising as to whether the U.S. Navy will long be capable of meeting this great responsibility. Its capability is now marginal due largely to the age and neglect of our surface fleets. The decision must be made now to develop rapidly the kind of modern navy needed to effectively implement a maritime policy and strategy. This will be as true for southeast Asia as it is for areas as close to our shores as the Caribbean.

If we do not pursue the only acceptable strategy open to us under the Nixon Doctrine, i.e., a peripheral maritime strategy, then the United States will be unable to adequately support our various treaty commitments around the world, and we will also be setting ourselves on a course destined to relegate us to the status of a second-rate power. Such a development will be neither in the interests of the United States nor world stability.

NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION

HON. BILL D. BURLISON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. BURLISON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of leadership for the nationwide National Farmers Organization has come from my State of Missouri. As you know, the president of many years past, Oren Lee Staley, is from Missouri. The organization's cotton division chief, Murray Wallace, is from my congressional district—Gideon, in New Madrid County and in the heart of the Missouri-Mississippi Delta Bootheel.

In the most recent edition of the NFO Reporter, that in March 1971, appears an article concerning the work of my constitutent. I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point, for perusal by my colleagues, excerpts from this article:

Cotton, blocked together in a phased program, has already delivered powerhouse results to NFO farmers, and promises to make secure one of collective bargaining's most impressive breakthroughs. Some NFO farmers have seen specialty cotton prices increase as much as $20 a bale in the wake of block bargaining, according to Murray Wallace, the organization's Cotton Division chief. Prices improved on all common varieties within days after NFO rolled out its three-phase program.

The NFO push came in the wake of a $10 per bale price drop, a development that put cotton well below the new loan level. Trade practices had long used the support price loan level as a floor, and bid for market cotton at prices above the loan. In August 1970 the running average stood at near 22 cents for mechanically harvested cotton, a figure that approximated the loan level.

Loan levels are complicated, running on an almost county by county basis, with numerous variations for type and production territory. The averages used by crop reporting services merely reflect an arithmetical figure, and not the spot situation that exists across the 13 cotton states.

In the wake of sinking prices last winter, NFO's cotton program pulled into gear. Starting in January, NFO regulars launched a cotton signup and made secure blocks of production on bill of sale. Three block phases characterized the program and insured its probable success.

The base bargaining block came first. Growers who put their production with the NFO bargaining program were asked to earmark 10% of their signup with the base bargaining block.

"Needless to say," commented Murray Wallace, "this 10% cut deep in the trade channel traffic. It simply wasn't available except through NFO's bargained supply contracts, and that in itself drove prices off the tired old floor."

To handle the workaday job of driving cotton prices off the floor, Wallace set up Cotton Bargaining Headquarters at Gideon, Missouri in the Show-Me State's bootheel cotton base. Staffers blocked out the 13 cotton states and ran through an endless inventory of contacts.

Out of the Gideon, Missouri headquarters for cotton, Charles Holiman set up the machinery for covering Missouri, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee and Alabama.

With a 10% base bargaining block in tow, and more cotton in a 30% backup block for pre-harvest bargaining available to the NFO teams, the market responded.

"Several developments took place almost immediately," Wallace reported at press time.

1. Almost all of the 10% base bargaining block was in fact bargained under supply contracts. In California the price inched back above the support level floor and returned to farmers the $10 per 500 pound bale that sinking markets had taken away. Moving from California, Arizona, and Texas east into the rainbelt south, cotton prices climbed simply because NFO bargaining instruments had to be matched by the trade.

2. The 30% pre-harvest supply contracts fell into harness, and are still working. With harvest starting July 1, the upward price pressure has a while to run, and each week of that running accounts for stair-stepped upward price pressure.

3. Phase three will roll into motion at harvest. Under the NFO program, 30% of the cotton earmarked for the program after machines move through the fields this year will have its price level determined by farmers bargaining together and selling together.

"The program is working," Wallace pointed out, "because cotton farmers understand what the trade is doing when it tries to break up an NFO block. We'll keep advancing prices area by area. Right now, the trade is coming to NFO."

The big sweep through the cotton country started off with seven county zone meetings. By blocks of counties, growers elected bargaining teams for workaday assignments under the four regional supervisors. Touring the cotton country and meeting the mill owners and processors at the trade's front door resulted in hundreds of contracts.

"We've had tremendous signups," Wallace summarized. "As a broad observation, we can say we moved the cotton price up from $10 to $15 a bale across the board at spot markets since January 7."

SOUTH DAKOTAN PRAISED IN A JOURNALISTIC MASTERPIECE

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, on March 10, my friend and colleague Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN inserted a biographical sketch of me in the RECORD and I was deeply honored. At this time I want to call the attention of this body to another excellent article by the same fine journalist, Mr. Bill Wagner, formerly of the Rapid City Guide.

This article is a profile of my friend and former law associate, ex-State Senator Frank B. Henderson of Hill City, S. Dak. The story tells how Frank, in a low-budget, one-man campaign took on and nearly defeated the incumbent Governor of our State in the 1970 Republican primary.

I especially commend this article to my friends on the other side of the aisle, because Frank Henderson is both a Republican and a man of the people:

HENDERSON TAKES ON GOP MACHINE

(By Bill Wagner)

Things are distinctly not what they used to be for Sen. Frank Henderson.

A few short weeks ago, nobody would have put a dime on his candidacy. Now the entrenched Republican regime is shaking in its collective boots out of fear that the lawyer-rancher from Hill City may very well pull off the biggest political upset in the history of the state.

The Republican machine politicians began to pull their hair when the South Dakota Poll showed the man, whose chances they had written off, with 44 per cent in the contest for the GOP nomination for governor.

For Henderson, it was a vindication of his belief that things are not what they should be in the Republican party, plus that in the final analysis it is the voice of the people that not only should be heard, but counted.

All this is nothing new for Henderson. Throughout his political career he has been

a fly in the ointment of the well-oiled GOP machine, but in Pennington County and on the state level. But efforts to muzzle him have failed and now he stands within striking distance of the governor's mansion.

In an age of campaigning with the aid of advance men, media specialists and heavy advertising budgets, Henderson stands out as some kind of anachronism, a throwback to the past when a candidate for public office took his case to the people by personal appearances and speeches. Henderson's "organization," if you can call it that, is a friend here, a friend there and lots of void in between.

He tries to fill that void by taking his candidacy to the people, shaking as many hands as possible and speaking whenever he gets the chance. He is his own press man, his own advance man. On the campaign trail, he starts early and quits late. His main theme is "throw the rascal out," but he also offers a positive program of progress as he treks up and down the state. Henderson these days is buoyed up by the poll results and is almost rejuvenated by his prospects.

Henderson is many things to many people. He is recognized at once as articulate, a fighter; to some as a spoiler and an irritant. Now he is a candidate for governor and when no one else was really taking him seriously, the people did and Henderson is confident more people will between now and the June 2 primary.

A little while on the Henderson campaign trail tells much about the man, his feelings and how he hopes to shatter precedent by unseating the incumbent Republican governor. The evening before he left for a campaign swing scheduled for eastern South Dakota Henderson and a couple of the older of his seven children were stuffing one-page brochures in envelopes for statewide mailing. Wife Norma was away making her campaign debut speaking before the union auxiliary in Lead.

Clad in a pair of blue jeans in his modest ranch home a few miles south of Hill City, the Pennington County State Senator was discussing his aims and aspirations, fears and frustrations. His monologue is occasionally interrupted by one of his sons filling him in on the basketball scores, requests for more envelopes and the normal household banter. His well-behaved children field his questions with a quaint "Yes, sir . . . No, sir."

Henderson makes no secret of the fact that he's happy in Hill City. "Look at those stars," he says walking outside on a clear night. "Did you ever see anything like that. Listen to the creek running. I love it here," he says commenting that he won't have lost much if he fails in his election bid, leaving him free to go about his way in the pine covered hills of the Hill City area.

Henderson's day begins early: he's got 80 head of cattle and 23 horses to feed and care for on the few hundred acres he rents and leases around Hill City. Armed with a pitchfork, he tosses the 80-pound bales of hay onto his pickup as if they were matchsticks. He calls the cows for chow, throwing a bale here and bale there and then spreading the hay out. He enthusiastically describes the type of hay he's feeding the animals like a chef describing the day's prize entree. Every now and then he philosophizes about his cows: "Some of them are just like people. They're selfish. But I have to be sure they all get enough to eat."

Helping him with the chores are his two youngest sons, John and Eric. They tug away at the heavy bales a bit until dad comes along to pull them off. Then they scamper off the back of the truck to pick up the bales' twine bindings. Needless to say, they and the rest of the other Henderson five children are the apples of Frank's eye and one of the main reasons that he forsook a lucrative fulltime law practice in Rapid City to divide his time between his law work in Rapid City and Hill City, the Henderson Pine Rest Motel and the ranch.

After he's wound up feeding his stock, Henderson climbs into a size 54 suit and prepares for an outing into eastern South Dakota. He gets a report from wife Norma about her outing to Lead the night before. He stops in his office in Hill City looking for an elusive political questionnaire from the East River Guardian requesting his views for that publication's readers. After a hectic half hour he finds it and he's set for a three-day excursion to eastern points in the state. At the airport, an unbidden man walks up to him and gives him a $25 donation—larger than most, but typical of the way Henderson raises funds: people just give him money, unasked and unsolicited.

Along the way, he tells his story of his lifelong fight bucking the Republican organization. "The entrenched special interests have fought me ever since I've been in politics and now today 15 years later I'm running for governor and they're not sure they can beat me."

He mentions the banks as one of these special interests and remembers he was the only senator to speak against the "banker's bill"—the law which raised the usury limit in South Dakota to 10 per cent. After that speech in the legislature, one state senator, a banker, came up to him and remarked caustically, "Thanks a hell of a lot, Frank."

And since then they've been paying him back. He was scheduled to give the main address at the Jefferson, S.D., Chamber of Commerce banquet a while back when the "Sioux Falls banking interests" got wind of it. They did their utmost to cancel his appearance. As it happened the furor only intensified the interest of the Jefferson populace to hear Henderson, although he was forced to an unofficial part of the program. His speech came after the banquet had formally closed, although only four of the 125 there left before he spoke. After he was through speaking, a Henderson for Governor club was formed. "I was stirred by the attempt to eliminate freedom of speech I fought for in the Korean War . . . I talked for an hour and when I got through it was the first time in the history of that little town that they gave a standing ovation."

This is typical of the type of frustrations that confront Henderson as he tries to take his message to the people of South Dakota. He tells of a time not too long ago when the Young Republicans in Madison invited him to speak. When an announcement came out in the local paper that Frank was slated to speak, the county GOP chairman was up in arms. He told the YGOP chairman in no uncertain terms that he cleared all the Republican speakers who came to Lake County and that YGOP was just an auxiliary of the Republican party. The lady YGOP chairman said she'd have to suffer the consequences, and now fears her husband, a professor at Dakota State College, may lose his job over the episode. "I can only conclude they run a pretty tight ship in Lake County," observes Henderson.

Another bane of his candidacy, Henderson feels, is the state's largest newspaper, the Sioux Falls Argus Leader. "The first week I was in eastern South Dakota I turned in a release to the Argus Leader about opening up my headquarters in Sioux Falls and it wasn't used.

"Wednesday of that week they carried a 165 word release from Farrar on taxation and education, the thrust of which was, he, Frank Farrar, was going to do a great deal for education—fund the minimum foundation, but he didn't say how. He said he would wait and see how the initiated income tax measure fared and then he would decide on what kind of tax program he'd recommend and how education could move ahead.

"To me, it's inconceivable how the voters in this state could accept such mush. We've had two sessions of the legislature under Farrar and we've had no legislation at all, no plan for financially distressed school districts.

"How can he have the gall to assume he'll defeat me in the primary, the Democrat in the fall and then take a look see at the initiated income tax? What he's apparently assuming is that he need not tell what he intends to do about the two most critical obligations facing the state."

Here Henderson mentions he was up until 3:30 a.m. the morning after the Farrar release was published working on a reply. He turned it into the Argus Leader at 9:30 a.m. Henderson says he was told it was too late, and the next day he was informed it was too old.

"That same day," Henderson recalls, "the Sioux Falls Argus Leader had a picture of Farrar with a man winning a safety award. I had given them a picture of me and Jim Arness shaking hands at the Rapid City airport. Matt Dillon coming to the Black Hills apparently was not news.

"The news media is trying to portray Farrar as some sort of a superman. I went to school with Farrar and was a better student and a better ballplayer and will be a better governor. He has no feel for the people.

"From what I can understand, Farrar is trying to portray himself as quite a collegiate basketball player. The truth of the matter is he never made the squad. He's a tinsel governor," Henderson goes on, "he's not a meat and potatoes governor. He manages the news and through a barrage of publicity and public relations gimmicks foists himself on the public as some sort of brilliant young leader. Nothing," asserts Henderson, "could be further from the truth. The legislature knows it and the people in Pierre know it."

Henderson sees his battle for the governorship as one which will determine the fate of the Republican party in South Dakota: "It's a matter of what to do with the Republican party. I'm trying to interject and give it some democracy, to make it the party of the people instead of the special interests." So far, he adds, it's been largely a one man war. He has scores of stories of how the Republican party in Pennington County has played into the hands of these special interests and frustrated the party's ideals. He is especially critical of the influence Rep. E. Y. Berry and his secretary have held over the Pennington County Republican party over the years.

"It's been Frank Henderson's one man war against the tight ship. The state motto is 'Under God the People Rule'—that's the last thing they want is for the people to rule.

"The resistance to me is chiefly because of one thing: they can't control me. I do not want to destroy the Republican party. I want to breath some life into it, I want to make it democratic so the people have a voice in the party in the state. The people don't rule in Pierre, a small band of special interest groups do."

Here he cites the 10 per cent usury bill, what he dubs the "loan shark bill" passed by the 1969 session of the legislature which permits small loan rates up to 36 per cent, the pollution bill passed by the last session of the legislature, which Henderson says "legalized" through the grandfather clause industries already polluting and the defeat year after year of a bill to create a state Department of Labor. "They don't want to recognize labor in South Dakota, yet they want industry but you can't have industry without labor.

"Look at the resistance to my $1 an hour minimum wage bill. When I first put it up, I was told it would get okayed if I voted for the governor's consumer council bill. I couldn't go along with that. After it was passed Gov. Farrar sat on it as long as he could and then signed it. He then sent me a note saying 'Frank, you owe me one.' To-

day the dollar an hour bill is shot full of holes with gimmicks like provisions to deduct so much for room and board. I just learned of a girl in Custer who went to work there for 75 cents an hour. I was told the people were afraid and needed the jobs. And then they wonder why the young people leave South Dakota . . . they leave because they can't get a decent wage in South Dakota."

After his plane touches down in Aberdeen, he's telling an audience there that an "election isn't much of an election unless there's a selection . . . where there's only one candidate that sounds a lot like Russia. The old guard says I'm being devisive, but the primary is the time to clean house. I'm disturbed about democracy within our party."

He touches on other themes: "Farrar was seen as a ray of hope but he didn't take the bull by the horns . . . Frogging and jogging doesn't take care of the problems . . . You can't say the party is one individual . . . People are willing to feed their children and are willing to support education," he says as he announces his support of 40 per cent state aid to education.

Henderson's crowds usually sit there spellbound. He starts off in a low key telling them about his boyhood background in Miller where he grew up in the back of a "saloon dash cafe." He then picked up the tempo a bit as he goes into his qualifications for governor: "The United States entrusted me with a commission during the Korean war. Judge Axel Beck and the late Judge George Mickelson appointed me to the United States judiciary system as United States Commissioner and the people of Pennington County have twice elected me state senator."

Then he reaches a crescendo as he denounces the special interests which he claims control the state government. He tells his audience with the fervor and finesse of an old time evangelist "Our state motto is 'Under God, the People Rule.' I want to breath life into that beautiful expression. Our state government at Pierre is dominated by the special interests. I want to return state government to the people. It is the ordinary family struggling for existence in South Dakota that concerns me. Laws and government should be structed to protect the weak. The strong can take care of themselves."

Then the words start pouring out in a sort of measured ferocity and defiance as he denounces these special interests and charts his "blueprint for progress." The audience is with him now as he launches into a full scale attack in his oratorical style that seems like a page from the past: broad sweeping gestures, a rich resonant voice that at once is seemingly shouting and then lowers down to a whisper. On his face the expressions range from a grimace, then a smile, a frown, a look of anger, an appearance of perplexity but always the look of a man in control of the situation. To stress a point he raises an arm and then moves his bulk a few steps back and forth. The words lend themselves to his somewhat bombastic delivery: "I'm here to tell you that under God the people do not rule in this state . . . It sounds a little disloyal doesn't it, but I'd rather lose with plain talk than loose with double talk . . . The people of South Dakota are controlled by a small band o." special interests . . . Sometimes I feel like John the Baptist crying in the wildneress . . . Do I have anything good to say about Frank Farrar," he asks rhetorically, "well I won't answer that . . . The state's problems can't be solved in Rome or Israel."

Then he throws the meeting open for questions, which vary depending on the type of audience he's speaking to. Henderson doesn't pause long to think over his response, instead he fires back a forthright reply.

After he speaks, he usually meets with his key supporters in the area and more often than not sparks the formation of a Henderson for Governor Club. He sounds out the people of the town on what they think are key issues and how they estimate Farrar's standing. His big plea these days is to Farrar dissidents, especially teachers and farmers. These meetings usually run late into the night, but Henderson doesn't show the least bit of fatigue.

He's up first thing in the morning writing press releases about his speech the night before. He patiently calls them in to the wire services, newspapers and radio stations. Then he's soon out amongst the voters. He walks his giant frame down the street pausing to give voters his one page brochure. His conversation with the voters goes something like this: "I'm Frank Henderson, senator from Pennington County. I'm running for governor against Frank Farrar. I want you to look at this and give me your consideration." Sometimes he elaborates a little more depending on whether his listener is in a hurry or interested: "It's time to throw little Frankie out and put big Frankie in." Or else he'll ask about "this fellow Farrar" and how he fares in that territory.

In Aberdeen last week, he had a stroke of good fortune: he was invited to appear on a popular radio talk show for 45 minutes. Again he handled the questions with skill and ease without avoiding the issues. He left Aberdeen feeling chipper and confident: he had gotten an organization formed and he had all that air time on the radio.

His next speaking stop was in the little town of Colman, just a few miles north of Sioux Falls. He was told there was a man in the audience who had placed an ad in the Brookings paper urging the formation of a Farrar for governor organization to save the governorship for the "East River." Henderson spent a great deal of time pointing out that South Dakota is one state, and that the twain, to paraphrase Kipling, can meet. He also denounced a reported Washington cut in funds for the Rural Electric Administration. He tells his audiences in eastern South Dakota that while Farrar suffers from a poor image, he has no image.

Then again it's late to bed and early to rise. He was up early calling the media telling them what he'd done the day before. Most of the radio stations were more interested in his views about student unrest, much in the news last Saturday. He said something to the effect that while he believed in "peaceful dissent," which he pronounces "dye-sent," he was opposed to giving the students in the state a day off to meditate on the woes of the world.

He spent the rest of Saturday walking up and down the main street of Dell Rapids. He approaches a passing pedestrian with his long arm outstretched and the fingers of his ham of a hand spread apart as he reaches out to shake a hand. He tells them who he is and what he's running for. Dropping into stores he comments, "I suppose you've been hit pretty hard by politicans here, but I can claim to have come the farthest. I come from Hill City out in the Black Hills and I'm running for governor."

He talks to them as long as they are interested. While most of these people he talks to are noncommittal, many mention what they feel to be an undue amount of showboating on the governor's part.

Although he was nearly a straight "A" student in high school, he attended the University of South Dakota on an athletic scholarship. In high school at Miller, he was recognized as one of the foremost prep athletes in the state. One newspaper dubbed him the "young giant from Miller."

He was offered a full scholarship from Dakota Wesleyan University but turned it down because he wanted to study law, a profession where he felt he could help people the most. Helping people has long been one of Henderson's chief concerns, a notion he picked up from his father.

"I would have to say my father was the greatest influence on me," says Frank. His father had been a railroad engineer until he was waylaid with asthma. After that he operated a hotel and cafe in Miller and a small farm near St. Lawrence. "He was a very forthright and outspoken individual—like me he irritated some and shocked them with bluntness. I can't help but feel some of it rubbed off on me because I idolize him. He was the most generous man I think I ever knew. Back in the days of bums and hoboes on the rails I never saw him turn away a hungry man."

Those were hard but happy days. It was in his years as a tyke that Henderson picked up the nickname, "Rudy." "They called me Rudolph Valentino because they thought I was such a handsome child, but the bigger I grew the more they realized what a mistake that was and after I lost the cute stage they shortened it down to Rudy.

"I'll never forget the time out at the St. Lawrence farm my Dad looked out on a row of corn and he told me it was the most beautiful crop of corn he'd ever seen. Then came four days in July of a hot dry wind that destroyed the crop. I was with him out in the corn field watching the corn wilt before his eyes. He looked down at me and said 'Rudy, I'm dying just like that corn crop.' I look back on it and I think what he meant was his spirit and dreams of saving the farm were dying . . . I don't think a day goes by that I don't say a prayer for the soul of my father. We used to go through western South Dakota and see deserted farmhouses and he would say 'Rudy, somebody had a dream.'

"I always think of that when I see deserted farmhouses. It is no different now. The people are migrating off the farms and it's something I hate to see. It was the family farm that gave South Dakota its strength and character. I have a very sympathetic attitude for the people of South Dakota who are trying to save their way of life. I think of that wilting corn crop and of my father's statement 'Rudy, somebody had a dream' as I campaign for governor. I sense in this campaign that I will get the vote of the rural people. It was these kind of feelings toward the rural people the governor's bill (the gas-utility regulation bill) that would have hurt rural life."

Here he pauses his narrative as he's driving from Aberdeen to Colman to comment "I like this country. The rolling hills and pastures make me feel at home." A bit later he pulls over to the side of the road to admire some cattle. "Do you know what they are," he asks. "They're Holsteins and they're heifers."

Henderson has always had an urge to excel, whether as a child prodigy at checkers, in sports and scholastic endeavors both in school and college and as an officer in the Army during the Korean War. Although he was a platoon leader, he spent most of his time serving as liaison officer and adviser to the regimental commander. One time when several young officers had been wiped out during some particularly heavy fighting, one of the colonel's aides suggested he send Henderson in to fill the gap. "I can't spare Henderson for dog meat," was the colonel's reply. Frank did see his share of the action but refuses to discuss it at all other than to say "I'm not a textbook fighter of communism."

After his honorable discharge from the army following 14 months in Korea and a near fatal bout with malaria, he hung out his shingle as a lawyer in Rapid City. He was drawn to the law because "essentially I wanted to help people and essentially that's what I want to do as governor." He was also influenced by former U.S. Senator and Gov-

ernor Harlan Bushfield, a resident of Miller. "There were some great lawyers in the little town of Miller. Bushfield was a distinguished looking man—his carriage, his whole countenance bore respectability. I also noticed when I read history and government that a great number of people who led and helped this democracy usually had a legal education.

"The basic reason lawyers exist is to help people protect their rights. It isn't to make money. Oliver Wendell Holmes said once that lawyers are not mere grubbers in the muck heap of the world. A lawyer owes a responsibility to be in public life to serve his state and nation more than any responsibility to make money. If I'm neglecting my law practice to serve in public life, if that's a sin, I'm guilty."

Although Henderson has been called a maverick within the Republican party, he feels he shares the heritage of the party than most. "I think one of the things that attracted me to the party was its founder, Abraham Lincoln. He was a man with great compassion for people. He was the first civil rights president and also made remarks about the workman being entitled to his just wages. Lincoln is on Mount Rushmore, so is Theodore Roosevelt the trust buster and conservationist whose credo was the common man. They were the two greatest Republican presidents. Whose the true proponent of the Republican party—the old clique or Frank Henderson?"

During his formative years he was influenced by South Dakota's progressive Republican Sen. Peter Norbeck and Sens. LaFollette and Norris. "They were my kind of Republicans. They were just like Roosevelt and Lincoln. I don't want the Republican party to be just simply against programs. Where the Democrats lose me is with their tax, spend, elect philosophy. I think the Republican party has been the party of fiscal responsibility. One of my hangups with the Democratic party is that I don't believe in a strong federal government."

Henderson has come a long way from the days of a struggling young lawyer who had to borrow law books and do his own typing. His pride and joy is his family. That's one of the reasons he moved to Hill City in the first place. "Being on the ranch gives me a chance to work with my boys. I'm raising those boys to be men, not pets. The boys don't want to leave the ranch to go to Pierre but I told them if I got to be governor I'd find a horse pasture and have the family horses there and they were relieved. The girls have heard there's an automatic dishwasher in the governor's mansion and they seemed more interested in that than Daddy getting to be governor."

All told there are seven young Hendersons—Stacey, nine months, John, 4; Kimberly, 11; Frank, 12; Eric, 6; Andrea, 8; and Pat, 10. "They all seem to take a great interest in the ranch and the animals and seem to enjoy it. They like to feed the baby calves and I think the children are enriched greatly by living on a place where there are animals . . . They like to fish in the creeks and go for hikes; even little Johnny and Eric will take a canteen and a sack of sandwiches and hike up into the hills. Life out there puts something into the kids that money can't buy."

A convert to Catholicism six months before he married Norma in 1956, Henderson particularly likes the church life in Hill City "because it's a small church and the religion is very personal. Another thing is that the kids get to serve mass more often." Henderson's mother, Hilda of Rapid City, still spry at 80 and an immigrant from Norway as a young girl, is also a convert to Catholicism.

Henderson isn't particularly concerned about what people think about him. Instead, he says, "I want to be a man of principal, not popularity—that blows with the winds. I want to be respected by the legislature. I don't think I have always been liked by the legislature, but I've had their respect."

At the moment Henderson is extremely confident. He predicts to one and all that the next statewide poll will show him even higher, and, come election day, he will be on top.

He and many others are wondering just how Gov. Frank Farrar is responding to his candidacy. So far the governor hasn't seen fit to take official notice of it, although it is well known that he called in key legislative leaders on how to parry the Henderson sally. Farrar is also consulting with the party faithful down to the precinct level.

The best guess at the moment is that the governor will continue to ignore the Henderson threat officially if at all possible. The best bet political observers see in the offing is a sniping campaign to be launched by Farrar's friends. It is expected to take the form of lavish praise of Farrar and various sorts of attacks on Henderson.

Henderson, of course, is waiting for the attack, whatever form it might take. And when it comes it won't be the first time the one man campaigner will have to fight off assaults of all types. It won't be the first time he's had to fight against the odds, and what he no doubt feels is a stacked deck, and although he wistfully speaks of eventual retirement from the political arena, chances are it won't be the last.

PREDATOR CONTROL PROGRAM ECOLOGICALLY DESTRUCTIVE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, it has been the policy of the Division of Wildlife Services of the Interior Department's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to engage in predatory animal control for almost half a century. Two million dollars will be spent this year on this program. It is my contention that there is no ecological justification for such a program and great evidence that predator control is environmentally cancerous. The poisoning of predators that is now performed under this program has shown to be shortsighted and ecologically destructive.

Important natural mechanisms have been upset by these poisoning programs, and the result has often been environmental disaster. For when the predators are gone, rodent populations explode, tripping a new onslaught of poisons. Millions of dollars may be spent merely to correct former damage by means of more destruction. It is time to declare a ceasefire in this national war against natural species of predators, for the warfare could soon approach holocaust proportions. When Dr. A. Starker Leopold headed a special advisory board to former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, he concluded:

Control tends to become an end in itself and, following Parkinson's law, the machinery for its accomplishment can easily proliferate beyond real need.

I can see no legitimate justification for the continuation of these mass poisonings. The bureau has conducted no studies to assess the results of their poisonings which often involve setting out huge amounts of meat chunks injected with a particularly vicious poison known as component 1080. This poison degrades quite slowly resulting in inadvertent poisonings almost whenever it is used. The deadly poisoned meat is simply dumped in great quantity into the ecological network—a recent seven-State study indicated that approximately 2,318,000 pounds of 1080—treated baits were used from 1964 through 1969—where it passes along long after its intended function has been fulfilled.

California condors, which conservationists are now trying to save from extinction, have died from eating ground squirrels poisoned by 1080. Massive poisonings of prairie dogs with 1080 have driven the black-footed ferret, which preys on prairie dogs, nearly to extinction.

I have just introduced legislation aimed to relieve wildlife services of its poisoning function. Extension mammal control agents in each regional office of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries would counsel farmers and ranchers on alternative methods of predator control.

I urge my colleagues to recognize the seriousness of this chemical tampering with the ecological balance of America and give careful consideration to this measure.

THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PARTY AND THE STATUS OF WOMEN

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, a group of Democratic women, informally organized, share common concerns about the endemic underrepresentation of women in party councils and their continued relegation to positions traditionally regarded as proper for women in politics; that is, secretaries, hostesses, petition carriers. These women, working with Mr. Ken Bode, have prepared and presented a resolution to the Democratic Policy Council and have suggested explicit rules changes to the Commission on Rules of the Democratic National Committee, which is chaired by the Honorable JAMES O'HARA of Michigan. At its next meeting, the O'Hara Commission will give final consideration to reforms of the National Convention and the National Committee. To date, as the statistics at the end of the document developed by the Center for Political Reform vividly attest, the party reform movement in the Democratic Party has meant little or nothing for the status of women. I submit for the RECORD, the Policy Council resolution on the status of women in the party:

RESOLUTION

On March 24, 1971, the Policy Council of the National Democratic Party unanimously passed a resolution on the status of women in the Party. That resolution stated:

"Women have been underrepresented consistently in the affairs of the Democratic Party. Their representation as party officers and on party committees is seldom commensurate with their numbers in the population.

Moreover, once included in party affairs, women are relegated to secondary positions and denied meaningful decision-making power."

As women and members of the Democratic Party, we have all experienced the problems expressed in the Council resolution. We have all experienced white, male dominance—both in numbers and in power—at every level of National and State Party organizations.

The information on the last pages of this document is vivid evidence that the largest task remaining for the Party reform movement is the effective involvement of women.

We wish to draw the attention of the members of the O'Hara Commission to their important role in the solution to this problem. In its consideration and recommendation of new rules for the Democratic National Committee and the National Convention, the Commission has the opportunity to exert a profound influence on female participation in the Party.

The Policy Council resolution urged the Commission to "mandate absolutely equal representation at all levels" of the Democratic National Committee and the 1972 National Convention. We concur with this resolution. We further urge the O'Hara Commission to give serious consideration to the following rules and recommendations. We submit them with the belief that their adoption would constitute a significant step toward equal representation for women in the affairs of the Democratic Party.

Gloria Steinem, Arvonne Fraser, Hon. Bella Abzug, Hon. June Franklin, Hon. Particia Derian, Ronnie Eldridge, Sarah Kovner, Hon. Midge Miller, Phyllis Segal, Anne Wexler, Patti Knox, Hon. Liv Bjorlie.

POLICY COUNCIL RESOLUTION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE PARTY

Women have been underrepresented consistently in the affairs of the Democratic Party. Their representation as party officers and on party committees is seldom commensurate with their numbers in the population. Moreover, once included in party affairs, women are relegated to secondary positions and denied meaningful decision-making power.

This underrepresentation of so substantial a portion of the Democratic Party must be corrected. We believe this is a particularly appropriate time for the Policy Council to speak on this internal party matter:

1. The O'Hara Commission will consider new rules for the Democratic National Committee and rules for the 1972 National Convention at its next meeting. Their decisions could have an important effect on the future role of women in the party.

2. The party reform movement has thus far meant little to women in the party. The status of women received official consideration only by the McGovern Commission, which stopped short of mandating the necessary quotas. The Commission's Guidelines require only "reasonable representation", which will probably be interpreted to mean less than the necessary 50% in some states.

Many state reform commissions are presently reviewing the rules and practices of their state parties. We cannot assume that their reform efforts will include the necessary attention to the problems and rights of Democratic women. The reform commissions have often neglected the issue of equal female participation and have sometimes written sex discrimination into party rules.

It is time for conclusive, forthright action. In the same way that initial female involvement in party affairs was not accomplished until their representation was made mandatory, similarly, positions of influence and power will be kept in the realm of male dominance until explicit provisions are made for equal representation of women on all committees and in all positions of influence in the party.

The Policy Council therefore:

1. Requests that the Chairman contact all State Chairmen and Chairmen of State Reform Commissions to urge them to pay special attention to eliminating rules or practices which place women in traditional roles and which functionally deprive them of equal status with men in the party.

2. Urges the O'Hara Commission, in its consideration of rules revisions for the National Committee and the National Convention, to mandate absolutely equal representation at all levels in each body and to pay special attention to providing positions of equal status to women and men at the 1972 Convention. These should include positions of influence, such as Co-Chairmanships of Convention Committees with equal power, and positions of visability, such as keynote speaker or Convention Chairman.

RULES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Women and the Democratic National Committee

1. *Officers of the DNC:*

The present rule provides that: "The Officers of the National Committee shall be a Chairman, a Vice Chairman who is a woman and five other Vice Chairmen including the Chairman of the Minorities Division, the Chairman of the Nationalities Division, a Democratic Governor, a Democratic United States Senator, and a Democratic United States Representative, as well as a Secretary and Treasurer and such other officers as may be designated from time to time by the National Committee." (Article IX, Section 1)

Recommended Rule Change:

"The officers of the National Committee shall be a Chairman *and a Vice Chairman of different sexes* and *six Directors*, including the *Director* of the Minorities Division, the *Director* of the Nationalities Division, the *Director of the Women's Division*, a Democratic Governor, a Democratic United States Senator, and a Democratic United States Representative, as well as a Secretary and Treasurer and such other officers as may be designated from time to time by the National Committee. *The Director of the Women's division shall be a person other than the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the National Committee.*

Note: It is recommended that a Women's Division be established as a permanent division of the National Committee. This Division should be charged with the responsibility of studying the special problems of Democratic women and of developing new means of increasing female involvement at all levels of Party activity. To this end, the Division should be given a broad range of initiative and authority.

2. *Vacancy in the Chairmanship:*

The present rule provides that: "In the event of any vacancy existing in the Office of Chairman, the member of the Executive Committee with seniority of service on the National Committee shall call a meeting of the National Committee promptly but in any event within sixty (60) days for the purpose of the election of a Chairman or if so desired by the National Committee, for the appointment of an Acting Chairman pending further consideration of filling any such vacancy." (Article IX, Section 5)

Recommended Rule Change:

"In the event of any vacancy existing in the office of the Chairman, the *Vice Chairman* shall call a meeting of the National Committee promptly but in any event within sixty (60) days for the purpose of the election of a Chairman. *Until such time as a permanent Chairman is elected, the Vice Chairman shall serve as acting Chairman of the National Committee.*

3. *Appointment of National Committee Personnel:*

The present rule provides that: "The Chairman shall be the chief executive officer of the National Committee and shall have full authority to exercise the executive power of the Committee. He may appoint and dismiss any and all personnel of the staff of the National Committee, including all deputies, assistants, counsel, and staff members." (Article IX Section 6(a)).

Recommendation:

Since the Chairman of the National Committee is given the power to appoint and dismiss all Committee personnel, he or she has the final responsibility for equitable female representation at all levels of the DNC staff. It is therefore recommended that the Chairman be directed to evaluate the status of women on the staff of the National Committee, giving special attention to the number of women occupying professional positions. The Chairman should correct any underrepresentation of women that is discovered and should insure that considerations of sex do not play any part in the delegation of responsibility and authority among professional staff members.

Note: The Chairman of the National Committee also has responsibility for the appointment of members of various Party Commissions and Committees. In making these appointments, he or she should be guided by the principle of equal representation for both sexes on all official Party bodies.

Women and the national convention

A woman was first selected as a delegate to the Democratic National Convention in 1900. Since that time, little progress has been made toward effective involvement of women in the Convention process. They are traditionally underrepresented on state delegations and are seldom appointed as Convention officers or Committee chairmen. (In the case of several important offices and chairmanships, a woman has never been asked to serve.) As means toward a more equal role for women at the Democratic National Convention, we offer the following recommendations:

1. Convention Chairman (Temporary and Permanent): The Temporary Chairman and the permanent Chairman of the National Convention should be of different sexes.

2. Convention Committees: States that elect a single Committee member to each of the four Standing Committees should be required to elect two women and two men as Committee representatives. States that elect two or more Committee members to each of the four Standing Committees should be required to elect an equal (or as equal as possible) number of men and women to each Committee delegation.

3. Committee Chairmanships: Convention Committees should no longer have a single Chairman. Two Co-Chairman, of different sexes, should be selected for each Standing Committee. The Co-Chairmen should share equally in the authority and responsibilities of the Chairmanship and should preside over alternate sessions of the Committee.

WOMEN AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

National conventions

1832—First Democratic National Convention was held.

1900—First woman delegate was selected to the Democratic National Convention.

1916—First woman was selected to serve on a Convention Committee (Credentials Committee).

1924—First woman served as Chairman of a major Committee (Credentials Committee).

1944—First time the National Convention had women as officers (Permanent Assistant Chairman and Permanent Secretary).

Convention Chairman: A woman has never served as Temporary or Permanent Chairman of the Democratic National Convention.

Convention Committee Chairman: Since 1924, when the first woman was chosen Chairman of a major Convention Committee, there have been only four women chosen as committee chairmen. (See chart on following page.)

Commissions established by the 1968 Democratic National Convention

Commission on Party Structure and Delegate Selection: Three members of the twenty-eight member Commission are women.

Commission on Rules: Five members of the twenty-six member Commission are women.

Commissions and committees established by the Democratic National Committee

Equal Rights Commission (1969): Three members of the nine member Commission are women.

Commission on Youth Participation (1969): Six members of the twenty-three member Commission are women.

Democratic Policy Council (Current):

Members-at-large: Six members of the forty-eight member Council are women.

Executive Committee: Three members of the twenty member Committee are women.

Committees: Of the six Committees of the Policy Council, only one has a woman Co-Chairman.

Site Committee (for the 1972 National Convention): Five members of the ten member Committee are women.

WOMEN AND THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

	1924	1928	1932	1936	1940	1944	1948	1952	1956	1960-68
National convention committees:										
Permanent organization	[1] 7	6	3	9	0	5	1	3	4	(1)
Credentials	12	3	2	3	8	5	4	4	3	(1)
Rules and order of business	1	3	2	4	0	6	5	2	3	(1)
Platform and resolutions	0	0	1	1	1	[2] 42	47	51	52	(1)

[1] Equal representation of men and women on all major committees of the Democratic National Convention was voted by the Democratic National Committee in September 1959 and has been applied to all convention committees since 1960.

[2] In 1940 a resolution was passed requiring that 2 members of the committee on platform and resolutions be selected from all States, and 1 of the 2 members must be a woman. This provision went into effect in 1944 and remained in effect until the Democratic National Committee Resolution of 1959, which required 1 man and 1 woman to be selected from each State delegation to serve on the 4 major convention committees.

Chairman of National Convention Committees

1924—A woman was chosen Chairman of the Credentials Committee.

1948—A woman was chosen Chairman of the Credentials Committee.

1960—A woman was chosen Chairman of the Committee on Permanent Organization.

1964—A woman was chosen Chairman of the Committee on Permanent Organization.

1968—A woman was chosen Chairman of the Committee on Permanent Organization.

Women and State politics

State Legislators

Only *163 of 4,445* Democratic State Legislators are women.

State party chairmen

Of the *55* State, District, and territorial Democratic Parties, only *one* (the Democratic Party) is chaired by a woman.

State Delegations to the 1968 Democratic Natinonal Convention

Only 13% of the delegates to the Convention were women represented commensurate to their presence in the population.

Only one (Oregon) of the 55 delegations to the Democratic National Convention was chaired by a woman.

Four state delegations included only one woman—the National Committeewoman, who, by Convention rule, was an automatic delegate.

By party rule, one woman from each state was to be appointed to each of the four standing committees of the Convention. Ten state delegations did not have the four women required to fill these positions.

Forms of Discrimination by State Parties

Even when state law or party rules imply equal representation for women, they are often relegated to subordinate positions in the party organization.

Example: Missouri state law requires the Chairman and Chairwoman of both the County and State Central Committees to be of opposite sexes. New party rules proposed by the Missouri Democratic *Reform* Commission imply that the secondary position should always be filled by a woman. The rules define the duties of both the County and State Vice-Chairman as primarily involved with supervision of the organizations of Democratic Women Voters.

Example: Colorado state law provides that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the State Committee "may be" of opposite sexes, and Party Rules require this. However, the Rules consistently refer to the Chairman with the pronoun "he" and the Vice-Chairman with the pronoun "she". (The Vice-Chairman is charged with the coordination of the county Vice-Chairwomen and precinct committeewomen.)

Example: Arkansas Democratic Party Rules provide for a Chair*man* and a Vice-Chair*woman* for county and state committees.

CHEYENNE FAMED HOSTELRY IS THE HITCHING POST

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, Wyoming prides itself on her increasing reputation as a vacation haven. With two national parks, two national recreation areas and seven national forests, Wyoming boasts one of the fastest growing tourist industries in the Nation.

I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the recognition recently accorded to one of Wyoming's outstanding hosts, the Hitching Post of Cheyenne, owned and operated by the Harry Smith family.

In the March issue of the Motel-Motor Inn Journal, the Smith family is featured in an article by assistant Journal editor Ray Sawyer.

The extensive article covers the meager beginnings of the Hitching Post in the mid-1940's and its continuing progress as a favorite visiting place for Wyoming tourists.

All Wyomingites share a pride in the modern and complete services available to visitors, and I am proud to have been a friend for many years to this talented and dedicated family. I am especially pleased to see that the quarter century of experience which Harry and Mildred Smith described has been treated to national coverage, and I recommend the article as an outstanding example of the hospitality and service associated with Wyoming and the West.

URBAN EDUCATION AND OUR DUAL SOCIETY

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, created quite a stir last year when he came out in support of the so-called Stennis amendment, urging this Nation, its leaders and its citizens to acknowledge that segregation, de facto as well as de jure, is wrong in the North as well as in the South.

Although the Stennis amendment died in the 91st Congress amid warnings that its overall effect would be to slow the elimination of de jure school segregation in the South while not affecting de facto segregation in the North, the logic of Senator RIBICOFF's argument was widely recognized and he continued his efforts.

In a noteworthy speech before the Senate last November 30, Senator RIBICOFF warned:

> We have made no noticeable progress toward dealing with this problem. Distrust, hostility, and bitterness are increasing among minority-group citizens of this country, especially in the major population centers, North and South, where whites continue to flee the inner city. Unless we take action soon to correct this volatile situation, the breach between the races will pass the point of no return.

In my view, Senator RIBICOFF's assessment is 100 percent correct and our colleagues would do well to heed his warning and take action now. To give added impetus to the effort he initiated, and to further dramatize the need for action by this Congress, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives two bills authored by Senator RIBICOFF—one cosponsored in the Senate by Senator BROOKE of Massachusetts and Senator CRANSTON of California, and another cosponsored by Senator MONDALE of Minnesota.

These bills—the Government Facilities

Location Act of 1971 and the Urban Education Improvement Act of 1971—represent a comprehensive and effective approach to the problems created by the economic and racial separation that poses so serious a threat to our society today.

The Urban Education Improvement Act requires State and local educational agencies in metropolitan areas throughout the Nation to develop and implement plans to reduce and eliminate minority-group isolation in the public schools, no matter what the causes of that isolation may be. The bill authorizes Federal assistance in the development of those plans, but school districts not complying would be deprived of all Federal education funds and States that funded such districts would lose Federal funds for statewide programs.

At the heart of this bill is a requirement that the State and local school district plans include a provision that within 10 years every school in a metropolitan area will have a percentage of minority-group students equal to at least one-half the percentage of minority-group students in the metropolitan area as a whole.

This bill recognizes that realities both of the racial isolation that has emerged in our communities and the inability of State and local educational agencies to establish quality, integrated school programs without new financial commitments from the Federal Government.

Another key feature of this legislation is a requirement that local committees of parents, teachers and students representative of minority and majority groups and the geographical areas within the metropolitan areas must be established to advise the local education agencies regarding the development of the plans and to report periodically to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare on the extent of compliance with the legislation.

The Government Facilities Location Act complements the education bill by going right to the heart of residential segregation. It requires that adequate housing be made available for low- and middle-income employees, both black and white, in a community before a Federal or State Government facility or a Federal contractor can locate or expand there.

Recognizing the financial plight in which many suburban communities find themselves this bill also provides financial assistance to suburbs which make available the housing required. While there will be those who may argue that enough wealth is already concentrated in the suburbs, that the advantages of having Federal facilities should be sufficient economic incentive for these communities to provide the housing needed by low- and middle-income workers. I think we must recognize that education costs represent a major portion of most suburban community budgets and that there is bound to be a reluctance to reduce the level of educational services in order to meet the costs imposed by new families. In recent years, we have seen growing evidence of a taxpayers' revolt in even the most affluent suburbs and I am convinced that we cannot hope to make progress in promoting integration and housing opportunity unless we face up to the economic and tax consequences.

Mr. Speaker, I offer these bills not as a complete answer to the growing separatism in our society but as a necessary first step toward bringing this Nation and its people together.

For years now, we have seen the white middle-class families of New York City flee to suburban sanctuaries, leaving that great metropolis to the poor and what has been happening in my city is becoming all too typical in other areas of the country.

We can no longer talk about pockets of poverty in our cities, for our cities are rapidly becoming entire ghettos, unable to meet even basic levels of essential services. It has been documented time and again how zoning practices, school district decisions, and Federal housing policies have contributed to this sad development. We can no longer ignore that while the style of segregation in the North may differ from the South, its nature is every bit as insidious.

As New York Times columnist Tom Wicker recently observed:

> These measures are not child's play; they do not evade the real problems of racial division with patty-cake and pretensions.

We face a serious challenge and we must face up to it with real commitment, not more rhetoric. Senator RIBICOFF has demonstrated courage and imagination in drafting proposals which, if enacted, will form the backbone of such a commitment. I am proud to join him in this effort and I hope that these bills will receive the support they deserve.

RB-211 ENGINE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the current negotiations involving Lockheed, Rolls Royce, and the British Government with respect to the RB-211 engine. In my opinion, a decision to provide any public funds, aid or guarantees by the U.S. Government to directly or indirectly assist Rolls Royce or Harlan and Short would be most unfair particularly in view of the severe unemployment crisis facing our own aerospace industry. Several outstanding American manufacturers like General Electric, Pratt and Whitney, and Rohr are ready and able to furnish American engines and power packages competitive with whatever new higher prices result from these negotiations.

In addition, I have been informed by reliable sources that these companies are also capable of meeting comparable new schedules. Such a decision would be most unfair to the thousands of unemployed American aerospace industry workers who should benefit from any expenditure of Government funds in the aviation field. I sincerely hope that the fate of our own aerospace workers will receive first priority in consideration of public funding or Government guarantee.

SHORT-HOP AIRCRAFT MAY FILL GAP

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as an enthusiast for STOL-type aircraft, I was impressed with a recent editorial from the San Diego Union covering the importance of STOL airplanes to solve the burgeoning transit problems of our major cities. We must have STOL airplanes as an integral part of our mass transit system and I am hopeful that the Department of Transportation as well as NASA will add real impetus to the development of American made STOL airplines. It is distressing to know that the Canadian Government and the British Government are providing 99 percent of STOL and V/STOL to the American market. This must not continue.

I include the following article, published March 3, 1971, as a portion of my remarks:

TRANSIT PROBLEMS SPREAD—SHORT-HOP AIRCRAFT MAY FILL GAP

The long debate over the supersonic transport has diverted attention from a problem at the other end of the travel spectrum. While the argument goes on over whether the world really needs an SST, few would deny that we need better ways to get around in our congested metropolitan areas and between neighboring cities that are blending into "megalopolis" patterns of vast urbanization.

An answer may be emerging from that same aviation industry now reeling from financial setbacks. Aircraft with vertical or short take-off and landing characteristics (V/STOL) have been maturing in the shadow of more spectacular developments in high-speed jets. With rotors or fixed wings, or a combination of the two, they are showing promise as a way to speed the transportation of cargo and passengers on short-haul routes over congested urban areas.

The efficiency and versatility of the helicopter has been put to the acid test by the military in Southeast Asia, while the expansion of its use as a civilian vehicle has been equally dramatic. Its weight-lifting capacity is making it a freight carrier and a tool in heavy construction. Helicopters are being used to fight fires, as ambulances and as airborne police cars.

From the mass transit standpoint, the significance of the new V/STOL technology is that the means are at hand to lift 50 or 60 passengers from a downtown airport with a runway no longer than 1,000 feet, and whisk them at more than 200 miles per hour to a similar landing spot in a neighboring city. This, surely, is rapid transit.

The new Railpax system hopes to salvage railroad passenger travel and breathe new life into commuter rail service, and experiments with highspeed "busways" look to a resurgence in bus travel.

However, technology already may have leapfrogged these conventional modes of transportation, either in terms of V/STOL aircraft or other striking new conveyances—such as the air cushion vehicle which needs

neither wheels nor rails but "flies" a few feet off the ground, or the hydrofoil which can make a high-speed roadway of a coastal waterway or a shallow river or bay.

If the U.S. aircraft industry proves to have failed to penetrate the sound barrier with a commercial supersonic transport, then V/STOL aircraft or another means of meeting the urban transit problem might present an alternate challenge for aerospace engineers faced with idleness.

Advances in the technology of travel have been breathtaking in the 20th Century. Another phenomenon of our time is the densely populated cluster of cities, swarming with vehicles, laced with rails and highways. The next revolution in travel may be to lift us off the ground for those trips too short for a high speed jet airplane, but too long and arduous for the means of surface travel now at hand.

ARCHITECTURAL FIRM ANNIVERSARY

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are few architectural firms in this Nation that have histories as lengthy and distinguished as that of Chicago's Graham, Anderson, Probst, & White. I am sure that I speak for all Chicagoans when I say that I am extremely proud of the architectural and engineering accomplishments of this award-winning firm which will shortly celebrate its 100th anniversary.

In 1873 Burnham & Root was founded in Chicago; in 1912 it became Graham, Burnham Co.; and in 1917 Graham, Anderson, Probst, & White succeeded to the business. In 1936 Edward Probst, his two sons, Edward E. Probst and Marvin G. Probst and Wellington J. Schaefer, organized a partnership under the firm name of G.A.P. & W. In 1942 Mr. Probst died, and his two sons continued as surviving partners. In the years following the firm has continued to design outstanding facilities, to establish impressive standards for the profession, and to be commended as one of the most visionary and reputable architectural offices in Greater Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, since 1873 G.A.P. & W. and its predecessors have planned and executed some of the largest buildings in downtown Chicago—the Field Building, Merchandise Mart, Continental Illinois Bank Building, Commonwealth Edison Building, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, Wrigley Building, Marshall Field & Co., U.S. Post Office Building, Chicago Historical Society Building, Shedd Aquarium, Civic Opera House, Pittsfield Building, and the Field Museum of Natural History.

In addition, G.A.P. & W. has designed the State Office Building, Indianapolis; new U.S. Department of State Building, Washington, D.C.; American Dental Association Headquarters, Chicago; Lake Point Tower, Chicago; Veterans' Administration hospital, Chicago; University of Illinois College of Dentistry; and the U.S. Naval Depot, Seal Beach, Calif.

The firm has also been active in civic, educational, philanthropic, professional, and youth endeavors, and, as a policy, seeks to involve its executives, directors, and staff in projects which serve their fellow man. Their dynamic president is William R. Surman, who attended Rice Institute, University of Illinois, and Northwestern University. He has been active since 1946 in architecture, engineering, and construction, and is a specialist in architectural programing and design, feasibility investigation, land use, and zoning and site planning.

Mr. Speaker, because I believe that this organization is in many ways most unique, I feel that it is appropriate at this time to honor its president, William Surman, its senior vice president, my good friend, Cliff Noonan, and, for that matter, all of its nearly 100 employees for both their professional accomplishments and their humanitarian services.

IMPORTS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the question of free trade and fair trade has been discussed many times before this House during the past few years. Those who cherish dreams of worldwide free trade among all nations predict the United States will unleash an international trade war if it takes steps to assure domestic industries of fair trade as well.

On the other hand, we who support worldwide fair trade cannot accept the concept of worldwide free trade if it excludes the United States. America has been the greatest of all practitioners of free trade. The amount of imports from all over the world into our domestic market is proof of that. We have been the greatest practitioners of fair trade as well. No foreign goods are barred from this Nation's shores.

But is this true of the rest of the nations in this world? These nations which threaten retaliation against any effort by the U.S. Government to protect American industries damaged by foreign imports—do they practice free trade? Fair trade? The European Economic Community does not. Japan does not. The EEC prevents certain American products from entering its market. In some instances where our products are permitted to enter EEC member nations, we find ourselves the victim of preferential tariff rates granted our major competitors. An example of this is the recent discrimination practiced against American citrus growers who must pay a much higher rate per carton than their major competitors exporting to Europe. Japan is the greatest protector of its home markets. At one time, she barred more than 100 major U.S. products from her mainland; but we are the prime target for her export business.

Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam has been turning the other cheek to foreign competitors for 25 years and now he is getting kicked in the pants to boot. We practice free trade but are not accorded it. We practice fair trade but are not accorded it either. In the March 28 issue of the Pittsburgh Press, this question was intelligently explored in an article by Mr. Ernest Cuneo. I insert the article in the RECORD and call the attention of my colleagues to Mr. Cuneo's noteworthy observations:

FAIRER TRADE ADVISED; FOREIGN CARTELS UNDERCUTTING UNITED STATES

(By Ernest Cuneo)

Free trade has been an American ideal since the beginning of the 20th century. Among other reasons is the fact that protective tariffs for the industrial North were one of the major contributing causes of the Civil War.

In the 20th century, variable tariffs were set up to provide for fair trade.

The reason, so early understood in Great Britain and so late in the United States, is that nations cannot buy the products of other nations except with the money they receive for selling their own products.

To achieve a balance where nations can sustain continued exchanges of products is fair trade. To open their domestic markets to the world without regard to such balance is, more or less, free trade.

Free trade, ideally, provides the best competitive price for the consumer, the lower prices stimulates volume, and ideally, a balance of fair trade results.

CONSUMER HURT

Out of honest conviction, and certainly with deep passion, it is widely felt in highly knowledgeable American quarters that protective American tariffs at this time mean not only an international commercial catastrophe, but a villainous impost on the American consumer.

The most respected mass media believe world free trade means world peace and, theoretically, they have a strong case.

Practically, however, they would be advancing the cause of both free trade and fair trade if they could convince the other nations of the world to go as far toward that ideal as the U.S. has.

The European Common Market, for example, provides protected markets for its member nations, but the U.S. is not a member.

Far from being a free market, for many American products it hasn't even a fair market. And in some instances, the European market has been actively closed to American companies.

American companies, additionally, may not enter into combines that would be in violation of U.S. anti-trust laws.

But combines, combinations and cartels are the ordinary methods of doing business in much of the world. Furthermore, in a considerable number of cases, the governments of the various nations enter into the cartels.

This is particularly true of Japan, where tremendous expansions into the world market are due to a cartel of the Japanese government and Japanese big business.

U.S. GIFTS AIDED

Much of the foreign industry clamoring for full free trade in the U.S. has been created by U.S. loans or outright gifts, such as the Marshall plan, for which the U.S. taxpayers are still paying.

Moreover, the U.S. taxpayer is bearing the tremendous expense of defending other countries; in the case of Japan, 80 per cent.

Free trade is not fair trade when a foreign product can undersell an American product in a U.S. market because the American taxpayers are bearing the expense of the foreign country's defense.

As another example, the high income tax deducted from an American steel worker's

pay goes, in part, for the defense of Europe.

Since the European steelworker doesn't have to pay as much for his country's defense, the foreign steel can be made and sold at a lower price.

But though it may be free trade, it is not fair trade.

This, of course, is an oversimplification, but it does illustrate the complexity of the problem.

ST. ALOYSIUS REQUESTS APRIL 30 PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO OUR FLAG DAY

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the Saint Aloysius School of Buffalo, N.Y., has joined with many other schools in my congressional district urging that April 30 be designated as Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag Day. I recently introduced a resolution which would authorize the President to make this proclamation and urge the support of my colleagues. Following is the text which was originally prepared by Mrs. Priore's third graders of Cheektowaga, N.Y.:

PROCLAMATION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas, on April 30, 1789 George Washington took the oath of office and was inaugurated as the first President of the United States.

Whereas, George Washington was the only President of the United States of America inaugurated on April 30th.

Whereas, April 30, 1802 Congress passed the first enabling act authorizing the people of the eastern division of the Northwest Territory to hold a convention and frame a constitution in order to become a state, and a precedent was set in helping Ohio's gaining its statehood, followed by the same, set for the rest of the states in this territory.

Whereas, on April 30, 1803 the United States of America, under the leadership of President Thomas Jefferson, made its first territorial expansion by purchasing 828,000 square miles of land (doubling the size of the United States by peaceful means) known as the Louisiana Purchase, which land eventually was divided into the states of Missouri, Nebraska, Iowa, Arkansas, North Dakota, South Dakota, most of Louisiana, Kansas, Minnesota, Montana, Wyoming and parts of Colorado and Oklahoma.

Whereas: on April 30, 1812, the state of Louisiana was admitted into the Union.

Whereas: on April 30, 1889 Congress fixed this date of April 30th as a national holiday to celebrate the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States of America.

Whereas, on April 30, 1970 the proclamation sent by Mrs. Irene Priore's Third Graders of Cheektowaga, New York requesting that April 30, 1970 be proclaimed as Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag Day in the United States of America for all school children in all schools of our nation, was read in Congress.

Whereas, schools, community leaders and citizens in all 50 states of our nation responded by letter, telephone and telegram to the Cheektowaga, New York Third Graders that they wished to participate in this unified promise of loyalty at 1:30 P.M. Eastern Saving Time so children's voices might echo throughout the land.

Therefore, We, the boys and girls of St. Aloysius do hereby ask the Hon. Jack F. Kemp to proclaim each April 30th as an annual special school day to honor our nation and its flag in school by song, speech and activities planned by the faculty and students of each individual school.

We request that this proclamation be made known to all the schools of our nation so that all the school children may have the pride and honor to help plan a dignified program for their own schools. We believe that by encouraging children to have the pleasure of involvement in planning a program for April 30th each year that we are taking a positive approach toward building better attitudes in school children and planning for better citizens and leaders of the future.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, as we consider the appropriation for the Office of Education, we should give serious thought to the direction we should take to provide education for the future. I agree with a growing number of educators that education in the future should be more pragmatic and more geared to the realities of preparing a youngster for a career. Vocational education is the kind of education which gives this direction.

Now, the administration has requested $468.9 million for vocational and adult education for the next fiscal year, a decrease of $25.3 million. This is, in my opinion, inadequate. In this time of uncertainty, when job opportunities for college graduates are decreasing, when college costs are increasing, the appeal of a college education is less than it was a few short years ago. At one time, high school counselors were pushing students into college as if it were the threshold to security. It was an unspoken shame for a student to choose the lower path of vocational or technical education. It was the unusual student indeed who successfully held out against the pressures of society and admitted to himself that college might not be for him. But times have changed and vocational education, which once suffered under a stigma, is becoming more appealing.

I support the amendment offered by the Honorable WILLIAM HATHAWAY to increase appropriations for the Office of Education, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise, for the Hathaway amendment would provide the kind of commitment needed to insure the growth of vocational education programs.

I think our vocational education programs must grow and must improve, and my reasons for such belief are not based solely on the present economic condition which I hope is only temporary.

The present economic slowdown has placed the perspective values of college and vocational education in balance and it has deflated the promises of college education, but far more important, it has pointed out a fundamental neglect in our secondary and post-secondary educational philosophy. For too long, this Nation, under the spell of increased scientific competition from the Soviet Union, has neglected the average student in favor of expanding opportunities for the extraordinary student.

This Nation needs skilled craftsmen and laborers just as much as it needs engineers and scientists, so any Federal program to educate young people in these areas will pay off.

Recently, the new U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland, Jr., gave an address in which he called for increased emphasis upon vocational education. We are glad that high administration officials are becoming aware of this need, but money—not talk—is the way to fulfill this need, that is why I urge my colleagues to support the Hathaway amendment.

APRIL 14, 250TH BIRTHDAY OF AMERICA'S FIRST PRESIDENT, JOHN HANSON

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, April 14 will mark the 250th anniversary of the birth of America's first President, John Hanson. John Hanson became the first President of the United States in Congress assembled, serving a 1-year term from November 5, 1781, some 8 years before George Washington became President under the new Constitution of 1789.

It is fitting that we honor John Hanson's birthday—he surely ranked among our Nation's greatest colonial patriots and statesmen. He represented Charles County and later Frederick County in Maryland's Colonial General Assembly and was a member of the Committee of the Assembly which instructed Maryland's delegation to the Stamp Act Congress of 1765.

When George Washington took command of the Continental Army in 1775, John Hanson organized and equipped two companies in Frederick and dispatched them promptly to General Washington in Cambridge, Mass. During the war he raised large sums of money to help the struggling States carry on their fight for independence.

Hanson was a Maryland delegate to the Continental Congress meeting in Philadelphia. In March 1781, the Congress ratified the Articles of Confederation which created the U.S. Congress. The new Congress met on November 5, 1781, and its first act was to elect John Hanson President of the United States. He had the honor of receiving General Washington before the Congress assembled in Philadelphia, of extending the gratitude of the Nation for the great soldier's services, and of receiving in return General Washington's thanks and appreciation.

As the Nation's first constitutionally elected Chief Executive he gave remarkable consideration, without predecent or guidance, to foreign and domestic state affairs which resulted in friendship and respect both at home and abroad. Under

his leadership, the United States was recognized by the kingdoms of Sweden and Holland. Hanson organized the Post Office Department, took steps leading to the first U.S. census, recommended establishment of a Federal mint, floated the new country's first loan, arranged for Federal uniforms for the troops instead of the State uniforms, and signed into existence the Great Seal of the United States. Hanson also proclaimed the first Thanksgiving.

Hanson was born at Mulberry Grove near Port Tobacco in Charles County, Md., on April 14, 1721, and lived there most of his life. He made his home in Frederick, Md., the last decade of his life and died at Oxon Hill Manor in Prince George's County on Saturday, November 15, 1783. John Hanson was a truely remarkable man, and it gives me great pleasure to join in marking the 250th anniversary of his birth. His entire life was dedicated to the service of his Nation—a great example to be followed in any age.

OAK CLIFF BANK INSTALLS WORLD'S LARGEST DRIVE-IN SERVICE

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Oak Cliff Bank & Trust Co. in Dallas has just added another big drive-in wing. This new complex now provides 21 drive-in banking service windows. This progressive bank again sets the pace for the Nation. President James C. Dycus keeps the Oak Cliff Bank & Trust moving ahead with new ideas and better service.

You will be interested in the full story just the way Ray Zauber and Doris Harris summed it up in today's issue of the Oak Cliff Tribune.

AUTOBANK REPRESENTS WORLD FIRST

Twenty one years ago, Oak Cliff Bank and Trust Company introduced multiple-window auto banking in the Southwest. Now, the addition of a new ten-unit contemporary complex combines with the previously existing 11 windows as Autobank Center, the world's largest and most modern auto banking installation. Autobank Center, which opened March 25, will serve an estimated 1,000,000 motorists annually from 9 a.m. until 8 p.m., Mondays through Fridays.

In remarks made just prior to the opening, James C. Dycus, the bank's board chairman and president, pointed out that the center, located just south of Oak Cliff Bank Tower, is bordered by Twelfth Street, Beckley and Zang, with the entrance off Beckley.

From an elevated, glass-walled control studio, tellers look out on a panoramic view of the ten new automated teller stations. As cars drive up to the island units, each customer is greeted by his teller through a two-way intercom system. Upon pushing a button, a drawer automatically opens in the unit. The customer then deposits his banking materials in a specially made carrier. The carrier is replaced in the drawer and whisked by pneumatic tube to the teller; then almost immediately returned. The customer then drives out, never having left the comfort and privacy of his own car.

Although the original 11 teller stations continue to be operated in the normal manner, with a new total of 21 windows customers can move through more rapidly, regardless of the complexity of their individual transactions.

The new ten unit complex was designed by Dallas architect C. M. Boatwright, Jr. The visual auto teller program and equipment was conceived and installed by the Southwestern Bank Division of Diebold, Inc. The general contractor was Dallas' Avery Mays Construction Company.

Pioneering innovation is nothing new to Oak Cliff Bank, for as Mr. Dycus pointed out, the bank was one of the nation's first in the use of magnetic ink character recognition checks, and currently is the Oak Cliff area's only bank to offer full trust services and to have an on-premise IBM 360-30 computer.

"A MAN'S IMAGE"

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1971

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Seattle Post Intelligencer regarding various ways the President has used to communicate with his fellow Americans.

The editorial states "there is no reason to think Mr. Nixon has been calculating anything in his recent press experiments other than trying to be better understood by the American public."

I include the article as follows:

A MAN'S IMAGE

Various critics of the President, and especially certain columnists, have been amusing themselves these days by reflecting sarcastically on Mr. Nixon's latest experiment with his journalistic coverage.

They suggest there is something underhanded and insincere in White House efforts stressing the role of Mr. Nixon as devoted husband, loving father and booster of traditional close family ties in general.

The special interviews with women reporters, coupled with the recent focus on events involving birthdays, daughters and other such highly personal matters are seen as a calculated campaign aimed at female sympathy and votes.

Here, we think is further proof that the Nixon critics are out to slam him whatever he does. For years they have assailed him as a politician lacking in human warmth. Now he is accused of coldly scheming to use his human warmth for cheap political leverage.

The charge is quite unfair. President Nixon, like every president before him, needs all the sympathy and support he can get. Why should he not try to project his best image—even as President Lincoln sought to do in growing a beard?

Any fair-minded person has got to admit that Mr. Nixon is—beyond any doubt—a devoted husband, a loving father and a champion booster of traditional American family ties. His charming wife and two lovely daughters bespeak the obvious truth.

There is no reason to think Mr. Nixon has been calculating anything in his recent press experiments other than trying to be better understood by the American public.

His critics, as usual, are doing their darndest to make his efforts ineffectual. We can only wonder how many of them can match his record as a husband, father and pillar of domestic responsibility.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE IGOR STRAVINSKY

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Igor Stravinsky, we have lost a great musical genius, and I insert the tribute carried to his life and creative works in the Washington Post of Wednesday, April 7, 1971, by Paul Hume:

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE IGOR STRAVINSKY

(By Paul Hume)

From the moment of the first performance of his music for the ballet, "Firebird," on June 25, 1910, when he was just 28, Igor Stravinsky has never been out of the public ear as one of the great, original creative geniuses in the entire history of music.

During the intervening 60 years, his music has, as did that of previous monumental innovators like Monteverdi, Haydn, Beethoven, and Wagner, reshaped the music that followed it. And in an unprecedented achievement, almost every note of music, from his Opus 1, which was his first symphony, to his last published compositions, dated 1967, has been recorded with Stravinsky as conductor or directly in charge of the recording.

No composer was more insistently reviled at intervals in his career, but Stravinsky, like Wagner and Strauss, lived long enough to see much of his music established in the world's firmly fixed repertoire. Few composers ever spent as much of their lives in intimate working contact and friendship with the world's great artists as did Stravinsky.

Born in the heyday of Tchaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakoff, he was quickly plunged into working association with Diaghileff, Nijinsky, Fokine, Pavlova, and Karsavina in the dazzling world of Russian ballet, with its famous scenic artists Bakst and Benois, and the young conductors Monteux and Ansermet.

To all that we know as the unfolding splendor of 20th century music, no one contributed more significantly than Stravinsky. In his youth a friend of Debussy, Ravel and Falla, he became an acquaintance of Schonberg, Webern, and Berg.

The century's great artistic names—Picasso, Matisse, Braque, Chirico, Rodin, Cocteau, Gide, St. John Perse—were among his intimates. And the world of musicians held no man in higher respect.

He enjoyed the warm friendship and unfetered admiration of conductors Koussevitsky, Reiner, Klemperer, and Stokowski, and of such renowned composers as Chavez, Sessions, and Prokofieff. He was a guest of honor at a White House dinner during the Kennedy administration, after which Stravinsky said, "The President reminds me of a young football player who cannot play because of his bad back."

Very few composers ever committed to print as many of their ideas on art and esthetics, religion, philosophy, and changing customs as did Stravinsky. Nor did any composer ever set out at such length anything like the blistering and often intemperate language that Stravinsky hurled, in his later years, against several music critics who most often irritated him.

The composer of the early triumvirate of great ballets—Firebird, Petrouchka, and The Rite of Spring—was born on June 18, 1882 in the town of Oranienburg, a suburb of St. Petersburg, in Russia.

In his memoirs, Stravinsky credits both his father, an opera bass, and his mother, whom he describes as a highly gifted sight-reader at the piano, with his own musical talents.

He says his father's family had Polish origins, emigrating from that country to Russia at the time of one of the numerous partitions of Poland. In spite of his father's stature as a professional musician, young Igor, at his father's orders, entered the University of St. Petersburg as a law student, taking his degree in jurisprudence in 1905.

STUDIED HARMONY

In the meantime, however, he had been studying harmony, in which he "found no satisfaction," and counterpoint, which he says, "amused me, even thrilled me, and I was never tired of it." Most importantly, he had found a close and valuable friend in Rimsky-Korsakoff, who advised him strongly against entering the conservatory, but who gave him private lessons in form and orchestration.

Rimsky's influence dominated not only Stravinsky's early works, up to and including "Firebird," but his advice and friendship was the first great musical guidance of his life.

It was as a young boy that Stravinsky first sensed that music was to be his life.

When he was 11, he was taken to hear his father in a performance of Glinka's "Ruslan and Ludmilla." Later he wrote, "During an intermission it was my good fortune to catch a glimpse in the foyer of Peter Tchaikovsky, the idol of the Russian public, whom I had never seen before and was never to see again. He had just conducted the first audition of his new symphony—the "Pathetic"—in St. Petersburg. A fortnight later my mother took me to a concert where the same symphony was played in memory of its composer. . . ."

"I think," concluded Stravinsky, "that the beginning of my conscious life as an artist and musician dates from this time."

Stravinsky's admiration and affection for the music of Tchaikovsky remained undiminished throughout his life. When he first appeared as guest conductor with the National Symphony Orchestra in January, 1941, his program included his own Firebird music, the later ballet, Jeu de Cartes, his early Scherzo Pantastique, written while studying with Rimsky-Korsakoff, and the Tchaikovsky Second Symphony.

The enormous success of the music for Firebird prompted the famous Impresario Sergei Diaghileff to ask his new protege for a new score immediately. On June 13, 1911, just a year after his initial triumph, the composer's second noted work, Petrouchka, was heard, to equal acclaim.

Thus it was with shock and dismay on May 28, 1913, that Stravinsky heard the Parisian audience in the Theatre des Champs-Elysees scream, hiss and boo and raise so vast a belligerent storm of disapproving noise that no one—onstage or off, or in the orchestra pit where Pierre Monteux was presiding—could hear the music. The new work was "Le Sacre du Printemps," or "The Rite of Spring," and it was the storm center of one of the most famous "scandals," in the threatrical sense of the word, in history. It was also one of music's most revolutionary moments.

In "Sacre," Stravinsky used the largest orchestral forces he ever employed. The work is a fantastic essay in orchestration, stretching far into a world not unrelated to those of Rimsky-Korsakoff and Debussy, but utterly different from theirs. Its principal effect, however, was to overturn traditional concepts of rhythm and rhythmic patterns.

Instead of a given time signature lasting for some appreciable length of time, "Sacre" has many passages in which the time changes every measure. It posed new problems of conducting and new and baffling puzzles for players accustomed to the rhythmic regularity of Beethoven, Wagner, or Debussy.

REFUSES TO REPEAT

One of the hallmarks of Stravinsky's genius is the way in which, at nearly every point of his long career, he refused to repeat himself. Not merely in basic content, but in form, in dimension, in purpose, his output contains a staggering diversity of ideas, proceeding from a parallel diversity of purposes.

Thus "Sacre" was followed by three pieces for string quartet. Then an opera, "The Nightingale," was begun in 1909, but not finished—because of the interruptions of the three ballets—until 1914. So greatly had his composing style changed that, by 1913 when he was asked to finish the opera, Stravinsky at first thought he could not do the job at all. He later realized, he said, that the Hans Christian Andersen story lent itself to two different styles, due to the difference between the real nightingale and its mechanical rival.

World War I and the accompanying Russian Revolution not only moved Stravinsky out of Russia forever—first to Switzerland and then to France—but cost him his personal library, a country house, and volumes of studies he had worked on with Rimsky-Korsakoff.

"This period," he wrote, "was one of the hardest I have ever experienced. Overwhelmed by the successive bereavements that I had suffered (an old family friend and a brother) I was now also in a position of the utmost pecuniary difficulty. The Communist revolution, which had just triumphed in Russia, deprived me of the last resources which had still from time to time been reaching me from my country, and I found myself, so to speak, face-to-face with nothing, in a foreign land and right in the middle of the war."

By this time Stravinsky was married and the father of two sons and two daughters. At the end of the war came the return of almost instant and widespread recognition with a series of compositions that included "The Soldier's Tale," the short opera "Renard," the ballet "Pulcinella," another short opera, "Marva," the famous and last of his Russian works, "Les Noces," or "The Wedding," a concerto for piano with woodwinds, a piano sonata and serenade.

The piano works were for the purpose of providing the composer with music he could play in concerts, in which he was increasingly frequently invited to take part. His creative resources, which never knew any kind of slump, were at peak energy. In 1927 there appeared the opera-oratorio "Oedipus Rex," in 1928 the ballet "Apollon Musagetes," commissioned by Elizabeth Sprague Coolidge for the Library of Congress. In 1930, for the Boston Symphony Orchestra's 50th anniversary, he wrote the magnificent Symphony of Psalms, in 1932 the Duo Concertant and Violin Concerto, and in 1934 his exquisite "Persephone."

By 1935 his son Soulima was old enough and proficient enough as a pianist that Stravinsky wanted to write something for two pianos to be played by father and son. The Concerto for Two Pianos was the result, followed in 1937 by the ballet "Jeu de Cartes," and in 1938 by the concerto commissioned by Mr. and Mrs. Robert Woods Bliss, called "Dumbarton Oaks."

WIFE, DAUGHTER DIE

Tragedy struck again in 1939, and again it was during wartime. Within a few weeks of each other, Stravinsky's first wife and his elder daughter, Mika, died. But even these blows and the problems of World War II did not stop him. He moved again, this time to the United States where Harvard University invited him to give the Charles Eliot Norton lectures—a request that resulted in the notable book "The Poetics of Music," which was reprinted in April, 1970. Established in the Los Angeles-Hollywood area of California, which he later called his happiest home, Stravinsky, in 1940, married Vera de Bosset, who survives him, as does the son, Soulima.

All this time his music continued to pour out in a remarkable flood. In 1940 the Symphony in C, for the Chicago Symphony's 50th anniversary; in 1941 the Danses Concertantes; in 1942 Four Norwegian Moods; in 1943 a two-piano sonata.

The unexpected combination of Stravinsky and Billy Rose got together in 1945 when the Broadway producer asked the famous composer for music to accompany a classical ballet in a production about "the lively arts." When the show opened in Philadelphia, several of its backers wired Stravinsky, "Great success. Could be sensational if you agree our arranger Mr. X touch up instrumentation here and there. Mr. X does arrangements even for Cole Porter. Telegraph agreement." Stravinsky immediately wired back, "Will settle for great success."

After the Symphony in Three Movements, in 1945, Stravinsky's direct involvement with American jazz produced the Ebony Concerto for Woody Herman's band in 1946. Still more of his greatest music was to come with the ballet "Orpheus" in 1947, and then his first mass in 1948.

At this point appeared the sole lengthy hiatus in the entire Stravinsky creative career. It was not, however, a time of silence, but rather the three-year period in which his only full-length opera was taking shape.

The public heard and wildly acclaimed the result in September, 1951, when "The Rake's Progress" was unveiled during the 14th International Contemporary Music Festival. To a text by W. H. Auden, the "Rake" is a "comic" opera in the same way that Mozart's "Don Giovanni" is. In less than 20 years it has made its way through the world's opera houses in a successful procession.

And still at the age of 70 there was neither any slackening of Stravinsky's creative energy nor the slightest lessening of his curiosity about new ideas in music and an interest in writing kinds of music he had not previously written. The music that stretches from the "Rake" to his most recent, shorter compositions shows a marked increase in the number of works on sacred themes, from the 1955 "Canticum Sacrum" written for St. Mark's Cathedral in Venice, the arrangement of Bach's "Von Himmelhoch" in the same year, the "Sacrae Cantiones" in 1957 to the 1958 milestone that is "Threni," or "Lamentations," Stravinsky's first 12-tone composition.

In that famous work, the composer, who had spent a lifetime in exploring and expanding concepts of diatonic and chromatic harmony, moved deliberately and with his own customary originality into the realm opened up 35 years before by a contemporary, Arnold Schonberg. Nor did new works end even in the composer's ninth decade. Without a significant break, the years from 1958 to 1967 saw him producing a continuing line of music.

At the same time he had become more active than ever, touring the world to conduct his music and also recording for Columbia records. He recorded nearly everything he ever wrote, except for a few pieces lost during wars and those like his early piano sonata that he himself suppressed. He said that he recorded "simply to show exactly how his music was intended to be performed."

Stravinsky has always objected to many common conceptions in the world of music, among them, certain ideas of conducting. He said of the Russian conductod, Napravnik: "He was the type of conductor which even today I prefer to all others. Certainty and unbending rigor in the exercise of his art; complete contempt for all affectation and showy effects alike; not the slightest concession to the public; iron discipline, mastery of the first order, an infallible ear and memory, and, as a result, perfect clarity and objectivity in the rendering."

In speaking of conductors of his music, Stravinsky often praised Monteux and Ernest

Ansermet for these qualities. In a recent discussion of his own "Sacre," he noted, "There are simply no regions for soul-searching in The Rite of Spring."

Stravinsky's gift for scathing invective was the equal of any. About Rudolf Bing he wrote, "What I find more difficult to explain is the installation of Mr. Bing as a culture hero, not how it came about, of course—he has virtually no competition—but why."

He freely expressed his opinions on world situations, sending a wireless message, via the BBC to Russia in 1968, "The Soviet Union can prove its greatness far more profoundly by pardoning the condemned writers than by the conquest of all outer space."

His firm view of music he often put unmistakably: "I consider that music is, by its very nature, essentially powerless to *express* anything at all, whether a feeling, an attitude of mind, a psychological mood, a phenomenon of nature, etc. . . . *Expression* has never been an inherent property of music."

He became an ardent U.S. citizen, naturalized on Dec. 28, 1945, with strong opinions on music for films: "I can probably count myself fortunate that none of the proposals Hollywood has made me ever reached a contractual stage . . . film people rarely try to obscure their motives with nonsense about art. They want my name, not my music—I was even offered $100,000 to pad a film with music, and when I refused, was told that I could receive the same money if I were willing to allow someone else to compose the music in my name."

DISCUSSES WEALTH

On the subject of his supposed wealth, Stravinsky said, "Those who imagine that my works make me rich do not realize that everything I composed before 1931 (I became a French citizen in 1934, and this citizenship extended authors' rights retrospectively for three years) was and is unprotected in the United States; the United States and the U.S.S.R. failed to sign the Bern copyright convention. I do not receive performance rights for the Firebird, which, as one of the most popular pieces of music composed in this century, would have made me a 'millionaire' (although, of course, for the good of my soul, I do not aspire to be any such thing)."

The bitterest of all Stravinsky's writing appeared in one of a series of volumes in which he collaborated with the young conductor and specialist in 20th century music, Robert Craft. In these it often appeared that Craft was, through an astute question-and-answer method, suggesting replies, if not actual words, to the aging composer.

However, there is no question about the meaning or strength of Stravinsky's remarks about two noted New York critics, Winthrop Sargeant, of the New Yorker magazine, and Paul Henry Lang, former critic of the New York Herald Tribune. The former Stravinsky called "S. W. Deaf," while Lang became "H. P. Langweilich."

"Nonsensical, usual grisly mediocrity" is some of Stravinsky's milder comment on "Deaf," while for "Langweilich" he cuts loose with "He writes so atrociously" and "ignorant, characteristically reptilian."

Stravinsky, whose own life was plagued by everything from pleurisy, Spanish influenza, typhoid fever and diphtheria to intercostal neuralgia and a host of other maladies, nevertheless came from a long-lived family. He said, "My great-grandfather lived to 111 . . . at 84 was making love. In fact, the old gentleman, bless his hormones, died in consequence of a fall while he was trying to scale a garden fence on his way to a rendezvous. What a way to go!"

Retaining the elasticity that never left him, Stravinsky, in his latest volume, asked "isn't it a tendency of old people of all periods to see everything absolutely and too moralistically, and haven't they always narrowed the issues to their own ever-shortening sight? Haven't they—we—always been puzzled by the enthusiasms of the young for things that we have outgrown, and no less puzzled by their lack of sympathy for things that we continue to feel enthusiastic about but that the *times* have outgrown?"

For 60 years Stravinsky did not permit the times to outgrow him, for he kept ahead of the times. There was never a time, since Firebird, when there was not some music by Stravinsky that touched new chords in significant ways. It is now unlikely that any time will come of which his music will not be a part.

ACCOMMODATING RED CHINA

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker—

"We are prepared to establish a dialogue with Peking."—President Richard Nixon—State of the World Message (February 25, 1971)

This statement, and others, by the President in his official outline of U.S. foreign policy gives notice that the United States, the leading nation in the free world, is ready to accommodate itself to one of the most oppressive regimes on earth. Just how oppressive it really is was made unmistakably clear to me by hearing the testimony given March 25 by Prof. Ma Szu-Tsung, formerly of Peking, before the House Internal Security Committee of which I am a member, when he said:

In China today, the most casual comment to a friend, to a relative, or even to members of your own family can often bring you before a tribunal. Everyone lives in a state of fear. Fear is everywhere. Everyone is isolated from everyone else by this fear. Allegations made by anyone can bring you before a people's tribunal and there is no defense . . . (Mainland China) has become the worst, most inhuman slave camp on earth.

Yet to promote dialog the administration is actively encouraging American firms to step up business with the Red Chinese. The Wall Street Journal has reported that General Motors, Monsanto, and Hercules chemical companies, American Optical, Sperry Rand, and Cummins Engine are presently all doing business with Peking. This influx of American goods can only strengthen the Communist hold on the Chinese people and help them expand both their strategic forces and their guerrilla warfare campaigns.

For example, on January 7 of this year the Department of Commerce approved the sale by General Motors of two huge earth-moving vehicles to the Red Chinese for use in their road-building efforts in the African nation of Zambia. Communist China is engaged in building a transportation system, including a railroad, from the seaport of Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania, on the east coast of Africa, through Tanzania and Zambia to Rhodesia's northern frontier. This transportation system will serve as an essential element of a logistical network for terrorist organizations headquartered in Dar Es Salaam, whose objective is the overthrow of the solidly pro-U.S. Governments of Rhodesia, South Africa, and Portuquese Mozambique. It is ironic that while we attempt to destroy the Ho Chi Minh Trail running through Laos we allow General Motors to participate in the construction of a similar network in southern Africa.

Numerous arguments have been advanced over the years in favor of recognizing the totalitarian regime on mainland China. One favorite cliche is that we cannot ignore the existence of 750 million Chinese people. This argument confuses the people of China with the pirate regime which is in power. It is precisely because we believe that the people of mainland China must be considered in our foreign policy dealings that we refuse to recognize the legitimacy of the Communist ruling class. To recognize the right of the Chinese Communist Party to rule mainland China is to strengthen their hand and weaken the position of the vast majority of non-Communist Chinese—both on and off the mainland.

Another specious argument is that since the Communists have managed to control the mainland for over 20 years, it is now time to begin dealing with them. But as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER recently said:

The passage of time does not alter principle. The mere fact that the government of Mao Tse-tung has proven that it has staying power is no reason why it smells any sweeter. Indeed, the length of time the Maoists have been able to hold China's hundreds of millions of people in subjection merely argues for haste in another direction.

Others in favor of accommodating the Red Chinese talk about some "irreversible trend" mysteriously pulling the Maoists into the world community. This is nonsense. No trend is irreversible. Trends can change, have changed in the past, and will change in the future. It is the duty of the Federal Government to encourage trends favorable to the security and integrity of our Nation and reverse those which are not.

While it is hoped that the American people will reject our new course of appeasement toward the Chinese Communists, it is certain that the free Chinese on Taiwan will not be cajoled into coming to terms with the mainland dictatorship which would seal the fate of the Chinese people. If there is any truth to reports that elements in our Government are attempting to bring about a change of attitude of the Government of Nationalist China toward the enslavers of the Chinese people, this only reveals another case in which they are operating under a delusion.

The Nationalist Government of free China is the only government of China worthy of U.S. recognition and support. If we correctly understand the long-term interests of the United States, there can be no legitimate reason whatsoever for strengthening the Chinese Communist Party by lifting the economic and diplomatic sanctions originally imposed on them in the name of free world security, justice, and a concern for the well being of the Chinese people.

A WYOMING FARM PROBLEM

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Department of Transportation has pending at this time new trucking regulations to begin July 1, 1971, which will be detrimental to the farmers and ranchers of my State of Wyoming.

The new ruling provides that any driver of a farm truck involved in interstate commerce, regardless of the size and weight of this truck, is subject to the following regulations:

First, he must be 21 years of age.

Second, he must have no record of State or Federal law violations.

Third, he must have a certificate showing successful completion of a road test on the use of a truck.

Fourth, he must have a certificate showing successful completion of a written examination on motor carrier safety regulations.

Fifth, he must have a certificate showing successful completion of a physical examination during the last 24 months.

Mr. Speaker, in my State, with the long distances between our towns, it is often a fact that a farmer's regular outlet for selling his crops and for buying supplies and equipment for himself and his family is actually outside the State of Wyoming.

In my State, driving trucks for ranchmen is often the only summer job employment opportunity for young men saving for higher educational achievement.

In my State, farm and ranch families work as a unit to make a living, and sons of driving age are often the only working force the family can afford.

The Department of Transportation's new ruling is unjust and is discriminatory to the rural members of States such as mine where it is difficult enough to earn a living from the land without these unilaterally imposed restrictions.

I would like to call the attention of this body to the following fact, and I quote directly from a statement of December 31, 1970, made by Mr. Robert A. Kaye, Director of the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety:

> The American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, and certain other individuals and groups representing farmers have filed petitions, asking the Director of the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety to suspend the application of the provisions of Part 391 of the Motor Carrier Safety Regulations insofar as those provisions apply to drivers of motor vehicles operated on behalf of farmers. Upon consideration of these petitions, the Director has concluded that, while some relief is warranted, it would not be in the interest of safety to provide an indefinite suspension of the rules or to exempt drivers of the larger, and inherently more dangerous, motor vehicles. Therefore, he is granting a 6-month suspension of certain of the driver qualification rules applicable solely to drivers of light-weight vehicles used to transport farm produce from a farm or supplies to a farm.

The Director of the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety saw fit to grant a 6-month suspension of his ruling in December of 1970. At that time the Director was willing to see the hardship his ruling would place on the small family farmer, the very root of our society, and he suspended his original proposal which was to have gone into effect January 1, 1971. I submit that on July 1, 1971, only 6 months later, circumstances will not have changed for the family farmer, and the ruling will be equally as harsh and unjust as it would have been in January of this year.

There seems to be no reason for the Department of Transportation to place these restrictions on our farmers and ranchers, and there are many reasons for not only an additional suspension, but a complete elimination of drivers of light-weight farm vehicles from this regulation. Certainly, a pickup truck is no more dangerous than the family automobile.

To stress to my colleagues the great burden this matter has placed upon my constituents I would like to enclose in my remarks at this time excerpts from letters received by me from fellow Wyomingites.

Mr. and Mrs. Wilfred Bunney, Aladdin, Wyo.:

> We are ranchers and do most of our trading in another state so this would affect us terribly. The 18 year olds are taken in the service and drive all equipment. Then they come home and are not able to drive a truck or a pickup. We are opposed to this bill; it would ruin us ranchers.

Mrs. Ernest Leither, Northeast, Wyo.:

> We are residents of the northeast corner of Wyoming (with a Belle Fourche, South Dakota address) and it would be a real hardship for us and many others here, to say nothing of the expense involved in driving greater distances to get the same services and supplies. And many times the only way we can get out is with a pickup truck.

Mr. and Mrs. Joe Svoboda, Alva, Wyo.:

> We are, of course, quite worried about the Department of Transportation ruling that requires pickup and truck drivers to be 21 years of age, besides several other requirements. Some exemptions must be given farmers or agricultural operations will be seriously handicapped.

Marion L. Peters, Pine Bluffs, Wyo.:

> Its effect on the farmers and ranchers can only be one of hardship unless federal regulations of the farm truck driver qualifications are modified.

Bud Raben, Jr., Huntley, Wyo.:

> As a small rancher-farmer, we have been depending on some part time help from high school age boys. We are a scant six miles from the Nebraska state line and occasionally do business in that state. If rigidly enforced, these federal regulations will hinder the economical operation of many such state line farmers and ranchers.

Albert Grammens, Powell, Wyo.:

> I am very concerned about the new Federal Regulations of Farm Truck Driver Qualifications! I farm 225 acres between Powell and Cody, Wyoming. I raise 135 acres of sugar beets and 90 acres of malt barley. Both of these crops have to be trucked to market. I would be directly affected by this regulation.

Mr. and Mrs. K. M. Driskill, Alva, Wyo.:

> We would like to protest the new trucking regulations the Department of Transportation has proposed. This regulation would work a real hardship on most farmers and ranchers who are just barely getting by financially now. Our young sons (17 and on) do most of the truck driving now. They are better truck drivers than the older fellows. This would cut them out and we would need to hire help for the job. You should realize that much of our traveling is done in such a vehicle because of our road conditions. These regulations are designed to strangle further the rancher and farmer—we do produce the food, you know, so why make it so tough that we can't do our job?

Mr. Forrest R. Allen, Cody, Wyo.:

> We farm 220 acres between Cody and Powell, Wyoming and raise alfalfa hay and malt barley. We also own property in Montana and make trips back and forth. We use our pickup to travel many times into Montana and back on farm business and this would affect us.

Mr. Paul Schiltz, Powell, Wyo.:

> I farm 200 acres on Heart Mountain project. I raise 45 acres of beets and about 50 acres of grain or malt barley. Both of these crops have to be trucked to the market, and under the ruling I would be directly affected by this regulation. I use my pickup to travel to Montana and also my truck to haul grass seed up there. In the interest of all of us farmers in the State of Wyoming, I sincerely hope that we can count on your support.

Dean T. Prosser, Jr., executive secretary of Wyoming Stock Growers Association:

> Several members of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, a trade association of some 3000 ranchers and farmers, have become quite concerned about the proposed safety regulation recently announced by the Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety to become effective July 1, 1971.
>
> It appears to us that it would be a great inconvenience to the average farmer and rancher if all drivers of these vehicles were required to be over 21 years of age and in possession of all the detailed requirements as specified in the order. This rule and regulation would also have a tendency to further reduce the availability of jobs for high school and college students during the summer months.

Mr. Bernard A. Bode, president, Laramie County Farm Bureau, Burns, Wyo.:

> This ruling will force a hardship on many farmers in our area as we live close to the Colorado and Nebraska lines, and many times find it necessary to buy or sell our products in one of these states. Although many farmers may not have to cross a state line more than several times a year, others who farm across the line in a different state may have to drive a pickup or truck across the line nearly every day.
>
> As to the age limit on drivers, if this law limits the driver to 21 years and over, it will rob our young people of a chance of employment which is very necessary financially as well as character building. Also, these young farm kids have a very impressive safety record when driving our trucks and pickups. Why limit our already short supply of farm labor?

Richard H. Neubauer, executive secretary, Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation:

> We feel that the new interpretation of these regulations is not only confusing to agricultural people, but if implemented would create tremendous hardships and unnecessary record keeping.

Mr. John Allemand, Hanna, Wyo.:

> This is really going to work a hardship on the farm and ranch people of Wyoming.

OPPOSITION TO RAILPAX DECISION

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Bluefield Daily Telegraph, Bluefield, W. Va., on Saturday, April 3, 1971. It is further evidence of the strong opposition in my congressional district to the recent Railpax decision.

The editorial follows:

N&W ROUTE CLEARLY SUPERIOR

The more one considers the selection by the new Railpax Corp. of the Chesapeake & Ohio route over that of the Norfolk & Western Railway from Norfolk, Va., to Cincinnati, Ohio, the more outrageous the decision appears. There is good reason to wonder whether those who made the decision took the facts of the case into consideration at all.

Some of these facts were spelled out in a recent communication by the United Transportation Workers Union headquartered in Roanoke, Va. The UTW chairman, M. Y. Lusk, sent this summary, regarding the situation in Virginia, to various officials and individuals in an attempt to gain recognition for the N&W route by the new federally subsidized rail passenger network:

"The Department of Transportation announced on January 28, 1971 that five new pairs of cities had been included in the basic plan for intercity passenger service under the National Rail Passenger Corporation when it begins operations on May 1, 1971.

"Included in the five new pairs added were Norfolk-Newport News and Cincinnati. There have been three routes suggested by which these trains would run. One plan would be from Newport News to Richmond, to Charlottesville, Clifton Forge, Charleston, Kenova and Cincinnati. This is the route now used by the C&O. The second would be from Norfolk through Petersburg to Lynchburg, then to Clifton Forge, Charleston and Kenova. The third route suggested would be the route now serviced by the N&W from Norfolk to Cincinnati. This would be Norfolk, Suffolk, Petersburg, Lynchburg, Roanoke, Christiansburg, Bluefield, Williamson, Kenova, Portsmouth and Cincinnati, Ohio . . .

"Naturally Richmond is making a big effort to secure this service. We, however, believe that in basic need, the route now used by the Norfolk and Western will provide the greatest number of people with an opportunity to make use of the service.

"The route we are proposing will serve directly six of the ten largest cities in Virginia. These are, (1) Norfolk, (3) Virginia Beach, (6) Portsmouth, (8) Roanoke, (9) Chesapeake, (10) Lynchburg. It would be within easy driving distance (30–40 minutes) of (2) Richmond, (3) Newport News, (4) Hampton and would therefore service nine of the ten largest cities of Virginia.

"The State Corporation Commission, in their December 30, 1970 presentation to the Department of Transportation, provided figures to show that the C&O handled 9,884 passengers in and out of Newport News, Norfolk and Williamsburg. The N&W, meanwhile, handled 25,398 passengers in and out of Norfolk alone. If the count for Suffolk had been added, as Williamsburg was for the C&O count, the total would be much greater. In 1969 N&W trains 3 and 4, between Norfolk and Cincinnati, handled 72,234 passengers for an average of 198 per day. This clearly shows the demand for service via this route.

"Virginia colleges and universities would be well served by the N&W route. In 1969, 58,165 instate students attended state-supported four-year institutions of higher learning. This route would directly serve Old Dominion Norfolk State, Virginia State, Longwood, Radford and VPI. The service would also be easily accessible to VCU students via Petersburg, thirty minutes away by Interstate 95 from the Richmond campus. In all over 40,000 of the state's 58,165 students would have access to this train. Longwood, Radford, VPI and Virginia State now depend heavily on this train for transportation. The bus service is indirect and infrequent and airline service is not available.

"Besides the state-supported colleges, the following private schools would be served—Bluefield College, Chesapeake College, Ferrum Junior College, Hampden-Sydney College, Hollins College, Lynchburg College, Randolph-Macon Women's College, Roanoke College, Sweet Briar College and Virginia Wesleyan College.

"I hope that you will see fit to support us in our drive to secure the selection of the Norfolk and Western route for this area."

Few did see fit, as it turned out, and the award went to the C&O. Now the problem is to see if anything can be salvaged from this mess.

Upcoming hearings before the House Interstate Commerce Committee headed by Rep. Harley O. Staggers, D-W. Va., may provide such an opportunity. In addition there is the problem of preventing the N&W, if possible, from abandoning its own rail passenger service effective May 1, now that it has been shut out of Railpax. That too needs a high priority. Rep. James Kee, D-W. Va., is working on that aspect of the situation, and hopefully will be able to do something about it.

SET THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON J. EDGAR HOOVER

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Congressman HALE BOGGS made grave charges Monday against the FBI and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover. These charges were made on the House floor and attracted national headlines and news comment.

Specifically, Mr. BOGGS charged that the FBI has engaged in wiretapping of telephones of Congressmen and uses the "tactics of the Soviet Union and Hitler's Gestapo." In demanding Mr. Hoover's resignation, Mr. BOGGS said:

We are a great country because we are a free country under the Bill of Rights. The way Mr. Hoover is running the FBI today, it is no longer a free country.

The FBI has denied these charges, stating that they "have absolutely no basis in fact." Attorney General Mitchell denied categorically that the FBI "has tapped the telephone of any Member of the House or Senate—now or in the past."

I challenge Mr. BOGGS to produce evidence to support these charges which have cast a dark shadow over Mr. Hoover and the men and women of the FBI, an organization which has remained untainted in the eyes of America for the past 47 years. The public has the right to know the basis of Mr. BOGGS' irresponsible charges and the record should be set straight. I think it is time for the majority leader to "put up, or shut up."

WASHINGTON SHOULD NOT BE INTIMIDATED BY HOOLIGANS AND RADICALS

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am sure everyone here is aware of the negotiations instigated by antiwar leaders, led by militant revolutionary Rennie Davis, for Government permission to set up an encampment in Rock Creek Park for some 75,000 protesters from April 24 to May 8. As reported by the Washington Post, this so-called "Peace City" encampment is "to be used as the launching point for 2 weeks of militant demonstrations—against the Indochina war."

Davis is reported to have warned, "I certainly hope the Government won't make the great error Mayor Daley made in Chicago," said to be a reference to the violence that resulted when Chicago police attempted to remove protesters from Grant Park during the 1968 Democrat Convention.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the position of the Government thus far has been that overnight camping in National Park areas in the Washington area is prohibited. There is no need for this city, the Capital of our Nation, to be intimidated by these two-bit hooligans nor should this collection of radicals from across the Nation be permitted to deprive others, many of them tourists, of the enjoyment of this city for that 2-week period. Tourists and all other organizations that come here for whatever purpose must make arrangements for their own accommodations, and I see absolutely no reason why these protesters should be treated any differently, aside from the implied threat of mass violence if the Federal and city officials do not bow to their demands.

Let me remind you of the bills that have been footed by the taxpayers, through the National Park Service, in the past in connection with these mass demonstrations. I would emphasize that the following are only Park Service costs and do not reflect the much larger amounts expended by the District government for added police protection and miscellaneous services:

Event	Date	Costs to Park Service	Reimbursement by sponsors
Resurrection City—Poor People's Campaign.	1968	$275,600	[1] $10,500
3-day antiwar moratorium.	November 1969	83,000	0
2-day antiwar demonstration.	May 1970	63,400	0
Total		422,000	[2] 10,500

[1] $5,000 bond plus $5,500 for lumber salvage.
[2] Reimbursed.

By contrast, the Honor America Day activities on July 4, 1970, cost the Park Service an estimated $186,000 of which $118,000 was reimbursed by the sponsors for facilities and services directly connected with the planned events. It might

be noted that considerable costs were incurred to secure against the dissidents that had vowed to disrupt the ceremonies.

Mr. Speaker, the use of park area for this antiwar encampment has nothing to do with the rights of peaceful assembly, however far such right might be stretched, but to allow such encampment to take place would definitely infringe upon the rights of every American to the unmolested and lawful enjoyment of such public areas. Furthermore, those who are concerned about the protection of our environment might take note of the mudhole that was left by Resurrection City in 1968, within eyesight of the Lincoln Memorial, that is only now being restored to its natural beauty. It is time to stand firm in the face of unreason.

ALLEVIATING CONGESTION OF NATION'S AIRWAYS AND TERMINALS

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk briefly about a new proposal for developing an experimental jet short take off and landing—STOL—research airplane having quiet engines. The proposed development is part of NASA's fiscal year 1972 budget request.

The proposed development is meant to provide our country with the basic technology to satisfy a pressing need for a short-haul air transportation system. Major objectives are reducing noise to acceptable levels and alleviating congestion of airways and terminals.

It should be understood as the budget is being considered by the Congress that the NASA proposal is solely for the design, construction, and testing of an experimental research aircraft using advanced technology.

The plan calls for this program to be a joint venture between Government and industry. However, the Government would participate only in the experimental aircraft stage. Development of a prototype aircraft leading to production for operational use would be solely the responsibility of the areospace and air transportation industries.

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I am speaking out today is to help bring about a clear understanding of the basic idea. Both the Congress and the public need to consider the proposal on its merits.

Therefore, it is with some dismay that I note what seems to be the beginning of a campaign to review the proposal in press releases skillfully designed to create confusion. The public and the Congress have every right to factual information on the STOL proposal—and on any other issue before Congress. On the other hand, attempts to cloud this issue—or any other issue—with distortions and innuendos must be strongly guarded against.

We on the Science and Astronautics Committee have held nearly 4 weeks of hearings during the past 2 years for specifically reviewing the state of aviation and areonautical research and development. Among the critical problem areas we identified were noise pollution and airport and airway congestion. The STOL concept is designed to assist in solving both of these major problems.

PLAYING WITH THE FIRE OF THE RISING SUN

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, an important article by former Under Secretary of State George W. Ball dealing with American-Japanese trade relations appeared in Newsweek of April 12. The article follows:

PLAYING WITH THE FIRE OF THE RISING SUN

(By George W. Ball)

The chronicle of our relations with Japan prior to the second world war begins with ineptitude and ends with disaster. Not only did we affront Japanese pride by slamming our doors on their sons and daughters, but, by prohibitive tariffs, we excluded their goods from our markets. For this protectionist outrage we, of course, paid dearly. By threatening Japan's ability to earn the foreign exchange needed to buy the raw materials required to sustain her then exploding population, we helped encourage her soldiers to gain control of raw material sources through conquest—a course of action pretentiously known as the "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere," which ultimately led to Pearl Harbor.

Happily, in the postwar period, we have shown the Japanese a more mature comprehension and a greater awareness of mutual interests; yet the critical test is only now beginning, as—a quarter century after the war—Japan abandons its "low posture" for a more assertive role.

Where that role may lead no one can say, since Japan is pervasively rootless. More than in any other country, the war tore asunder the fabric of Japanese society and politics. No longer was the Emperor the god-king, with his imperial will expressed through the military. No longer was the state cult of Shinto intact, or the obsession with ancestor worship and the Confucian authority of the family. Today, as a great industrial nation, Japan turns her eyes toward the West; yet even now the atavistic pull of the mainland remains strong, since Japan's Western ties lack the vital adhesive of a common culture, language, literature or history.

Largely because Japan leaped from feudalism to industrial pre-eminence in less than a century, the resemblance between her institutions and those of Western nations is more apparent than real. We watch with dismay as her great industrial companies pursue pricing policies and practices in external markets that subordinate profit to the national purpose. We find the collective spirit of national effort permeating every aspect of society.

SENSIBLE COMPROMISE

Thus to fit Japan into a world system of politics and economics shaped by the traditions of Western individualism will not be easy, nor can it be achieved by America alone. Although European statesmen and business leaders seem deaf to the problem, it remains a common task for the whole community of industrialized nations. Meanwhile, Japanese relations with the rest of the world are becoming more and more polarized between Tokyo and Washington.

Undoubtedly, those two capitals have much to say to one another, but not always with full understanding. Recently they have faced two issues of special urgency: the reversion of Okinawa and the opening of the burgeoning Japanese market to the produce and investment of the West.

On the first issue, President Nixon took a long stride forward when he promised Prime Minister Sato in November 1969 that Okinawa would revert to Japanese administration during 1972. It was a decision long overdue, since how could anyone possibly justify the continued rule by the United States, a whole generation after the war, of more than 1 million Japanese living in Japanese territory? The solution—a sensible compromise that assured the United States the same rights in the Okinawa base as in the bases in the Japanese home islands—came just in the nick of time. It saved the Sato government and forestalled the termination of the security treaty which might otherwise have occurred last spring.

Yet, having taken this statesmanlike step, the Administration is now in danger of throwing away the benefits by deciding not to effectuate the Okinawa reversion by executive agreement, which at the most would require only a majority vote of both houses of Congress, but rather by a treaty, requiring the approval of two-thirds of the Senate.

DANGEROUS SUSPICION

All other things being equal, one could properly regard the issue as deserving full Senate treatment. But all things are not equal, for a totally irrelevant reason—that the Administration has shown a persistent willingness to sacrifice larger interests to fulfill a campaign promise to the American textile industry. In a so-far futile effort to reduce the inflow of Japanese textiles, not only has it squandered much political capital with Japan but it has proved more Catholic than the Pope by rejecting a proposal of self-restraint from Japanese industry that had been accepted by the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Wilbur Mills.

In the atmosphere of bitterness and confusion thus created, calm analysis cannot flourish, and suspicion has inevitably developed in Tokyo and elsewhere that the treaty route was deliberately chosen to strengthen the Administration's hand in extracting a more restrictive import limitation from Japan. Yet what could be more grotesque than an attempt to trade off the reversion of Okinawa—a vital step to preserve our security in the Far East—for the appeasement of a single industry and a few Southern senators, at large cost to American consumers and with grave risk of undercutting all hopes of widening access to the vast Japanese market?

Whatever the Administration's motives—and I prefer to draw no invidious conclusions—the situation demands the most careful attention, for we dare not let protectionism again wreck our relations with Japan, as occurred 40 years ago. But, unless the White House vigorously intervenes, the protectionist lobbies may well mobilize the maximum 34 Senate votes needed to block the Okinawa treaty, in the event Japan refuses to grant their protectionist demands. That is an eventuality to make one shudder, for if the President should prove unable to deliver on his promise to hand back Okinawa, there is no doubt that the whole fragile structure of our relations with Japan would come tumbling down. And if that should happen with the only large modern make defeat in Indochina seem like a pinindustrial nation in the Far East, it would prick.

DR. WILLIAM C. PETTY—EDUCATOR EXTRAORDINARY

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the dean of Illinois county school superintendents, as well as the dean of public officeholders in Lake County, Ill., is Dr. William C. Petty, superintendent of the educational service region. Dr. Petty is retiring voluntarily from his long service in the field of education on August 2, 1971. In recognition of Dr. Petty's distinguished career as a public servant and educator, he is to be honored at a testimonial dinner at the Illinois Beach Lodge in Zion, Ill., on April 23, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, born on a farm in Richland County, Ill., Bill Petty attended a rural one-room school and thereafter attended and was graduated from Olney Township High School in Olney, Ill. His higher education resulted in his earning a bachelor of education at Illinois State Normal University, a master of arts degree from the University of Chicago, and an honorary doctor of humane letters degree from Lake Forest College.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Petty began his career in education as a teacher in the country schools of Richland County, Ill. He served later as a principal and superintendent in public schools, and on March 11, 1931, began his service as county superintendent of schools in Lake County, Ill. He has been consecutively elected and reelected since that time—being the chief administrative officer of the public school systems of Lake County during a 40-year period of rapid growth and development.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Petty has won many honors and tributes in the course of his distingushed career. He is a member of Kappa Delta Pi, Phi Delta Kappa, honorary educational fraternities, and Pi Gamma Mu, an honorary social science fraternity. He served as a member of the Illinois Public School Commission, contributing to the codification of the laws of Illinois pertaining to public education. He is a life member of the Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers, as well as an honorary life member of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Petty's devotion to education is reflected also in the special attention which he has given to the handicapped youth of Lake County. He organized the Special Education Joint Agreement District for Lake County to benefit boys and girls whose handicaps prevent their normal education in the regular school system. He quite recently developed a parent's guide to special education services for the handicapped in Lake County.

Mr. Speaker, the program established by Dr. Petty sets forth the rights of the handicapped students as well as the steps for securing special educational services.

Mr. Speaker, this statement would be quite inadequate if I did not make mention of his devoted wife, Mrs. Lillie Petty, whose individual career and talents have contributed substantially to the success of Dr. Petty's career. Lillie Petty in her own capacity is an educator of some reputation and has served as a member of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. She and Dr. Petty have resided in Antioch, Ill., during the period in which I have known them and their three married sons, Mr. Frank E. Petty of Los Angeles, William E. Petty of Antioch, and Dr. R. David Petty of Shawano, Wis. All have distinguished careers of which the family is rightfully proud.

Mr. Speaker, there are a great many persons in Lake County, Ill., who enjoy the same privilege as I of a close personal friendship with Dr. Bill Petty and his family. In paying this tribute to him, I speak also in their behalf, as well as in behalf of the teachers and school administrators, students and parents who have benefited from his service and leadership in education.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. William C. Petty has provided an example of the best in public service to the residents of the 12th District of Illinois, as well as to the citizens of the Nation. I am proud to call his 40-year record to the attention of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives and to express to Dr. and Mrs. Petty my personal affection and profound respect on the occasion of the completion of his service as head of the public schools of Lake County.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that this does not mean the end of Dr. Petty's career. Instead, I expect him to contribute in many ways to an improvement of the quality of life in our Nation during the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding these remarks, I wish to extend to Bill and Lillie Petty many more happy, healthy, and productive years.

REORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say how pleased I am with the President's proposal for reorganizing the executive branch of the Government. The task is of such colossal size that many people are tempted to believe it cannot possibly be done. Yet, I feel certain, myself, that what must be accomplished for the smooth operation of this great country can in fact be achieved. We all want to study the bills and the detailed research papers in order to begin action as soon as possible.

I am particularly eager to see that decisionmaking is shifted away from Washington, back to the regions where projects and people actually receive Government assistance. It is impossible for Washington bureaucrats, no matter how professionally dedicated they are to understand the intricacies of local problems. Even field visits over a few days do not really acquaint Federal administrators with the local needs, previous planning measures, and local priorities.

However, if the executive branch were to establish regional offices in 10 cities across the country as has been suggested, then professional administrators could study regional needs and develop vital expertise in the appropriate fields.

Organizationally, under the regional offices would be local field branches for the four major Departments so the decisionmaking power would, in fact, be returned to the people. The administration proposals outline that only regional directors and assistant directors would report to Department Secretaries in Washington. That would in itself contribute to speedier decisions and less bureaucratic redtape.

At last count, OEO, HEW, HUD, Labor, and Interior had 629 field offices reporting directly to Washington. We must reorganize our system of doing business for such practices are obviously inefficient and not in the best interests of the American people.

GOLD AGAINST INFLATION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, almost everyone says he is against inflation, yet it continues with no end in sight. For to end inflation requires fiscal discipline—by Government, business, labor, and the consumer. No one must demand and obtain more than he is actually worth, or spend more than he takes in. And this is not an age which takes kindly to discipline.

Under our present monetary system, it is fatally easy to break the bonds of fiscal discipline. All that is needed is to pass a law—such as the recent bill raising the national debt limit—and then to borrow money by a process which creates more dollars not backed by anything of actual value. This situation has developed as a result of our abandonment of the gold standard for the dollar in 1934.

Nearly all advanced civilizations have used gold as their basic monetary standard. Its attributes of durability and beauty have given it a character apart from that of any other metal, a character that has remained untarnished throughout the ages. Gold commands respect in all quarters for its quality and imperishability. You may throw it into the ocean; you may hide it in the earth; or you may subject it to the heat of the furnace, but it remains essentially unchanged and unmistakable in its appearance.

So long as gold may be freely owned and traded, the very qualities which give it so much intrinsic value also act as a check on the inflation of other media of exchange, whose value will then inevitably be soon measured in terms of gold. When gold is in circulation, the people cannot long be fooled about what is happening when Government dilutes the value of their paper money. But when only paper money circulates and private ownership of monetary gold is banned, as in the United States today, then each

group in society can blame another for inflation, and no one really knows just how fast the paper money is losing value because of it.

Among other things, inflation is a hidden tax. When Government creates new money unbacked by real value, Government gets to spend it first, thereby obtaining more for its inflated dollars than the private citizen who gets them only later when the effects of dilution begin to be felt. And Government manipulation of the paper money supply is standard practice in every advanced totalitarian regime.

Prof. Hans Sennholz, chairman of the Department of Economics at Grove City College in Pennsylvania, leading disciple of and heir apparent to world-famous economist Ludwig von Mises, states the problem and the solution very clearly:

> Step by step the federal government has assumed control over our monetary system. It thus captured a potent source of revenue and a vital command post over the economic lives of its people. That is why every friend of freedom is dedicated to the restoration of free money which is also sound money. It is the gold standard . . .
>
> The first objective must be the freedom to trade and hold gold . . . There must be no government interference with the gold markets, no regulation or controls, no taxation or dictation that would sabotage the gold markets. The next objective must be the individual freedom to use gold in all economic exchanges . . . the legal tender law which decrees that government must be accepted in payment of all debt, public and private, must exempt "gold contracts" and "gold clauses" that specifically call for payment of certain measures of gold.

I have introduced H.R. 6790 to give effect to these two excellent suggestions of Professor Sennholz. This bill would remove all present restrictions on the ownership, buying and selling of gold by American citizens, and allowing payment of contractual obligations in gold if both parties to a contract agree to it.

NO EVIDENCE PRODUCED IN HOOVER CRITICISM

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, Monday on this floor one of our distinguished colleagues severely criticized the distinguished Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover. It was charged specifically that the FBI taps telephones of Members of this body and of Members of the Senate.

To my mind, no charge leveled against the FBI could be more shocking if it is true. I repeat, if it is true.

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that not one scintilla of evidence has been produced. In fact, an FBI spokesman has denied this charge as it has been denied in the past. Additionally, Attorney General John Mitchell has unequivocally declared that the FBI is not tapping the phones of Congressmen or Senators. In the face of these denials, the newspapers reported that the majority leader called the press to say he had "proof positive" that the FBI had tapped and bugged Members' telephones.

I say it is time to stop the game of allegations, denials, and counterallegations. If there is proof, this body is entitled to have it produced now. If there is none, and I believe there is none, then J. Edgar Hoover and his dedicated employees are due an apology. I think this body has the right to know the facts.

CALLEY: EXPOSING THE MORAL ISSUE

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, a worthwhile article discussing the quality of the debate over the trial and conviction of Lieutenant Calley appeared in the Wall Street Journal on Monday, April 5, authored by David C. Anderson. The article follows:

CALLEY: EXPOSING THE MORAL ISSUE

(By David C. Anderson)

The conviction of Lieutenant William Calley, on charges of premeditated murder by a military tribunal has accomplished what the militant doves have been trying to accomplish for the past several years. It has momentarily moved the moral implications of the U.S. participation in the Indochina war into the field of intense national debate.

The moral question has tended to be studiously ignored. When Calley was arrested nobody denied that what he has now been convicted of doing was morally contemptible; the prevailing argument held only that the My Lai massacre was an aberration and not a conscious result of American policy, whose basic moral intent was positive. Only the most vociferous doves sought to extend Calley's guilt to all of American policy.

With Calley's conviction, however, a striking combination of hawks and doves has begun to argue differently; Calley is only a scapegoat, they say, for in fact the kind of atrocity he committed has been a routine result of U.S. strategy and tactics. If he is guilty of premeditated murder, they continue, so are countless other infantrymen, artillerymen, bomber pilots, and the officers who give them their orders.

This moral question of Indochina deserves the attention of every American, in government and out. For the evidence is unavoidable that the current understanding of Lieutenant Calley is sound; it is implicit in the nature of the war and the way the U.S. chose or felt compelled to fight it.

Aware that the enemy had the ability to disappear easily into the South Vietnamese villages, U.S. commanders sought to deny the Vietcong this sanctuary. "Pacification," winning the sympathies of the rural people, didn't work very well, so the solution had to be military.

Now this, as former Vietnam correspondent Neil Sheehan wrote recently in the New York Times Book Review, could have been accomplished relatively humanely, by sending enough U.S. troops to Vietnam to occupy enough of the rural areas.

But since it would have required a much heavier commitment to the war than the American people were willing to accept, U.S. commanders turned to reliance on firepower, with the effective result of denying the enemy his base in rural villages by destroying the whole structure of rural life. Rural areas were cleared as "free fire zones," their residents moved into refugee centers.

Furthermore, the war was a guerrilla war; this meant friend was hard to distinguish from foe. It also meant U.S. commanders employed the sweep-and-destroy mission, whose index of success was the body count. Very understandably, the somewhat frustrated American GI, fighting in a deeply alien land, could conclude easily that even a friendly Vietnamese life isn't worth much if it gets in the way of American operations. A great many American GIs had enough moral sense to resist this notion, of course, but many apparently did not. Murdering Vietnamese civilians at My Lai, Lieutenant Calley testifies, "wasn't any big deal."

It has been argued, with good reason, that the North Vietnamese and Vietcong commit atrocities too, and that their immoral behavior results from the pursuit of an immoral cause while ours at least is the product of a moral cause. This is true, but lately it has also begun to look less relevant. The magnitude of the military's moral lapse is substantial, and the pursuit of our cause frustrated, if not a failure.

Now these facts are depressing enough, but equally depressing is the quality of the debate which has begun over them. Some of those who have supported our involvement in the war try to excuse what Calley did, though a jury of military officers judged him a murderer after a searching trial. And some dovish politicians are calling for an American Nuremburg trial to exorcise the demons whose influence placed Calley in My Lai on that terrible morning—surely an extreme remedy.

It is too bad, for the questions raised by Calley's conviction are quite important to the future of America. Specifically, they involve at the deepest level the fact that since World War II we have managed to combine vast global power with viable democratic government, an unprecedented combination. The moral issues raised by Lieutenant Calley reflect the fundamental tension in this arrangement.

Increased power leads to increased moral ambiguity in the conduct of foreign policy; power tends to preserve itself for good reason or bad, even if morally questionable tactics are necessary to the task.

But viable democracy likes moral simplicity, and furthermore, a democratic society will not be fooled. Had Calley been a Soviet officer, and My Lai an Eastern European town, the Russian people and the world might never have learned about him. But as an American in an American war, attempts to hide him failed. An American journalist won a Pulitzer prize for telling us about My Lai.

For the U.S. to survive as a powerful democracy, this conflict—the ultimate magnification of the ancient dilemma of power and morality—must somehow be resolved, or at least better understood by the American people. Approaches to resolving it are by no means impossible:

A powerful democracy should seek consciously to limit its foreign involvements only to those which involve clear and obvious threats to its own vital interests, and only to those where the application of its power will work effectively.

A powerful democracy, furthermore, should make surer than it has in the past that its democracy is effective for its power decisions—its people should have a large and rational voice in the shaping of its foreign policies and commitments.

A powerful democracy should seek somehow to educate the rest of the world to the idea that it is different, that its self-limitation in cases of ambiguous threat should not be taken for weakness in the face of clear threat, for example.

Perhaps, of course, such suggestions are a bit naive, given the normal murkiness of international diplomacy. Perhaps there is no way to resolve the dilemma of power and mo-

rality; perhaps a powerful democracy is a contradiction in terms and is doomed to fall.

But the issue exposed by Lieutenant Calley is of that magnitude, and beyond the matter of his guilt or of his superiors', that is what we should be discussing now.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S POW POLICIES: A STUDY IN FUTILITY

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, on January 2, 23 Members of the House sent President Nixon a letter proposing a new plan for ending our military involvement in Southeast Asia and recovering all American prisoners of war held by the North Vietnamese, the National Liberation Front, and the Pathet Lao.

We called it "proportional repatriation." The letter explains the basic outline of the plan, and I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

JANUARY 2, 1971.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We share your strong desire to secure safe return of the American prisoners of war now held in Southeast Asia, and to end our military involvement in Vietnam by shifting responsibility back to the Vietnamese. We share the sense of national outrage at the inhumane treatment these brave prisoners have been forced to endure, which has caused great anguish to their families.

We share your dismay that your offer to exchange prisoners of war has not been accepted, and your commitment to secure their safe return at the earliest possible time. It is a source of deep concern to us, as it is to you, that efforts to obtain release of our prisoners of war have been essentially unsuccessful, and we wish there were more reason for confidence that similar efforts will be more successful in the future.

We know of your interest in developing new approaches which may offer hope for these unfortunate men, and hope of ending American involvement in the war. After considerable thought, we suggest that our best hope of achieving both goals may lie in tying them together in a coordinated plan which would be offered to the other side at the Paris negotiations. The purpose of this letter is to offer such a plan for your consideration.

The basis of the plan is what might be called "proportional repatriation." It consists of an agreement between us and the North Vietnamese that we would withdraw a certain percentage of our troop complement in Vietnam each time they returned the same percentage of American prisoners of war to us. It should be understood that this approach in no way implies a willingness to let our men suffer one additional moment beyond the earliest possible time we could otherwise secure their safe return We make this proposal only in the hope of achieving a breakthrough in the negotiating deadlock caused by the apparent unwillingness of the other side to return any substantial number of prisoners in the foreseeable future.

Unfortunately, while the number of American troops in Vietnam is a matter of public record, the numbers of prisoners of war held by the National Liberation Front and the Pathet Lao are not. Thus, before the coordinated repatriation and withdrawal could begin, it would be necessary for the North Vietnamese to publicize the total number of American prisoners held by all these groups. As further signs of good faith, it would be reasonable for us to require them to publicize the names of the individual prisoners, and to agree to repatriate all prisoners as long as we withdrew all American troops.

As a corresponding sign of good faith on our part, it would be equitable for us to declare our intention to withdraw completely within some specified reasonable maximum time, on the order of twelve months. The exact length of time, as well as the withdrawal sechedule, could be a subject of negotiations. This would leave you, as "Commander-in-Chief," flexibility in determining the best way to safely disengage U. S. troops.

Use of a mutually acceptable intermediary would free each side from fear of duplicity by the other. The intermediary would be a neutral nation or an international agency. It would receive and hold each contingent of prisoners of war from the other side; it would then release the men to us only after observing that the appropriate number of American troops had in fact departed from Vietnam.

The other side would agree to allow the intermediary to run checks and inspections to insure there were not more prisoners of war than publicly admitted. We in turn would allow the intermediary to run checks and inspections to insure we were not replacing our withdrawals under guise of rotation.

We regard this as a reasonable and equitable proposal that should be accepetable to both sides. If you feel, as we do, that this plan represents a fair settlement in terms of our national interest, we hope you will consider incorporating it into our negotiating strategy.

Signatures as of February 25, 1971:

Robert L. Leggett, Democrat of California; Donald W. Riegel, Jr., Republican of Michigan; Frank Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania; Jerome Waldie, Democrat of California; Richard Hanna, Democrat of California; Michael Harrington, Democrat of Massachusetts; David Pryor, Democrat of Arkansas; Abner Mikva, Democrat of Illinois; Spark Matsunaga, Democrat of Hawaii; Shirley Chisholm, Democrat of New York; Henry Helstoski, Democrat of New Jersey; James Howard, Democrat of New Jersey; Paul McCloskey, Republican of California; Peter Kyros, Democrat of Maine; Seymour Halpern, Republican of New York; William F. Ryan, Democrat of New York; Parren Mitchell, Democrat of Maryland; James Abourezk, Democrat of South Dakota; Ronald Dellums, Democrat of California; Nick Begich, Democrat of Alaska; John Seiberling, Democrat of Ohio; and Arthur Link, Democrat of North Dakota.

Members of 91st Congress:

George Brown, Democrat of California; Allard Lowenstein, Democrat of New York; Jeffery Cohelan, Democrat of California; and Richard McCarthy, Democrat of New York.

I will not call it a "bold new proposal"—that phrase has been somewhat overworked lately. But proportional repatriation contained several elements which to the best of my knowledge had not been suggested earlier, and I believed, and still do believe, that it offered considerable hope. We awaited the President's response.

It never came. To this day, the President has not bothered to send us his views on our proposal. I do not know what he has to do that is more important than ending the war and freeing the POW's. I do not know why he failed to answer. I suppose there is nothing to be gained by speculating on his motives.

A few weeks ago, the Armed Services Committee, on which I have the honor to serve, heard testimony by Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird on the military procurement bill. I took advantage of this opportunity to ask him to give his views on proportional repatriation for the record, which he was kind enough to do. I assume he speaks for the administration in this matter.

I insert the full text of his reply in the RECORD at this point:

RESPONSE BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE MELVIN LAIRD TO THE LEGGETT-RIEGLE PLAN FOR PROPORTIONAL REPATRIATION OF PRISONERS OF WAR

It is my view that, at the present time and in its present form, the proposal would not achieve the desired result and, in fact, might well prolong the return of our men and an accounting for those missing.

The proposal discards a well-founded U.S. position. We have long maintained that the prisoner issue is humanitarian and should not be related to other aspects of the conflict. The enemy has taken the opposite position and has sought to link the prisoner issue to the political negotiations for a settlement of the conflict. Agreement now to link the prisoner issue solely to political concessions would establish a precedent that could well make it more difficult to resolve satisfactorily the prisoner problem. An offer to connect prisoner release only to U.S. troop withdrawals would formally establish their hostage value.

The proposal suggests that agreement on such an offer would still permit the President the flexibility to arrive at a satisfactory withdrawal schedule through negotiations. This seems most unlikely. The President has repeatedly offered to negotiate a timetable for the withdrawal of all non-South Vietnamese troops. However, faced with the enemy's refusal to discuss withdrawal, especially that of its own troops, the President has undertaken to remove U.S. forces under the Vietnamization plan.

With regard to flexibility, the proposal would tend to foreclose on other opinions. We believe that, in the absence of a negotiated settlement, Vietnamization offers us the best course toward the achievement of our ends. At the same time, as Vietnamization progresses, we believe there is increasing incentive for the enemy to negotiate a settlement including the release of POWs.

The problem of prisoners and missing servicemen is one of the issues that must be resolved before any final settlement. The suggested proposal could have the effect of denying the President the flexibility to proceed with Vietnamization. Should we make the proposal as suggested and the enemy then refuse it, we would find ourselves faced with choosing between continuing our withdrawal under Vietnamization or retarding and perhaps stopping withdrawals. The former position would be in direct contradiction to the principles of the suggested proposal. The latter position totally compromises our best course of action, in the absence of negotiations, to achieve our objective of self-determination for the Republic of Vietnam while ending American involvement in the fighting.

There is still another aspect to be considered. We should not discount the value of the help given by various intermediary countries which have interceded with the enemy in behalf of our men missing or captured. The efforts of third parties have in our view had some effect and might still provide the catalyst for obtaining some agreement on the release of our men and an accounting for those missing. In all cases, intermediaries have been willing to assist us

solely on the basis of humanitarian considerations. Linking the prisoner issue to the political aspects of the conflict would in all probability remove this possible means of achieving the return of our men.

In summary, while the "proportional repatriation" proposal would appear to provide a reasonable plan if none other existed, there are other options which present, in our view, a higher probability of success. Efforts to undertake the suggested plan would tend to place achievement of the very objectives we seek even further beyond our immediate reach.

While I am grateful for Mr. Laird's taking the time to give us the substantive response we were unable to elicit from Mr. Nixon, I find myself in strong disagreement with his views.

It seems to me that Mr. Laird's strategy, while well meant, is bound to be an exercise in futility. I cannot imagine that it will achieve any success.

The crux of the administration position is explained in this paragraph:

The proposal discards a well-founded U.S. position. We have long maintained that the prisoner issue is humanitarian and should not be related to other aspects of the conflict. The enemy has taken the opposite position and has sought to link the prisoner issue to the political negotiations for a settlement of the conflict. Agreement now to link the prisoner issue solely to political concessions would establish a precedent that could well make it more difficult to resolve satisfactorily the prisoner problem. An offer to connect prisoner release only to U.S. troop withdrawals would formally establish their hostage value.

Mr. Speaker, I know we have a drug problem in the Armed Forces. But this paragraph suggests that the use of pot and LSD has penetrated far higher than we had thought.

Mr. Speaker, the emperor's new clothes do not exist, and for the sake of our POW's we had better stop pretending otherwise. Whether we do or do not consider the prisoner issue to be political is of no importance. The fact is, the other side considers it to be political, and they are the ones who have complete control over the fate of the prisoners. If they say it is political, we must either play the game on their terms or we cannot play at all. I do not like this; I wish it were not so, but it is so, and we are not going to change it by playing with words. The hostage value of the POW's is there, whether we formally acknowledge it or not.

I find it ironic that President Nixon himself acknowledged their hostage value on March 4, when he said:

As long as there are American POWs in North Vietnam we will have to maintain a residual force in South Vietnam.

This meant we value the prisoners so highly that for their sake we will do something which is against our national interest: we will remain in Vietnam. But now Mr. Laird says we do not value them so highly that for their sake we will do something which is consistent with our national interest: we will not get out.

We choose to stay in Vietnam, to let our men rot in the prison camps while others are killed or maimed on the battlefield and our national treasure continues down the drain, rather than returning prisoners and troops safe to their families and turning our financial resources to urgent domestic needs.

Is this not absurd?

Mr. Laird says:

Should we make the proposal as suggested and the enemy then refuse it, we would find ourselves faced with choosing between continuing our withdrawal under Vietnamization or retarding and perhaps stopping our withdrawals. The former position would be in direct contradiction to the principles of the suggested proposal.

This is a legitimate misunderstanding on Mr. Laird's part. Our letter to President Nixon was not explicit on this point, and I will use this opportunity to clarify it.

If the other side does not accept, then we would continue the withdrawals. We would continue as if we had never made the offer.

The question which now comes to mind is, "If we are withdrawing anyway, what incentive does the other side have to release the prisoners?" The answer lies in the difference between partial and complete withdrawal. This difference is enormous in the eyes of the other side.

Vietnamization calls for partial withdrawal. President Nixon has consistently refused to state that he will ever take all troops and all air and logistic support out of Southeast Asia. Vietnamization says, "We're putting Saigon on a sink or swim basis, but every time they start to sink we're going to jump in and save them, even if this means we have to hang around forever." Vietnamization says we will not leave unless we can be sure a foreign-installed and foreign-approved government will sit in Saigon. This is what the whole war has been about.

Proportional repatriation offers to turn Vietnam back to the Vietnamese. This is what the other side has been fighting for for 30 years. I cannot imagine a stronger incentive to return the American POWs.

Moving from the serious back to the curious, we come to Mr. Laird's discussion of the use of third countries as intermediaries:

In all cases, intermediaries have been willing to assist us solely on the basis of humanitarian considerations. Linking the prisoner issue to the political aspects of the conflict would in all probability remove this possible means of achieving the return of our men.

What Mr. Laird is saying is that neutral countries are willing to help on the prisoner problem, but they would have no part of a proposal which offered to end the war as well. To argue that neutral nations will not act as peacemakers is to assume that your audience has not read a newspaper in 20 years.

Mr. Laird concludes:

In summary, while the "proportional repatriation" proposal would appear to provide a reasonable plan if none other existed, there are other options which present, in our view, a higher probability of success.

This is Mr. Laird's summary. In my summary, I would like to know what "other options" he is referring to in his summary. Nine prisoners have been released, primarily as gestures of goodwill toward the American peace groups. But official Government efforts have yielded nothing. The Sontay raid released zero prisoners. Efforts to appeal to world opinion have released zero prisoners. Letters to Hanoi have released zero prisoners. The Paris negotiations are universally acknowledged to be deadlocked. There is no reason to expect any of these approaches to be more fruitful in the forseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just that I can not see any other options which present a higher probability of success. I read the newspapers and attend the top-secret briefings, and I do not know of any other options which offer any probability of success.

We have offered a proposal which would work, and which I believe the other side would accept. Mr. Laird does not attempt to deny this. But he speaks of "other options which have a greater probability of success." What are these options? If anyone knows, I wish he would tell me.

TEXTILE RESOLUTION PASSED BY SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the South Carolina General Assembly recently passed a concurrent resolution which memorializes the President and the Congress to take steps necessary to restore order to international trade in textiles. The resolution also supports the U.S. Government's rejection of the fake proclamation by the Japanese textile industry which was purported to be a reasonable solution to the problem of textile imports.

Mr. Speaker this most timely resolution was introduced in the South Carolina Senate by Senator John D. Long, Senator Robert C. Lake, and Senator J. C. Bonner. I commend them and their colleagues for taking this action, and I urge the Congress and the administration to respond by taking the necessary action to curb the flood of cheap, low-wage textile imports. The concurrent resolution follows:

A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Memorializing the President and the Congress To Take Steps Necessary To Restore Order to International Trade in Textiles and Commending the President for Rejecting the Unsatisfactory Japanese Unilateral Textile Export Restraint Offer

Whereas, the importation of textiles and apparel from foreign nations has seriously undermined the entire economic structure of the State of South Carolina; and

Whereas, thousands of South Carolinians have lost their jobs or are on short time that causes them to earn below average wages; and

Whereas, the revenues of the State Government, County Governments and Municipal Governments of South Carolina are down by millions of dollars causing mandatory cutbacks in all agencies of State Government thereby affecting every citizen of this State; and

Whereas, the foreign competitors who flood our market and force thousands of our citizens completely out of work or onto short time manufacture and market their textiles and apparel under conditions that are illegal in the State of South Carolina and in the United States; and

Whereas, the government of Japan has offered a most unsatisfactory proposal to restrain, unilaterally, its textile-apparel exports to the United States; and

Whereas, the Japanese proposal has been rejected by the President of the United States, by the Governor of South Carolina, by many members of the Congress, including the Senators and Representatives from South Carolina, by the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, by the South Carolina Textile Manufacturers Association, by numerous newspaper editorials and by many others; and

Whereas, the textile markets of the United States are virtually wide open to foreign imports while many of the major exporters to this country tightly protect their own markets against our textile exports; and

Whereas, our government has imposed upon the American industry numerous regulations and cost factors that are not required of our foreign competitors; and

Whereas, the recent Japanese offer is based upon imports at the highest level in history; and

Whereas, the percentage growth rate under the Japanese proposal would be nearly double the percentage growth rate of the American textile industry since World War II; and

Whereas, it would undercut the long-term arrangement on cotton textiles that has been in effect for ten years; and

Whereas, the Japanese plan destroys the vitally important concept of categories and government to government agreements; and

Whereas, the textile industry of South Carolina and the entire nation has invested billions of dollars in recent years in new plants and equipment, making it the most efficient in the world; and

Whereas, the American textile industry pays its employees approximately two dollars an hour more than the industry of Japan, with the gap being even wider between this country and some other Asian Nations; and

Whereas, the Legislature and the people of South Carolina are not willing to see these terribly unfair conditions continue to weaken their most important industry which together with its supply and related industries over the years have been good, responsible corporate citizens; and

Whereas, these unfair conditions largely have been created by a combination of policies of our Federal Government. Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

That the General Assembly of South Carolina respectfully memorializes the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power through legislative and administrative action, to see that order is restored to the chaotic international textile-apparel trade situation.

Be it further resolved that the General Assembly of South Carolina expresses to the President of the United States its appreciation for his forthright statement in which he rejected the recent Japanese proposal and gave his strong support to textile quota legislation (H.R. 20) now pending before the Congress; and also expresses to the members of the South Carolina Congressional Delegation and to other members of the Congress, who continnue to work for a solution to this problem, deep appreciation for their dedication to this vital effort.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each United States Senator and each member of the House of Representatives of Congress from South Carolina, the Clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of State of the United States.

THE NEW ROLE OF THE NAVY IN THE DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in reshaping our military presence abroad to conform to the Nixon doctrine, it is expected that the Navy will become the dominant service by the end of this decade. This means the Navy will have to make some hard choices in the 1970's concerning programs and policies. Adm. E. R. Zumwalt, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, in his recent remarks to the National Press Club, discussed the problems faced by our Navy in fulfilling its new role and the program for meeting them. Admiral Zumwalt's statement reflects the innovation required of the Navy in meeting the challenges of our defense needs.

Admiral Zumwalt's remarks follow:

REMARKS BY ADM. E. R. ZUMWALT, JR.

I became Chief of Naval Operations at what I believe to be a unique time in modern history. Never before, to my knowledge, have so many diverse and powerful currents of opinion and fact converged so strongly to influence the occupant of my office.

As I approached the job, I attempted to isolate for my own benefit the major problem areas which were both most pressing and most influential on our future Navy. I am satisfied that the analysis we went through in those early days was sound, and that the relative priorities we have been applying are correct.

Last July we had arrived at or were approaching an entire set of decision points each having powerful interactions on the other—and no individual decision could stand alone or be separated in its impact on the future choices we might like to have.

Some of you have followed our efforts closely, and are well able to judge for yourselves whether or not our program has realistic goals, and the rate of progress toward our objectives.

But, I believe that it is quite possible that a full discussion of our entire program and its rationale might be in order if our separate actions are to be placed in proper perspective.

First, let me list for you the influences I see as most strongly affecting our Navy and its future. Since, as I have said, these matters are strongly interactive, my list is not in order of relative importance.

Most obvious is that as we wind down the war in Vietnam, our people are once more going through the same type of psychological rejections of things military as they have done after every war in our history. But this time, because of the nature of the war and the manner in which it had to be fought, we are faced with a much more deep seated feeling than the "bring the boys home" attitudes of 1918, 1945, and 1953.

I am sure I need not tell you of disenchantment with the military now seen among many of our citizens. There are no bands playing "Hail the Conquering Hero" in middle America today.

But, in addition to this traditional desire to turn swords into plowshares as the end of fighting comes in sight, a fundamental change of attitudes has become visible among Americans. They are more than ever determined to influence the direction of their own lives—they are giving greater attention to what are perceived as the social ills of the community—they have extended their personal interest to the need for cleaning up our environment and our cities—and they are being very expressive of their views on all problems which they see.

In the vast spectrum of opinion represented within our democracy, there have always been voices of dissent, but never before have so many in all walks of life seen fit to speak out directly or through their representatives in criticism of policies, customs, or circumstances long-accepted, rightly or wrongly, as part of the American way of life.

Out of these changed attitudes have come new elements of vital interest to those who would lead our military services:

There are sincere pressures to end the draft and move to an all-voluntary service concept.

The authority, customs, and organizational structure of military life are under question at all levels of our society.

The idea that military service is an honorable and challenging career for the individual is widely questioned, particularly among our young people.

Associated with and stemming from these trends we see a growing desire to reduce the level of resources committed to defense purposes. From that step inevitably flows the need for us in the military to reappraise the types and levels of forces we are to be able to support within a shrinking budget.

On the international side, we see a world far different from that of only a decade ago.

As President Nixon had put it, "the postwar era in international relations has ended" and new approaches were in order. This reshaping of our approach to allies and friends throughout the world under the Nixon Doctrine could have profound effect on the roles of each member of the defense team, and our Navy clearly will need to be responsive to its changed requirements.

At the same time, an expansionist Soviet drive to extend their influence world-wide is underway. Soviet recognition that attainment of their goal could be facilitated by sea power operating in conjunction with the political, diplomatic and economic power of the Soviet state has been clearly revealed by their expanding navy, oceanographic and commercial fleets.

Thus, it seemed to me that in our consideration of what we wanted and needed to do in this coming decade, there were four major realities that had to be dealt with—

First, the Nixon Doctrine, seeming likely to demand more of the Navy, second an adverse budgetary climate, promising to limit the forces and people we would have to do the job; third, a general disaffection with things military on the part of our population, accompanied by a turning away from the world beyond our shores to favor problems closer to home; and finally, a rising Soviet military-political presence approaching world-wide in scope.

These factors could create an endless chain of cause-and-effect which might have prevented us from effective action in pursuit of our defense responsibilities—

For example, the world-wide Soviet challenge has made a credible U.S. military-political overseas presence essential in the eyes of our allies, particularly if we were to ask them to assume a more responsible role in their own defense under the Nixin Doctrine—but the credibility of that U.S. presence hinges on our ability to maintain control of the sea lines of communications that bind together our essentially maritime alliance structure. In turn, such sea control ability

depends on our projected post-Vietnam Navy force level and structure—but, our projected Navy force level depends on the resources in money and men our Navy can expect to receive from a populace grown visibly weary of the price in blood and treasure asked of them in defense against constant Soviet pressure over the last twenty-five years—thus coming full circle.

My first aim was to determine for myself what the principal task of our Navy would be in this decade.

To me, a logical U.S. military strategy consistent with our stated national interests and the new approaches of the Nixon Doctrine is sea-based mobility—mobility to shift our land-based forces to where they may be needed, and to support them there so long as their presence is required.

Therefore, I concluded that our first goal must be to provide that mobility and the means to protect it.

In order to do that, I felt that we had to break that circle of cause-and-effect that limits our ability to move toward any goal.

We might have tried to break it by pointing more directly at the growing Soviet military threat—but we already had been talking long and loud about the Soviet naval threat—perhaps too loud and too long. Many people no longer heard us.

In my view, the key, as always, lay with people—our Navy people who have for so long been asked to operate under the demands of war service while the nation was nominally at peace.

It was increasingly clear that the personnel situation in the Navy was approaching a disaster level and that failure to turn the situation around could pose a more immediate threat to our country than the Soviets.

For over twenty years, our Armed Forces have all been operating under conditions which heretofore had only existed under the pressures of war—our nation's land-based bomber force has spent years on a strategic alert status no less demanding than the tensions of war—our Navy carrier and escort forces have spent deployment after deployment operating intensively in all the oceans of the world, from the Mediterranean to the South China Sea. Equally exhausting demands had been made of our submarine forces, our Army, our tactical air squadrons—in short, all of our armed services.

Our military people were weary—and more and more, by one means or another, they have been made to feel that even their countrymen doubt that military service is an honorable career.

In the Navy their discouragement was obvious, and, in true democratic fashion, they showed their disillusionment by voting—their vote was registered in the re-enlistment tallies rather than the corner precinct house, but it was just as influential.

Fortunately, my predecessor, Admiral Tom Moorer, and Navy Secretary John Chafee had already begun to attack the problem.

They had initiated many "people-oriented" programs long before my return to Washington. With their strong support and encouragement, we continued their initiatives, and actively began seeking more ways by which to let our Navy people know that we intended a dramatic change in direction.

Over the last several months, you have all seen or heard about the many initiatives we have undertaken in our efforts to put people first, where they belong.

Some aspects of the program have received a bit more attention than others, with the result that many questions have been raised regarding the goals of our overall program.

I can state to you categorically that our intention to put people first is but the essential first step in moving to enable our Navy to carry out its mission in coming year.

People are the beginning, not the end, of our plan of action.

There are some, however, who suggest that we are pampering our people to the detriment of discipline. When this question comes up, I usually find that the concern centers around only 4 or 5 of the more than seventy-five "Z-GRAMS" we have issued since last July.

These deal with grooming and uniform policy, beer in the barracks and bachelor officers quarters, "hard rock" music in Officers Messes, and the so-called "Mickey Mouse" directive on beards and other minor issues.

Admittedly, these issues are the kind likely to catch the public eye, and to stimulate broad public interest in our Navy. But I would like to suggest that we put our people programs into perspective.

In the Navy we are dealing with a substantially youthful population. The average age of our Navy enlisted man is 25.1 years while that of our officer corps is 32.4 years. Among our enlisted community nearly 63% are under 24 years of age.

Essentially all of these people are drawn from the American population, and their value standards and perspectives of judgment are representative of those found in our civilian community—just as our civilian youth are showing a growing concern to influence events around them, so also do our young Navymen.

The majority of American youth is moving in constructive ways to exert influence within constitutionally-granted channels—and I believe the nation will be the better for it. We believe that similar channels can be created within the structure of our Armed Forces to permit youth to influence our Navy in similarly beneficial ways.

It is true that the Navy can never be a true democracy—the need will always exist to issue and accept arbitrary orders in battle—but I see no need to extend that necessity for arbitrary authority to include how Officers Messes shall be run, or to dictating hair styles, or to denying our men time with their families when no useful military purpose can be served.

Our modifications of what have proven to be demeaning or abrasive aspects of Navy life is intended collaterally to open doors of communication with our middle and junior grade executives and technicians—our officers and petty officers.

We have not undertaken to open these doors without regard to the views of our senior executives and technicians—indeed in staffing out each of our programs, these experienced people have been heavy contributors and valued counsellors. It must be so, for if we are able to communicate anything of enduring value to our juniors, it must be derived from the collective wisdom of our senior people—wisdom and experience in the techniques of naval warfare, of international affairs, and of military management—the core skills of our profession.

I believe that as our personnel situation turns around, the other major problem areas I mentioned will inevitably become more manageable.

In a restrictive budgetary climate, increased retention of trained people brings efficiency and economy—with fewer total forces available for deployment, those which are manned by people of experience and mental commitment will also be more effective and more battle-worthy.

With increased opportunity for youth to have its say, and to assume greater share of leadership responsibility through early promotion, our procedures and tactics will become more imaginative and less stereotyped, thus adding to the problems our Soviet counterparts must consider in planning for their operations.

With our visible determination to retain a quality force, and to pay the price it will cost, our allies can be more readily reassured of our national will to respond to our obligations as senior partner in a world maritime alliance, while our growing unit effectiveness will encourage a response in kind on their part.

As to the attitudes of our citizenry, I believe that there is a spirit of idealism now growing in our land. Not only among our youth, but as well among Americans of all ages. It is an idealism best reflected by the late Robert F. Kennedy when he said, "Some people see things that are and ask "why"—I dream things that never were and ask "why not?"

I share that philosophy.

But, I also believe idealism must be tempered by real world constraints if concrete change is to be made.

In the Navy today, many of our new programs seemed to be quite far down the road to idealism at the outset—but we have put our faith in people to work within our policies and to apply practical real world constraints only to the degree needed to get positive results and change for the better.

Our faith seems warranted.

Generations of Americans have looked upon the Navy as a demanding and honored profession, to which they could commit their sons both with pride and a certainty that they would be better men for the experience.

I believe that the American people want to see that view reaffirmed, and that they can be pleased with the progress we are making to that end.

I also hope that what we now see coming to pass in the Navy will serve in part to restore the spirits of those Americans temporarily disillusioned with the idealistic but costly and burdensome demands of Free World leadership.

Just as I believe that we in the Navy, by taking account of real world limits, are on the road to attaining our idealized goals, so also do I believe that this nation is on the road to peace so long as we temper our idealistic aim with realism.

A "generation of peace" is the announced goal of our President, but as he has made clear, that end cannot be attained without accounting for the threats to peace which exist in the real world.

We did not create them, but they are there nevertheless, and must be dealt with.

I believe that the threat posed to our security by Soviet aspirations to world dominance is real—it need not be overstated, but it does need to be accepted as reality.

I am deeply concerned by that growing threat—concerned not because I believe that the Soviet Union will attack us, either with their substantial nuclear arsenal or their conventional land and sea forces—they are too rational for that—but rather, concerned by their obvious determination to challenge our ability to maintain the maritime alliance structure which has been fundamental to our security for more than three decades.

In Cuba in 1962, Khrushchev gambled that he could get away with placing missiles so close to us that he could double the total megatonnage with which they could confront us and halve our warning time. He lost that gamble because we had the strategic nuclear and conventional superiority in our Navy and other services which made it rational for our leaders to confront him and demand their removal—in the face of that dual superiority, he made the rational decision to salvage what he could and to back away.

The Soviets also have made the further rational decision never again to be confronted with such a preponderance of power.

Since then, they have attained strategic nuclear parity, and are moving to attain a world-wide naval superiority over our own diminishing and aging Navy.

I believe that we need to be reminded of these facts—not because I am a "drooling, fanged militarist" hoping to frighten the tax-

payers out of a few more ships and planes and missiles—rather, in my judgment, we need to know, in order to decide for ourselves what sort of defense establishment we will need in the years immediately ahead—years in which for the first time, the Soviet Union will become the world's leading naval power if present trends continue.

I share the idealized desire of many Americans that the burdens of defense be lightened—but I also fear the reality of Plato's view that "only the dead have seen the end of war."

I also believe that sufficient resources are available within this rich nation to meet our internal needs and those of national security, and that as President Nixon said, ". . . We will meet both, or we will meet neither."

Finally, I intend that our Navy will continue to play a valuable and productive role both in our defense and in setting the pace for changes to military life which reflect the desires and values of our citizenry.

In China, there is a saying—"May you live in interesting times."

Those of us in the Navy today believe that we are so blessed.

ARMED FORCES JOURNAL EXAMINES CBS PROGRAM

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, James D. Hessman, senior editor for the Armed Forces Journal, has written a concise and enlightening article about the CBS program, "The Selling of the Pentagon."

Of particular interest is the fact that he tells of the signed memos from five congressional offices which state that CBS told them it was planning a documentary on prisoners of war.

These memos prove false the statements made by Peter Davis, producer of "Selling," and Richard Salant, president of CBS News. Both said other Congressmen were asked for film clips of their Rowe interview and that these Congressmen knew CBS was doing a documentary on how the Pentagon sells itself to the public.

I released these memorandums to the press on March 22, but unfortunately they received little attention.

I insert the article from the April 5 issue at this point in the RECORD, so everyone may have the benefit of Mr. Hessman's observations:

CBS BACKFIRES, CREATES OWN CREDIBILITY GAP

(By James Hessman)

A recently televised CBS program, "The Selling of the Pentagon," has backfired, leaving the network with a bigger credibility gap than the Pentagon's own.

The program, a purported expose of Defense Department hucksterism, was marred by numerous factual errors, distortions, dubiously honest film editing, half-truths and untruths, and an apparently abysmal ignorance of what the Pentagon is really doing in the field of public affairs. Some examples:

Deputy Assistant SecDef (Public Affairs) Jerry Friedheim was depicted giving several "no comment" answers at a news briefing. Roger Mudd of CBS said Friedheim "does not, of course, tell all he knows; he wouldn't have his job long if he did." Mudd and CBS neglected to tell viewers that, at the same briefing, Friedheim made nine announcements and answered over 30 questions—the only "no comment" answers related to national security or to questions to which Friedheim did not have specific answers but promised to "check back."

A military officer was shown speaking about the danger of South Vietnam being taken over by Communists, and the implication made that he was making a personal comment that related to foreign policy. The officer was, in, fact, reading a quotation from the Prime Minister of Laos, but careful editing by CBS turned the quote into a "personal comment."

CBS said "a team of colonels" lecturing "on foreign policy . . . to a mixed audience of civilians and military reservists" in Peoria, Illinois, had been invited there "by the Peoria Caterpillar Company, which did $39-million of business last year with the Defense Department." As pointed out in an incisive article ("The Wayward Press—Tube Division") by Claude Witze in the April *Air Force Magazine*, the Peoria seminar was arranged, not by Caterpillar, but by the city's Association of Commerce. Witze also pointed out that the "team of colonels" consisted of five military officers and a State Department officer from the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF), and that the State Department and Defense Department both clear all ICAF presentations.

A series of five apparently related statements made by Col. John A. MacNeil, USMC, one of the Peoria speakers, was actually, according to Witze, spliced together from, in order, pages 55, 36, 48, and 73 of the ICAF text.

HÉBERT STRIKES BACK

Vulnerable as the program was in substance, the CBS tactics were worse. The network's most grievous error, probably, was depicting House Armed Services Committee Chairman F. Edward Hébert (D-La) as a tool of the Pentagon. Hébert, a prize-winning reporter and former city editor of the *New Orleans States*, has, since the program, kept up a rolling thunder campaign against CBS, pointing out, item by item, the numerous distortions, false innuendoes, and unfounded allegations which characterized the program. Hébert took particular exception to the fact that CBS used a taped interview between Hébert and Maj. James Rowe, USA, a former POW, to demonstrate how "the Pentagon tries to counter what it regards as the anti-military tilt of network reporting," and how "war heroes are made available for the taped home district TV reports from pro-Pentagon politicians."

In an angry rebuttal, Hébert pointed out that (a) the interview "was not the Pentagon's idea; it was Hébert's idea," (b) the interview "was not filmed to counter network TV reporting—it was planned by Hébert for his local TV show in his home district because he felt his constituents should see Major Rowe," and (c) Major Rowe "was not supplied by the Pentagon. Major Rowe appeared at my request."

HÉBERT TRAP?

Adding insult to injury, CBS apparently obtained the Hébert/Rowe film segment under what Hébert termed "false pretenses." Hébert's press aide, Lou Gehrig Burnett, stated on 3 March that the film clip had been requested by CBS in July 1970 for what the network said would be "a documentary on the POW situation."

A follow-up Washington Post story reported, however, that a spokesman for CBS (unidentified by the Post) "termed the Congressman's charge untrue. The spokesman said the network . . . asked Hébert's office for use of the film for a program 'on how the Pentagon presents its message to the American people.'"

On 17 March, Steven Scheuer of WNYC (channel 31, New York) interviewed CBS's Peter Davis about Hébert's charges. "Well, he's mistaken," said Davis, who produced and wrote "The Selling of the Pentagon" for CBS. "There was never any suggestion that our broadcast was on anything except military public relations . . . we had similar tapes from a number of other congressmen. All of them knew what our broadcast was about," Davis added, possibly still believing it was the network's word against Burnett's word.

If so, he was mistaken. Hébert's office has made available to newsmen a transcript of the Scheuer/Davis interview, and along with its letters from the offices of Representatives Sam Steiger (R-Ariz), William R. Dickinson (R-Ala), Page Belcher (R-Okla), and Thomas N. Downing (D-Va), and former Representative Ed Foreman (R-NM)—all of whom also had been asked for interviews by CBS. The memos make it clear that, as Steiger phrased it, "The man from CBS sought the strip because he said the network was intending to do a documentary on POWs."

SELECTIVE BIAS

CBS, it would seem from a number of reports critical of the program, had numerous legitimate editorial points to make about DoD public affairs activities, but weakened its case considerably because of its ill-disguised preconceived bias against the Pentagon, and even more because of what can only be considered devious tactics both in obtaining material for the program and in "editing" several filmed sequences to give an impression substantially different from what was actually filmed.

Chairman Hébert, who noted in passing that "it would be hard to find anybody in this town who has issued more public criticism of the Pentagon than I have over the last 30 years," perhaps critiqued the program best when he said: "But presentations which are biased throughout, which are slanted to only use language and items which support that bias, and which clearly make false innuendoes about individuals in order to prove the bias—such presentations detract from the media's function of being a true critic of society and make it more difficult for the worthwhile criticism to be presented and accepted."

(NOTE.—As a matter of policy, The Journal normally does not reply to specific attacks on the military by members of Congress, magazines, newspapers, or other media, preferring instead to report the facts about any given situation and to let those facts speak for themselves—to act rather than to react, so to speak. An exception was made in this case because: (1) the CBS program was so blatant a distortion that an answer was all but mandatory; (2) unlike most newspapers, which have local audiences, or most magazines, which, except for a limited few mass-circulation magazines, have relatively small special-interest readerships, the TV networks claim a national audience often numbering in the tens of millions and encompassing all strata of U.S. society; and (3) the short CBS-edited rebuttal of the program by Chairman Hébert, Vice President Agnew, and SecDef Laird which followed a 23 March rebroadcast, although a step in the right direction, consisted largely of general rather than specific criticisms, and included a CBS counter-rebuttal almost as misleading and offensive as the original program.—The Editors.)

IS LIFE MAGAZINE TAPPING TELEPHONE LINES?

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, recently we have heard on the floor of the House an accusation against the FBI and in particular its Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

I wonder if there is any significance to the fact that in the April 9 issue of Life magazine, received in the mail yesterday, one finds this statement on page 39:

Mr. Hoover has drawn the attention of more powerful critics. Now he has been challenged—of all places—on the floor of the House.

The coincidence of the floor accusations and the publication of the Life article raises the question whether the distinguished Member who made the allegations was in conspiracy with Life magazine or whether it is Life magazine, and not the FBI, who is actually tapping his telephone line.

THE COMMON LAW OF MORRISON COUNTY

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, the American Bar Journal carried an article on the common law of Morrison County. Since I believe this article has widespread application and the doctrines set forth in there usually find themselves with no legal force but with great practical efficacy, I believe this article will be of interest to my colleagues:

THE COMMON LAW OF MORRISON COUNTY

(By John E. Simonett)

Not all the law is in the books, as any county seat lawyer will tell you. And in Morrison County, there is a vast quantity of legal lore that is never taught in the law schools. Members of the local Bar learn it only gradually, although real estate men, justices of the peace and notaries public seem to know it intuitively. In Morrison County, for example, wills should not be executed on Sunday; legal documents cannot be signed with ball-point pens; and there is an irrebuttable presumption that all defendants in personal injury actions are insured. Mr. Simonett writes of these and many other peculiar features of the common law of Morrison County.

"There are three great branches of the law", the senior member of the Bar told me when I first arrived at the county seat. I listened respectfully, but also somewhat skeptically, as befitted a man fresh out of law school. He then elaborated: "First, there is the statutory law, the law enacted by the legislature, found in the codes and statute books; second, there is the common law, the law handed down in court decisions since before the days of Coke and found in the reported court cases; and finally, and most important, there is the common law of Morrison County."

It is now ten years later and, oh, 'tis true, 'tis true. Not all the law is in the books.

Strange, these days when legal book publishers expertly minister to every felt and unfelt need of the modern law office, that the common law of Morrison County has been singularly ignored. Never a day passes but new volumes appear off the presses, but all of them deal with the first two great branches of the law, never the third. There are books on planning the estates of clients with estates exceeding one million dollars, learned dissertations on whiplash injuries, and a veritable paper blizzard of monthly supplements to the "complete" six-volume set on motorcycle intersection accidents purchased only two years ago. Yet the rich vein of Morrison County common law has never been mined.

Surely to the legal book publishers this field must be as lucrative as it is virgin. There are eighty-seven counties in Minnesota alone, each with its own distinctive common law. Each day new precedents are being set down in every county by real estate agents, bankers, justices of the peace, constables, auction sale clerks, notaries public and other prominent jurists. Indeed, when one realizes this legal process is also proceeding apace in forty-nine other states, the complete dearth of literature on the subject is nigh incredible.

This brief essay is written, then, in the modest hope it may be some kind of pioneering effort in exploring the little known third great branch of the law, so that it may stimulate both the serious student of jurisprudence and the law book publisher. It is fitting, I think, that Morrison County leads the way now, as it has so often in the past, in the field of jurisprudence. Justice Holmes observed that the life of the common law is experience, not logic. Undoubtedly he had Morrison County in mind.

A MORRISON COUNTY RULE TRAVELS TO MASSACHUSETTS

It was the common law of Morrison County that first established that no legal document signed with a ball-point pen is legal. Nobody knows who first made the ruling or why, but it stubbornly persists, and, as I understand it, the rule has spread as far east as Massachusetts.

A will, of course, should not be executed on a Sunday, nor should a deed except in the direst emergency, although it is legally permissible to execute an earnest money contract on Sunday. Apparently the law succumbed to the temptation of the earnest money. Assuredly some day it will happen, human nature being what it is—the dream case—somebody will sign a will on Sunday with a ball-point pen. This will mean going to see a lawyer and paying money, which might have otherwise been used for worthwhile pursuits, to get the whole mess straightened out.

Also a will does not have to be probated. Where this notion originated has never been adequately explained. Like much of the common law, its origin is shrouded in mystery, in the legends and mores of past generations. Some say the doctrine evolved from a logical rather than a historical basis; that it was reasoned by the people of Morrison County that if a man paid a lawyer once for making the will it could hardly be expected that he, or more accurately his estate, should have to pay the lawyer a second time for probating it.

Perhaps the first legal crisis any married couple faces is when, having purchased their home, the lawyer asks how the deed should be drawn—with the husband's name alone or with both husband and wife as grantees. If the wife's name is not included on the deed, won't she, the keeper of the hearth, be without any legal rights to her own home? This is at best a sticky situation, and, unless love is strong, domestic tranquillity dictates both spouses hold title. This explains why so much property is held in joint tenancy in Morrison County, or to put it more precisely, why husbands and wives hold property with an "or" between their names.

True, there is the academic objection that joint tenancy disinherits the children, that upon the father's death the property goes outright to the wife, evading any provision the father might have contemplated for his offspring. The objection is academic because it is firmly believed in Morrison County that a surviving spouse will not remarry and will always cherish the children in a pecuniary as well as a maternal or, in the unheard of instance where the wife dies first, paternal way.

THE IMPACT OF WOMAN ON THE COMMON LAW

The full impact of woman on the common law has never been really explored. There is the story which has long circulated in Morrison County, although it is propably apocryphal, about the grieving widow who was interrogating the caretaker of the local cemetery as to the location of her spouses' grave, her late husband having been J. Howard Jackson. The caretaker, having checked the directory, told her there was no cemetery lot in that name although there was one in the name of Mathilda Jackson. "That's him," the widow vowed with satisfaction, "Everything, you see, is in my name."

If the common law of Morrison County is ever put in print, there should be a separate volume entirely on criminal law. I say this not only because a multi-volume set is more impressive as well as expensive, but, equally important, the subject deserves a volume to itself, and I can only touch on it here. I do not mean the lackluster offenses of armed robbery, murder and white slavery, but real criminal law—crimes of passion such as driving a car under the influence of liquor; crimes of revenge, such as non-support; and crimes of premeditation, such as shining deer. Here a textbook would stand in good stead the practitioneer who must encounter a Morrison County jury. The governing principle, as Mr. Dooley once said so well, is that "In this counthry a man is presoomed to be guilty until he's proved guilty an' afther that he's presoomed to be innocent." (As contrasted with the English system where ". . . a man is presoomed to be innocent till he's proved guilty an' they take it fir granted he's guilty.")

ALL DEFENDANTS ARE INSURED

On the other hand a Morrison County jury is never influenced by sympathy for an injured plaintiff unless the defendant is insured. Since the Minnesota Supreme Court has held that it is prejudicial error to disclose to a jury that a litigant has liability insurance, local law has established the presumption that all defendants are insured. This is an irrebuttable presumption because it is usually objectionable in Minnesota to tell the jury that the defendant is not insured.

What gives the common law of Morrison County its zest and vitality is its great capacity to adapt to changing conditions. One illustration, the local law on fixtures, will suffice. It has always been understood in Morrison County that the corn crib goes with the land and the Venetian blinds with the house. When my aunt sold her house a few years ago, she unscrewed and took with her all the light bulbs, leaving the new tenant in darkness. When I protested, she told me, first, that she was surprised her nephew had learned nothing in law school, and, second, that everybody knows the light bulbs never go with the house.

This last decade, however, presented a new and vexing problem, when television antennas began sprouting ubiquitously on rooftops. Is the television antenna, or is it not, a fixture? For several years the law was unsettled, with some real estate agents claiming the antenna stayed with the house, others disagreeing, and notaries public generally refusing to venture any opinion on the reasonable assumption that, as soon as all homes had antenna, the problem would solve itself. In any event the question today is at rest. The television antenna is a fixture which stays with the house; any realtor or notary in the county will tell you this is the law.

In other ways, too, the common law of the county has admirably adapted itself to modern times. This is seen in the trend toward specialization which is common to all professions. Bankers in the county seem to specialize more in banking nowadays and draw fewer contracts and wills than a generation again, and, as often happens, the increased proficiency resulting from this specialization has paid off handsomely in higher banking income to bankers.

There might be, too, a separate volume, or at least a chapter, on the relatively new field of administrative law and procedure.

Actually in Morrison County administrative law is very old and there is much to say about it. There is much to say, for example, on such sensitive matters as how to call a creamery board meeting to order, how to find out when the town board will meet and where, and when not to speak at a village council meeting.

The common law pronounced by judges in reported court decisions and the common law of Morrison County are, at the same time, closely related and far apart. Both draw on the vast fund of common sense, prejudice, habits and customs of the community, and though the routes at times appear to go in different directions, they criss-cross and seek the same destination. The common law of Morrison County is aware that a set of rules and order is necessary for a community to carry on its daily business. The arena of the common law is the lawyer's office, the courtroom and the appellate judge's chambers; the arena of the uncommon law is the realtor's office, the sales barn and the street corner.

NO ONE NEEDS A LAWYER—UNLESS HE'S WRONG

The common law is made, or at least announced, by lawyers and judges. The common law of Morrison County avoids lawyers on the grounds that lawyers cost money and why should a man consult a lawyer about something so uncomplicated as to what is right and wrong—unless he knows he is wrong.

The common law of Morrison County is inconsistent at times. It suspects lawyers and "their" law represent a triumph of technicalities over common sense, but the common law of Morrison County treasures technicalities far more technical—witness the rule of the ballpoint pen.

Yet one should not think harshly of the common law of Morrison County for it serves a useful function discharges a ready justice. Much of it is good common sense, although I have dealt here mostly with its uncommon aspects. If at times the rules are arbitrary, it is sometimes better to have an arbitrary rule than none at all, and, if at times its doctrines seem irrational, it may be because people do not always act rationally, even in Morrison County.

The common law of Morrison County recognizes, as someone once said, that the law is too important to leave to the lawyers alone. Yet lawyers need not feel slighted. Indeed, the system pays the lawyer the supreme compliment, for in matters of great moment, where an appeal is taken from the decision of the insurance agent or the notary, the appeal is taken to the attorney's office, the court of last resort. This is, in truth, a matter of trust as well as a compliment, and if at times here I have sounded a plaintive cry, it is only because each year of law practice has brought with it an increasing realization of my vast ignorance of the third great branch of the law, the kind that is not to be found in the books.

ABOUT THIS THING I FOUND

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a sixth grade student from my congressional district, Chancel Cargill, has written a theme which I think would be of interest to all Members of Congress. I find it most encouraging that young people like Chancel, a student at the All Saints Episcopal School in Beaumont, Tex., can show such a depth of understanding and appreciation for their country.

The item follows:

ABOUT THIS THING I FOUND

It is all full of love. It is big and wonderful, great and joyful, and it is also invisible to the eye except from above and within. What is this thing I found? Why, it is us. U.S. that is what it is and U.S. stands for the United States. The United States is where I live. But I never really knew it till a while ago. Sure, I have seen it before this, but I never thought about it being something other than a huge piece of land. I know now that the United States isn't land. It is a name for a people bound together in determination to follow God and to gain eventual peace and prosperity. You see the United States' initials are what that thing is, US.

SUPPORT FOR SUMMER RECREATION PROGRAMS

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I am today proposing legislation to refund and expand the very successful program of Federal support which last year helped 100 major cities conduct expanded summer recreation programs in their inner city areas.

The $15 million allotted to this program last year enabled Philadelphia to receive $528,000 for the employment of additional summer recreation workers and $24,360 for special transportation for the participants in these programs.

These sums were very important to the well being of our city in the hot summer months when young people are not in school.

The situation could be even more difficult this year, when the National Urban Coalition is forecasting a hot summer in our inner city areas. I am supporting through other legislation greater Federal support for efforts to create more jobs, especially public service jobs which are vitally needed in our cities. I feel, however, that this recreation program is also very important.

I was distressed to find that the administration has not specifically recommended the continuance of this program this year. I would hope that he would do so in a supplemental budget request; but I do not think we can wait much longer if we are to enable the local communities to plan their summer recreation programs in such a way as to make the best use of these funds.

I include in the RECORD the following table of the funds spent for recreation and transportation in connection with this Neighborhood Youth Corps summer support program in 100 cities last summer, so my colleagues can see what this program has meant to their areas. The $30 million I propose would enable these cities to receive more money and permit the expansion of the program to other cities which need it.

The tabulation follows:

1970 SUMMER PROGRAM ALLOCATIONS

	Recreation	Transportation
New York City	$1,836,000	$96,960
Chicago	564,000	42,240
Los Angeles	552,000	43,120
Philadelphia	528,000	24,360
Detroit	360,000	26,560
Houston	324,000	25,060
Baltimore	276,000	11,100
Washington, D.C.	228,000	12,960
Dallas	204,000	17,840
Cleveland	132,000	19,310
Boston	168,000	10,720
Milwaukee	108,000	17,280
San Francisco	180,000	11,920
San Antonio	324,000	11,570
San Diego	144,000	14,360
St. Louis	240,000	11,360
New Orleans	252,000	14,790
Kansas City, Mo	108,000	11,970
Seattle	84,000	12,760
Memphis	264,000	11,860
Columbus	132,000	8,640
Pittsburgh	108,000	12,650
Phoenix	144,000	11,740
Atlanta	132,000	12,080
Indianapolis	108,000	8,480
Cincinnati	120,000	7,920
Jacksonville	84,000	6,300
Denver	120,000	8,320
Buffalo	96,000	7,500
Minneapolis	60,000	10,500
San Jose	60,000	7,500
Newark	72,000	7,500
Toledo	84,000	7,990
Louisville	96,000	7,500
Oklahoma City	108,000	8,580
Long Beach	72,000	7,500
Portland	84,000	8,580
Omaha	48,000	7,500
Oakland	84,000	7,500
Fort Worth	108,000	8,130
Honolulu	60,000	7,500
Tulsa	72,000	7,500
Birmingham	120,000	7,790
Miami	120,000	7,500
El Paso	144,000	7,500
Norfolk	132,000	7,500
St. Paul	36,000	7,500
Rochester	47,000	7,500
Tampa	132,000	7,500
Wichita	60,000	7,500
Akron	48,000	7,500
Nashville	72,000	7,500
Jersey City	48,000	7,500
Sacramento	48,000	7,500
Charlotte	60,000	7,000
Dayton	48,000	7,500
Tucson	84,000	7,500
Austin	84,000	7,000
Albuquerque	72,000	7,000
Richmond	72,000	7,000
Mobile	84,000	7,000
Syracuse	36,000	7,000
Des Moines	36,000	7,000
St. Petersburg	72,000	7,000
Yonkers	24,000	7,000
Grand Rapids	36,000	7,000
Flint	36,000	7,000
Corpus Christi	84,000	6,300
Salt Lake City	36,000	6,300
Providence	48,000	6,300
Fort Wayne	24,000	5,400
Worcester	36,000	6,300
Gary	36,000	6,300
Baton Rouge	60,000	5,400
Kansas City, Kans	24,000	3,750
Madison	24,000	5,400
Jackson	60,000	5,400
Fresno	60,000	5,400
Lubbock	48,000	5,400
Spokane	48,000	6,300
Shreveport	72,000	5,400
Hartford	24,000	5,400
Springfield, Mass	24,000	5,400
Lincoln	24,000	5,400
Amarillo	36,000	5,400
Montgomery	60,000	4,200
Youngstown	36,000	5,400
Bridgeport	24,000	5,400
Rockford	24,000	4,200
Evansville	36,000	4,200
Tacoma	48,000	5,400
Paterson	24,000	4,200
New Haven	24,000	5,400
Greensboro	48,000	4,200
Savannah	48,000	4,200
Erie	36,000	4,200
South Bend	24,000	4,200
Topeka	24,000	4,200
Chattanooga	48,000	4,200
Albany, N.Y.	24,000	4,200

GAINESVILLE, FLA., CITIZENS SHOW UNSELFISH SERVICE AS ALL-AMERICAN CITY

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most inspiring stories of unselfish service has recently been told in Look magazine and its award to Gainesville, Fla., in my congressional district, as an All-American City.

This is a story of citizen-participation, where students, businessmen, college professors and others use their leisure time to help build a better community by repairing and cleaning up rundown neighborhoods. This is an excellent example of individual volunteerism, and hopefully will be copied in other areas of America.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the story and the cutlines from the article in the March 23, 1971 issue of Look magazine, which featured a photograph of Dr. Robert B. Bennett, a professor at the University of Florida in Gainesville, who is the brother of our colleague, Congressman CHARLES E. BENNETT of Jacksonville. We can gain something from this story of Dr. Bennett and other members of the neighborhood development group—volunteerism at its best.

ALL AMERICAN CITIES—GAINESVILLE, FLA.

A COLLEGE TOWN WHERE EVERYBODY GETS INVOLVED

The streets buzz with motorcycles carrying couples piggyback; middleaged teachers jog on a crunchy cinder track; others suit up in white to chase those furry tennis balls. Gainesville is a college town, home of the University of Florida. The average age is 23, which traces to the large student population. Located in the middle of the state, far from the profitable white-sand beaches and Miami-style hotels, Gainesville owes the largest slice of its economy to the University. But Gainesville is not just a college community in which the town and university lead separate lives. They are interested in each other's problems. Tumbledown housing in ghetto areas on the edges of town has aroused students and faculty. Drug abuse and a high suicide rate—on campus and in the ghetto—have shocked housewives and businessmen into seeking remedies through volunteer work.

"People in the ghettos feel the only thing the world owes them is a chance," says one city official. And community-action groups have moved in to show them how to refurbish their neighborhoods. Self-help organizations, with city aid and student-faculty manpower, comb neighborhoods, street by street, loading discarded furniture, refrigerators and boxes full of junk onto city trucks. Volunteers, white and black, in the Gainesville Neighborhood Development group, help repair and paint homes and hook up badly needed sewers.

College kids in Gainesville don't want phony do-gooder labels. They'd rather go into the ghetto the way Project Samson does, to work with neighborhood leaders like Rena Mae Goode, and help deprived children directly. The students tutor, make hot lunches, pack picnics and, in the summer, run a day camp.

At the Corner Drug Store, a rented house funded by the Federal state and local governments, Gainesville students offer refuge and counsel to kids hung up on drugs. "The police chief here understands and doesn't interfere," says John Creech, the director of the Drug Store. "It's a remarkable association; they let us work things out if we can. So far," he adds, "we've had no problems."

The people of Gainesville don't have all the answers—apathy, fear and suspicion still exist. But students and townspeople hope to erase them and get on with the job.

FIFTY YEARS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST POLLUTION

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, with all the talk today about the problem of pollution and what we must do to combat it, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the efforts of a group of very dedicated people in my congressional district who have been doing something for 50 years.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the department of environmental science at Rutgers—the State university in New Brunswick, N.J. Today marks the end of their 50th year observance. It has been a year full of remembering the projects, the breakthroughs, and the awards which have marked the 50-year history of this department. But it has also been a year of further planning, because the department of environmental science at Rutgers will continue to be an active participant in the fight against pollution.

Under the leadership of such men as Dr. Rudolfs, Dr. Orford, Dr. Heukelekian, and now Dr. A. J. Kaplovsky, the department of environmental science has attained an international reputation for its contributions in research in the environmental field. I take this opportunity to place in the RECORD an article on these achievements and a further outline of the department's program.

In closing, I would like to again commend the department of environmental science for its efforts in making our world a healthier place in which to live, and I wish them the very best in their next 50 years.

The article follows:

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE, RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY

The Department of Environmental Sciences has embarked upon its 50th year as a multidiscipline, problem-oriented, teaching and research, graduate department dealing primarily with technological solutions to the contamination of our environment. The mission of the Department of Environmental Sciences is the application of the physical, chemical, and biological sciences for the protection of Man and his environment against unwarranted assaults. These assaults include particulate matter, gases, vapors, liquids, ionizing and non-ionizing radiation, and undesirable organisms.

HISTORY

The Department of Environmental Sciences has attained international reputation for its long standing multidiscipline graduate teaching and research programs. The Department had its inception 50 years ago as an outcrop of a multidiscipline team of investigators working on a serious pollution problem.

In 1917, Dr. Headlee of the Department of Entomology investigated an infestation of flies in the trickling filters of the Plainfield Joint Meeting Sewage Treatment Plant. Recognizing other research problems besides fly nusiances, investigations were made and subsequently sufficient interest was developed concerning the valuable service Rutgers Experiment Station could give the state and communities in water pollution studies.

Thus an act was pased by the State Legislature on April 7, 1920 (N.J. Laws 1920, Chapt. 126, p. 263) that authorized the State Experiment Station and the N.J. State Department of Healh to conduct "an investigation of the biology of sewage disposal to the end that more effective methods of sewage purification may be discovered and applied to the purification of sewage in this state."

This was the first interdisciplinary organization formed in this country directed toward the problems of the environment.

Under the leadership of Dr. Rudolfs, Dr. Orford, Dr. Heukelekian and presently Dr. Kaplovsky, the Department has gained national and international reputation for its outstanding contributions in research, graduates and services to the field.

Over the years, the Department has recognized the many emerging problems of the environment, and has marshalled its forces and has maintained its front running position—in attacking the many complex problems.

The Department is carrying out a solid, technical program in the areas of Water Resources, Wastewater and Treatment, Stream Pollution, Water Chemistry, Microbiology of Water and Wastewaters, Aquatic Biology, Air Pollution and Atmospheric Chemistry, Radiation and Radiological Health, Solids Waste Management and Environmental Health.

In light of the tradition of the Land Grant College, the Department is continuing and expanding its services to all segments of the public: Example, service on State Commissions, on advisory groups to municipalities, Federal agencies, State Institutions and Agencies, professional societies, industries and to the private citizen.

The celebration of the completion of our first 50 years carries with it the obligation on the part of the Department and the State to expand the activities of the Department and its pursuit of excellence to meet the pressing needs of State, of our country and of our field.

FACULTY AND STAFF

Faculty of the Department is made up of the following disciplines: chemistry, engineering, biology, bacteriology, and physics, in keeping with the tradition of the multidiscipline theme. Presently, we have 16 faculty, two of which are Extension Specialists in air. In addition, we have 16 supporting staff and 5 summer personnel. Graduate student registration for the coming year (July, 1970) will approximate 75 students.

TEACHING AND RESEARCH PROGRAM

The primary areas of specialization include air resources, aquatic biology, aquatic chemistry, chemistry and physics of aerosol and hydrosol systems, environmental chemistry, environmental biology, environmental radioactivity, water and wastewater treatment, and water resources. The Department offers 12 undergraduate and 28 graduate courses. The advanced degree programs offered are: (1) the 2-year M.S. program, with thesis, and (2) a 1-year M.S. program, with expository essay, (3) the Ph.D. program with thesis.

Current research and activities cover the following broad areas:

Air Pollution; Fate and Effects.
Air Pollution Control.
Aerosols.
Incineration.
Photochemical and Atmospheric Reactions.
Governmental and Private Sources.

Ground and Surface Water Supply.
Ground Water: Pollution.
Municipal Waste Characterization.
Industrial Waste Characterization.
Wastewater Treatment.
Solid Wastes.
Solid Waste Treatment.
Animal Wastes.
Stream Pollution.
Environmental Pollution—Ecology.
Biodegradability.
Environmental Analytical Methods.
Advanced Waste Treatment.
Radioactivity in Environment.
Radiation Applications.
Ionizing and Non-Ionizing Radiation Biology.
Departmental General, Including Env. and Occupational Health.
Ultimate Disposal.
Continuing Education.

Over the years the Department has contributed over 1,000 research papers to the field.

AWARDS

The Industrial Waste Award of the international Water Pollution Control Federation was established in 1949 to be awarded annually for the most outstanding contribution by an industrial employee on any aspect of industrial waste control. The Board of Control named this award "The Willem Rudolfs Award" in 1966. This was in recognition of the extensive industrial waste research carried on by Dr. Willem Rudolfs (The Department's first Chairman) and his Department over many years. In addition, Dr. H. Heukelekian was given the Harrison Eddy Award for Research.

FACILITIES

The Department of Environmental Sciences occupies 23,000 square feet in six separate locations on the CAES and University Heights Campuses. However, active efforts are under way for a new Environmental Science building to bring the dispersed operations together.

GENERAL

The multidiscipline makeup of the Department of Environmental Sciences, both the past and the present, is geared to provide total solutions for assaults on man and his environment.

In order to achieve a total technological solution, the teaching and research are blended with the various needs and requirements of man and the ramifications associated with getting a completed package. Therefore, consideration is given to the quality of the environment desired, the methodology of treatment, basis for design, effective control and operation, socio-economic impact, legislative aspects, and enforcements. In addition, we have been and are increasing our efforts to help meet the varied manpower requirements in the field. Our continuing education specialists pursue the training whereas our graduate faculty concentrate on teaching and research. The Department acts as a technical adviser to all state institutions with regard to water and wastewater treatment, and radiation science such as nuclear reactor siting.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, great praise is due the President for putting the full weight of his office behind the executive branch reorganization. The proposals submitted for restructuring the Federal efforts in the domestic field according to purpose rather than constituency address the very great concerns of effective government.

Today the complexities of government need to be reassessed and simplified wherever possible. Much good will be accomplished by bringing together, as the President suggests, those programs closely allied to common purposes.

Federal officials cannot reasonably be held accountable for program performance, because so many conflicting programs are conducted within competing departments. In the question of housing—both Agriculture and HUD are involved. Health, Education, and Transportation all repeat the same story of too many overlapping programs. As an example, in the southeastern section of Idaho a conservative estimate is that 29 Federal programs are administered by nine Federal departments and agencies.

Under the plan proposed by the President this entire area would probably apply to one area office or regional office where representatives of the four new departments would coordinate local problems with Federal funds.

I think the American people want to understand Government programs. They want to see performance. I hope we can begin immediately on the task of Government reorganization.

THE AMERICAN SST REJECTION: VICTORY FOR CHICKEN LITTLE

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest is weathering the loss of the supersonic transport program, despite the fact that thousands of highly skilled and capable engineers have lost their jobs in the Seattle area alone.

However, a recent printed article clearly indicate the frustration felt in the community caused by congressional rejection of the SST project. I call this statement to the attention of my colleagues who voted against the SST. There is a strong message in it which I hope will be heeded as the Congress faces future deliberations and decisions on research and technology in our great aerospace industry. The aforementioned article appears at this point in the RECORD:

SST REJECTIONS "VICTORY FOR CHICKEN LITTLE"

Following is the complete statement of James B. Douglas, first vice-president, Seattle Chamber of Commerce, regarding U.S. Senate rejection of the SST.

The rejection of the SST Program by the U.S. Senate is a victory for Chicken Little.

Opponents were successful in generating tremendous public pressure against the SST through the use of innuendo, misstatements of fact and deliberate deception. The use of scare tactics by irresponsible public figures created near-hysteria among sincerely concerned and mis-informed citizens, and that concern was expressed in vocal constituent opposition to the SST.

Hell hath no fury like a public deceived. The delay in the American SST Program involves a tragic waste of money and manpower which will only intensify public reaction against opponents as the truth about the SST becomes better known and understood.

We are convinced that, ultimately, an informed public will support the development of an American SST. For the present, we can only commend those Senators and Representatives who supported the SST Program for having the courage to place the national interest ahead of political expediency.

It takes a real statesman to risk his political future in the national interest—to support the SST Program in the face of hysterical opposition, and hope that his constituents will be enlightened by the truth before the next election.

We are frankly alarmed by the temporary success of SST opponents in deceiving the American public and discrediting American business, science nad technology. We are seriously concerned that political opportunists will make further efforts to exploit sincere public apprehensions about our environment and the very real problems of air water and land pollution.

While we agree with Abraham Lincoln that "you can't fool all of the people all of the time," the controversy over the SST demonstrates that political opportunists can fool enough people long enough to create economic chaos in the name of conservation.

The humanitarian goals of our society cannot be accomplished with a bankrupt economy and massive unemployment. Our best hope for improving the human condition—and surviving in a hostile world—rests with the optimum use of the tools of science and technology to achieve both environmental and economic objectives.

We are aware that a credibility gap exists between business and the public. Much of the blame rests with businessmen, themselves. They do an excellent job of merchandising their products and services, but have not been equally successful in informing the public of the advantages and social benefits of our American business.

On the other hand, business critics and the mass media are quick to point out the imperfections of business—real and imagined—but only rarely call attention to business contributions in the public interest.

As pointed out by Bernard Baruch, "everyone has the right to his opinion, but no one has the right to be wrong in his facts." Business must accept responsibility for getting the facts to the public and must take the initiative in seeking public understanding and confidence. Otherwise, political opportunists will continue to use business as the scapegoat for all of the social and environmental ills of our nation, and business will have only itself to blame if a mis-informed public is persuaded that our economic system is absolute.

In defeating the American SST, a majority of the Congress has demonstrated conclusively that the future of our nation rests with an informed public.

No longer can we afford to place our confidence in the integrity and intelligence of a majority of elected officials and complacently trust that statesmanship will prevail over political expediency in matters of national and public interest.

We cannot afford, ever again, to jeopardize the public and national interest by failing to challenge—immediately—efforts of political demogogues to mis-inform the voters of this nation.

The Seattle Chamber of Commerce is taking immediate steps to seek a nation-wide mechanism for countering deliberate efforts to deceive the American public in the future on issues affecting the national and public interest.

Business has a responsibility to itself and

the public to seek a better understanding of the contributions of our business system to the preeminent social and economic condition of the American people.

Only through public understanding and confidence can we maintain a climate for survival and further improvement in a system which, with all its imperfections, has done more for the human condition than any other system yet evolved by man.

It is not enough for business to act in the public interest, we must make sure that the public knows business is acting in the public interest.

Business must re-establish and maintain credibility with the American public by being completely candid and responsive to the public interest.

Otherwise, business ultimately will suffer the same fate facing SST opponents and will become discredited and impotent with an informed and enlightened American public.

ALASKA RESOLUTION

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, presently there is an urgent and immediate need not only for keeping Public Health Service hospital and outpatient clinics open but a more pressing need to make more funds available so necessary operations such as upgrading, modernization, and expansion of all programs and functions that raises the quality of services can be continued.

The people who suffer most from these inequities are Alaskans. All Americans look forward to the day when quality health care is in the reach of all people. It will take several years for this to happen. Until that time comes the Public Health Service must expand and provide more and better quality medical care to all our citizens.

It seems inconceivable that the United States, given the medical needs of today, should be debating whether or not we should close health services. We should have passed this stage many years ago. The question, of course, should be how can we get better services to more people. The narrow outlook of the budget cutters is irresponsible in thought and inconceivable in action. The obvious scarcity of adequate health facilities should demand expansion rather than reductions and to do so is intolerable.

An Alaska Legislature resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 6: OPPOSING THE CLOSING OF THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE HOSPITAL IN SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the fishing and maritime industries in the Pacific Northwest would be adversely affected by the closing of the United States Public Health Service Hospital in Seattle; and

Whereas this facility, because of its central location, has as actual and potential patients fishermen from Alaska, Washington and Oregon; and

Whereas a conservative estimate would be that the closure of this hospital could affect approximately 12,000 fishermen; and

Whereas there are no known replacement facilities which would be adequate should this hospital be closed;

Be it resolved that the Alaska State Legislature expresses its opposition to the closure of the United States Public Health Service Hospital in Seattle and respectfully requests that Governor Dan Evans, the Washington State Legislature, and the United States Congress do everything possible to prevent the contemplated termination of this facility.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable Dan Evans, Governor of the State of Washington; the Washington State Legislature; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF SENATOR STEVENSON

HON. ADLAI E. STEVENSON III

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I believe that the financial affairs of a public servant are a legitimate matter of public concern. I am, therefore, continuing my past practice of disclosing my economic interests. This report lists all such interests, together with my debts, to give a complete picture of my financial affairs. I will keep it current on a quarterly basis with copies available in my office. The values have been estimated to the best of my ability, or otherwise determined as indicated.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

Financial statement

REAL ESTATE	
Fractional remainder interest in farm, McLean County, Ill	$10,000
Home, Chicago, Ill	90,000
Home, Washington, D.C. (cost)	125,000
One-third interest, residence, Beverly, Mass	30,000
Interest in farm, Jo Daviess County, Ill	60,000
Fractional interest, Fish Building, Amarillo, Tex	3,200
Fractional interest, 1776 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, D.C.	20,000
Fractional interest, 633 Folsom St., San Francisco, Calif	12,000
Real estate—St. Maarten Island	8,000
STOCKS AND BONDS	
12,640 shares, Evergreen Communications, Inc. (publishes Bloomington, Ill., Daily Pantagraph, operates WROK, Rockford, Ill., and WJBC, Bloomington, Ill., owns 10 percent of Bloomington, Ill., CATV)	160,000
34.1 shares, R. R. Leaseholds, Inc	5,000
533 shares, KBA Townbuilders Group Limited, Tel Aviv	550
Market value as of Mar. 9, 1971:	
10,000 bonds, Baltimore, Md., 6.25 percent, 10–15–84	11,480
210 shares, CBS $1 Cv. Pfd	5,066
27 shares, International Telephone & Telegraph, $4 Cv. Pfd	2,903
68 shares, International Business Machine	23,732
400 shares, International Telephone & Telegraph	23,350
150 shares, Xerox	14,831
1,012 shares, Harris Intertype	65,780
306 shares, Boise Cascade	13,770
200 shares, Capital Cities Broadcasting	8,275
305 shares, Delta	11,514
400 shares, Lin Broadcasting	4,700
550 shares, Northwest Industries	13,269
305 shares, R. R. Donnelley	7,587
25 shares, Doubleday & Co	6,000
400 shares, McGraw Hill	8,700
130 shares, CBS 22/100	4,089
300 shares, RCA	9,825
100 shares, Standard Oil of New Jersey	7,678
CASH	
Less current obligations	3,000
MISCELLANEOUS	
Personal property, including securities of nominal value, furniture, cars, paintings and clothing	45,000
Total	814,299

DEBTS	
Mortgage—Perpetual Building Association, Washington, D.C.	79,820.73
Mortgage—Continental Bank, Chicago, Ill	20,187.13
Note payable to Charles J. and Charlotte T. Whalen	7,025.00
Notes payable to Warwick Anderson (father-in-law)	24,000.00
Total	131,032.86

MADISON MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL CHOIR

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. J. WILLIAM STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my appreciation and thanks to the Madison Memorial High School Choir for their outstanding performance on the steps of the U.S. Capitol on Monday, April 5.

The choir, under the able direction of Mr. David Ayers, traced America's history by means of a musical theme, "America: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow." Their selections ranged from the "Ride of Paul Revere" to "Aquarius," and everyone in the audience, which included some of my colleagues, as well as staff employees and tourists, thoroughly enjoyed the performance. I was particularly impressed by the girls' costumes—pantsuits which they made themselves—and with the choir's use of coordinated hand and foot movements to give an extra spark to some of the songs such as "Kumbaya" and "Let the Sunshine In."

The Madison choir combined a trip to Washington with a busy singing schedule, giving similar performances to the patients at the VA hospital and the Soldiers Home. I am very proud that these fine students, who demonstrated so well their concern for the betterment of our country, are from my district, and I was glad to have the opportunity to introduce them to official Washington.

JAMESTOWN HIGH SCHOOL BAND IS NO. 1

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the Jamestown, N.Y., High School Marching Band.

This outstanding group of musicians captured first place in the band competition during the recent Cherry Blossom Festival here in the Nation's Capital. In doing so, they brought new honor to a school which already has a lofty reputation in the realm of music and gladdened the heart of a prideful city.

The greeting accorded the band on its arrival home after its triumph in Washington would have made a conquering hero envious. But it was all justified. The 170 youngsters, led by Jeffrey Corbin, director, had competed against 17 of the best high school bands in the Nation.

With little chance to practice marching formations because of the snow in their hometown, they came to Washington and quickly caught the spectators' fancy with their precision afoot and their skill as musicmakers. As one television commenator said:

It didn't take long for the judges to determine that the Jamestown High School Band was number one.

They are indeed, and it is particularly fitting that their prize-winning honors should be bestowed by the Mayor of Washington, D.C. Mayor Walter Washington was once a student at Jamestown High School.

These youngsters represent what is good in America. Their excellence comes from many hours of practice and working together as a team.

They well deserve their new laurels as the No. 1 band and I invite my colleagues to share my pride in their achievement by including in the RECORD, copies of news stories from the Jamestown Post-Journal and a radio editorial from station WJTN, telling the story of their welcome home:

[From the Jamestown (N.Y.) Post-Journal, Apr. 5, 1971]

DIRECTOR DESCRIBES BAND'S EXPERIENCES

"The Jamestown High School Marching Band was very thrilled by the whole trip," Jeffrey Corbin, director, commented this morning in The Post-Journal editorial room.

He added that so many wonderful things happened besides the honors won that went into making the trip an unforgettable experience. Among these, he said, was the greeting given the band by Congressman James F. Hastings who got on each of the four buses after the band's performances and expressed his pride in the young people. The Congressman told them that he would bring attention to the group on the floor of Congress and that their accomplishments would be reported in "The Congressional Record."

Mr. Corbin said he was extremely proud of the band. "They worked so hard and their performance gave evidence of this. In fact, when they had finished the competition they could hardly move. They had seemingly used every ounce of strength they had. But the results were most gratifying.

"The students were just wonderful on the trip and very good representatives of Jamestown. They enjoyed the many social and sightseeing events that went along with the trip."

"We were delighted also that a former Jamestowner, Mayor Walter Washington, presented the trophy to us."

Mr. Corbin said that the welcome by the townspeople in coming back to Jamestown left everyone speechless. "We never dreamed the city would turn out in such large numbers," he said. "There wasn't a dry eye on any of the four buses. Together with the young people I would like to thank everyone involved, those who had to wait a couple of hours on a brisk cool evening, school officials, music parents, the Mayor, the police department, the radio and press, all who had any part in this fantastic welcome home."

Mr. Corbin explained the delay of almost two hours was caused when one of the buses had to have its brakes repaired at Harrisburg, Pa.

(From The Jamestown, (N.Y.) Post-Journal, April 5, 1971)

BAND GETS ROUSING WELCOME

(By Jennie Vimmerstedt)

Jamestown has seldom given a more rousing welcome home to any honor group than it did last night to the Jamestown High School Marching Band on its arrival from the Cherry Blossom Festival in Washington, D.C. where it took top honors.

The 170-member band, in competition with 17 bands selected from throughout the Nation for musicianship excellence, took first place in both concert and field work.

Lights from hundreds of automobiles and honking horns by a crowd estimated at from two to three thousand greeted the bandsmen as their four buses came into view both at the Foote Avenue Plaza and at the Jamestown High School.

The hour of arrival had been set at 7 p.m. and long before that time, there were hundreds of cars lining up at both parking areas. The crowds had to wait almost two hours before the buses arrived at 8:45 p.m. but were kept informed by Radio Station WJTN both of the buses' departure from St. Mary's, Pa., and again as they were seen going through Warren, Pa.

The Jamestown Police Department did an admirable job in lining up the cars and directing the motorcade up Foote Avenue to the high school parking area.

Crowds thronged against the buses as they pulled up to the side entrance of the high school. Here the greetings were poured out from hearts swelling with pride. Among those who formally welcomed the bandsmen were Mayor Stanley N. Lundine and members of the Jamestown City Council; Bryan A. Shaddick, superintendent of Jamestown Public Schools; Charles Jacobson, principal of Jamestown High School; Russell Johnson, head of school music; and Harold A. Johnson, president of the Jamestown High School Music Parents Association.

GREAT HONOR FOR CITY

Mayor Lundine said that the entire community is proud of the band and the great honor it has brought to Jamestown. He spoke in appreciation of the continued excellence of the band over a long period.

Superintendent Shaddick said that he was proud of the band and expressed his feelings that the taxpayers of Jamestown should sense that the support they give the schools of Jamestown is most worthwhile.

Principal Jacobson used the word "fantastic" which seemed to be the keyword on the part of many last night. He said he had promised the band a royal welcome at the City Line if it took first place. He added that Jamestown has waited 15 years for this honor, that other conductors, including himself had worked with the band and that "Jeffrey Corbin had put it all together."

Russell Johnson who was among those accompanying the band said he had never expected such a wonderful welcome, and that the young people, whom he described as the greatest kids in the country, had played well and behaved well. He also called attention that the short time of practice in Washington, D.C. was the first the band had experienced without marching in mud and snow this winter.

Harold Johnson spoke for the music parents in their pride in the band and their happiness in having a part in supporting various endeavors through raising money for uniforms, instruments, trips, etc.

TROPHY DESCRIBED

Jeffrey Corbin also gave a response for the band on its arrival. "We're happy as can be," he exclaimed and also described the first place trophy as a replica of the Washington monument done in white marble.

Many parents and bandsmen also expressed their elation in words like "it's great," "fantastic," "never expected anything like this," "glad we live in a small town where people get excited over events of this kind," "great credit to school's music department," and "well deserved."

Much credit for last night's expression of community pride should be given the cooperation of Principal Charles Jacobson, Harold A. Johnson and Samuel Nalbone, the city's ombudsman.

WJTN EDITORIAL

WJTN jumped the editorial gun Thursday by congratulating the Jamestown High School Band for being one of the 18 top bands to compete in the Cherry Blossom Festival.

Though fully aware of the excellence of Jeff Corbin's 170-member outfit, we perhaps showed too little faith in not waiting for the competition to be held, before offering our congratulations.

The JHS Band marched off with all the prizes in sight at the Nation's Capitol and made James F. Hastings the proudest Congressman around.

The band won top prizes in the marching contest behind the White House, then moved to the Commerce Department auditorium and won first place in the Concert competition.

There is no way the band could have done better! And our congratulations go again to Mr. Corbin . . . to Russell Johnson, who heads the music program . . . to the school board for supporting it . . . to the taxpayers for providing that support . . . and, most of all, to the band members themselves and their proud parents.

We think the band should get a hero's welcome when it gets back to Jamestown Sunday evening.

HOUSE HELPS COLLEGE JOURNALISTS

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week the House passed a joint resolution designating April 24, 1971, as National Collegiate Press Day.

While this action will not exactly cause echoes around the world, it was extremely important to many thousands of college students and advisers who work on campus newspapers.

I am certain that I speak for those of my colleagues who joined me in sponsoring this resolution when I express my

appreciation to the House and the Judiciary Committee for taking this affirmative action.

Now, I would hope that prompt action in the Senate will be forthcoming on this measure so that students in more than 20 States across this Nation can properly observe National Collegiate Press Day, when working seminars will be held aimed at improving the campus press.

For, it is my belief that the newspapers published on our college campuses play an important role in our higher educational system.

They offer students a legitimate voice in educational affairs. They provide a method for the student body to make itself felt, effectively, and constructively.

Moreover, college newspapers provide a valuable training area for future newsmen. Many of the most respected national correspondents here in Washington began their careers in the university newsroom.

While many students in this country take to the streets to picket and demonstrate, and some cause violence and disruption which has ended in death in the past, college journalists press their case more peacefully.

They use their ability to communicate through the press by appealing to reason and to public opinion.

National Collegiate Press Day activities will demonstrate the willingness of college reporters and advisers to learn about journalism and to approach careers in the field with valuable background and knowledge.

DUQUESNE LIGHT CO., PITTSBURGH, LAUNCHES BICENTENNIAL IN SALUTE TO OUR FLAG

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, although our bicentennial will not be officially celebrated until 1976, Duquesne Light Co. of Pittsburgh, in cooperation with Flag Plaza, operated by the Allegheny Trails Council, Boy Scouts of America, has already moved to honor our country's 200th birthday.

Underway right now, as a result of a 2-year planning effort on the part of these sponsors, is a "You Are the Flag" essay contest—for the 65,000 seventh- and eighth-grade students in Allegheny and Beaver Counties, Pa., designed to stimulate an interest in our young people for the heritage of our country, its leaders, ideals, and a love of patriotism.

The contest, programed to be held annually, has the endorsement of local educators who have received educational materials and films to assist their students in preparing the essays, supplied by Duquesne Light Co., local educators, and civic groups. There will be many prizes for the classroom winners and semifinalists; the 15 grand prize winners, selected by a panel of educators, business and civic leaders, will be announced appropriately on Flag Day, June 14, at Flag Plaza, Pittsburgh. A 3-day, all-expenses paid "Cradle of Democracy Historic Flag Expedition" to Boston, will follow.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the early efforts of Duquesne Light Co. and Flag Plaza, and know you will join me in congratulating them for their significant contribution toward our bicentennial. I include a descriptive article about the flag contest for the interest of my colleagues:

DUQUESNE LIGHT SPONSORS "YOU ARE THE FLAG" CONTEST FOR AREA STUDENTS

In an effort to stimulate interest in the heritage of the United States, Duquesne Light Company, in cooperation with Flag Plaza, is launching what will be an annual "You Are the Flag" essay contest for 65,000 seventh and eighth grade students in Allegheny and Beaver Counties.

Fifteen grand prize winners, selected by a panel or educators, business and civic leaders, will be announced on Flag Day, June 14, 1971 at Flag Plaza in Pittsburgh.

The following day, the 15 winners will leave on a three-day, all-expense paid, "Cradle of Democracy" Historic Flag Expedition to Boston with the famous flag historian Dr. Whitney Smith.

Two years in the development, teaching aids, individual learning tools and resource booklets have been especially prepared by an advisory panel of teachers and school administrators under the leadership of Duquesne Light and Flag Plaza.

Like each one of you, Duquesne Light and its employees have an important stake in the free enterprise system that was founded nearly 195 years ago. That's why we have developed this program.

Today's patriot is not just a flag-waver. He is one who is aware of his heritage and is determined to build on that heritage, using the methods of self-correction afforded him and every citizen by the Constitution.

FLAG CONTEST OPEN TO 65,000 STUDENTS

As each student writes his essay, he'll learn through the study of our history the meaning of American ideals—for which men and women have fought and died—and of the significance of our flags of the past, present and future.

The "You Are the Flag" contest has received the endorsement of the major school systems in the Duquesne Light service area; also of a number of civic-minded groups including veteran's organizations.

According to George Cahill, Executive Director of Flag Plaza Foundation, this program is the most significant salute to the celebration of our Nation's Bicentennial announced to date by any corporation.

Each of approximately 2,000 classroom winners will receive a four-color "Certificate of Excellence" bearing signature reprints of Astronauts Aldrin and Armstrong.

One hundred fifty semifinalists will receive the book "Broad Stripes and Bright Stars," a historical account of the American flag prepared by Flag Plaza, and a Certificate of Literary Achievement.

DUQUESNE LIGHT SUPPLYING SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL MATERIAL

To aid teachers in preparing their students for the contest, Duquesne Light is supplying a kit of educational material including a filmstrip, study guide, bibliography, and booklets dealing with the history of the flag and the role it played in the development of the United States. The 14-minute filmstrip, entitled "You Are the Flag," is narrated by James Stewart and Paul Long and features the works of the well-known artist, Milton Caniff.

Duquesne Light is also providing copies of "Use Your Voice"—a guide of congressional and senatorial districts—for use in classroom projects.

The school laws of Pennsylvania state that all supervising officers and teachers in charge of public, private or parochial schools must instruct each student in the principles and ideals of our nation . . . in an effort to promote respect and allegiance for the flag of the United States.

Duquesne Light believes that the "You Are the Flag" essay contest will help fulfill those requirements and instill in our young people an awareness of that heritage . . . so that we can continue to build on the solid foundation our forefathers left with us.

"Don't wait for other guys to do the job—to carry high the faith in what we've won. The other guy is You!

You Are the Flag!"

AN HONEST REPRESENTATION OF VA HOSPITAL CARE

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, when news is scarce, some of the national magazines and networks seek out the attendant misery of a Veterans' hospital to exacerbate the miserableness of their viewers who find some enjoyment or emotional release in sharing the unfortunate plight of others.

In a beautiful juxtaposition from the magazine and network misrepresentations of our VA hospital system, I received a personal letter from a friend who was simply sharing her VA hospital experience with me.

The candid, unsolicited letter tells me much more clearly and honestly about the care, treatment and concern of the VA hospital personnel and the condition and operation of the VA facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a copy of a letter from Marie G. Browne, of Salinas, Calif., from Hines Veterans' Administration Hospital in Illinois.

Most patients, in spite of their illnesses and afflictions, are sincerely grateful for the care they receive in our VA hospitals.

This one letter is more honest and more representative of VA hospital care than the pages of posed pictures, and the reels of contrived film by which a national magazine and national network tried to discredit and malign the dedicated people of the Veterans' Administration.

Before you give credence to another slur of a VA hospital, may I suggest that you ask a patient or two about their treatment. The patient may know more than the critic whose livelihood depends more upon criticism and controversy than upon care and concern.

The letter follows:

HINES VA HOSPITAL,
March 22, 1971.

DEAR FRIEND BURT: While sitting around here all day, I decided to write you a letter. At the present time I am a patient at the VA hospital in Hines, Illinois. Have been here three weeks and it looks like three or four weeks or longer.

Jimmy came to the Montgomery plant of Western Electric about a year ago and I came to see him, and was not too well so hence my

being a patient. They have diagnosed terminal cancer of the breast, so here I am. The treatment is very rugged but they sure are giving me fine care. I would return to Los Angeles to the VA there; but the doctors believe it wiser for me to stay here. This is a large complex and at the present time they about have 1500 men and I am the only woman here. So you can see I get more than 100% cooperation. I will say that it is run very efficiently and everything is spotless.

The food is excellent and plenty of it. They have some of the finest doctors and surgeons I have met. I am grateful indeed that I came here. I am not bed-ridden, but up and down and their recreation rooms are fine, and the Red Cross girls are wonderful. When they discovered a lady in the place they have showered me with so much it sort of makes me embarrassed. It is a fine organization and they are doing fine work. Several of the Legion Posts close by have workers, also the VFW. They have nightly bingo games and you get a $2.50 certificate for the PX.

They have a number of Vietnam amputees here. Young lads, and they are so happy for the care and attention they are receiving.

If you get a chance tell Senator Percy he should take time out and check this place. It's a wonderful place, but my heart really belongs in California.

I have heard from the Post, flowers and cards. It was so nice.

I hope to return to California and may try to get into Napa-Yountville home; but until the Doctors decide, I will remain here. They had two specialists here from Washington, D.C. and they suggested I be sent there, but at least I know they are willing to help.

There are so many nice men coming here for out-patient care and it is all run so efficiently.

It is a very hard job to run a place like this, but from all I see it is wonderful and gratefully thank all for their help.

This is about all for now and I surely wish you much more success, and we are so happy to have such a fine man in the Congress.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely,

MARIE G. BROWNE.

ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the conviction and sentencing of Lt. William Calley has created a tremendous upheaval in the minds of many people. I have been reluctant as an elected official to pass judgment without the evidence which has been presented in the case. The more I hear, the more convinced I am that the position is correct. I have urged the President to release the evidence compiled so it can be studied by all. I have further requested that clemency be given full consideration if the verdict of guilty is upheld.

Yesterday, a friend of mine sent me an article which was published in a John Birch Society pamphlet dated December 17, 1969. I have no way of knowing about the documentation of facts as they are presented. I do think the article is worthy of consideration as we try to establish a proper course of action in this matter. I include the article in the RECORD for the study of my colleagues:

[From the Review of the News]

ANALYSIS: THE MY LAI "ATROCITIES"

(By Frank Cappell)

One of the most important propaganda campaigns of modern times is now being waged by the Communists in America and around the world. The flash point for this effort was the alleged "massacre" at My Lai in Vietnam. If all proceeds according to the current expectations of the Far Left, the blaze will be developed into a Presidential Commission amounting to a "War Crimes" Tribunal fashioned after the infamous Nuremberg Trials. The propaganda potential of the proposed Commission is almost limitless as emotions are fired by horror tales and gory films of doubtful origin.

It was open Communists who began calling American servicemen "War Criminals." Now selected servicemen are being brushed with this charge by conspirators in their own government.

The Presidential Commission was first used by the Left for political purposes shortly after the attack on Pearl Harbor. That one ruined the careers of U.S. Admiral Husband E. Kimmel and General Walter C. Short, by placing on them the blame for failing to defend properly against the Japanese sneak attack. The real culprit, of course, was President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who had done all but invite the attack by Japan to counter pacifist sentiments and get the United States into World War II. The Japanese code had been broken and Washington was aware of the Japanese threat, but our Pacific fleet was nonetheless ordered into Pearl Harbor to be sitting ducks for an attack which both Franklin Roosevelt and George Marshall knew was imminent. Warning was deliberately withheld from the officers at Pearl Harbor until the attack was well under way.

More recently, the Presidential Commission was used after the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to cover up a high-level conspiracy by promoting the myth that Communist agent Lee Harvey Oswald was but a "psychopathic loner." The Commission had even been proposed by the Communist *Worker*, which suggested that it be headed by Earl Warren.

Now comes a group of "prominent jurists," led by Arthur Goldberg, who are proposing that Mr. Nixon convene a Presidential Commission "of unquestionable impartiality" to investigate the alleged "massacre" at My Lai. Again the suggestion of a civilian tribunal was first made by a Communist newspaper—the *Daily World* of November 29, 1969—which cited as precedent the phony Roberts Commission on Pearl Harbor.

It was on December fourth at a news conference in the Center for International Studies at New York University that Arthur Goldberg read the statement of his group of "prominent jurists." Among these were Francis T. P. Plimpton and Ernest A. Gross, both former U.S. representatives at the United Nations; Loftus E. Becker, Abram Chayes, and Adrian S. Fisher, all former legal advisors in the U.S. State Department; Dean William Clements Warren of Columbia Law School; Dean Louis H. Pollak of Yale Law School; Dean Derek C. Bok of Harvard Law School; the Reverend Robert F. Drinan, Dean of Boston College Law School; and, a number of others including the former Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense, Adam Yarmolinsky.

One remembers that Goldberg had earlier pontificated about the "appalling, indeed frightening, deterioration in our national standards of morality and law" when the Green Beret Case was finally dropped after every ounce of anti-American propaganda had been squeezed from it. In a short article in Life, however, he had lightly dismissed the sort of savagery later alleged to have occurred at My Lai:

"Of course war is hell. I suppose there has never been a war in which troops under stress of battle have not committed acts of savagery which they would not think of performing under other circumstances. And I recognize that a counter-guerrilla war in the jungles and rice paddies of South Vietnam is peculiarly prone to instances of misconduct of this kind."

Having found a propaganda reason to change his mind about savagery in the stress of battle and the terrible nature of guerrilla warfare, Goldberg now makes this pitch:

"The allegations of atrocities committed in Vietnam are hurting the reputation, but even more the conscience, of all law-respecting Americans. But even more damaging than the allegations would be the failure of this country to show itself manifestly unafraid to examine all the evidence, to review the context within which the alleged acts occurred."

The Goldberg group even urged that the propaganda commission they recommend be authorized to inquire into "the larger questions of policy guidelines for the conduct of military operations." Earl Warren was specifically mentioned as a man with the sort of experience necessary to run such a commission.

The Goldberg "prominent jurists" are, of course, little more than pro-Communist propagandists. Goldberg and the "Reverend" Drinan, for example, have both been connected with the subversive National Lawyers Guild, Goldberg as a president and Drinan as a vice president. Yarmolinsky was formerly an activist with the Young Communist League. Another member of the group who has shown himself to be interested in the "War Crimes" aspect of the war in Vietnam is Robert Woetzel of Boston College. In 1965, when he was a member of the staff of the radical Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Dr. Robert K. Woetzel wrote a long letter which appeared in the Los Angeles Times for July 17, 1965. There he stated:

"It is undoubtedly true that according to the principles of the Nuremberg trials, especially the International Military Tribunal which tried Goering and other leading German war criminals, and which was unanimously endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly, a person has the obligation to resist criminal orders; compliance could make an individual an accessory.

"A GI who commits a war crime, whether or not he is obeying orders, can also be held liable under the U.S. Rules of Land Warfare . . .

"It is clear that Americans from the President down to a lowly private who is capable of understanding the implications of a criminal order (the shooting of women and children, for example) can not hold themselves exempt from a law which they helped to fashion . . .

"The issue of intervention has not been decided by any international authority like the U.N. Security Council, and it would be difficult to conclude at this time that a crime against peace was committed by the United States or an infringement of the right of self-determination. Nazi and Japanese crimes which were tried before international tribunals were preceded by widespread protests. . . . It can be concluded, therefore, that there do not exist grounds at the present time to accuse anyone of crimes against international law."

But ah, that was before the My Lai accusations. We are faced now with the prospect that this expert and others like him will argue that American boys, who tried to do their duty, should be placed on trial as part of an all-out propaganda effort to end the war in Vietnam on Communist terms.

There can be no doubt whatsoever that the My Lai story has been promoted to serve Communist purposes. As Trotskyite Communist Robert Langston bragged in the Communist *Militant* for December 12, 1969:

"It took the power of the organized anti-war movement to break through the conspiracy of silence and distortion sustained by all the established institutions of American capitalist society, and bring to the attention of the world the Songmy massacre by a U.S. Army task force.

"The capitalist press [sic] is now attempting to claim credit for having disclosed what happened to the Mylai hamlet at Songmy. An examination of the way the story unfolded shows the fraudulence of this claim."

Remember that the source of the "atrocities" story that so much of the world has swallowed is not an unbiased news agency, but a product of "investigative reporting" by an antiwar agitator whose efforts were financed by a radical foundation and "sold" by a Leftist propaganda agency calling itself a "news" service. The man whose gory descriptions of hearsay incidents stirred up this investigation openly admits that he did not adjust to Army life and spent months collecting outright rumors. As *Time* magazine noted in its issue for December 5, 1969:

"Now a literature student at Claremont Men's College . . . [Ronald Lee] Ridenhour insists that he "has no ax to grind" with the Army. But he concedes that he did not get along well in the service. "It's very authoritarian, just not my bag. I'm one of those guys who question orders."

Ridenhour sent copies of his 1,500-word letter of March 29, 1969, to every Leftist in government he thought might get interested and, though an investigation by the Army was begun, things had been proceeding very quietly. In fact, Ridenhour was so dissatisfied with the lack of publicity wrought by his attack on the "authoritarian" Army that he hired a "literary agent" to try to peddle the story. There were no takers. None, we are told, until a key Leftist named Seymour Hersh got a "tip" from one of his "many sources" within the Pentagon that a juicy story was being ignored by the press. This, even though the Associated Press had on September 6, 1969, wired a report of the allegations to all of its subscribers. Datelined Fort Benning, Georgia, the A.P. report declared:

"An Army officer has been charged with murder in the deaths of an unspecified number of civilians in Vietnam in 1968, post authorities have disclosed. Col. Douglas Tucker, information officer, said the charge was brought yesterday against First Lt. William L. Calley, Jr., 26 years old of Miami, who was to have been discharged Saturday after two years in the service."

Seymour Hersh was just the man to front the promotion of such a story. He is a Leftist propaganda specialist who has long been crusading against the American military, even writing a book entitled *Chemical And Biological Warfare: America's Hidden Arsenal*. So important is he, in fact, that he served as press agent for Eugene McCarthy during his New Hampshire campaign, and in October was a speaker for the Vietnam Moratorium which supported the Vietcong.

Hersh moved quickly to acquire the necessary financing to develop his propaganda tale, going to the officers of the Philip Stern Family Fund. Although the amount Seymour Hersh received has been set at $1,000, the executive director of the benevolent Stern foundation is reported to have told him that the Sterns would pay the tab, no matter what the cost. The executive director who made this kind of offer was James Boyd, who has himself been involved in similar "investigative reporting." Boyd is, in fact, the former assistant to Senator Thomas Dodd who copied the Senator's files and turned copies over to Drew Pearson for a series of articles designed to smear Senator Dodd. The Stern Family Fund was established by Edith Rosenwald Stern and her late husband Edgar Stern. Mr. Stern's millionaire brother, Alfred, is a Communist spy who fled behind the Iron Curtain with his wife, Martha Dodd Stern, to avoid prosecution for espionage. The Boyd-run Investigative Journalism section of the Stern operation was personally funded by Philip M. Stern, an active supporter of the Communist-directed Moratorium and New Mobilization operations.

With his financial problems solved by the crimson fat cats at Stern, Seymour Hersh proceeded to track down malcontents in Lieutenant Calley's company. But, when he had his story ready he ran into difficulty peddling it and finally turned to the services of the virtually unknown Dispatch News Service, only recently founded by David Obst and Michael Morrow. Assisting Dispatch as an "adviser" is Richard J. Barnet, who has just returned from Hanoi where he gave propaganda speeches calling for a Vietcong victory.

Dispatch News Service's Dave Obst, age twenty-three, got on the phone and sold the story to thirty-five newspapers which printed it on November thirteenth. For a reported fee of $10,000 from C.B.S., the News Service even produced a participant in the alleged "massacre," one Paul Meadlo, to be interviewed for television by Mike Wallace. That it was a cash operation has been confirmed by Meadlo himself, who told one reporter: "I ain't talking to nobody now unless they pay." Senator Ernest F. Hollings has described Meadlo as "obviously sick."

With the purchased Meadlo interview, and the production of what were said to be color slides of the "atrocities" by former Army photographer Ronald L. Haeberle, the "massacre" story was on its way. Haeberle had been present on March 16, 1968, when Company C, 1st Battalion of the 20th Infantry, 11th Light Infantry Brigade, went into the hamlet of My Lai on a "search and destroy" mission. A member of the 31st Public Information Detachment, Haeberle claims he volunteered for this operation because word was out that it was to be "a hot one." He says he carried three cameras—two for himself and one for the Army. He maintains that he took his Army pictures in black and white and turned them over to his superiors; his own film was in color. Ronald Haeberle left the service shortly afterward and, returning to the United States, began lecturing and showing his slides around the Cleveland area without arousing so much as a hint of horror.

A year and six months after the "atrocities" are alleged to have occurred, Haeberle took a series of photos—which he claims reveals American atrocities at My Lai—to Joseph Eszterhas, a friend who worked for the Leftist *Cleveland Plain Dealer*. Eight of those pictures were published in that sheet on November 20, 1969. Then Haeberle and Eszterhas flew to New York, set up an office in Room 801 of the Gotham Hotel, and offered eighteen color slides to the highest bidder. *Life* magazine is said to have paid $40,000 for the slides and the services of reporter Eszterhas in writing gory captions.

There is, of course, a rodent in the woodpile. On December fifth, United Press quoted Senator Peter H. Dominick (R.-Colorado) as follows:

"Not one picture in the Life story showed anyone committing an atrocity. Not one was tied in with the My Lai terrain. . . . No one has challenged the integrity of the photographer who sold the pictures to Life for $40,000.

"Yet these pictures are published as fact by a national magazine. I think this is shameful."

He said the photographs do not jibe with the actual geography around the village of Song My ". . . and yet Life used the pictures and wrapped them up with an editorial judgment of guilt on the part of those involved."

Nonetheless, charges have been filed against Lieutenant William Calley and Sergeant David Mitchell, the former accused of slaying 109 Vietnamese civilians. Their commanding officer, Captain Ernest L. Medina, has not as yet been charged. A thirteen-year veteran, holder of both the bronze and silver stars, he has been permitted to speak to the press. Captain Medina commented:

"The task force was ordered to conduct a combat assault on a village which was named My Lai 4, which intelligence reports indicated that the 48th Vietcong Battalion was there in that village. . . . We had also been told by intelligence sources that there would be no women or children or innocent civilians in the village of My Lai 4 after 0700 hours. . . . At 0730 the first flight of the combat assault began its final approach up to the landing zone. . . . I immediately received a gunship pilot, or helicopter pilot, . . . "You are receiving fire. We are receiving fire. There are V.C. with weapons running from the village."

. . . I saw no shooting of any innocent civilians whatsoever. . . . I did not receive any reports of any atrocity or any shooting of civilians inside the village."

When questioned about the "massacre" stories detailed by "eye-witnesses" produced by the Leftist propagandists, Captain Medina was asked how such statements could be so totally in conflict with his own. Medina explained:

"There were certain individuals that have made statements for which they have been paid. Certain dissident groups have welcomed the chance to speak out against the military. There are certain individuals that I had disciplinary problems with."

It is interesting to note that the account of Captain Medina's interview published in the New York Times ignored the comment about his having had "disciplinary problems" with those making the charges.

At the time of the alleged "massacre" an investigation was conducted by the Army into "atrocity" stories spread by the Vietcong, who began dropping propaganda leaflets about the attack on the V.C. headquarters at My Lai within two weeks of the encounter. At the time, neither U.S. nor South Vietnamese officials investigating the matter found any basis whatsoever for the charges. A recent communique from South Vietnamese authorities reiterates their findings, based on an investigation by Lieutenant General Hoang Xuan Lam, commander of the area which includes the village of My Lai:

"More than a year ago in March 1968, an operation was launched by the Americal Division's Task Force Barker in the area of My Lai hamlet, Son My village, Son Tinh district, Quang Ngai Province, with the aim of destroying an important Communist force in that area.

"When Task Force Barker moved into that area, they met strong resistance from the enemy. . . . The result of the contact was 125 enemy killed and at the same time about 20 civilians living in the hamlet were killed by tactical air strikes and artillery while the fight was on.

"Reports from newspapers and foreign news agency recently saying that 527 civilians were killed were completely inaccurate."

Colonel Ton That Khien, Chief of Quang Ngai Province in which My Lai is located, also thoroughly investigated the charges. He said he could find none who saw any massacre, and that as the village was dominated by the Vietcong what tales there were amounted to Communist propaganda.

Nonetheless, under Leftist pressure, the U.S. Army has now named an eight-man board to check the possibility that the original investigations of the alleged incident could have been "inadequate" and that both the South Vietnamese authorities and the Army might have covered up what they knew of the alleged killing of South Vietnamese noncombatants. The board appointed on November 24, 1969, by Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor, Chief of Staff William C. Westmoreland, is headed by Lieutenant General William R. Peers.

With so many investigators looking into

the situation, why are Arthur Goldberg and his "prominent jurists" of the Left trying to get into the act? The reason can only be that they are afraid the present investigation will come up with the "wrong" answers, whereas an "impartial" Presidential Commission can always be depended upon to come up with the "right" ones. The effect of all this upon the military can only be disastrous—a disaster which the Vietnik press and Mr. Goldberg's "prominent" jurists are seeking to embrace as a part of a Leftist victory.

Meanwhile, our GIs are being subjected to unrelenting and increasing pressure of which the "atrocity" accusations are but one more straw in a load designed to break the camel's back. Coffee houses where seditious propaganda is served with cream and sugar have sprung up near our military bases throughout the world. Underground Marxist newspapers aimed at servicemen are allowed distribution on our military bases to undermine morale and discipline. Orders from Washington have forced commanders to permit onbase delivery of the Communist clenched-fist salute, dissemination of openly Communist propaganda, and organization of soldiers by Communist-led "unions."

During the March on Washington in November, a National Conference on G.I. Rights was held in the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, to organize Vietnik dissent within our armed forces. Sponsors were the separate Chicago and New York Veterans for Peace in Vietnam organizations; the American Servicemen's Union; G.I.'s United Against the War in Vietnam; Servicemen's Link to Peace; and, the G.I. Civil Liberties Defense Committee.

Speaking at the opening of the above Conference was David Rein, a Washington lawyer identified by official government reports as a Communist. Mr. Rein's point was that war resistance by servicemen could be used to force an American withdrawal from Vietnam. Another of the organizers of the Conference was Leroy Wolins, an officer of the Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, who is also an identified Communist. Chairman of the affair was Melvin L. Wulf, director of the legal department of the American Civil Liberties Union. Much of the discussion centered around refusals to obey "unjust, immoral and illegal orders"—a euphemism for insubordination under fire, and a key objective of the current furor over the alleged My Lai "massacre."

This business is very important. One remembers that in The Russian Revolution Isaac Don Levine noted:

"No single factor in the revolution was of such paramount importance as the army joining the ranks of the rebels. Without the army's support the Russian democracy [sic] would never have succeeded in overthrowing the Czar. . . . The alienation of the army from its traditional masters . . . became the most vital necessity of all for a successful revolution."

Those planning "revolution" in the United States know that similar tactics can be important today, and are therefore making our Armed Forces a prime target. That our mass media are supporting this operation should tell you something very important. Think about it.

NIMBUS IV WILL COMPLETE FIRST YEAR IN ORBIT

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, a space birthday will be marked tomorrow when the Nimbus IV meteorological satellite, built for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, completes its first year in orbit.

Nimbus IV, constructed by General Electric Co. in Upper Merion Township, Montgomery County, Pa., has achieved almost 5,000 orbits in its year-long space journey. In the tradition of previous Nimbus satellites, it has considerably exceeded its designed lifetime and has produced a tremendous amount of data about our weather and our atmosphere.

The nine advanced sensors aboard this weather satellite have tracked hurricanes, tropical storms, measured the amount of ozone and water vapor in the atmosphere, have measured and recorded the temperature profile of our atmosphere, have measured ultraviolet radiation from the sun, and have tracked and interrogated balloons, ships, and buoys carrying data-collection platforms.

In the process of its polar orbit, it has defined navigational landmarks, recorded erupting volcanoes, and traced the ice flow in the great oceans to prevent damage to ships.

I think it is most important that practical applications of our space technology be brought to the attention of the public. While we must keep expenditures for our space program in proper perspective with our national priorities, there are benefits being produced almost daily that contribute to our people and our country.

Contributions to space technology—such as Nimbus IV—are worthy projects. I feel that these are among the space efforts that we must support and to which we should lend encouragement.

I congratulate GE and its personnel in Upper Merion on their outstanding record of service to the country which is exemplified by the first anniversary of Nimbus IV's flight. I share the pride of managements and workers in a job well done—a job that has given the taxpayers their money's worth and has benefited our citizens.

AMERICAN JUSTICE ON TRIAL

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter from Capt. Aubrey M. Daniel to the President of the United States.

Captain Daniel has just performed, for his country, the prosecution of Lt. William Calley for murder at My Lai. His was a most difficult task, and it involved the protection of our basic system of law and the moral principle which gives substance to America. He did his duty well, and the verdict was victory for law and for morality. Admittedly the verdict was a difficult one, particularly within the full emotional climate of the Vietnam war. However, it was the only verdict possible under the law.

Now we have the President of the United States personally intruding in the administration of justice. He has interfered in the confinement of Lieutenant Calley, and he has announced that he will personally review the case further down the line, thereby prejudicing the entire appeal procedure. By his action, he may have compromised the military justice system, and, indeed, the American judicial system itself.

Captain Daniel has written an eloquent letter to the President dealing with the aftermath of the Calley verdict. I commend it to you, to the Members of this body, and to the American people:

TEXT OF CALLEY PROSECUTOR'S LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

SIR: It is very difficult for me to know where to begin this letter as I am not accustomed to writing letters of protest. I only hope that I can find the words to convey to you my feelings as a United States citizen, and as an attorney, who believes that respect for law is one of the fundamental bases upon which this nation is founded.

On Nov. 26, 1969, you issued the following statement through your press secretary, Mr. Ronald Ziegler, in referring to the Mylai incident:

"An incident such as that alleged in this case is in direct violation not only of United States military policy, but is also abhorrent to the conscience of all the American people.

"The Secretary of the Army is continuing his investigation. Appropriate action is and will be taken to assure that illegal and immoral conduct as alleged be dealt with in accordance with the strict rules of military justice.

"This incident should not be allowed to reflect on the some million and a quarter young Americans who have now returned to the United States after having served in Vietnam with great courage and distinction."

At the time you issued this statement, a general court-martial had been directed for a resolution of the charges which have been brought against Lieut. William L. Calley Jr. for his involvement at Mylai.

NIXON QUOTATION CITED

On Dec. 8, 1970, you were personally asked to comment on the Mylai incident at a press conference. At that time you made the following statement:

"What appears was certainly a massacre, and under no circumstances was it justified.

"One of the goals we are fighting for in Vietnam is to keep the people from South Vietnam from having imposed upon them a government which has atrocity against civilians, as one of its policies.

"We cannot ever condone or use atrocities against civilians in order to accomplish that goal."

These expressions of what I believed to be your sentiment were truly reflective of my own feelings when I was given the assignment of prosecuting the charges which had been preferred against Lieutenant Calley.

IN THE FINEST TRADITION

My feelings were generated not by emotionalism or self-indignation but by my knowledge of the evidence in the case, the laws of this nation in which I strongly believe, and my own conscience. I knew that I had been given a great responsibility and I only hoped that I would be able to discharge my duties and represent the United States in a manner which would be a credit to the legal profession and our system of justice.

I undertook the prosecution of the case without any ulterior motives for personal gain, either financial or political. My only desire was to fulfill my duty as a prosecutor and see that justice was done in accordance with the laws of this nation. I dedicated myself totally to this end from November 1969 until the trial was concluded.

Throughout the proceedings there was criticism of the prosecution but I lived with the abiding conviction that once the facts and the law had been presented there would be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable person about the necessity for the prosecution of this case and the ultimate verdict. I was mistaken.

The trial of Lieutenant Calley was conducted in the finest tradition of our legal system. It was in every respect a fair trial in which every legal right of Lieutenant Calley was fully protected. It clearly demonstrated that the military justice system which has previously been the subject of much criticism was a fair system.

Throughout the trial, the entire system was under the constant scrutiny of the mass media and the public, and the trial of Lieutenant Calley was also in a very real sense the trial of the military judicial system. However, there was never an attack lodged by any member of the media concerning the fairness of the trial. There could be no such allegation justifiably made.

JURY CAREFULLY CHOSEN

I do not believe that there has ever been a trial in which the accused's rights were more fully protected, the conduct of the defense given greater latitude, and the prosecution held to stricter standards. The burden of proof which the Government had to meet in this case was not beyond a reasonable doubt, but beyond possibility. The very fact that Lieutenant Calley was an American officer being tried for the deaths of Vietnamese during a combat operation by fellow officers compels this conclusion.

The jury selection, in which customary procedure was altered by providing both the defense and the prosecution with three peremptory challenges instead of the usual one, was carefully conducted to insure the impartiality of those men who were selected. Six officers, all combat veterans, five having served in Vietnam, were selected. These six men who had served their country well, were called upon again to serve their nation as jurors and to sit in judgment of Lieutenant Calley as prescribed by law.

SHOCKED AND DISMAYED

From the time they took their oaths until they rendered their decision, they performed their duties in the very finest tradition of the American legal system. If ever a jury followed the letter of the law in applying it to the evidence presented, they did. They are indeed a credit to our system of justice and to the officer corps of the United States Army.

When the verdict was rendered, I was totally shocked and dismayed at the reaction of many people across the nation. Much of the adverse public reaction I can attribute to people who have acted emotionally and without being aware of the evidence that was presented and perhaps even the laws of this nation regulating the conduct of war.

These people have undoubtedly viewed Lieutenant Calley's conviction simply as the conviction of an American officer for killing the enemy. Others, no doubt out of a sense of frustration, have seized upon the conviction as a means of protesting the war in Vietnam.

I would prefer to believe that most of the public criticism has come from people who are not aware of the evidence, either because they have not followed the evidence as it was presented, or having followed it they have chosen not to believe it.

Certainly, no one wanted to believe what occurred at Mylai, including the officers who sat in judgment of Lieutenant Calley. To believe, however, that any large percentage of the population could believe the evidence which was presented and approved of the conduct of Lieutenant Calley would be as shocking to my conscience as the conduct itself, since I believe that we are still a civilized nation.

If such be the case, then the war in Vietnam has brutalized us more than I care to believe, and it must cease. How shocking it is if so many people across this nation have failed to see the moral issue which was involved in the trial of Lieutenant Calley—that it is unlawful for an American soldier to summarily execute unarmed and unresisting men, women, children and babies.

APPALLED BY LEADERS

But how much more appalling it is to see so many of the political leaders of the nation who have failed to see the moral issue or, having seen it, to compromise it for political motive in the face of apparent public displeasure with the verdict.

I would have hoped that all leaders of this nation, which is supposed to be the leader within the international community for the protection of the weak and the oppressed regardless of nationality, would have either accepted and supported the enforcement of the laws of this country as reflected by the verdict of the court or not make any statement concerning the verdict until they had had the same opportunity to evaluate the evidence that the members of the jury had.

In view of your previous statements concerning this matter, I have been particularly shocked and dismayed at your decision to intervene in these proceedings in the midst of the public clamor. Your decision can only have been prompted by the response of a vocal segment of our population, who while no doubt acting in good faith, cannot be aware of the evidence which resulted in Lieutenant Calley's conviction.

Your intervention has, in my opinion, damaged the military judicial system and lessened any respect it may have gained as a result of the proceedings.

You have subjected a judicial system of this country to the criticism that it is subject to political influence, when it is a fundamental precept of our judicial system that the legal processes of this country must be kept free from any outside influences. What will be the impact of your decision upon the future trials, particularly those within the military?

"RESPECT WEAKENED"

Not only has respect for the legal process been weakened and the critics of the military judicial system been given support for their claims of command influence, the image of Lieutenant Calley, a man convicted of the premeditated murder of at least 21 unarmed and unresisting people, as a national hero has been enhanced, while at the same time support has been given to those persons who have so unjustly criticized the six loyal and honorable officers who have done this country a great service by fulfilling their duties as jurors so admirably.

Have you considered those men in making your decisions? The men who since rendering their verdict have found themselves and their families the subject of vicious attacks upon their honor, integrity and loyalty to this nation.

It would seem to me to be more appropriate for you as the President to have said something in their behalf and to remind the nation of the purpose of our legal system and the respect it should command.

I would expect that the President of the United States, a man whom I believed should and would provide the moral leadership for this nation, would stand fully behind the law of this land on a moral issue which is so clear and about which there can be no compromise.

ABHORRENT TO CONSCIENCE

For this nation to condone the acts of Lieutenant Calley is to make us no better than our enemies and make any pleas by this nation for the humane treatment of our own prisoners meaningless.

I truly regret having to have written this letter and wish that no innocent person had died at Mylai on March 16, 1968. But innocent people were killed under circumstances that will always remain abhorrent to my conscience.

While in some respects what took place at Mylai has to be considered to be a tragic day in the history of our nation, how much more tragic would it have been for this country to have taken no action against those who were responsible.

That action was taken, but the greatest tragedy of all will be if political expediency dictates the compromise of such a fundamental moral principle as the inherent unlawfulness of the murder of innocent persons, making the action and the courage of six honorable men who served their country so well meaningless

---

LET MY PEOPLE GO

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, I have observed the agonies of the Russian Jewish community for some months now. It is such a sadly familiar tale, only with a unique new twist which can only lift the spirits of anyone who is deeply concerned with the cause of human liberty.

The Soviet regime, true to its heritage of anti-Semitism, seeks to keep the Soviet Jewish community, 3 million strong, in the silent grip of an all-pervasive terror.

Russia's Jews, inheritors and victims of one of the most long-standing, vicious traditions of bigotry in the world, have at last resolved to confront the Soviet hierarchy with the full force of their dedication to their faith and determination to live their beliefs. Such sublime courage has rarely been demonstrated before an astonished world in our time.

Here is a picture of the world's mightiest depotism backed into a corner by these frightened, yet stubbornly courageous remnants of a persecuted people. In spite of all the assembled might of the Soviet Union, they raise the ages-old cry of the Jew: "Let my people go."

And what does the Soviet Union do? What can it do? Whatever any tyrant confronted by resistance does. It deports them to labor camps. It questions whether protestors have full possession of their senses.

How marvelous. Just what is needed to show the Soviet Union up for what it really is—an apprehensive despotism still thrashing about in the throes of medieval anti-Semitism. And the world observes. And the world understands. And the world turns up its nose in distaste at the sight and sound of a familiar degrading spectacle.

Dozens of minorities are allowed a full range of intellectual, cultural and political expression in the Soviet Union today. Only the Jews are deprived of such privileges. Only Jews are unable to print prayer books—to bake unleavened bread on the Passover—to travel within the

Soviet Union unmolested—to pray in temples—to freely express their religious preference and faith. Only Jews are treated as their ancestors were under the czars—like 10th-class citizens. The evidence of this is damning, revealing the Constitution of the Soviet Union to be unworthy of the paper it is printed on.

"Woe unto the Jew living in Russia," was the ancient cry. History books are replete with names of those places and times representing so much Jewish blood spilled—for nothing. Kishinev pogrom, Lodz pogrom, Kiev pogrom, Grodno pogrom, Lwow pogrom. And what is a pogrom? Why it is simply an organized frenzy of violence and murder on the part of a government against the innocent Jewish population of a given district—that is all it is.

And how long did such pogroms go on? Why, just for several centuries, at given intervals—that is all.

And who was harmed by these terrible happenings? Why, just the Jews—helpless Jews—wailing Jews—praying Jews—people of the Book and Covenant—that is all.

And has anything changed? Nothing at all. Just the name of the persecuting government. Instead of a czar named Romanoff, it is a Communist named Brezhnev or Kosygin. And the Jews are still not allowed to live and pray as they wish.

Only today it is different. Today there is an Israel eager to welcome the persecuted home. Today there are those who will not sit in silence when they should speak out. Today there are Jews who take their cue from those who would not die like animals in a slaughterhouse.

There has been a Warsaw ghetto. There has been an Auschwitz. There has been a 1967 war. Jews no longer climb with alacrity down into the gutter, sweeping off their caps and bowing as a despot passes. Such days are gone forever, whether the Moscow regime wishes to admit it or not.

Instead of Fagin, the name reads, "Dayan." Instead of Mendel Bayliss, the word is "sabra." Instead of satchel, there is a gun. And if anyone seeks to butcher a Jew today, he had better be ready to fight in the process. That is why Russian Jews are ready to stand up to this awesomely powerful tyranny.

And where is some voice of encouragement from the U.S. State Department? Why is it not heard? It would not be gentlemanly to say anything, would it? It would be interference in internal affairs of another, supposedly friendly nation, would it not? Even though the Soviets freely criticize the United States for internal policies.

Ironically, it is the Jews who are in the forefront of the struggle for self-expression and individual liberty in the world today. Their ages-old cry echoes down the corridors of history from the time of the Pharaohs. It has sounded in every age, against every tyrant. It has survived despotism in a hundred lands and a thousand autocrats. And again the lament is heard—"Let my people go."

Many calling themselves righteous, upright, God-fearing human beings have turned a deaf ear when that tearful cry has sounded at an inconvenient moment for them. Today is no exception. The U.S. Government hears that utterance and does not listen.

The "Voice of America" will not even broadcast a program to the Soviet Union in Yiddish or Hebrew, although missionaries from Monaco do so. We subsidize broadcasts in dozens of languages, but not in that of people who have shown so eloquently they seek to hear what we say. All they wish is to know that somewhere—somehow—they are heard.

The righteous of other times and places rationalized their silence in many ways. During the Crusades, it was because Jews were heretics. In Eastern Europe, it was because Jews were despised outcasts unworthy of interceding for. In the France of Dreyfus, it was because the honor of the army was at stake. Under Hitler, it was because of fear and an unwillingness to stretch forth a hand in simple human compassion. Today, the U.S. Department of State does not want to utter a peep because it would be meddling in the internal affairs of another nation. How easily conscience is silenced. How smoothly the sounds of agony are stifled.

History has a special brand of contempt for those who have ears and refuse to hear and for those who have eyes but do not see. The Caesars are gone. The Crusaders have vanished. The Inquisition is but a horrid memory. Royal regimes who slew so many innocents have gone the way of all oppressors. Yet the Jews remain with us, and their cry is the same—"Let My People Go." Their epic poem of sorrow has an infinite number of stanzas.

And the world hears. And the world does nothing. And the world debates whether or not Israel has a right to use a strait—or a canal—or to have some relief from terror and murder.

Mr. Speaker, the voice of conscience can never be silenced. There is no escape from the cry of the persecuted by any honorable man or nation. If our ideals mean anything to us, let us heed it out of honor, dignity, and simple human compassion. For until that appeal is stilled by humanity's answer, there shall be no peace for any of us. The test of mankind is the answer, if any, to that awful, echoing, penetrating cry quavering now from Russia—"Let My People Go."

PRESENTATION TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE BY GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT OF THE AFL–CIO

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the presentation to the Senate Committee by George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, is worthy of Senate consideration by every Member of Congress.

It points up the serious problems and conditions in a clear and easily understood presentation.

I am happy to make it available to the House:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT OF THE AFL–CIO

The AFL–CIO supports the general aims of S. 1201—to extend the legislation, adopted in 1969 and 1970, that provides the President and the Federal Reserve Board with authority to stabilize the national economy.

This is not a new position for the AFL–CIO. We endorsed the purposes of the original legislation, when it was pending before the Congress. We support its extension. We believe that the economy urgently needs government action to achieve full employment and a reasonably stable price level.

Economic distress is continuing to spread. Millions of workers are adversely affected by unemployment and by production cutbacks, which reduce working hours and weekly pay checks. All Americans are suffering from the rapid rise of living costs, which continue to wash out much of the buying power of their incomes.

The time is long overdue for the Administration to stop playing with misguided "game plans" and take the necessary action to restore the economy to health. It is time for the Administration to cease its double-standard—one for workers and another for the banks and big business—and pursue evenhanded, equitable policies.

The government's reports of the past few weeks reveal that stagnation persists in most parts of the national economy, following the general economic decline of 1969–1970. Let me call to your attention these few benchmarks of economic stagnation:

There were 5 million unemployed in March, after accounting for seasonal changes—up 1.4 million from a year ago and 2.3 million from January 1969, when the Administration took office.

Substantial unemployment has spread to 50 major industrial areas in March—from six in January 1969—and to 662 smaller areas.

The cost-of-living in January and February was 5% above a year ago and 11.6% more than in the same months of 1969.

The buying power of the weekly after-tax earnings of the average nonsupervisory worker, in January and February, was hardly any greater than a year ago, less than in the early months of 1969 and even below 1965.

Although the Administration attempted to blame the high unemployment of the October-December quarter on the effects of the auto strike, the rebound of auto production in the January-March quarter brought no improvement in the unemployment situation. Approximately 5 million people were unemployed in both quarters and the number of jobless, 15 weeks and more, has risen to 1.1 million. Moreover, the Labor Department report for March states that "full-time employment was down by 190,000 from the last quarter of 1970, mostly among adult men."

Yet the Administration persists in its optimistic rhetoric. Instead of positive actions to turn the economy around from stagnation to sustained and rapid expansion, the Administration has given the American people a diet of rosy predictions that have not been achieved. Instead of directing its attention and policies to real problems in the economy, the Administration has tried to make workers in general—and construction workers, in particular—the scapegoat.

Chairman Arthur Burns of the Federal Reserve and much of the Administration's leadership have been engaged in the shocking and blatant use of a double standard. To cover their record of failure in economic policy, with its tragic consequences for millions of American families, they try to pin the blame on workers, while providing subsidies and aid for the banks and big business.

Let me cite a few examples of these double standards:

Since the cash flow to corporations moved down after mid-1969, as a result of the Administration's engineered recession—follow-

ing a 91% rise from 1960—the Administration has proposed a step-up depreciation, which would cut corporate taxes by $3 billion to over $4 billion a year in the next few years. But workers' wage increases to offset the accelerated rise of living costs and to gain some improvement in buying power are denounced as inflationary.

When exports lag, while imports continue to rise, the Administration proposes, as it did last year, to provide business with a mechanism to defer taxes on profits from exports, at a cost to the Treasury of hundreds of millions of dollars. But when organized labor seeks economic justice for workers, it is attacked as exercising "excessive market power."

In recent months, billions of American dollars from wealthy people and corporations have been transferred to other countries for personal gain. The only Treasury response (announced on April 1) of trying to bring some of that money home is to reward these people. Treasury will sell $1.5 billion of 3-month government notes to foreign branches of American banks at an interest rate of 5¾%—about 1.5 percentage points more than for similar borrowings in the U.S. But workers are told they should be restrained in seeking wage increases, which are singled out as the primary inflationary factor.

When bank profits shoot up—like 21.9% for J. P. Morgan and Co. and 16.1% for Chase-Manhattan in 1970—there is not even a hint of government guidelines for the banks. And the New York Times reports that "the heads of the nation's largest banks—which enjoyed sharp increases in profits during the recession year of 1970—generally were rewarded with higher salaries last year." No Administration spokesmen admonished the bankers but workers are told that their wage increases are supposed to be held down.

Soaring land costs and financing charges have resulted in sharply rising housing costs (see Appendix). The cost of financing on FHA homes has risen 356% in the past 20 years and land costs have gone up 296%, while structure costs (which include on-site labor) has risen 65%. However, the Administration tries to pin the blame solely on construction wages and attempts to institute specific and immediate wage restraints. It offers only a vague promise of some future restraints on construction prices and profits and no mention at all of the major inflationary pressures of soaring land and financing costs.

The AFL–CIO rejects such lopsided double standards. They are unfair. They are unbalanced. They are not workable.

Back in February 1966, the AFL–CIO Executive Council adopted a policy statement which declared:

"If the President determines that the situation warrants extraordinary overall stabilization measures, the AFL–CIO will cooperate so long as such restraints are equitably placed on all costs and incomes—including all prices, profits, dividends, rents and executive compensation, as well as employees' wages and salaries. We are prepared to sacrifice as much as anyone else, as long as anyone else, so long as there is equality of sacrifice."

This statement has been reiterated by the constitutional conventions of the AFL–CIO in 1967 and 1969 and on numerous occasions by the Executive Council.

Mandatory government controls are never desirable, but at times, they may be needed. If such controls are deemed necessary by the President and are even-handed, across-the-board on all costs, prices, rents and incomes—including profits, dividends, interest and executive compensation, as well as workers' wages and salaries—they would be both equitable and workable.

It is our view that one-sided curbs on workers' wages, with no effective restraints on prices or the incomes of other groups in the economy, are neither a balanced and equitable stabilization program nor a workable policy in a free society.

It is also our view that government measures to restrain wages—or both wages and prices—in one industry or sector of the economy are also inequitable and unworkable. In this complex, interdependent and huge American economy, it is not possible to single out one industry or sector, in the hope of curbing price pressures, when all other parts of the economy are free of similar restraints.

How can the government, in good conscience, apply wage restraints on workers in one industry—to single out one group of workers—when the prices of the food, clothing and other goods and services they buy are free to move up? Such a measure smacks of punitive action, rather than a stabilization policy.

Moreover, how can the government hope to stabilize prices in one industry, alone—such as construction—when that industry depends on materials and services it buys from other industries, whose prices are free to rise? It just can't be done.

On April 1, only a few days after the President's Executive Order "Providing for the Stabilization of Wages and Prices in the Construction Industry," the Labor Department reported that wholesale prices of building materials shot up in March.

"Most of the advance for industrial commodities in March was due to price increases for commodities used in construction," the Labor Department report stated. "Lumber and wood products rose sharply again. . . . Almost all non-metallic mineral building materials were higher in price, with particularly large gains registered for asphalt roofing and concrete ingredients."

The costs and prices of the construction industry cannot be isolated from the price pressures in the rest of the economy. The prices of no industry can be isolated, for very long, from the pressures on the prices of the materials and services it requires.

The recent report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress indicated recognition of the inter-dependence of the economy's various industries and sectors, when it declared: "If a freeze is imposed, it should be general. A freeze should not be imposed on only one industry, nor should it be applied to wages without also being applied to other costs or prices."

A basic prerequisite for a genuine stabilization program, in our view, is that it must be across-the-board, equitable and even-handed.

For that reason, we endorse the bill's extension of the standby authority "to stabilize prices, rents, wages and salaries," with provision for "such adjustments as may be deemed necessary to prevent gross inequities."

We believe the Congress must make it abundantly clear that this authority is for overall, across-the-board and even-handed measures, rather than for singling out one industry or one group of workers. In addition, in the event that across-the-board economic controls are imposed, the Congress should immediately adopt an accompanying tax mechanism on profits, dividends and capital gains to assure genuine, overall and equitable stabilization. A balanced, fair and workable stabilization program must include overall restraints on all costs, prices and incomes—including profits, dividends, and capital gains—as well as wages, salaries and rents.

The AFL-CIO endorses the bill's proposed extension of authority to the President to establish selective credit controls. Such selective credit controls and interest-rate ceilings were urgently needed in 1969 and most of 1970—to curb the inflationary extension of credit for land speculation, business mergers, conglomerate take-overs, gambling casinos and investments in foreign subsidiaries, while providing increased credit for housing, community facilities and the regular operations of business. Selective credit controls will become urgently needed, in the months ahead, if the Administration does what it talks about—pursues expansionary measures to rapidly lift the economy.

The AFL–CIO also endorses the bill's provision for variable bank reserve requirements in order to allocate the flow of bank credit to where it is most needed, while restraining the extension of credit for low-priority purposes.

We recommend that the Committee examine the Federal Reserve's operation of this provision, within a year of its enactment. Moreover, we repeat our request that the Congress engage in a detailed study of the structure and policies of the Federal Reserve system, as the basis for a thorough reform of this key economic agency of the federal government.

In addition to authority for stabilization measures, America now needs expansionary economic policies to achieve and sustain full employment. The needed rise in output will, in itself, reduce inflationary pressures by boosting productive efficiency and easing the pressures on unit costs and prices. Moreover, such immediate measures to lift the economy out of its present stagnation would create jobs for the millions of unemployed and underemployed, restoring confidence and health to the economic foundation of American society.

In sum, then, this is the position of the AFL–CIO:

We want inflation ended. We want full employment restored. We are prepared to sacrifice to meet these goals—as much as anyone else, for as long as anyone else. But we will not be the scapegoat for the economic mess created by this Administration's ill-conceived "game plan."

APPENDIX I

INCREASES IN COSTS, FHA HOUSES, 1949-69

	1949	1969	Percent increase
Land	$1,144	$4,525	296
Structure	7,176	11,850	65
Financing	520	2,370	356
Overhead and profit	1,560	2,800	79
Sales price	10,400	21,545	107
Monthly mortgage payment	55.15	168.00	205
Cost of structure per square foot [1]	9.44	13.88	44

[1] Excluding land, the average number of square feet of the structure increased from 980 in 1949 to 1,226 in 1969.

Source: Journal of Homebuilding, June 1970, p. 31.

NOTE.—In the 20 years, 1949–1969, the size of the structure increased and the cost of the structure—materials plus on-site labor—rose 65%, while the cost of overhead and profit went up 79%. But the major inflationary cost increases, by far, were the cost of land which rose 296% and the cost of financing which soared 356%. These cost increases in combination, resulted in a 107% rise in the sales price. The additional costs to the homebuyer of closing fees and charges, which are not examined here, probably rose by a somewhat similar percentage or more.

Moreover, the homeowner's monthly mortgage payments jumped 205%—nearly double the 107% rise in the sales price of the FHA house. This resulted from the additional impact on the homeowner of the sharp rise of mortgage interest rates—from an effective rate of 4.34% on FHA new home mortgages in 1949 to an effective rate of 8.19% in 1969.

Essentially as a result of the inflationary increases of land costs and financing charges to the homeowner, as well as the developer and builder, the price of the FHA home more than doubled, between 1949 and 1969, while monthly payments on the mortgage

more than tripled. The 205% rise in the homeowner's monthly mortgage payments was almost four times greater than the 54% increase in the overall cost-of-living, as measured by the Consumer Price Index.

APPENDIX II

CHANGES IN BUILDING COSTS, SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSE 1949-69

[In percent]

	1949	1969
Structure	70	56
On-site labor	33	18
Materials	36	38
Land	11	21
Overhead and profit	15	13
Financing	5	10
Average sales price	$9,780	$20,534

Source: National Association of Home Builders Economics Department. Congressional Record, Oct. 29, 1969, p. E9113.

NOTE.—This breakdown of building costs is slightly different from the FHA, Sec. 203, houses examined in Appendix I, but the changes in cost components are almost precisely the same.

In the 20 years, 1949–1969, the average sales price of this typical house increased 110%. But the total wages and fringe benefits of on-site construction workers fell from 33% of the price of the house to 18% and the cost of materials increased from 36% to 38%.

The major inflationary increases were land costs which rose from 11% of the price to 21% and the cost of financing to the developer and builder, which increased from 5% to 10% of the price.

On top of the 110% rise in the sales price, the homebuyer also paid the sharply increasing closing costs, which include a variety of fees, charges and taxes. In addition, interest rates on home-mortgages approximately doubled from 1949 to 1969. As a result, the homeowner's monthly payments on principal and interest charges of the mortgage approximately tripled.

This process of compounding cost and price increases has priced most families out of the market for new houses. Since a similar process has affected costs and rents of apartment units, most families have also been priced out of the market for new apartments. The result has been a growing housing shortage in a period of serious urban problems.

MIKE VANDEVEEGAETE OF WYOMING WINS FOURTH PLACE IN THE NATIONAL "ABILITY COUNTS" CONTEST

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call attention today to the accomplishment of a gifted young man from Wyoming, Mr. Mike VandeVeegaete. Mike is a 17-year-old high school student in Powell and this week he has been awarded fourth place in the national "Ability Counts" contest.

The Community Survey Contest, sponsored by the President's and the Governors' Committees on Employment of the Handicapped, was open to thousands of junior and senior high school students in 47 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The theme of the essay competition was "Employment of the Handicapped: Community Attitudes." Its objective was to instill in young Americans a positive attitude toward their handicapped peers and to focus national attention on the capabilities, potential, and accomplishments of the handicapped.

Prize money for the contest was provided by the Disabled American Veterans, whom this House has recently honored. The presentation of awards will take place on April 15 at the Washington Hilton Hotel during the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Mike VandeVeegaete submitted a sensitive account of the problems faced by the handicapped in a small town and the encouraging report that Powell, Wyo., is making strides in improving the future of the young, disabled person. I ask you to share his insights by submitting for the RECORD his award-winning essay:

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED: COMMUNITY ATTITUDES

(By Mike VandeVeegaete)

My home community, with a population of under 5,000, regards its 35 handicapped residents as small town curiosities. The 35 are amputees, blind, paraplegics, or mentally defective. Also most are receiving welfare, veteran's disability pensions, or social security.

I interviewed 44 businessmen in town who said they would not hire any handicapped. Since most of them manage their own stores, and employ at the most five people, there simply aren't any opportunities for anybody. The businessmen made it plain, also, that they would consider college students first. Even the managers of the 11 branches of the national chain stores here told me that while their nation-wide company policy was nondiscrimination against the handicapped, the chance of any handicapped persons getting on with the local branch was zero because there were no vacancies.

The only handicapped employed in town were at the grain elevator (seasonal), the police station and the city school system. The foreman of the grain elevator said he hired the handicapped not because he felt obligated to, but because he felt they were just as qualified as regulars. "I feel they are more conscientious of their job than others and are usually exceptional workers." The work is dirty, especially during harvest but those handicapped men stick with it until the crop is in. The summer I worked at the elevator, I saw four amputees with artificial limbs, whose duties were to push the grain into augers. Another permanently employed handicapped person I interviewed was a lovely young woman confined to a wheelchair who is a dispatcher at the local police station. Finally, there are three teachers in the city school system who have permanent employment.

Most of the unemployed handicapped in town are over 40, natives, and have their roots here. They prefer to stay here close to their families and friends, and survive on some sort of welfare or disability benefits. They don't want to break away and go to a large city, where they could no doubt find work. Yet many of them are very bitter about the community and feel that the town has no interest in them. They certainly carry a lonely, heavy burden, and for many the only place where they can find company and consolation is a bar. I observed two local bars and interviewed the bartenders to see if handicapped people frequented their establishments. They did, but they did not come to buy; they came to the bars to be with people who would accept them. I also interviewed a fifty-year old man in the bar, with an artificial leg and three fingers on his right hand missing. I asked him what life was like for the handicapped. He looked at me and bitterly replied, "Life for us here? We, great or otherwise, can go to hell as far as this town is concerned." I have seen this same man followed by teen-agers who were mocking him, and following him down the street, further making his life a hell.

Except for some church groups and people at these bars, the local population stares, looks the other way, or indulges in teasing and even harassing the handicapped.

For the young handicapped, the future looks more encouraging. The high school has two special programs for the handicapped and mentally retarded. Some are sent to rehabilitation centers where they can be evaluated and trained, or re-trained so they may lead productive lives and make personal achievements. Yet, once they've had training and are ready to be employed, they seldom come back here because there are almost no opportunities in comparison with the metropolitan areas. Also, in the larger cities, these handicapped individuals can associate with others like themselves. Their lives can and do have meaning, beyond waiting for the undertaker to pull up at the door.

The story of older handicapped persons in my town has few bright spots. Yet it must be similar to that of many handicapped persons in thousands of small towns over the country. The future for the younger people is promising, as the community, looking on the waste it has allowed or even contributed to in the case of the older people, now becomes aware of the urgency of their problems and their efficiency as workers. The change is slow but inevitable, that handicapped people will one day gain a productive place in small town society.

F-14 COSTS RISE

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, according to press reports today, there is now another big question mark hanging over the Navy's proposed swingwing F–14 fighter. The crash of the test version of the F–14 raised questions about whether this aircraft will be able to perform well enough to meet the requirements of the missions projected for it. Now we are informed that the cost of developing and producing the plane is going up by an as yet uncertain amount and that the contracts for the plane will have to be renegotiated to reflect these increased costs in the months ahead.

Despite these ominous question marks, the Congress is being asked to make a commitment to purchase another 48 production copies of this airplane in fiscal year 1972. In my judgment, the Federal Government should impose a "fly before you buy" rule on development of this aircraft from here on out by withdrawing requests for any further funds from Congress for purchase of these planes until it has been thoroughly and successfully tested in flight and the costs of producing it are precisely known. I hope such a decision is reflected in House Appropriations Committee action on this project.

An article by Michael Getler from today's Washington Post reporting the in-

creased cost estimates on the F–14 follows:

$700 MILLION COST OVERRUN SEEN ON NEW NAVY SWING-WING JET

(By Michael Getler)

Rising costs on the swing-wing F–14 fighter, the single largest new Navy program, are expected to push the price tag per plane up at least $1 million above the $11.5 million cost estimated by Navy officials early in December.

Spread over some 720 F–14s the Navy is planning to buy over the next several years, the cost increase could add more than $700 million to the project, pushing the total cost to about $9 billion.

The Navy is now looking into renegotiating its contract with Grumman, the plane's manufacturer, because of a reported financial squeeze on the Bethpage, N.Y., company.

Congressional, Pentagon and other administration sources say Grumman's position is comparable in some ways to what brought the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. to the brink of financial disaster over the Air Force C–5A jet transport contract.

These officials add, however, that the Grumman problem is not nearly as severe as Lockheed's. But it does involve a fixed-price contract for a huge, top-priority defense program which, if fully enforced by the government could cause serious financial troubles for Grumman or prevent the Navy from getting the planes it says it needs.

In his annual defense posture statement March 9, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird noted that the F-14 contract was let before the Nixon administration took office and that the agreement "does not have some of the features we now believe necessary for good management control."

A Grumman spokesman said yesterday it would be inappropriate for the company to comment while the Navy is still studying the situation.

Government officials close to the project say it is virtually certain that the contract will have to be rewritten.

These officials say the Navy is now completing a proposal for Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard and for Congress to deal with Grumman's money problem and with a six-month delay in the project caused by the crash Dec. 30 of the first test aircraft during its second flight.

Though no final estimate on the exact cost increase has been made, these officials say that "at least $1 million per plane is a reasonable estimate."

Only part of the anticipated cost increase is said to be because of mechanical changes growing out of the crash. The general business crunch that has hit several aerospace firms in recent years has hit Grumman as well. Less new business in the plant than was anticipated at the time of the contract bidding in 1968 is said to have forced up general overhead costs. Inflation has also played a major factor in the expected price increase.

Grumman won the F-14 contract on Jan. 15, 1969, in the last week of the Johnson administration after a tough competitive battle with McDonnell Douglas. The bidding was another factor that some project sources believe may have forced Grumman's price too low.

Defense officials remain generally optimistic that the craft, despite is cost troubles and the crash, will perform well, protecting U.S. aircraft carriers and repelling enemy fighters. The plane is meant to replace the Navy's highly successful, but aging, fleet of F-4 Phantom fighters.

Defense Department officials, briefing newsmen on the new military budget Jan. 28, reported the total F–14 request for the coming fiscal year, including further development work plus production, as $935 million.

But project sources say the actual total is $1.035 billion. An additional $100 million, they explain, is being spent by the Navy as its portion of joint development work with the Air Force on a new jet engine to power later models of the F–14, as well as the Air Force's new F–15 fighter.

The Navy is considering buying fewer than the 48 planes it planned to buy this year to keep within its budget, and also reducing the number of the F–14 "A" version, the first model scheduled to be produced. This version uses the jet engines originally developed for the ill-fated F–111 or TFX. The Navy had planned to buy 67 F–14As and the rest "B" versions with the new engine.

Project sources also say that the Navy's initial response to the Dec. 30 crash was overly optimistic about its impact on the schedule.

The cause of the crash was quickly determined and officials say the solution is in hand. Nevertheless, the F–14's entry into service is now expected to be delayed about six months beyond the April 1973 date which the Navy originally said it could stick to. Flight testing with the second test aircraft is expected to resume shortly.

LAND FOR UNALASKA, ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, as most members of Congress know, well over 90 percent of the State of Alaska is owned by the Federal Government. Many Federal locations have been used in the past, particularly during World War II, and have since been abandoned. The naval base at Dutch Harbor, Alaska, is such a location. The city of Unalaska has prepared a proposal for annexation and use of this land, and the agreement of the Secretary of Defense is necessary to make this proposal a reality:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 18

Relating to the former Naval Base at Dutch Harbor

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the City of Unalaska has annexed all of an area which encompasses the former Naval Base at Dutch Harbor; and

Whereas the City of Unalaska has had prepared a preliminary development plan for Dutch Harbor and is now in the process of obtaining a comprehensive and detailed development plan for the same area; and

Whereas the large area of Dutch Harbor which is still under Naval Reserve and that which is leased to private enterprise presents a hindrance to the comprehensive development plan of the city and to the economic progress of the whole area;

Be it resolved that the Secretary of Defense is respectfully requested to reconsider the necessity of keeping the former Naval Base of Dutch Harbor under reserve; and be it

Further resolved that the Alaska delegation in Congress is respectfully requested to cooperate in bringing about the change in the status of the Dutch Harbor base.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable John H. Chafee, Secretary of the Navy; and the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U. S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U. S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

INDIA: DRIFTING TOWARD CHAOS

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, a native of India, Arabinda Ghosh, sees India as drifting toward chaos in his provocative article in the Wall Street Journal of April 5. The article follows:

INDIA: DRIFTING TOWARD CHAOS

(By Arabinda Ghosh)

Time is running dangerously short in India.

The Naxalite terrorism in West Bengal is spreading fast in Bihar, Andhra and Orissa, and if unabated, will engulf the major part of India soon. Unemployment is more than 16 million, and the educated unemployed are the powder kegs. There are 63,000 engineers waiting for jobs, countless arts and science graduates are pouring into the job market when there is no work.

In the fifties and early sixties the frustrated youth turned toward the leftist parties that more or less talked of capturing power by parliamentary means or at least through non-violent ways. Today the frustrated youth has in his hand the little red book of Chairman Mao and is convinced that the power will be wrested only by using pipe-guns and home-made bombs. And his action is attracting others to join in the act.

AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS

The "green revolution" has given India only a breather. First, only the "wheat revolution" has taken place in India, and mainly in East Punjab, which was already more advanced in agricultural productivity than the rest of the country. Second, the "miracle" rice has touched only a fringe of rice cultivation and has barely taken root in the rice fields of West Bengal, Orissa and other major rice-growing areas. Since wheat accounts for only 15% of the total acreage in foodgrains and rice 31%, the latter is more important. Third, it is doubtful that the green revolution can continue the increase in agricultural productivity without fundamental changes in land tenure, fertilizer supplies, credit policy and price incentives, among others. Finally, the weather has been unusually good for three consecutive years. There is no guarantee that the spell will not break soon, and there is no guarantee that without the fundamental changes in agricultural methods and organizations the miracle seed will sustain the green revolution.

In other areas the picture is dismal. Industrial production has fallen from last year by 3.5%. In exports, the increase caused by the 1966 devaluation of the rupee has leveled off, as evidenced in a 2% increase of exports in 1969. General prices have gone up sharply, scoring a 6.8% increase in the wholesale price index from last year. The national income rose by only 2.2% in 1969 at 1960-1961 prices. With a population growth of 2.4% per year the per capita real income already among the lowest in the world, has gone down during this planning decade.

India's present economic policy is misleading and retrogressive. In the name of controlling monopolies, expansion has been denied to big industrial houses while few new investments have taken place in small and medium-scale firms. In an underdeveloped country like India, where the industrial sector is too small to break the agricultural stronghold of the economy, the big companies run by the large industrial houses are the only ones equipped for financing and undertaking technical development, product innovation and new industrial ventures. They are the only ones in the private sector that

are big enough to ensure economies of scale and continual expansion leading to the creation of new employment and more supplies in the market.

The inefficiency and sluggishness of the small- and medium-scale companies had already been witnessed duirng the Second Five Year Plan period (1956–1961), when so much false hope was pinned on these companies for the creation of rural employment and consumer supplies. The present policy of reliance on medium-scale companies for new jobs and expansion of production will only worsen the current situation of large-scale unemployment and soaring prices. If Japan had restricted the growth of Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Fuji, Nissan, and other industrial houses, what would Japan's employment and economic growth be today? Indian unemployment is mounting because the big companies are barred from expansion and the small companies are limited in employment potential.

Not that the government-controlled enterprises are doing well. Of the 85 public-sector concerns, which enjoy a total investment of 39 billion rupees, 73 running concerns showed a net loss of 2.8 billion rupees during 1968–1969 despite government patronage and monopolistic supremacy.

The course Prime Minister Indira Gandhi is following now, nationalization by bits and starts, will dull the growth points of the economy and strangle the private sector slowly. If she follows the process of wholesale nationalization, the economy will stagnate, as happened in socialist Arab countries like Syria and Iraq. Egypt has been saved from chaos by those groups of Western-trained economists who have persuaded the regime to allow for private initiatives and less bureaucratic strongholds. The extreme example is neighboring Burma, where the Burmese way of socialism has wiped out the once-flourishing export trade in rice and timber, along with any hope of economic growth.

WHILE IN KENYA . . .

President Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya wants the Asian shopkeepers and business concerns in Kenya either to transform into Western corporations or to leave the country entirely. This is the general psychosis now prevailing among the rulers of most underdeveloped countries. If the private sector is to stay, let it be big corporations. But they forget that it took many years in the Western countries to transform the majority of the entrepreneurial corporations into mature corporations.

It took more than 60 years in the U.S. to evolve the process of separation of ownership of capital and the management of business, the public participation in the stock market and the education of the professional managers. These things are simply not available in underdeveloped countries. To hasten the maturing of corporations the most important need is the structural change in the stock market, so that many people may participate, and holdings by founding families may change hands, leading to collective decision-makings by professional management.

But the stock markets in these countries are always suspect and prone to abuses. So instead of creating any congenial condition for corporation growth, just to tell the Asian businessmen of Kenya to transform or to pack, most of them will be forced to pack, leading to a sharp increase in unemployment and a severe drop in production.

The same trend of thought is prevailing in India today. Since most of the big corporations in the private sector are entrepreneurial corporations, to prevent them from expansion in the name of curtailment of monopolies will stifle the growth of the entire corporate sector. The latest decree by the central government denying licenses to 28 of the largest industrial houses for expansion of production facilities is a case in point. While the government-owned mammoth Hindustan Steel Ltd. showed a loss of 400 million rupees last year and is working at present at about 65% of capacity, the private sector steel companies are not allowed to expand their capacity, although they are in a position to do so quickly and cheaply.

Even the long-avowed government policy of "mixed economy," in which the simultaneous development of the public and private sectors would take place in their respective spheres, has given way to a policy of creeping government encroachment on the private sector. Today this brave talk of creating a socialist economy will lead India to a deadening sway of statism where just the replacement of private management by government bureaucrats in the nationalized concerns would not accomplish any economic growth, as has been seen in recent bank nationalization, without scoring any visible improvement in functions.

A STUPENDOUS TASK

If Prime Minister Gandhi is serious about the socialist economy, she must undertake a stupendous task: complete mobilization of energies and resources, long hours of work in fields and factories, rationing of virtually all consumer goods, and the denial of protests, strikes and other expressions of freedom must be adopted immediately. (In 1969 alone, 16.6 million man-days were lost due to work stoppages.) Only then would the problem of unemployment be solved and millions of street-dwellers of India will at least be assured of two meals a day, two trousers a year, and roofs over their heads. Then India would no longer be a democracy in the usual sense of the term. Apart from bothering her mind with that, is Mrs. Gandhi ready to forgo her life-style, and lead peasants in paddy fields as Mr. Castro is doing in Cuba? If not, then let the private sector foster economic growth without further inhibition.

Time has come for a decision. Instead of following a moribund socialistic policy of the Arab variety, either India must undertake a complete transformation of the economy, in the Chinese way, or to let the private sector be the mainstay, in the Japanese way.

PRESIDENT NIXON IS RIGHT

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon is right in responding to widespread expressions of public concern relative to the Calley court-martial, by stating that at the appropriate time he will review the conviction. As the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the President has the ultimate reviewing authority. By the Constitution, article 2, section 2 he also has "power to grant reprieves and pardons for offenses against the United States."

Charging the President with undermining military justice by declaring that he would do what the Constitution of the United States gives him the power to do in his discretion, is ridiculous.

President Nixon has not indicated how he would dispose of the case after such a review. Nor is his release of Calley from the stockade to be taken as a reflection on the Calley trial or the participants therein. Permitting Calley to be confined to quarters during his appeal, instead of being kept in the stockade, like bail in civil cases, is also appropriate discretionary action by the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States.

PAY INCREASES FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the action recently taken by the House and Senate in approving the conference report on H.R. 4690, which includes a retroactive 10-percent increase in social security benefit payments, and the special 5-percent increase for those individuals, aged 72 and over, not eligible for the regular benefits. I was pleased to support these measures, but consider them only the first steps of a comprehensive program to improve the standards of living of all our senior citizens.

I believe there were several crucial measures omitted from this legislation, measures which must be enacted if we are to truly begin meeting the needs of our older Americans.

This legislation did not provide for an easing of the stringent earnings limitation, which restricted the annual outside earnings of the social security recipient to $1,680. Many of our senior citizens are both physically and intellectually capable of work. By placing this limitation at such a low level, we are, in essence, creating a deterrent for many of our older citizens to work to their fullest potential, as well as depriving society of the contributions they can make. I have consistently supported the measure whereby beneficiaries could earn up to $2,400 with no reductions in benefits. House Resolution 4269, which I have agreed to cosponsor, provides for such an increase in allowable outside earnings.

Another important provision omitted from this legislation deals with the much needed rise in the minimum monthly benefit payment. The approved 10-percent increase will bring the minimum benefit to $70.40 a month, hardly enough to maintain an adequate standard of living. I believe the minimum benefit should be raised to no less than $100 a month; H.R. 4269 provides for this highly desirable increase.

I urge my colleagues not to be fully satisfied with the legislation recently approved. Many more reforms in the structure and operation of the social security system need to be enacted. We must continue our efforts to develop a comprehensive national program, designed to allow our senior citizens to live with dignity and honor. We must end this unjust discrimination against the aged, and commit ourselves to the passage of the new and creative legislation our older Americans so rightly deserve.

ADDRESS BY DR. JACK K. WILLIAMS AT CHARLESTON, S.C.

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, it was recently my pleasure to attend the inauguration of Maj. Gen. James W. Duckett as president of the Citadel, South Carolina's famous military college. General Duckett is an outstanding American, from my own hometown of Greenwood, who will be a tremendous credit to The Citadel and to all American higher education.

The guest speaker for this memorable occasion was Dr. Jack K. Williams, president of Texas A. & M. University and one of the Nation's most dynamic education leaders. I have had the privilege of observing the progress of Dr. Williams' career from the time he was a professor at Clemson University in my own district, and I was extremely proud of the timely address he delivered at Charleston. Dr. Williams gave a splendid discussion of the problems and opportunities that await the modern-day college president. I commend this speech to the attention of my colleagues and to all the American people:

REMARKS AT THE INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE CITADEL, CHARLESTON, S.C., MARCH 19, 1971

(By Jack K. Williams)

Governor West, President Duckett, ladies and gentlemen: we are gathered to honor our esteemed colleague and to induct him formally as a member of a minority group called "University President".

During the course of today's pageantry, as your program indicates, the distinguished Governor of this beautiful and friendly state will authorize the medallion of office and pledge support from the executive and legislative branches of government. A representative of the alumni association will offer assistance and understanding in full measure. A spokesman from The Citadel's faculty will guarantee the cooperation of that great body in accomplishment of the tasks ahead, and the student body president will vocalize his constituency's expectation to move with our colleague along the cutting edge of high academic adventure (and with students these days, it is a cutting edge and it is a high adventure).

Indeed, we will all witness the symbolic ceremony of marriage of President Duckett to his university, with which he has been living in sin for the past several months.

We wish our colleague well, obviously, and we congratulate this great military college on having as it chief administrative officer a man of Jim Duckett's outstanding and enviable blend of scholarship, perception, courage, and commitment. He is offering and he will continue to offer executive leadership which is at once compassionate and firm, deliberate and decisive. These qualities have enabled him to make a remarkable record of accomplishment over the years—and those of us who have worked with him have long admired and respected him for that record.

A college presidency is, of course, a series of experiences which are in the collect a paradox of extremes. One might define this schizophrenic nature of the presidency through a paraphrase of Charles Dickens, as "the best of work and the worst of work; an encounter with wisdom, an encounter with foolishness; moments of belief, moments of incredulity; efforts made with light, efforts made with darkness".

But perhaps this apogee-perigee approach to the presidency is undeserved. One could make a strong case that these are the days of wine and roses for one about to move into college administration; for despite the Coxey's army of problems, serious and ridiculous, there exist remarkable, unparalleled, and even unexpected opportunities for purposeful and satisfying accomplishment. Never has the product of education been in a higher demand. Never has the role and scope of education been subjected to a more detailed analysis. And never has the totality of the *modus operandi* of education been placed under a heavier mandate for improvement. Hence, to be active in educational administration these days is to share in the heady excitement of moving against frontiers as it were; an undertaking which, while wholly within the American tradition, is not often associated with the management of colleges.

There are a number of reasons—four in particular—why I believe that Jim Duckett assumes his presidency, as others in education assume theirs, at a time of promise and purpose.

For one thing, I believe that during the years ahead we will be witness to an almost gebmetric rise in the development and adoption of innovative techniques and programs in our work. When we could hear our critics through the shouting and tumult, their message was clear and unequivocable that todays students (and the clientele of education generally) are wary of the archaic methodology and meaningless minutiae which crowd the pages of our academic rule books.

In matters large and small, the atmosphere of education is heavy with the smell of change. For some this is a heady perfume; for others, it is the stench of brimstone. This is so because while progress requires change, change comes hard in education. We who work in education teach change as a vital ingredient of life itself, but we sometimes deplore it because we are comfortable in our old ways and have them well mastered; or, perhaps because change involves sailing into uncharted seas, and many of us are past the age of exploration. But, either we will sail the strange seas, benefited by whatever navigational experience we have, or we will become passengers on educational vessels whose rudders are manned by those who have replaced us.

But if momentous change is in the air, s/ also is a return to stability in on-campus governance and to rationality in on-campus decorum; and this is a second reason why I believe these to be good times.

On the matter of stability in college governance, I think we will see during the year ahead, more and more faculty and student groups relinquishing the arguments that they should be in positive control of university administrative procedures. This simply has not worked in the years which have passed and faculty people who are concerned about their professional welfare, as well as their philosophic welfare, are becoming convinced that governance by slow-moving committee action or by voice-vote of faculty conglomerates is not productive. As a result, in the years ahead, more and more faculty will support boards and administrators in designing areas of administrative responsibility which are clearer and which call for consultation, advice, and suggestion rather than the mob rule of pure democracy.

What is happening here is that the faculty in instance after instance has taken the lead in declaring that part-time governance too often substitutes apathy and unpreparedness for meaures discourse and sound managerial research. The costs of such governance are too high in teaching time lost, in marginal productivity of scholarship, and in the increase of possibility of gross error through a pooling of ignorance.

Concerning the second facet of a return to stability—that being stability of on-campus conduct—I believe we will have a continuation of disruption and destruction by the rag-tag of student activists, together with their camp followers and ego-trippers. But while the day of building burning, indecency of speech and act, and unreasoned harassment of administrative and faculty personnel may continue, we will witness a quicker reaction to episodes involving these maneuvers. Police in strength will be called without hesitation. Students and faculty who are identified as leaders of felonious conduct and as inciters of riots will be moved off the campus and out of their positions, and the injunctive process will be applied to prevent their reentry. This is the backlash we have heard so much about, and I think it is as sure as death and taxes.

I believe this because, as Kingman Brewster of Yale has said, "The academy, if it is to continue to attract academicians, must provide orderly processes designed to protect the scholar from the coercion of the mob, which is wholly inconsistent with the life of the mind".

I do not refer here to those who protest legitimately and petition legitimately against rules and regulations deemed to be anachronistic—or to those who participate with reason and legal force in the giant effort to end war, poverty, and the inhumanity of man against his fellowman. I do refer to the trojan-horse army of militant fanatics in our midst, and I believe that all the communities of interest in the welfare of education are demanding that these persons not be allowed to interfere further with the educational process.

The substantial changes in method and technique, and in stability in governance and decorum, are two bright bands in the new college president's rainbow. A third is the promise that an end must soon come to unnecessary program competition, curricula duplication and academic empire building generally. These costly and plague-like activities will stop because soon every state in our union will have a central board, or coordinating group, based in law and given sufficient authority to enforce its judgments. The authority factor must be added to these coordinating boards because only through such addition can the board function with effectiveness.

These new and more powerful coordinating boards will assist presidents mightily in their endeavors. Members of these new boards will be citizens whose interest in, commitment to, and general knowledge about higher education, will be uncommonly deep; who will have the verve to shrug off special interest pleadings; and who will have the courage substantial enough to stand against the heavy pressures brought by persons inside and outside the education establishment who see a new or enlarged college either as a personal status symbol or as a state-fed community payroll.

The new coordinating boards will combat successfully the reluctance of so many political leaders, university administrators, and trustees to accept decisions which deny the initiation of programs or seek equity in finance for units of the educational complex. On this point, each university president and each governing board chairman has a right to expect the coordinating group to hear all sides, evaluate alternatives, and approach problems professionally. But if all board decisions, or any substantial number of them, are to be contested publicly after they are made, if the processes of gorilla warfare are to follow each board judgment; then voluntary coordination as such will die. Thoughtful legislators and lay citizens, believing as

they do that public interest is more than the sum of the interest of separate institutions, will conclude that coordination has failed and will replace it with centralized total control.

The fourth factor I see in the future, which bodes well for the new college president and for higher education generally, is a reaching of agreement that no single university can be all things to all the diverse echelons of society, and that no university can be politicized and remain free.

I need not tell you that the role of higher education has undergone elaborate discussion and debate during the past decade. We have felt the need to restate existing theses about education, and this compulsion to restate has led, for one thing, to the complexitizing and compounding of university function. Indeed, as you well know, the literature of higher education has become top-heavy in advice about what the university should be doing—to whom, for whom, and against whom.

I will offer four illustrations taken from articles written by well-known educators during the past few years and indicating the alpha to omega nature of the problem.

One educator has insisted that "The critical function of higher education is not exhausted with the considerations of teaching and research. To the contrary, American universities must exercise their function by acting as watchdogs, defenders, Jeremiahs, and at times Cassandras of our society".

Another writer tells us that, "It is no longer enough to educate the men who will serve society; the American university must now become an instrument to be used for direct social action".

A third writes that, "Higher education in America has the responsibility for retraining and rehumanizing the mature American. To accomplish this function, radical and pervasive conversion of academic life is needed".

A fourth educator declares that, "There is the overall responsibility of education to contribute to a peaceful and progressive world order. At the apex, there is the special and formidable world responsibility which rests squarely on the universities and colleges".

These men insist that the function of the university today is not only to teach, research, retrain, and instill the love for truth—but to criticize, become action oriented and set the force of talent and intellect and conscience to the precise definition and active solution of problems in the whole fabric of civilization.

The truth is, of course, that no university can address itself to all these matters with vigor and action or with accuracy; and an institution which attempts to do so will lose its viability as a teaching institution.

We are in the teaching business, or we should be. We are responsible, as is no other institution, for the preservation and dissemination of knowledge and for the development of new knowledge. In turn, this awesome responsibility means that we must offer our students a basic framework of both fact and theory on which they can build and to which they can add. We must give our students the mental equipment with which they may think clearly as well as feel deeply. We must become again the pivot point for the maturation of leadership because our graduates are the leadership group, whether philosophical, economical, political, managerial or military. The direction of our social change—if it is to be reasoned progress rather than the chaos born of purposelessness—will be set by that leadership and not by the egocentric gadflys among us.

These, then, are to my mind illustrations (or predictions, if you like) of why Jim Duckett becomes President of The Citadel at a propitious and promising moment in the history of this remarkable military college. Under his strong and benevolent direction, The Citadel will continue at an accelerated pace to be a meaningful power center for the development of leadership qualities in young men. The Citadel, under Jim Duckett's lead, will devise a clear articulation for its direction; will skillfully mediate counter claims for its special services; will carefully sift the diverse evidences about its successes and failures; and—most importantly—will commit the exposure of new ideas to the light of day.

In the exercise of these heavy responsibilities, President Jim Duckett, we wish you Godspeed and all good fortune.

LIEUTENANT CALLEY

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the text of a letter written by Capt. Aubrey Daniel III, prosecutor in the trial of Lt. William Calley, to President Nixon was released to the public. I completely concur with the arguments made by Captain Daniel.

There is no getting around the fact that war is hell. Lieutenant Calley is, admittedly, to some degree a victim of the war. He was sent by his Government to fight in a cruel and vicious war, one for which he was ill-prepared. Here is a man who was taught to kill and then punished for doing just that.

This is the easy, emotional view. It is true, but it is not the whole truth. The truth is that Lieutenant Calley rounded up men, women, and children, ordered them into a trench, and systematically murdered them. There is nothing in the military code that either explicitly or implicitly gives a soldier the right or the authority to summarily execute. Because others in this war and past wars have also killed innocent women and children does not diminish the guilt of Lieutenant Calley. If we can excuse these actions as consequences of war, how can we justifiably condemn the North Vietnamese for their inhumane and brutal treatment of American prisoners of war? In addition, the idea of assuming collective guilt for the murders at Mylai does not settle anything. There is truth in saying that we are all guilty for Mylai, but there is also an implication that no one is guilty.

The people of this Nation are horrified by the war and by the sentencing of Lieutenant Calley. This is an emotional and sympathetic reaction, and one which is understandable. What is not understandable and what cannot be accepted is the callous use of these emotions by politicians.

The interference in this case by the President of the United States is most appalling. Here is a man, a lawyer no less, who is aware, as Captain Daniel wrote:

> It is a fundamental precept of our judicial system that the legal processes of this country must be kept free from any outside influences.

Here is the President of the United States, who again and again has told the young people of this country to work within the "system," and that it will work. Now he himself is bypassing the system. Admittedly, as Commander in Chief he has the right to release Lieutenant Calley from the stockade and even to pardon him. But if he is to act then he should be the last person to act, following the complete judicial process.

Had the trial been unfair or biased, then maybe Mr. Nixon's actions could be understood. But this is not the case. Five out of the six-man jury had served in Vietnam. For over 4 months they heard testimony on what occurred at Mylai. Lieutenant Calley received all of the safeguards guaranteed by the Constitution. Captain Daniel has been praised by everyone, including the defense, for his just and fair prosecution.

Let me remind this body of the words of President Nixon in December of 1969 when this incident first became public. At that time Mr. Nixon stated it was important to insure that the incident "does not smear the decent men who have gone to Vietnam." Accordingly, "I am going to do everything I possibly can to see that all the facts in this incident are brought to light and that those who are charged, if they are found guilty, are punished."

Lieutenant Calley has been found guilty, and if the Appeals Court upholds this decision, then he should be punished. As William Greider of the Boston Globe pointed out, he is not the first American soldier to be prosecuted for killing civilians in this war. There are presently 75 to 80 men serving in Fort Leavenworth on murder charges which originated in Vietnam. Unlike Lieutenant Calley, most of these men killed only one or two people, not 22.

So while I truly sympathize for this man, I cannot condone what he did. The Vietnam war has done much to tear this country apart. I only pray that it has not also taken away our sense of morality.

TOBACCO PRICE SUPPORT

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, for some years now cigarette packages have carried the Surgeon General's warning that smoking is dangerous to health. Since January cigarette advertisements have been officially banned from radio and television. And only recently, efforts have been made to prevent the distribution of sample cigarettes through the mails.

But for all our work to discourage smoking, we have continued to promote its only source: tobacco. A conservative estimate places tobacco production at 2 billion pounds a year with Government subsidies amounting to at least $70 million annually. Such Federal assistance runs directly counter to our official stance on smoking, for we subsidize the grower while we penalize the distributor. In doing so, we perpetuate a dangerous and hypocritical double standard. This should not be allowed to continue.

I am introducing today a bill that would terminate price support payments and export subsidies for the 1972 tobacco crop. I urge that this measure be given the most careful consideration by my colleagues.

In our deliberations we will recognize the serious problems that are involved in this proposal. Alternate crops would have to be found for the small farmer and the processor now dependent upon the production of tobacco and the manufacture of cigarettes. In addition, the many Americans who have jobs in tobacco processing plants must be equitably provided for.

But whatever the difficulties we face, I see no reason why tobacco price supports should be continued. The money we now pump into these subsidies could better be used for research in cancer and heart disease. We can no longer compromise the Nation's health to the interests of a single industry.

NEW DOCK FACILITIES FOR SEWARD, ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, few people outside Alaska realize that most of the freight shipped into interior Alaska comes into Seaward, Alaska, on barges carrying railroad cars, and that in order to reach Anchorage these cars must be pulled through an area of tunnels and narrow canyons. This entire route is in the midst of an area which is subject to earthquakes. As the attached Alaska Legislature resolution indicates, some alternative must be provided in the case of an emergency:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 9

Relating to the Construction of a Train Slip Rail Car Loading Facility at Seward

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas it is recognized by the Alaska Legislature that most freight being shipped into interior Alaska at this time arrives in freight cars aboard barges; and

Whereas these barges are currently unloaded principally at the Port of Whittier direct to the Alaska Railroad rails; and

Whereas, if an emergency should occur such as the closure of tunnels on the existing rail route from Whittier by an earth slide, earthquake, or even by an enemy military action, no provision has been made for an alternate train slip-type car unloading facility; and

Whereas freight tonnage projections by the North Commission indicate tonnages in excess of what can be handled through the Whittier Port when North Slope activities are in full gear; and

Whereas the City of Seward has recently seen the completion of a new $15,000,000 dock facility which does not include a train slip for handling rail cars;

Be it resolved by the Seventh State Legislature that the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to provide the Alaska Railroad with sufficient funds to enable that entity to build a train slip rail car loading facility at Seward which would safeguard, in all contingencies, Alaska's freight handling capability, and which would enable the new Seward dock facility to be utilized to the utmost.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation; the Honorable John E. Manley, General Manager, Alaska Railroad; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

THE ELECTRONIC ENGINEER ENDORSES CONVERSION LEGISLATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the problem of converting our national and local economies from a wartime to a peacetime footing with minimum dislocation and hardship on workers and firms is one of overriding importance as we try to bring the war in Southeast Asia to a close. With that in mind, I have introduced legislation in the House—H.R. 1744—that would induce companies to plan for orderly conversion to peaceful production. I was pleased to note that the respecting engineering magazine, the Electronic Engineer, has editorially endorsed my bill, along with compatible legislation of which I am a cosponsor introduced by my colleague from Connecticut, Mr. GIAIMO. The editorial by Electronic Engineer Editor Alberto Socolovsky follows:

WRITE TO YOUR CONGRESSMAN

Unquestionably, the most important engineering development last month did not happen in a lab, nor in a factory. It took place in Congress, with the introduction of two bills—H.R. 4122 and H.R. 1744—which deal directly with the problems of unemployment and conversion of technology and funds from defense to civilian and socially oriented programs.

H.R. 1744, introduced by Representative Bingham, is directed at defense contractors. One of its most important provisions states that, to obtain a defense contract, a company must have a plan for conversion to peaceful uses of the technology it will implement in the contract. Or, where such a plan does not exist or is not practical, it must pay 12.5% of profits from the contract as a "conversion tax" to build a fund from which it can borrow to finance nondefense projects.

On the other hand, H.R. 4122 comes closer to the engineer who works (or worked) in defense programs. Introduced by Rep. Giaimo, it proposes to direct the Federal Government to fund the retraining of "scientists, engineers, and technicians" to "forestall and reduce unemployment and the related waste of national talent and resources." To this end, the Giaimo bill requests an appropriation of $100 million for Fiscal Year 1972 (July '71 to June '72), $150 million for FY 1973, and $200 million for FY 1974. Of these funds, more than 40 percent are for "conversion fellowships" for highly qualified technical persons, and 15 percent are to fund education programs for such persons.

Both of these bills deal in detail with the *machinery* required to implement them, rather than with the programs they will implement. And rightly so, since a law should establish goals, instead of spelling out the details of such goals. They both refer in general to "national goals" such as housing, urban rehabilitation, education, health facilities and equipment, and to the elimination of problems such as unemployment, poverty, crime, pollution, alienation, and the like.

However, while it may not be the job of Congress to spell out the specific problems involved, technical people constantly ask for a definition. "What kind of pollution? Controlled and monitored by whom? Over whose communication lines? For what price? Centralized, multiphasic health stations or remote, instrumented stations for health care?"

Used as we are to deal with military men or with space scientists who specify their systems parameters, we find it difficult to understand the broad and imprecise language of government officials, or even of social scientists.

But we must bridge the communications gap. The discussions and hearings for both bills will shed light on some technical solutions or programs. If only for this reason, these bills are worthy of your support. Write to your representatives. Tell them to get behind both bills, and do it now. A small investment of your time may reap incalculable benefits not just for you and for your fellow engineers, but for the whole country.

ALBERTO SOCOLOVSKY, *Editor.*

COMPASSION ASKED FOR PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing my deep and compassionate concern for those American soldiers now detained as prisoners of war or listed as missing in action.

The wrath of this unjust, unwanted war has created a double tragedy. Our imprisoned soldiers are forced to endure great pain and suffering, and their parents, children, and wives must also endure the agony and frustration of the unknown.

I join concerned individuals and groups from across the world in imploring the Government of North Vietnam to abide by the provisions of the Geneva Accords, and comply with four simple mandates: to identify all prisoners of war they hold in captivity, to permit the impartial inspection of their POW camps, to release seriously injured or sick prisoners, and to permit the free exchange of mail between prisoners and their families.

I also call upon our own President to set a date for complete and total withdrawal of all American military personnel from Southeast Asia. Judging from Hanoi's past statements, as long as the hostilities continue, there is little hope for the release and repatriation of our prisoners. I firmly believe that the most expedient way to negotiate the release of American prisoners and relieve the tremendous emotional burden shouldered by over 1,600 American families, is to negotiate a settlement of the war as a whole.

Let us show our true concern for our imprisoned soldiers and their courageous families by ending this war and bringing all our men home.

UTILITY CONSUMERS' COUNSEL ACT

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, I introduced the Utility Consumers' Counsel Act of 1971 with 21 cosponsors. Today I reintroduce this bill with an additional five cosponsors.

This legislation would establish an independent agency to represent the consumers of the Nation before Federal and State regulatory agencies with respect to matters pertaining to certain electric, gas, telephone, and telegraph utilities. In addition, grants would be provided to States and local governments for the creation of State utility consumers' counsels.

The need for the Utility Consumers' Counsel Act is evident. For years citizens have been frustrated in their dealings with utilities. It is time that we effectively regulate utilities in the public interest.

I include at this point a list of the cosponsors and a copy of the bill:

COSPONSORS

Mrs. Abzug, Mr. Collins of Illinois, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Link, Mr. Abourezk, Mr. Badillo, Mr. Blanton, Mr. Burton, Mr. Eckhardt, Mr. Fraser, Mr. Gibbons, Mrs. Grasso, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hathaway, Mr. Howard, Mr. Mikva, Mr. Moss, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Ryan, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Roe, Mrs. Hicks of Massachusetts, Mr. Wolff, and Mr. Brasco.

H.R. 7444

A bill to establish an independent agency to be known as the United States Office of Utility Consumers' Counsel to represent the consumers of the Nation before Federal and State regulatory agencies with respect to matters pertaining to certain electric, gas, telephone, and telegraph utilities; to provide grants and other Federal assistance to State and local governments for the establishment and operation of utility consumers' counsels; to improve methods for obtaining and disseminating information with respect to the operations of utility companies of interest to the Federal Government and other consumers; and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Utility Consumers' Counsel and Information Act of 1971.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "Federal agency" means any department, agency, or instrumentality, including any wholly owned Government corporation, of the executive branch of Government.

(b) The term "State" means any State of the United States, any territory or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or political subdivision, department, agency, or instrumentality of any of them, but does not include the Panama Canal Zone.

(c) The term "utility" means—

(1) any company which owns or operates facilities used for the generation, transmission, or distribution of electric energy for sale, other than sale to tenants or the employees of the company operating such facilities for their own use and not for resale;

(2) any company which owns or operates facilities used in the production, generation, or distribution of natural or manufactured gas for heat, light, and power (other than distribution only in enclosed portable containers or distribution to tenants or employees of the company operating such facilities for their own use and not for resale); and

(3) any company which is a common carrier as defined in the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

(d) The term "company" means a corporation, a partnership, an association, a joint-stock company, a business trust or an organized group of persons, whether incorporated or not; or any receiver, trustee, or other liquidating agent of any of the foregoing in his capacity as such; having an annual gross operating revenue in excess of $1 million; but not including any cooperatively, federally, municipally, or other publicly owned person, company, or organization.

(e) The term "utility service" means any service provided for the public by a utility.

(f) The term "interests of consumers of utility services" means any matter relating to rates, charges, methods of service, adequacy of service, and safety measures which directly affect the consumer of utility services.

TITLE I—UTILITY CONSUMERS' COUNSEL

ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE

SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established within the executive branch of the Government an independent agency to be known as the United States Office of Utility Consumers' Council (referred to hereinafter as the "Office"). The Office shall be headed by a Consumers' Counsel (referred to hereinafter as the "Counsel"), who shall be appointed for a term of five years by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate provided for level 2 of the Executive Schedule.

(b) The Counsel may—

(1) promulgate such rules and regulations as may be required to carry out the functions of the Office; and

(2) delegate to any other officer or employee of the Office authority for the performance of any duty imposed, or the exercise of any power conferred, upon the Counsel by this Act, and any reference herein to the Counsel shall include his duly authorized delegate or delegates.

PERSONNEL AND POWERS OF THE OFFICE

SEC. 102. (a) The Counsel shall, subject to civil service laws and the Hatch Act, appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he determines to be required for the performance of the functions of the Office.

(b) In the performance of the functions of the Office, the Counsel is authorized—

(1) to obtain the service of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code;

(2) to appoint such advisory committees as the Counsel may determine to be necessary or desirable for the effective performance of the functions of the Office:

(3) to designate representatives to serve on such committees as the Counsel may determine to be necessary or desirable to maintain effective liaison with Federal agencies and with departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the States which are engaged in activities related to the functions of the Office; and

(4) to use the services, personnel, and facilities of Federal and State agencies, with their consent, with or without reimbursement therefor as determined by them.

(c) Upon request made by the Counsel, each Federal agency is authorized and directed—

(1) to make its services, personnel, and facilities available to the greatest practicable extent to the Office in the performance of its functions; and

(2) subject to provisions of law and regulations relating to the classification of information in the interest of national defense, to furnish to the Office such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics as the Counsel may determine to be necessary or desirable for the performance of the functions of the Office.

REPRESENTATION OF PUBLIC INTEREST

SEC. 103. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Counsel is authorized to petition for, initiate, appear, or intervene in, any investigation, complaint, action, appeal, or other proceeding except a criminal proceeding, before any Federal, State, or local agency, or Federal or State court, in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure of such agency or court, where, in the opinion of the Counsel, there is a matter or controversy affecting substantially the interests of consumers of utility services within the United States: *Provided,* That such action by Counsel before any State or local agency or State court shall be authorized only when—

(1) it is requested by the Governor of a State or any official designated by him for such purpose; or

(2) it is requested by an agency or official duly authorized by a State to represent the interests of utility consumers before any State or local agency or court; or

(3) it is requested by a local government serving a population of fifty thousand persons or more, or a combination of local governments covering 10 per centum of the population of the service area of a utility within any State; or

(4) it is requested by a duly certified petition signed by the consumers of services of a utility within any State as follows: if the total of such consumers equals one thousand or less, petition must be signed by 20 per centum of such consumers; if the total of such consumers equals an amount over one thousand but less than ten thousand, petition must be signed by 10 per centum of such consumers; or if total of such consumers equals ten thousand or more, petition must be signed by 5 per centum of such consumers.

(b) With respect to any such proceeding, the Counsel shall present to the agency or court, subject to the rules of practice and procedure thereof, such evidence, briefs, and arguments as he shall determine to be necessary for the effective representation of the interests of such consumers. The Counsel or any other officer or employee of the Office designated by the Counsel for such purpose, shall be entitled to enter an appearance before any Federal agency or Federal court without other compliance with any requirement for admission to practice before such agency for the purpose of representing the Office in any proceeding.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Counsel is entitled as a matter of right to appear as a party before any Federal agency or Federal court, but not including the Supreme Court of the United States, with respect to any matter or proceeding described in subsection (a), and coming within the jurisdiction of such Federal agency or court.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND REPORTS

SEC. 104. (a) The Counsel from time to time shall compile and disseminate to the public, through such publications and other means as he determines to be appropriate, such information as he considers to be necessary or desirable for the protection of the interests of consumers of utility services.

(b) In January of each year, the Counsel shall transmit to the Congress a report containing (1) a full and complete description of the activities of the Office during the preceding calendar year, (2) a discussion of matters currently affecting the interests of such consumers, and (3) his recommendations for the solution of any problems adversely affecting those interests.

(c) The Counsel shall transmit to the President from time to time such recommendations for proposed legislation as the

Counsel may consider to be necessary or desirable for the adequate protection of the interests of such consumers.

GRANTS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

SEC. 105. (a) (1) The Counsel is authorized to make grants to any State or local government, or combination of such governments, that serve a population of one hundred thousand or more persons, for up to 75 per centum of the cost of performing any of the following functions:

(i) representing the interests of consumers of utility services before Federal, State, or local agencies and Federal or State courts, including but not limited to the initiation, appearance, or intervention, with respect to any investigation, complaint, action, appeal, or other proceeding and the preparation and presentation of evidence, briefs, and arguments in connection therewith;

(ii) compiling and making available to the public information which is necessary or desirable for the protection of the interests of consumers of utility services;

(iii) making available, to the extent possible, technical assistance, statistics, information, and personnel for consultation and assistance to Federal, State, and local governments and agencies, and to nongovernmental organizations having a special interest in matters affecting the interest of consumers of utility services.

(2) No grant under this subsection shall be made to any State or local agency authorized by law to regulate one or more of the utilities defined under this Act.

(b) (1) The Counsel is authorized to make grants to any State or local agency authorized by law to regulate one or more of the utilities defined under this Act for the following purposes—

(i) increasing the number and quality of professional staff personnel assigned to matters affecting the interests of consumers of utility services;

(ii) developing personnel, systems, and facilities, including automatic data processing equipment, for obtaining essential information, making studies and other evaluation of data, and assisting in the making of decisions with respect to matters affecting the interests of consumers of utility services; or

(iii) providing for training and education programs, including internship, work-study, fellowship, and similar programs for professional staff positions relating to matters affecting the interests of consumers of utility services.

(c) A grant authorized by this section may be made on application to the Counsel at such time or times and containing such information as the Counsel may prescribe.

(d) The non-Federal contribution may be in cash or in kind, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services, or as otherwise determined by the Counsel. If, in any fiscal year, a recipient under this section provides non-Federal contributions exceeding its requirements, such excess may be used to meet its non-Federal requirements for the next fiscal year.

(e) The Counsel shall allocate grants under this Act in such manner as will most nearly provide an equitable distribution of grants among States and local governments, taking into consideration such facts as size of population, extent of utility services, the urgency of programs or projects, and the need for funds to carry out the purposes of this Act.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

SEC. 106. The Counsel may furnish technical advice and assistance, including information, on request to any State or local regulatory agency for the purpose of establishing and carrying out any program of utility consumer interest within the general purposes of this Act. The Counsel may accept payments, in whole or in part, for the costs of furnishing such assistance. All such payments shall be credited to the appropriation made for the purposes of this section.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 107. A State, or local government office receiving a grant under this Act shall make reports and evaluations in such form, at such times, and containing such information concerning the status and application of Federal funds and the operation of the approved program or project as the Counsel may require, and shall keep and make available such records as may be required by the Counsel for the verification of such reports and evaluations.

REVIEW AND AUDIT

SEC. 108. The Counsel and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access, for the purpose of audit and examination, to any books, documents, papers, and records of a grant recipient that are pertinent to the grant received.

TERMINATION OF GRANTS

SEC. 109. (a) Whenever the Counsel, after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a grant recipient under this Act, finds—

(1) that the program or project for which such grant was made has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of this Act; or

(2) that in the operation of the program or project there is failure to comply substantially with any such provision;

the Counsel shall notify such recipient of his findings and no further payments may be made to such recipient by the Counsel until he is satisfied that such noncompliance has been, or will promptly be, corrected. However, the Counsel may authorize the continuance of payments with respect to any projects pursuant to this Act which are being carried out by such recipient and which are not involved in the noncompliance.

(b) (1) If the recipient of a grant under section 106 is dissatisfied with the Counsel's final action under subsection (a), such recipient may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such recipient is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Counsel. The Counsel thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) The findings of fact by the Counsel, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Counsel to take further evidence, and the Counsel may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(3) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Counsel or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

MODEL LAWS

SEC. 110. The Counsel shall make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of—

(1) preparing a comparison and analysis of State and Federal laws regulating utilities; and

(2) preparing model laws and recommendations for regulation of such utilities.

The results of such investigation and study shall be reported to the President, the Congress, and the Governor of each State as soon as practicable.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 111. There are authorized to be appropriated annually for the purposes of this title an amount equal to three-tenths of 1 per centum of the aggregate annual net operating revenues of all utilities.

SAVING PROVISION

SEC. 112. Nothing contained in the Act shall be construed to alter, modify, or impair any other provision of law, or to prevent or impair the administration or enforcement of any other provision of law, except as specifically amended or to the extent that it is inconsistent with this Act.

TITLE II—PUBLIC INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN UTILITIES

SEC. 201. (a) The Federal Power Commission with respect to electric companies and gas companies and the Federal Communications Commission with respect to common carriers as defined in section 2(c)(3) of this Act, shall obtain the information required pursuant to subsection (b) with respect to each such utility and shall publish such information at least annually in reports prepared for and made readily available to the public, especially in the service area of each such utility.

(b) The information to be made available pursuant to this section with respect to each such utility shall include, insofar as practicable, comparable data for previous years and national averages and shall include—

(1) annual earnings stated as a rate of return on a depreciated average original cost rate base and pursuant to other accounting principles and practices of the relevant Federal commission;

(2) annual earnings in dollars as determined pursuant to clause (1);

(3) capital structure stated as percentage of capitalization obtained from long-term debit, preferred stock, common stock, and earned surplus;

(4) average rate of interest on long-term debt;

(5) rate of return on average common stock equity;

(6) yearend yield on common stock (annual common dividend divided by yearend market price);

(7) dividend on preferred stock;

(8) yearend preferred dividend yield (annual preferred dividend divided by yearend market price of preferred stock);

(9) yearend earnings price ratio (earnings per share divided by yearend price per share);

(10) the names and addresses of the one hundred principal stockholders including, in those cases where voting stock is held by a party other than the beneficial owner, the name and address of each beneficial owner of 1 per centum or more of the voting stock in the company;

(11) the name and address of each officer and director and his annual income from the utility and its parent or subsidiary companies, if any;

(12) the names and addresses of other companies of which such officers and directors are also officers or directors;

(13) the names of directors, if any, who were not nominated by the management of the utility;

(14) terms of restricted stock option plans available to officers, directors, and employees (not to include plans available to all employees on equal terms) and including name, title, salary, and retirement benefits of each person to whom stock options have been granted, number of options each has exercised, date on which options were exercised, option price of the stock and market price of the stock when option was exercised;

(15) all payments included in any account

for rate, management, construction, engineering, research, financial, valuation, legal, accounting, purchasing, advertising, labor relations, public relations, professional and other consultative services rendered under writen or oral arrangements by any corporation, partnership, individual (other than for services as an employee), or organization of any kind, including legislative services;

(16) all payments included in any account for the purpose of supplying free goods and services or goods and services supplied below the usual charge for the purpose of securing additional customers;

(17) all payments included in any account for contributions, gifts, donations, dues, honorariums, and any other gratuities;

(18) policy with respect to deposits of customers and service connection charges, if required;

(19) rate of interest charged customers by the utility, stated as simple annual interest;

(20) rate base valuation and components of the utiltiy's rate base, as determined by the State commission having jurisdiction, expressed in dollar amounts, and including amount permitted in rate base in each of the following categories: accumulated tax deferrals, allowance for working capital, construction work in progress, customers' advances, materials and supplies, plant acquisition adjustment, and plant held for future use;

(21) rate base valuation and components of the utility's rate base, as determined by the Federal commission having jurisdiction, expressed in dollar amounts;

(22) dollar difference in each category and in sum, between the rate base as computed pursuant to clauses (20) and (21);

(23) summaries of franchises or certificates of convenience and necessity;

(24) with respect to each purchase of fuel, whether coal, oil, gas, or nuclear, including all cost components, the following information: supplier from whom purchased; producing company; location of mine or mines, well or field from which fuel is extracted; summary of terms of fuel purchase contract; including length of contract—long term or spot sale, and price provisions—fixed price, price escalation clauses; quantity purchased, stated in tons, barrels, cubic feet or pounds as appropriate for type of fuel; price of fuel per ton, barrel, cubic feet or pound, as well as stated in cents per million BTU where specified, at the originating source; cost of transportation per ton, barrel, cubic foot or pound of fuel, as well as stated in cents per million BTU where available; total cost of fuel as delivered to each powerplant per ton, barrel, cubic foot or pound, as well as stated in cents per million BTU; cost of fuel as burned stated in cents per million BTU at each powerplant; and average cost per kilowatt-hour of energy generated at each plant attributable to fuel, exclusive of costs associated with investment. Where more than one fuel is burned in a plant, composite heat rate for all fuels used at plant must be shown;

(25) a summary of terms of pooling, interconnection and exchange agreements;

(26) a description of expenses incurred, whether in payment of money, performance of services, use of officers, agents or employees on company time or any other things of value, with respect to (1) the candidacy, nomination, election or appointment of any person for any Federal, State, or local legislative or administrative other issue for which an official vote of the people has been authorized, or (3) any lobbying with respect to Federal, State or local legislative or administrative bodies;

(27) the names and addresses of the holders of 1 per centum or more of any issue of long-term debt including, in those cases where the debt is held by a party other than the beneficial owner, the name and address of each beneficial owner of 1 per centum or more of any issue of debt of the company;

(28) the names and addresses of any party who holds or held more than 10 per centum of the short-term debt (such figure to be derived on the basis of the short-term debt outstanding as of January 1 of the reporting year) at any time during the calendar (or repeating) year; including, in those cases where the liability is held by a party other than the beneficial owner, the name and address of each beneficial owner of 10 per centum or more of the short-term debt in the company;

(29) brief descriptions of rate schedules currently in effect for all classes of retail service and facilities, including but not limited to residential, rural, commercial or industrial service for general or limited use, which will inform the public accurately in clear, non-technical language of the rates, terms of purchase, character and conditions of each class of service; and

(30) such other information as the appropriate Federal commission determines to be in the public interest. Such information shall be determined on a fiscal or calendar year basis as may be appropriate and shall be reported as soon as practicable after the termination of such year.

(c) The Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Securities Exchange Commission are hereby authorized and directed to coordinate and assist in carrying out the provisions of this Act and to conduct investigations and promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement this Act each in accordance with its own rules of procedure. It shall be a violation of this Act to fail to provide information required by this Act or to give false information. Any person so violating the Act shall also be deemed to have violated the Federal Power Act, the Natural Gas Act, the Public Utility Holding Company Act or the Federal Communications Act, and the civil and criminal penalties and procedures for enforcement provided in each of said Acts shall apply, whichever is most appropriate.

AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING

SEC. 202. The Federal Power Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission are hereby authorized and directed to make full use of automatic data processing in preparing the information required under this Act and other Acts to which they are subject, to the end that Federal and State regulatory bodies, the Congress, the United States Office of Utility Consumers' Counsel, such State and local offices of consumers' counsel as may be established with assistance under this Act, and the public shall receive in a timely and understandable manner information upon which the interests of utility consumers may be assisted and protected. Such Federal commissions are hereby directed to include in their annual reports account of their progress toward full use of automatic data processing.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 203. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for the purposes of this title.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 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?

NEWSLETTER FROM YOUR OPEN DOOR IN WASHINGTON—CONGRESSMAN ALBERT W. JOHNSON

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I have completed the tabulation of the results of my recent questionnaire and for the information of the Members and other interested persons, I am pleased to present it today. The results of the questionnaire are set out in the form of a newsletter and contain the following caption: "Newsletter From Your Open Door in Washington—Congressman Albert W. Johnson, 23d District of Pennsylvania, Newsletter 19, April 1971."

The newsletter also contains a recent publication of the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce entitled "Discover the New Pennsylvania." The newsletter then continues as follows:

NEWSLETTER FROM YOUR OPEN DOOR IN WASHINGTON—CONGRESSMAN ALBERT W. JOHNSON

WASHINGTON, D.C.

DEAR FOLKS IN THE 23d CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: In February of this year, as is my annual custom, I mailed a Questionnaire to all homes in the District. The response was tremendous and I am pleased to present the results, together with my own comments on the same.

Question No. 1—To assure an adequate petroleum supply for the United States, do you favor the construction of the 789 mile pipeline to transport oil from Alaska's North Slope southward to the Gulf of Alaska?

The answer:	*Percent*
Yes	57.9
No	32.4
N.A.	9.7

In 1968 oil companies discovered oil at Prudhoe Bay, Alaska, and the oil capital of the world shifted to the United States. The strike was first estimated to be 10 billion barrels, now increased to a 16 billion barrel reserve. Oil geologists speculate that the Alaskan Arctic may hold 50 billion barrels of petroleum. The oil strike was a life saver to our Nation's dwindling discovered oil reserves, and in face of increased domestic demand for oil each year. Our daily oil requirement for 1970 was 14.8 million barrels a day, with 11.3 million barrels produced at home. We imported 3.5 million barrels of oil a day. The Chase Manhattan Bank has projected that by 1980 we will be using as much as 25 million barrels of oil daily. This production will have to come from our own wells, and from imports. Oil countries around the world, in the Middle East, Africa, and Venezuela threaten nationalization of their oil. All these factors emphasize the importance of the Alaskan Oil to the U.S. The permit for the pipeline has not as yet been granted. If it is finally built, over ½ of the pipeline will be built above ground on stilts in order to do as little damage as possible to the environment. Other pipeline routes are being investigated.

Question No. 2—Do you favor continuing our space program on the conclusion of the three remaining space flights?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	50.3
No	45.0
N.A.	4.7

The historic landmark of the 20th Century was the landing of United States Astronauts on the moon in July of 1969, fulfilling dreams and prophecies of hundreds of years. Since Apollo 11 two other lunar landings have been achieved, Apollo 12 in November of 1969 and now Apollo 14 in February of 1971. The remaining three flights in the moon landing program are Apollo 15, which will aim in for a deep gorge known as Hudley Rille, and Apollo flights 16 and 17, which will head for Descartes and Copernicus craters, in 1972. Dividends from moon landings are said to include more accurate weather forecasts, early storm warnings, detection of crop diseases and pollution, spotting of mineral deposits and large schools of salable fish to say nothing of the scientific data already acquired from construction and from the moon rocks and information about the moon and solar system. Monitoring devices on the moon are now sending back scientific data. The paradox is that even though manned space programs have been sensational, they are losing public support. The Apollo program to date has cost $24 billion and NASA now is asking Congress for $3.3 billion this year. Future manned space programs planned for the *Skylab*, a two-decked orbiting laboratory to be launched in 1973, largely a military vehicle to watch troop maneuvers and fleet movements as well as study life in space; a *Space Station*, an earth-circling base, larger than the Skylab, having 4 decks full of labs and space for 12 men, to keep aloft for 10 years, and a re-usable vehicle called a *Space Shuttle* to get men to and from the space station. The future of these projects is uncertain, as there is a strong sentiment now favoring only future un-manned flights.

A flight to the moon is a stunning display of U.S. scientific progress, making Americans proud and despite its cost, the people seem to favor its continuance.

Question No. 3.—Do you favor the continuation of the poverty program beyond its present expiration date of June 30, 1971?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	28.4
No	49.9
N.A.	11.7

The Poverty Program was first initiated by President Johnson in *1964*. Since that time the program has cost $10.9 billion. The House Labor Committee is now holding hearings on whether to continue the OEO Agency beyond June 30th. President Nixon in statements over the past two years has indicated he was to break away from OEO all action programs and leave OEO merely a research agency. However the President has asked that the OEO be continued for 2 more years so that this plan can be made effective. The President wants the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, etc., to be taken over by the states under revenue sharing. Community action programs would also be turned over to the cities under revenue sharing. Those who are against the poverty program state, "It isn't doing what it was intended to do." "I think Welfare and Poverty programs are being abused."

Question No. 4—In the event railroad unions and management cannot agree, do you favor:

	Percent
(a) Governmental operation in case of a strike, with profits and dividends impounded until the dispute is settled; or	27.3
(b) A binding settlement by government appointed neutrals, using the final management offer and the union counter offer as a basis for the settlement?	62.7
National average	10.0

The Congress by a special measure stopped the one-day railroad strike of December 10th, 1970. In ordering the strike halted, Congress gave the workers retroactive wage increases of 13.5% for 1970. This was part of the 37% wage increase over 3 years, recommended by the fact-finding panel. The Panel also recommended changes in work rules, which changes would help offset the pay raises. The workers will accept the 37%, but train crews are against the rule changes. The strike deadline of March 1st, 1971, has been reached and workers have agreed not to strike right now. In the opinion of many a railroad strike would be a national catastrophe. The "b" plan above is the Nixon Plan, which 62.7% favor. I would say Congress will have to pass this or a similar plan before very long.

Question No. 5—Do you favor a complete reform of the Federal Government by reducing twelve Cabinet Departments to eight?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	70.2
No	19.1
N.A.	10.7

This plan is the proposal of the President's Advisory Council on Executive Organization. It would set up four new departments out of 8, namely (1) Economic Development, (2) Community Development, (3) Human Resources, and (4) Natural Resources. Departments untouched: State, Treasury, Defense, Justice. It would appear that the plan is headed for trouble, despite widespread voter approval. Labor and Business do not want to be grouped in the Economic Development Department. Congressional Committees fear they will be ousted of jurisdiction. Government executives fear loss of jobs. Congressman Holifield (D), the Chairman of the Government Operations Committee does not even intend to hold hearings on the plan. It looks like President Nixon will have to go to the country for grass roots backing. The plan seems like a good idea for modern planning and government. Some Questionnaire comments: "Yes: providing we dump the bureaucrats and surplus employees and save some money." "No: things will be worse." "I think there is a lot of dead wood in Government."

Question No. 6—Do you believe the need to strengthen the national economy and gain full employment justifies resorting to Federal budget deficits?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	30.5
No	59.5
N.A.	10

Now with a business slowdown eating into the Government's revenue, President Nixon is accepting the idea of a deficit in order to prime the pump of business. His budget for 1971–72 totals $229.2 billion, which will mean deficit of $11.6 billion. The President called his budget a "Full Employment" budget, wherein spending is geared to revenues that would be generated if the country was operating at full employment. The Administration says this planned deficit will see 1972 a genuine boom year. The idea of a full employment budget was first proposed in 1947 by the "Committee for Economic Development" and was widely promoted by the Kennedy Administration, but not adopted. The poll results indicate that the district favors a balanced budget. A typical comment from a Questionnaire: "No: Maybe a depression will teach some of our citizens the value of a hard earned dollar." "Yes: full employment will bring on revenue."

Question No. 7—Would you be willing to pay substantially more for products (i.e., automobiles and gasoline) and utilities (i.e., electricity) if they were made virtually pollution free?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	55.8
No	37.1
N.A.	7.1

The affirmative answer to this question indicates the concern of citizens in the control of pollution. Folks in other districts share this concern: Corbett (R) 18th District of Allegheny County, Pa.—Yes: 60%; Eshleman (R) 16th District of Pa.—Yes: 55%. However, in view of the outcry against air and water pollution, I thought the percentage of *yes* votes would be greater. However. I discovered in the comments by those who replied that they feel industry should bear all the burden. Here are some typical comments: "The manufacturers can budget the expense." "The money would only be placed back into Corporate profits." "Prices are high enough now." It appears to me that the added cost of correcting pollution will fall on consumers, as indicated by the increase in automobile prices already.

Quesion No. 8—Do you favor:

[In percent]

(a) A new program extending medical care to indigents only regardless of age, coupled with insurance to everybody against catastrophic illness; or	23.5
(b) A Federal Health Insurance program for everybody, financed from Federal revenues and by increased social security taxes; or	28.7
(c) No new Federal Health Insurance program at all?	37.6
N.A.	10.2

As you can see, the district is divided on the above question, with the majority favoring no new Federal Health Insurance Program. Congressman Corbett (R) of the 18th District of Allegheny Co., Pa., asked only whether one favored National Health Insurance for everybody and the answer was No: 68%. Eshleman (R) 16th District of Pa., a similar question was No: 57% and Scott (R) of the 8th District of Virginia—No: 52%. The Dubois Courier recently in an editorial states: "The idea of National Health Insurance is one whose time at last has come." There are various plans before the Congress. One that would completely nationalize our health insurance industry is one sponsored by Senators Kennedy, Cooper and Saxbe. The plan would cover every person in the Nation for hospital care. Doctors fees, etc. The program would be financed by 50% from Federal taxes; and a Social Security tax on employers of 3.5% and employes 1% up to $15,000 earnings. Estimated cost: $77 billion annually, administered by the Social Security Administration. On February 18th, President Nixon announced his plan. He rejected the idea of nationalizing our health insurance industry to be run by the Government and proposes instead that employers of one or more provide basic Health Insurance coverage for their workers, 65% to be paid for by the employer and 35% by the employee the 1st 2½ years. For the poor or indigent there would be a family Health Insurance Plan fully financed and administered by the Federal Government. The plan for workers provides catastrophic illness coverage. The Nixon Plan would cost the Government about $3 billion. Other plans have been submitted by the American Medical Society, and Rep. Omar Burleson. Hearings will be held on the plans soon.

Question No. 9—Now that 18-year-olds can vote in Federal elections, do you favor an amendment to the Pennsylvania State Constitution to permit them to vote in State and local elections as well?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	68.3
No	29.5
N.A.	2.2

Last year Congress passed a law giving 18 year olds the right to vote in all elections. However, the Supreme Court of the U.S., on December 21st, 1970, by a 5 to 4 decision, held that Congress only had the power to extend this right to Federal elections. This has made it incumbent on State Legislatures to pass a State law giving teenagers the right to vote in State and local elections. In Pennsylvania the voting age is fixed by our State Constitution, as follows: Article VII, Sec. 1—Every Citizen twenty-one years of age . . . shall be entitled to vote . . ." It will take 3 years to amend the Pennsylvania Constitution Congress has therefore passed an amendment to the Federal Constitution which could be adopted by ¾'s of the states in time for the 1972 elections. This amendment would give 18 year olds the full franchise. I supported this amendment. Many States have already ratified it.

Question No. 10—Do you favor the imposition of trade quotas on certain goods entering the United States?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	66.8
No	25.1
N.A.	8.1

At the present time emotions about imposing trade quotas is very high. Last year the House passed an import quota bill, but it died in the Senate. Textile and shoe manufacturers have been hard hit by cheap imports resulting in unemployment and plant closings. A majority of Congressmen and Senators now seem willing to at least enact a textile quota bill. Japan, in order to avoid this, offered to restrict textile imports to a growth of 5% this year, and 6% in each of the next two. The textile industry and President Nixon turned the offer down because the 5% is figured on an already swollen import quantity. The 23rd District with its large plant capacity to build television sets, tubes, etc., is also hard hit. Japan imported into the U.S. last year black and white and color T.V. Sets valued a $255 million, about 28% of the TV sales in the USA. Recently the U.S. Tariff Commission ruled that these sales of TV sets were at less than "fair value," thus agreeing with the "Dumping" charge of the industry. The I.U.E. Union is now suing Japan for $68 million for loss of jobs. Because trade quotas invite retaliation, every effort is being made to obtain agreements on quotas to forestall legislation.

Question No. 11—Would you vote to bar food stamps to strikers?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	63.0
No	31.0
N.A.	3.0

This vote indicates that many people rebel at the thought of prolonging or encouraging strikes by subsidizing them. Congressman Corbett found the same feeling in 18th District of Allegheny County, Pa., where the vote was: Yes: 73%. Those who favor food stamps for strikers argue that not providing the stamps penalizes the wives and children of the strikers' families and that a union member pays taxes too. Other arguments against the furnishing of Food Stamps to strikers are that a person who walks off the job should not be treated the same as a person who is in need for reasons over which he had no control. All attempts in Congress to deny strikers the stamps has failed.

Question No. 12—Do you favor the administration's "family assistance plan" with its provision for a guaranteed minimum income and which also requires work incentives and work requirements?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	63
No	31
N.A.	3

Most people agree with President Nixon's statement, "The present welfare system has become a notorious consuming outrage." Our relief system now makes possible widespread chiseling, and the heart of the system—Aid to Families With Dependent Children (AFDC) encourages fathers to desert their families so that they can obtain this AFDC relief. The AFDC payments keep growing. In 1951 to 1969 the number of individuals receiving AFDC doubled and costs tripled. Today 6.7 million are on AFDC and received $4.2 billion in Federal Aid last year, and unless changed, in 5 years 12 million will receive $8.8 billion. President Nixon's plan would scrap AFDC and set up a "Family Assistance Plan," "FAP" and in order to keep families together the plan would guarantee an income to a poor family of 4 of $1600.00 a year, the states to make up any d'fference in Welfare now received. Each family of 4 would also receive $800 in Food Stamps. The Plan also requires able bodied recipients to go to work, and if unskilled or handicapped to accept training or rehabilitation so that they can go to work. The Plan passed the House last year and died in the Senate. Both Houses are now again holding hearings and the plan will emerge again, drastically changed, and with even stronger work requirements.

Question No. 13—Do you favor the continuation of the Peace Corps program?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	59.8
No	33
N.A.	7.2

The Peace Corps, a revolutionary idea in foreign aid was established by an Executive order of President Kennedy in 1961. It is a missionary type program consisting of trained American Volunteers who assist interested countries in solving domestic needs in order to promote understanding, peace, friendship, good will and prosperity. Peace Corps Volunteers serve two years without pay. They receive living expenses and when they leave the Corps they receive $75.00 for each month served. The Peace Corps grew quickly to more than 12,000 Volunteers in nearly 50 Nations. The enthusiasm of volunteers has been subsided and there are only 7,770 now abroad, serving in 61 countries, 20 of them Latin America. However, in many of the countries, the Corps is in trouble and was recently ordered out of Panama. President Nixon in a speech on January 14, 1971, sensing this disenchantment, revealed a plan to consolidate all Volunteer Agencies, and give the Peace Corps a new direction.

Question No. 14—Should the United States sell enough jet aircraft and military supplies to Israel to replace combat losses and maintain military balance in the Middle East?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	70.3
No	22.7
N.A.	7.0

This question received the highest percentage of "Yes" vote of any of the 18 questions in the Questionnaire. Recently, Gerald R. Ford, Minority Leader, stated that a Soviet Military Headquarters staffed by dozens of first line Russian Generals and Colonels, has been established in Egypt, with 13,000 Russian troops there and 3,000 troops in missile battalions in the Suez Canal, mostly installed during the cease-fire last summer. We assured Israel that Russia and Egypt would not violate the cease-fire, but Russia moved in the missiles despite their promise. The last Congress appropriated $500 million to cover military equipment for Israel. Recently, Gerald R. Ford, the Minority House Leader, stated, "America has a moral obligation to Israel's security. The defense of Israel is linked with the security of the U.S." The situation in the Middle East continues to be a critical one, a virtual tinder box at this writing.

Question No. 15—Some women's organizations claim women are denied full equality. Should the Constitution be amended to guarantee equal rights for women?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	42.6
No	49.8
N.A.	7.6

Congressman Teague of California, in a Floor speech last year when this amendment passed the House stated, "It is a vital truth that the word persons mentioned in our Federal Constitution does not mean women, because the Constitution itself was written in the light of the old English common law which did not recognize women as persons." This statement furnishes the background for the so-called "woman's lib" amendment. Last Fall Congressman Corbett asked the above question and the results were—No: 66%. It is quite a controversial issue. The Questionnaire replies produced some interesting comments: "Yes. They should have to go to war, pay alimony, and have no special working conditions." "No: (by a woman) Men and women are in no way equal, and should be satisfied to let well enough alone." "Yes: If they accept all the responsibilities of men." "No: (by a woman) "So who wants being equal? I am happy as I am, fulfilling my job . . ."

Question No. 16—It is estimated wage and price controls will require 250,000 employees and $1.5 billion a year to administer. Despite this cost, do you feel Congress should impose mandatory wage and price controls now?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	40.8
No	49.1
N.A.	10.1

Congress recently extended the power of the President to put on wage and price controls for 2 more years. However, the new Secretary of the Treasury, John B. Connally, stated that the Administration felt that general wage-price controls are not needed now, nor do they believe the American people would stand for the regimentation that it entails. It goes without saying that wage-price controls is a drastic remedy. When they were on during World War II, everything was frozen, there were OPA offices in every county and big city in America with 65,000 employees alone in Washington, D.C. Three million businesses were covered and 8 million commodities and services controlled. My last Questionnaire showed 75% favored controls. The result above indicates a new attitude by many who remember the 1941–1947 OPA days. President Nixon has already placed wage-price controls on the construction industry.

Question No. 17—Should Congress appropriate $2 billion to provide 200,000 Federal, State and local government jobs for the unemployed?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	32.6
No	58.1
N.A.	9.3

This is the so-called manpower bill that President Nixon vetoed last fall. He vetoed the bill because it was a "make work" kind of a bill—similar to those in depression years. None of the jobs were linked to training programs, or were to lead to other employment. President Nixon said in his veto message: "WPA type jobs are not the answer for the men and women who have them." The Presi-

dent indicated he wants a bill that will train people for real jobs with a real future. This vetoed bill has been re-introduced already this session and soon will be before the Congress for a vote.

Question No. 18—Do you think our present Vietnam policy will be successful in ending the United States involvement in that conflict?

The answer:	Percent
Yes	38.6
No	50.2
N.A.	11.2

This percentage is a surprise in as much as one year ago 65% were in favor of the Vietnamization policy against all alternatives. Congressman Corbett's recent Questionnaire on the same question was No: 57%, and Congressman Eshleman's result was No: 49%. Despite the Laos campaign, President Nixon is winding down the war and soon the combat role will almost entirely be turned over to the South Vietnamese. When President Nixon took office we had 535,000 men in Vietnam. Now it is down to 265,000 and by the end of this year it will be less than 200,000. All during this year the President will of necessity have to make military decisions to assure the security of South Vietnam during the completion of the withdrawal of U.S. Combat forces. While the President is doing this he will need the support of the American people.

In closing I want to thank those who took the time and made the effort to return the Questionnaire. A separate acknowledgement is being sent to persons who wrote separate comments on the form.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT W. JOHNSON.

A SALUTE TO J. E. HILL

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a pioneer in the outstanding program of vocational education in the State of Illinois is dead.

J. E. Hill, a resident of my district for 45 years, died Monday after retiring in 1966 as director of vocational education for the State of Illinois.

He was a man always close to the productive soil of my State and responsible for thousands of young men receiving a solid education in the science of agriculture. Many of the farmers in Illinois owe a good measure of their success to the high school training received in vocational agriculture under the overall direction of J. E. Hill.

His leadership in the development of vocational agriculture in Illinois and his direction as State adviser of the Illinois Association of the Future Farmers of America were unexcelled.

But Mr. Hill was more than an educator of young men destined to be farmers. He was a national pioneer in realizing that young men not on farms need education in vocational as well as academic subjects. To fill this need he charted one of the leading vocational systems in the Nation to provide training in a variety of fields, helping young men and women learn an interesting, needed, and rewarding vocation.

Illinois has lost a dedicated educator and I wanted to call attention to his monumental contributions at his passing.

TECHNOLOGICAL SURPRISE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in recent testimony before the House Armed Services Committee Dr. John S. Foster, director of Defense Research and Engineering stated that:

Starting about 1971 we could reasonably expect several technological surprises from the Soviet Union.

This statement may not mean a great deal to those who are not familiar with the implications of technological surprise in the present day. In order to shed some light on the ramifications of technological surprise I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point an extremely interesting chapter from a recent book by Dr. Stefan T. Possony and Dr. J. E. Pournelle entitled "The Strategy of Technology—Winning the Decisive War," Dunellen Press, 1970.

As our esteemed colleague, Honorable CRAIG HOSMER, states about the authors in his introduction to this very important book:

The authors have had long personal experience with these problems. They have been closely associated with major technological problems in both military and civilian areas and have followed our performances closely as part of their professional careers. Both men are of that rare breed, the generalist. Both are trained academically as political scientists but have spent many years of their professional careers in positions requiring an understanding of the intricate details of technology. Both are students of strategy and strategic problems, and both were closely associated with one of the most remarkable studies of technology performed in recent years, the Air Force's Project Forecast.

In order to obtain a better grasp of technological surprise, both from past examples and what it could mean for our future, I would highly recommend that my colleagues pursue the following article which is chapter 5 of the book the Strategy of Technology:

SURPRISE IN MODERN WAR*

It never troubles a wolf how many the sheep be.—Virgil.

THE SNEAK ATTACK

The popular view of modern war surprise is identified with a sneak attack. Our experience at Pearl Harbor makes it easy to understand this belief, while the widely-known characteristics of the intercontinental ballistic missile permit us to grasp readily the nature of a future surprise ICBM attack. The missile is the ideal weapon for a rapid sneak attack, not just against one base like Pearl Harbor but against entire countries and continents.

Of the characteristics that make the missile suitable for a sneak attack, the most important is speed. Although the total flight time of an intercontinental ballistic missile from the U.S.S.R. to the United States is about 30 minutes, the present advance-warning of an attack is only 15 minutes. Operational satellite systems and over-the-horizon radars may increase the warning of an attack almost to the total missile flight time, some 30 minutes minus X seconds; but even if we are given this much warning, the intercontinental ballistic missile has changed the dimension of surprise and has given the aggressor a most potent tool. In addition, attack can come from space with literally no warning at all.

Space warning systems must be built despite the excellent performance of our space tracking radars, or else the enemy may attack over the South Pole, where we now have no warning systems. Since the attack can come from even more directions, warning systems may be too costly to be bought, even though they are technologically feasible.

A massive intercontinental ballistic missile attack launched by an aggressor is an ever-present danger. Such an attack would come as the culmination of a series of measures, operations, and techniques, orchestrated to achieve maximum psychological effect on the surprised. The aggressor would have undertaken specialized campaigns in the various elements of conflict—political, psychological, economic, military and, above all, technological.

Once the time is ripe, the attack comes suddenly and catches the defender asleep. But despite the present concentration on the sneak attack, surprise is not the exclusive province of the aggressor. Defenders have used surprise to great effect in the past and should strive to do so in the future. The future security of the United States requires that our strategy include measures to achieve surprise, as well as those to prevent it. The main surprise to aim for is that we won't be surprised.

Before we examine the broader aspects of surprise, let us point up the fundamental aspects of the sneak attack. First, surprise is tactical. Second, surprise is used by the aggressor, not the defender. Third, it will be achieved only with the most advanced weapons. Fourth, prevention of surprise requires use of the most advanced technical means.

STRATEGIC SURPRISE

There are also surprises on the strategic level. For illustrative examples, let us look at two of the ways in which the U.S.S.R. has actually achieved strategic surprise in the last few years: the opening of the space age, and nuclear testing during the test moratorium. As a result, the Soviets obtained a lead over us in space that has only partially been overcome by our massive and expensive NASA spectaculars. They lead in many military phases of space, whereas we are ahead in nonmilitary uses; in near-earth operations their lead may be as much as three years.[1]

The evidence on nuclear testing is less clear, but it is clear that the moratorium allowed the Soviets to determine critical effects of nuclear explosions in space. Because we honored the test ban, we let much of our testing capability atrophy, and now the Treaty of Moscow prevents us from finding out just how far behind we are in the application of nuclear weapons in space. The impact of these surprises cannot be calculated with precision but the Soviets have gained a considerable time advantage in offensive orbital weaponry and ballistic missile defenses. Note that preparing for stra-

* Copyrighted Material. Research on which this book is based was supported in part by a grant from the Relm Foundation, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

[1] As this was written the news was announced that the U.S.S.R. has demonstrated a space-borne "satellite destroyer."

tegic surprise must continue over a period of several years.

These two surprises occurred in the technical phase of the Technological War, not in the military phase. They were achieved by an orchestrated strategy that employed several forms of conflict, including intelligence operations, propaganda and psychological warfare, political and diplomatic maneuverings, and a concentrated technical effort. While the goal of the Soviets has been to develop advanced weapon systems, such weapons were not employed militarily in these two surprises; however, military technology was developed, and diplomacy and treaties closed off our access to the means of catching up or at least made it difficult.

The best way to counter surprise is to deploy the most advanced technology possible and to keep up by means of fast modernization. This is not to imply that the technical effort must be devoted exclusively or even oriented primarily to countering potential technical surprise; but as we have insisted, surprise must be made a key element of any technological strategy. Since technology has given a new dimension to surprise in the strategic equation, technology is needed to support our own or prevent enemy surprise in all forms of conflict.

The misconception that surprise aids only the aggressor is especially harmful in the Technological War. In his classic work on surprise, General Erfurth [2] has shown that there are two parties to the operation, the surpriser and the surprised—this is not the same as saying the attacker and the defender. The defender also can employ the technique of surprise, and perhaps more effectively than the attacker.

Furthermore, there is a widespread misunderstanding that surprise refers exclusively to the initiation of war. Some writers consider surprise to be just a more elegant term than sneak attack. To other writers, surprise is tantamount to technological surprise. This is far too restrictive an understanding of suprise and its role in modern war.

TACTICAL SURPRISE

We begin the analysis of surprise by examining tactical surprise in more detail. Tactical surprise is essentially surprise in combat: the weapon of A is used in such a way that it bypasses or neutralizes the counterweapon of B; if no surprise were attempted, A would be required to use massive superiority to crush B's counterweapon. The difference is like that between judo and a bare-knuckle fight.

Tactical surprise usually does not lead to the nullification of the opponent's armament, but if it is well-conceived and backed by technological improvements and adequate forces tactical surprise can go a long way toward eliminating enemy armor as a relevant factor. Given the complexity of modern systems, the surprised opponent is faced with considerable delay before he can readjust his tactics; in a fast-moving war such readjustment may not be feasible.

Under modern circumstances time and technology as well as combat procedures are needed to gain tactical surprise. Technology can produce new types of weapons, new weapon effects, improved weapon effects, improvements in delivery systems, combinations of weapon systems, better active defense, and so on. Examples ranging from the "War of the Iron Ramrod" of Frederic the Great to the devastating effect of Lee's rifle pits at Cold Harbor show that technology and its proper tactical use may achieve surprise. With superior armaments or doctrines, and with troops trained in their use, the entire armament of the opponent can be nullified.

[2] General Waldemar Erfurth, *Surprise*, S. T. Possony and Daniel Vilfroy, trans. (Harrisburg: Military Service Publishing Company, 1943).

While this is the ultimate goal of tactical surprise, it is usually difficult to achieve. This is so because the possibilities of complete technical surprise are limited. Because of time required to develop a new weapon system, opportunities are increased for technical warning and for counterefforts, either technical or operational. Furthermore, excessive secrecy or failure to deploy weapons can result in surprising one's own troops, with disastrous results—as happened with the use of the mitrailleuse by the French in 1871. On the other hand, tactical surprise can be accomplished by a minor weapon improvement that from a technological point of view may be marginal but which today or tomorrow may facilitate victory in battle by creating a decisive advantage.

STRATEGIC SURPRISE THROUGH OPERATIONAL SURPRISE

Surprise can result from operations of the forces available, as well as from technological innovation. To achieve surprise of this type, the commander operates in a way unexpected by his adversary; in the ideal situation the enemy is unable to devise countermeasures in time. The failures, and interests. Another method is to send scientists to international meetings, where they either spread misinformation or are evaluated by their counterparts as not being knowledgeable or as being geniuses. Such evaluations may lead to all kinds of false deductions.

For example, we have seen arguments that the Soviets did not know anything about decoupling techniques to conduct nuclear tests underground in secrecy. Also, we have been told by Soviet leaders that the day of the heavy bomber is passed—which did not deceive us. On the other hand, we were quite surprised when the Soviets sent a man into space, although they had been forewarning us.

STRATAGEMS TO ACHIEVE SURPRISE

Scientific deception can have a great impact on research and development lead time. The United States has devoted a great deal of effort to reducing the time required to translate a scientific theory, discovery or invention into a practical weapon system. In spite of much study we have not reduced the time interval to less than five years. To develop and produce a weapon in even this fairly long time costs billions of dollars.

Scientific deception aims at keeping the enemy's lead time as long as possible. In this way a significant military advantage may result. This advantage may be crucial at the tactical level where it could have a direct impact on a strategic decision such as overt aggression.

The ultimate goal is to gain a strategic advantage by acquiring a major new family of weapons while concealing from the enemy that it is being developed. The appearance of a brand new weapon often is termed a breakthrough. When a nation makes a breakthrough of this type, as we did with the atom bomb, the British with radar, the Soviets in space, an entirely new arena for military operations is opened up. If the breakthrough leads to a military advantage that the enemy cannot counter in time, such as domination of the air, space, or deep water, the breakthrough may be decisive.

Strategic surprises can be accomplished in many ways. A few examples are:

The choice of a strategic concept;

The selection of weapon systems and their combination;

The quantitative and qualitative strength of the battle forces;

The size of the reserves and their degree of invulnerability;

The exploitation of geography such as bases, areas of access, and approach routes;

The formation of alliances, including secret prewar alliances or the utilization of an allied territory to launch an attack from an entirely unexpected direction;

The proper choice of a center of gravity of the operation; and

The mounting of diversions, so that the opponent divides his forces.

The major problem is developing techniques to achieve technological surprise. If we assume that the enemy intelligence service watches the development of a weapon system from its early scientific inception to its use by operational forces, deceptive moves we make at any step in the process contribute to the ultimate surprise. For example, in the scientific field we can misinform and disinform to fool the opponent, Scientific misinformation would not be propagated in the form of false formulas which would not survive the first test, but it can be created by cryptic hints about programs and alleged results. Disinformation makes the enemy doubt the accuracy of his findings.

In addition there is secrecy. A classic method of achieving a technological surprise is secretly using foreign know-how. Another widely used method has been making an unobserved modification in a technologically inferior weapon systems to give it a massive improvement in performance.

In the period of weapon development, surprise can be achieved through hiding and concealment, by pretended inadvertent showing of weapons and weapon components, by phony orders placed abroad for spares or scarce materials, and through a whole host of such stratagems that are not complex but must be planned into the production cycle.

One of the most effective methods is to start the development of several competing weapons, select one, and then give a great deal of publicity to the weapons that have been rejected and will not go into production. This was used by the Soviets when they exhibited the TU–31, equivalent to our B–36; the TU–31 did not go to production. In addition, rejected test models can be exhibited in operations in such a way that the enemy will be sure to see them and draw erroneous conclusions, while tests of the chosen models are concealed. If this is impossible, erroneous information can be fed into the technical intelligence stream and various red herrings can be used. In brief, the true testing operation can be enveloped in a lot of phony operations.

Similar tricks are available to hide production. The weapon system perhaps cannot be hidden, but there are many methods to make it difficult to obtain accurate performance data. As time goes on, several modifications that change the over-all characteristic of the weapon system can be concealed.

Errors contributing to surprise can be induced about the state of training and the precise deployment. In ground war, the effective concealment of a center of gravity is half the battle won. Generally, it is not correct to assume that military forces act consistently. Some nations tend to bluff; the German pre-World War I general staff operated on the principle that one should be considerably stronger than one appears to be. With respect to technological strategy, it is much better to create simultaneously impressions of greater, as well as lesser, capabilities.

The purpose of such maneuvers is to generate uncertainty in the mind of the opponent. Surprise may result from technology, but the actual surprise is not in the weapon system; it is in the mind of the staff that is being surprised.

The devastating effect of surprise in the past has been caused by the fact that the members of a particular staff have for years conditioned their thinking according to firm expectations of enemy behavior and have carried out all their calculations within that framework. Suddenly, the basic assumptions are proved false. The result is a paralysis of thinking which often makes it impossible to carry out even those adaptations which could be accomplished within the time available.

In a discussion of surprise in very broad sense, it is often overlooked that surprise about many smaller items has occasionally been truly decisive. If it is true that a major weapon system cannot be hidden, it also remains true that specific performance data can be manipulated in such a way that the enemy makes small errors. These errors may be within the margins usually allowed by statisticians, let us say 5%. In actuality, speed differentials of 10 or 20, let alone 50, miles per hour may spell the difference between victory and defeat in combat. Similarly, such small differentials in, let us say, a radar performance, reliability of communications, or accuracy of missiles can be of the greatest significance.

In missile warfare, the reliability of the birds is crucial. If reliability is 10% higher or lower than estimated, the enemy's strike capability is quite different from what it is supposed to be. In addition, this reliability must be figured in the time dimension. Reliability can be very high if there are hours to get ready for the launch. If there are only 30 minutes, and if the force must be launched as the attack commences, the figure would change substantially.

When Minuteman II was deployed the reliability of its guidance and control system was about one-sixth of requirement. It took three years to overcome the difficulty, but then performance exceeded specifications. If we had been attacked during this period, we would have been in a fine mess. Since the mishap was widely rumored, the Soviets probably knew about it—fortunately, the U.S.S.R. lacked adequate strength.

There are a number of rationalizations that facilitate the surprise. For example, the assumption is frequently made that the enemy wouldn't do what we don't do—"Why should he do that?" Another widespread notion is that the enemy would not do what he apparently is doing because, according to his opponent's calculations of the cost-effectiveness of a weapon system, there are cheaper and better ways to achieve the desired result. There are also such common beliefs as that the enemy would not pursue a certain course of action because he would duplicate a strength he already possesses, because he could not afford the expenditures involved, or because he would not be so dastardly.

By contrast, sometimes the enemy makes a spectacular demonstration or diversion for no other reason than to create attention and misdirect the estimator's interest. Then, after losing years in trying to figure out what the military significance of the stunt really was, the estimator arrives at the wrong conclusions.

HISTORICAL EXAMPLE

In 1937, the Germans won a race in a spectacular manner by stripping down their Messerschmitts whereas the other nations entered fully-equipped fighters. Presumably the staffs understood this particular trick, but the public, the reporters, and the political decision makers were fooled. This, of course, is an example of combined technological and psychological strategy.

The most intriguing aspect of the history of aerospace war and the role of the surprise is that very professional staffs have been deceived about the most basic elements of this new type of war. At times this has been self-deception; at other times they were deceived through deliberate campaigns.

There was once the notion that the airplane was not really a militarily useful weapon. When this notion was dispelled—it took years—it was believed that the airplane would serve its purposes best by direct support of the ground battle. Consequently, the range of the aircraft was considered to be of no importance and it was thought that the range should rather be short. Later there was a great deal of doubt about the proper targets for strategic bombardment. The effectiveness of strategic air war was a matter of considerable dispute, largely because the interrelationships between industry, battle strength, and time factors involved were not understood. Furthermore, some air warriors overlooked the recuperation factor.

Similarly, during World War II there was a debate about whether the air weapon should be used for only one purpose—against industrial targets. After World War II, similar arguments raged with respect to nuclear weapons, jet aircraft, long-range bombardment versus forward bases (the question was ill-conceived as an either-or proposition), and, of course, space and air bombardment in Vietnam. Few debaters ever look at the whole range of arguments, and non sequiters usually abound because emotions become involved in the arguments.

Another frequent source of error is that the versatility of the weapon system is underrated. The aircraft obviously is an excellent purveyor of firepower. But often ignored are its uses for demonstration, reconnaissance, the transport of goods and troops, command posts, and damage assessment and its possible employment in big as well as small wars. Some people who know such capabilities only too well, but for political reasons don't want new equipment, put up smoke-screen arguments against it.

BREAKTHROUGHS

The many facets of developing, acquiring, and operating advanced weapons systems illustrate the need to consider surprise as one of the key elements of technological strategy. Technological warfare includes the anticipated breakthrough, but the breakthrough need not be a surprise.

In fact, it could well be tactical to announce a happy breakthrough that for a while cannot be countered by the enemy. His inability may come from one of two sources—technological inferiority or inferiority in the decision-making process. Naturally, the combination of these two deficiencies would increase the lead of the opposing power. In the end, unless he is defeated, the opponent would catch up with the new technique. The strategic impact of the breakthrough is a function of the duration of the one-sided advantage.

While surpirse has its advantages as far as modernization of the force in being is concerned, the breakthrough has the potential of pushing the state of military art into an entirely new field that may lead to clear dominance. This is the role space warface will play in the future. As we stand on the threshold of the space age, we face an unprecedented situation: a clear military superiority in space potentially can ensure dential of creating a countercapability. There may be a significant novel feature, namely, that even without war such denial could be long-term.

EXPLOITATION OF SURPRISE

Initiation of war usually is the object of a great deal of surprise planning. Prior to the initiation of war, the planning of the opponent can be rendered ineffective by such techniques as misinformation (the propagation of misleading and false knowledge) and disinformation (the propagation of news designed to induce the enemy to disbelieve existing truthful and reliable information and buy false new information instead). The aggressor can use the time-honored techniques of single and double deception[3] to cloak the steps leading to his attack and induce the opponent to misread his intentions.

To meet deceptions of this sort, the strategic planner by necessity must plan against a war that might come regardless of the probability that it will not. This planning must be based on the enemy's capabilities to strike rather than on his professed intentions. The fact too often ignored is that intentions can change very rapidly, and that implementation of the new intention might require a shorter lead time than improvisation of defense against an attack that was not expected.

Under conditions of nuclear war, the importance of deception techniques is growing ever more rapidly. Disarmament must necessarily be a part of an aggressive strategy under modern conditions; the aggressor must use deception techniques to bring about disarmament arrangements which reduce the size of hostile forces in being and thus greatly simplify his planning. For example, the reasonableness the Soviets seemingly displayed in the initial SALT talks may denote (a) a turn toward peace, (b) a maneuver to delay U.S. reaction to the missile build-up in the U.S.S.R., and (c) an attempt to gain a safe rear and increase supplies for a Soviet attack on China.

Surprise can be achieved through disarmament and arms control arrangements and the use of propaganda and diplomacy, on one hand, and through counterintelligence, introduction of misleading intelligence, and infiltration into intelligence and policy-making staffs, on the other. As an example, before they had completed operational tests of their antimissile system, the Soviets refused to discuss an atmospheric test ban; afterward they rushed to agree before we tested our weapons concept. Other surprise techniques which may be applied could involve the holding of deceptive maneuvers, the building of dummy forces and targets to divert firepower, the employment of electronic equipments that would not be used in war, and electronic deception on a broad scale.

One important technique of surprise of which American writers seem to remain unaware, is provocation.[4] This word in English usage denotes the provoking of an opponent into a rash act, but in the Communist dictionary it also means entrapment and instigation of a fight between third parties. Many wars have been started by provocations deliberately engineered by the aggressor; the purpose has frequently been to shift the onus of aggression from the aggressor to the defender.

Other purposes may be to force the defender to make some sort of premature move and thus expose his strategy, or to get him embroiled in a struggle on another front so that he would disperse his forces and lose control. Such an effect could be achieved, for example, by forcing the defender into a limited war in a peripheral theater and gradually cause him to invest ever-greater military strength from his forces in being into this limited operation. Thus, he would expose his main base to effective attack. If he can be induced to use obsolete equipment in the diversionary war, the victim may never develop the kind of weapons that will be used in the decisive combat.

So-called preemptive strikes also may play a great role in surprise. The attacker could proceed by a combination of double deception and provocation to make open preparation for attack and to evacuate his cities. Then by other surprise techniques he could divert the defender's fire to false targets and achieve military superiority. Cer-

---

[3] Double deception is best explained by the story about the two Jews who met on a train in Russia. Aaron asked Moses, "Where are you going?" Moses answered, "To Pinsk." Aaron replied, "You say you're going to Pinsk so I will believe you: are actually going to Minsk, but in fact you are going to Pinsk. So why do you lie?"

In military parlance, if A plans an operation he would not try to hide his plan, but would make sure that B assumes that this particular plan is being advertised because it will not be instituted. The German deception plan of 1941 that preceded the attack on the U.S.S.R. was planned as a single deception but actually worked as a double deception.

[4] The Six-Day War in the Middle East has made the concept better known.

tainly moves of this sort are extremely risky, because the defender has surprise options of his own and may see through the deception. The risk can be reduced through a first-rate intelligence system and good penetration of the opponent's military apparatus and inner decision-making cycle.

Strategic planning aims at the exploitation of weaknesses and vulnerabilities, just as the wrestler tries to apply holds that force his opponent to submit. But the strategist has one advantage over the wrestler: he can contribute to the creation of vulnerabilities in the opposing force.

Creating vulnerabilities is an area where the problems of force and budgetary levels become highly significant. They can be created by an opponent who uses political means to achieve surprise. With low budgets there will always be a great tendency to cut corners, and that means that many of the support systems needed to operate weapon systems effectively will be eliminated or reduced to insufficient numbers. Very often it becomes a question of whether it is more advisable to buy firepower and delivery weapons than to harden the missiles or acquire such items as warning systems. Sometimes the choice is between offensive and defensive weapon systems.

If the aggressor can, through the employment of political means, manipulate budgetary and force levels of intended victims in a downward direction, the effectiveness of the opposing forces will be greatly reduced. Fundamentally, with a low budget it is very difficult to maintain several weapon systems simultaneously, and even more difficult to maintain forces based on different technologies. It is extremely difficult to provide them with good warning and protective features, to acquire suitable shelters for population and industry, and to bring new systems into being. Consequently, low defense budgets and low force levels aid the attacker in his strategic planning by reducing the complexities of his operations. Political operations in both the economic and diplomatic fields may be used to reinforce the natural tendency of the defender to save money on defense. These operations will have as their twin goals the reduction of strategic complexities through the lowering of the defender's budgets and the achievement of a state of relaxation in the victim. Then, when the attack comes, on the victim's allies and or on his homeland, he will be unable to believe it has happened and be unprepared to defend himself. In this case, the last phase of the battle may not be a sneak attack at all; the defender may know it is coming and be unable to do anything about it.

To repeat: surprise techniques are available to both the attacker and the defender. Because we are firmly committed to a defensive strategy it is vital that we prevent surprise. We must understand also that capabilities for surprise exist for us and we must emphasize such capabilities.

These come directly from the basis for surprise: uncertainty. Although the attacker has freedom in choosing his surprise moves, the defender can do a great deal to increase the uncertainty in the mind of the attacker. If the attacker has no uncertainty about the enemy, it is child's play to plan operations that can be decisive. If instead he experiences a great deal of uncertainty, even the planning of surprise operations becomes extremely difficult.

For example, the antimissile may be used to create uncertainties. If the defender does not have this weapon, the attacker will be certain that he has a completely free ride. But if the defender does have this weapon, and if the attacker is in doubt about whether its effectiveness lies between 50 and 90 percent, the attacker's strategic plan is greatly complicated. Suppose he assumes it is 50 percent, but it is actually 90 per cent effective. Then he will fail in attack. Suppose he assumes it is 90 percent but it is actually 50 percent. In this instance he may not attack at all. Suppose his experts argue about whether it is 60 or 85 percent. In this case, the decision makers' will may be weakened. By manipulating the attacker's understanding of this situation, the defender may achieve considerable advantages.

The interplay between achieving and preventing surprise is one of the decisive elements of modern war. Speed appears to give the attacker greatly enhanced possibilities of surprise, but the defender is not without his options as well. The key to being the surpriser or the surprised is initiative, which in turn is based upon planning.

CONCLUSION

In guarding against technical surprise, it is important to keep its effects in the proper perspective. Technical advances generally and technical surprise in particular are steps to more decisive measures. Technology makes possible tactical, strategic, and timing surprise. It contributes to strategic deception. Surprise and deception are most vital when they contribute to or maximize the effectiveness of modern weapons. If our technological advantages are not exploited, while those of the U.S.S.R. are, we will inevitably lose the Technological War. Put differently: we must not be surprised about the fact that this is a Technological War and we must never be deceived about our relative technological standing.

Success in an operational approach based on deception and surprise depends on total orchestration of the types of conflict, not on the effectiveness of each element. Partial successes attained and exploited in many areas will offset the failures that will occur in others. The net result is that overall success is rendered more likely.

If the defender understands this particular aspect of the problem, he can devise many actions through which aggressive stratagems are neutralized. He can maintain force levels, both quantitative and qualitative, that preclude a successful attack. The defender must move constantly during the period of so-called peace, to keep abreast of technical and strategic developments. He must initiate actions to which the attacker must react, using resources that would otherwise be employed against the defender, and must initiate these actions in time to prevent the aggressor from achieving a significant advantage. Success in this game will mean that aggression by nuclear weapons would be unthinkable, simply because the aggressor would remain confined to an incalculable but low probability of success.

The really important point is that war has not become unthinkable simply because weapons of mass destruction have been invented. The prevention of war is just as much a strategic undertaking as preparation for aggression. If the strategy of prevention is effective, the aggressor will be blocked. If, on the other hand, it consists merely of dependence on passive deterrence and on weak retaliation, the strategy of prevention is doomed to failure.

For the Communists, surprise is vital to successful aggression. For our part, through the application of a rehumanized strategy surprise can be our path to the initiatives and maneuvers that suppress aggression.

IMPROVEMENT OF POSTAL SERVICES IN ALASKA REQUESTED

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, communication has always been one of the basic ingredients to the growth of a community, a State, or a nation.

One of the major problems facing Alaska today is the poor communication facilities linking communities with communities and communities with the southern 49 States. Basic and primary communication facilities is the U.S. Post Office.

It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to build and maintain postal roads and provide postal services. It is clear that in the growing communities of Nelson Lagoon, Ivanof Bay, and Chignik Lake, Alaska, the Federal Government has failed to meet its responsibilities. The Alaska State Legislature has observed this problem and has passed a joint resolution that calls on Postmaster Winton Blount to establish minimum post offices in each of these communities.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 19

Relating to Establishing a Post Office at Nelson Lagoon, Alaska, Ivanof Bay, Alaska and Chignik Lake, Alaska

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas communication facilities are essential for the development of Alaska and the normal comforts of its population; and

Whereas Nelson Lagoon, Ivanof Bay and Chignik Lake are economically stable and growing communities; and

Whereas there are no roads to these communities and the only means of transportation is by airplane, either on scheduled or charter flights; and

Whereas these communities are being denied access to the regular postal services which are available to many communities of smaller size elsewhere in the nation, thus working a great hardship on the residents, be it *resolved*

That the Honorable Winton Blount, Postmaster General of the United States, is hereby respectfully requested to establish minimum post offices in each of these communities.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Winton Blount, Postmaster General of the United States; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

MOVING THE HAINES, ALASKA, U.S. CUSTOMS OFFICE MAKES SENSE

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems encountered by tourists entering Alaska near Haines, Alaska, is the location of the U.S. customs office 42 miles away from the actual border. Since the Federal law requires that persons crossing the border must report to U.S. customs office immediately, the distance is not only an inconvenience but also an unnecessary burden on all businessmen operating along the 42-mile route. The solution, as indicated in the following resolution by the Alaska Legislature, is a simple one. It is to move the customs office to a point on the border immediately adjacent to the location of the Canadian customs office.

The resolution follows:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 22

Relating to the Relocation of the United States Customs Office at Haines

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the Canadian Customs Office is situated at the United States-Canadian border while the Customs Office of the United States is located some 42 miles away at Haines, Alaska; and

Whereas those persons crossing the border at mile 42 are required by United States law to report immediately to United States Customs; and

Whereas these facts have and continue to create an intolerable state of affairs for tourists as well as neighboring Canadian and American citizens; and

Whereas the distance between the two offices, together with the requirement that persons proceed directly from Canadian Customs to United States Customs, effectively stymies business development between the two points and particularly affects the tourist industry of the Village of Klukwan, and otherwise causes all concerned unnecessary and aggravating inconvenience;

Be it resolved by the Alaska State Legislature that the United States Bureau of Customs is urgently requested to relocate immediately the United States Customs Office at Haines to a position adjacent to the Canadian Customs Office at approximately 42 mile of the Haines Highway.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable John Connally, Secretary, Department of the Treasury; the Honorable Myles J. Ambrose, Commissioner, United States Bureau of Customs; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

PROPOSAL FOR FEDERAL JUDICIARY COUNCIL

HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that I hope will be a step toward restoring full public confidence in our judicial system.

The bill I am introducing today proposes to establish a Federal Judiciary Council, whose purpose would be to advise the Congress, the executive, and the Judicial Conference of the United States on matters affecting the administration of our Federal courts.

My bill is identical to one introduced in the other body by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has a continuing obligation to examine and reform out judicial system. The proposed Federal Judiciary Council would expedite this examination and reform. The duties of the proposed Council would be of aid to the Judicial Conference and the Federal Judicial Center in that useful communication between the branches of Government would be guaranteed as these matters involving our judicial system are considered.

The Federal Judiciary Council would be composed of six appointed members, two by the President, one each by the Committees on the Judiciary of the House and Senate and two by the Judicial Conference of the United States. The Council would be required to report to Congress at least once each year on the impact of proposed legislation on the administration of justice in the court, on the desirability of legislation and other steps aimed at modernizing court procedures and thus ease crowded dockets. The Council would be authorized to request from any department or agency of the Federal Government any information it requires to perform its duties.

While this legislation will not be a panacea, I believe it will help in expediting the job of court reform. One thing is certain: We cannot afford the economic or social costs of an inefficient judicial system.

A TRIBUTE TO FLOYD C. COVINGTON, SR.

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding individuals in Los Angeles, Floyd C. Covington, is to be honored for his four decades of service at a forthcoming testimonial. This recognition is long overdue. Floyd, as everyone calls him, has dedicated his life to the betterment of the lives of others. As a persevering and effective crusader in the battle for racial equality and human dignity, he has proved that economic and social progress can result from intelligent, aggressive, and moderate leadership.

Commencing in 1928 his employment career includes the positions of industrial relations secretary and executive director of the Los Angeles Urban League, and membership secretary of the YMCA. In 1950 he became intergroup relations adviser for the Federal Housing Administration and in 1957 he was appointed equal opportunity specialist for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

His community service activities are many and varied, and include the following:

COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES

Appointed to Governor Earl Warren's Crime Commission. Lecturer in Economics, Sociology, and Racial Relations at University of Southern California, Los Angeles City College, University of California at Los Angeles, Occidental College, Claremont College, Whittier College, University of Arizona; public and private schools, governmental organizations; Chambers of Commerce; Labor organizations; Real Estate Agencies; Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish Religious institutions; Business and professional organizations.

Organizer and first Chairman of Leadership Roundtable, a special project in the Little Tokyo area following the evacuation of the Japanese.

Organized first training class for Negro Building Service Custodians at Frank Wiggins Trade School.

Responsible for first Negro teller at a branch of Bank of America; first Negro drivers with the Carnation Milk Company; first Negro drivers with Helms Bakeries Company.

Member of Mayor's Home Front Unity Committee.

Commissioner of Housing Authority of City of Los Angeles.

One of the founders of the Community Relations Conference of Southern California.

Served on committees and consultant to Human Relations Commission, Los Angeles County; and Human Relations Bureau City of Los Angeles.

Following Watts disorders in 1965 delegated as coordinator of housing programs and services for Federal Housing Administration, located in State of California Service Center in Watts.

Organizer and Consultant to Special Workshops on government housing programs and services for Consolidated Realty Board of Southern California, Incorporated.

Consultant on housing services for the Department of Housing and Urban Development in State of California Service Centers in East Los Angeles and Venice, California.

Organizer and first chairman of Interagency Coordinating Committee, Watts, California.

Founder-member Southeast Symphony Association.

Member of Advisory Committee of South Central Welfare Planning Council.

Member of Los Angeles Branch of the Association for the study of Negro Life and History.

Served on regular and special committees of the Welfare Planning Council and Community Chests.

Served on committees and membership drives of the 28th Street Branch of Y.M.C.A.

One of the organizers of the Safety Savings and Loan Association.

Member of Housing and Social Welfare Committees of the Los Angeles Urban League.

Member of the Board of Directors and Committees of the Los Angeles Branch N.A.A.C.P.

Supervisor of Social Work Staff of the California Relief Administration.

Mr. Covington's record of public service is one that inspires us all. His pattern of life and work, and his insistent efforts to secure full rights and opportunities for all our citizens, have earned him this tribute. He has served his community and his country well and faithfully.

NEED CITED FOR INTENSIFICATION OF "JOBS FOR VETERANS" PROGRAMS

HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, at the midwinter conference of the American Legion of Maine last month, Mr. Steve St. Laurent made the following address, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. St. Laurent, formerly of Falmouth, Maine, and currently national membership consultant of the American Legion, outlined the concern of the Nation's newest generation of war veterans for their future as they leave military service. He pointed to the fact that young Vietnam veterans face a difficult readjustment to civilian life knowing that jobs are scarce. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the problem of finding jobs for

these fine young men, and the wherewithal for them to continue their education, is becoming increasingly serious. For this reason, I want to commend Mr. St. Laurent's excellent address to your attention.

REMARKS BY STEVE ST. LAURENT

Thank you for inviting me to come home and to participate in the Mid-Winter Conference in my own Department.

Commander John, I would like you and all of the Maine Legionnaires here to know just how proud I have been of your accomplishments—not just in the field of membership, but in such programs as "Jobs For Veterans."

All of you are aware of my assignment with the Membership Section of National Headquarters. What many of you may not know is the high percentage of our time that is spent on activities not directly involved in membership procurement. I said "directly"—indirectly is another matter.

You have heard us repeat over and over that it's "Service First, Membership Second" when you are working with or visiting that Viet-Vet. What we are really saying is that The American Legion must be a very salable product—particularly at the post level. If you are going to sell you've got to have something to sell. That is one more reason why I am glad to be with you today.

During this meeting we have been developing a Legion with programs that have appeal—that serves a purpose—that justifies our continuing as the world's greatest veterans' organization—that will attract and keep a high percentage of the Viet-Vets. How important is this Mid-Winter Conference or any Legion meeting where we are attempting to improve ourselves and our organization?

Just before I left Indianapolis my boss was working with the latest statistical summary furnished by the Veterans Administration. If their figures are correct (and certainly I don't doubt them), The American Legion lost 5,000 World War I Legionnaires by death during the month of December alone. Add to that 2,500 World War II Legionnaires and a few miscellaneous from Korea or Vietnam and it means that The American Legion will lose by death close to 90,000 members this coming year. This is a little higher than the figure we have been publishing. But if it is only 70,000 a year, to replace a loss of that magnitude we have got to get replacements in numbers that can come only from the reservoir of youth—the Viet-Vet who will soon number one out of every three veterans and who, by the end of 1971, will be outnumbered in The American Legion only by the World War II veterans.

You are not seeing these newer Legionnaires at this meeting in that kind of numbers but you soon will, if our programs and our organization develops purposes that have meaning to them, and you will, if we remain concerned with and do something about their problems. Yes, they do have problems but these are also America's problems.

Many of you here are of an age to have experiences or at least observed at close hand the deadly effect of joblessness in the 1930's. Some never recovered their self-respect or their independence. But consider how much more shattering the experience is today when the vast majority of Americans are enjoying a degree of affluence never before known. At the same time, inflation stretches ever thinner the dwindling resources of the young, jobless veteran.

I have talked with men who have served in Vietnam, and of this I am certain. They performed a very difficult task that their country asked of them. But they are concerned about their future as they leave military service. They know that jobs are scarce. They have heard that GI Bill allowances will not meet the cost of further education or training—and at least 20% of them have either limited or no vocational skills.

We are indebted to the President and to the Department of Labor for measures that are being taken to improve our public facilities for job-finding for veterans. As a matter of fact, The American Legion as early as last June launched a "Jobs For Veterans" program in some 17 pilot areas and this fall expanded it into a national program. We are cooperating to the full with public agencies and other volunteer groups, including the national Jobs For Veterans program headed by Mr. James F. Oates.

But let me tell you, gentlemen, that good intentions, hopeful promises, and press releases are not enough. The decade in which we are entered has been described as "the socially sensitive seventies." Any institution—governmental, commercial or non-profit—which fails to respond to legitimate social needs is headed for trouble. For the veteran, an adequate job is a legitimate social need. For the veteran who is without marketable skills, further education or vocational training is a legitimate social need.

Yet, in spite of last year's increases in GI Bill educational benefits, many, many veterans simply do not have the additional resources of their own that are necessary to meet today's rising costs of schooling.

It's not my purpose to present problems without attempting to give some answers. Fortunately, in the field of finding jobs for veterans I can learn from many of you here. Maine is making one of our most outstanding contributions in finding jobs for the returning serviceman. Watch for a write up on the part Maine is playing in the March issue of The American Legion Magazine.

But no matter how closely we work with veterans, with business, with the Veterans Administration, with the Employment Security Commission and the Veterans Employment Service we are not going to find jobs for every deserving veteran. This doesn't mean that we have to abandon them, far from it. We need to expand our program to include development of educational on-the-job apprenticeship programs. We need to get more of our young men going back to school and we can do it with such friends as Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis, the State Department of Education and the Guy Gannett Publishing Company.

Nationally we have a close relationship with the National Association of Collegiate Veterans. Locally many posts are working very closely with Veterans Clubs on campuses. This is good because these young men can make your job easier and more successful. Collegiate veterans have been helping other veterans returning or entering school, to assimilate into college life, and have been helping them stay in school by helping in their studies. Collegiate veterans groups have made their own social activities on campuses because, for many of them, the so-called generation gap exists between them and their eighteen year old counterpart.

Last month the National Membership and Post Activities Committee met in Indianapolis to plan a 1972 membership campaign. A special guest was Dr. Wm. E. Snead, President, Forest Park Community College, St. Louis, Missouri. Dr. Snead was there because he had written the National Commander expressing an interest in developing a closer relationship between the American Legion and the veterans on campus. He offered a 7-point program which I rather like. Each one of them would involve The American Legion and Legionnaires in a constructive way with the college student veteran. The 7-points were as follows:

1. Each post should urge its Legionnaires to be an informal sponsor of a college veteran. He suggested one veteran for every two members.

2. One of the problems that the veterans think about is the problem of getting started on the GI Bill. World War II veterans came out with some money and it was enough to tide them over until they could get started on the GI Bill. If the Legion could "free up" some money (at very little risk) for 90 day emergency loan funds, these would be rapidly repaid and would be available for the next semester.

3. Posts should make their facilities available for meetings and social events at no cost. Veterans do not have money to pay for such facilities.

4. The Legion is doing a lot about scholarships. I would like to see the sponsoring post have scholarship plans—these may be long term loan plans and scholarship plans for the particular college which they are sponsoring.

5. A program of working with the college administration on each campus to arrange panels among older veterans and younger veterans.

6. The Legion should continue its support of the National Association of Collegiate Veterans, Inc. I have written to them and have asked for some of their brochures for our college. You cannot order or direct students—you can counsel and advise them.

7. If at all possible, I urge you to take a student veteran from the college being sponsored by the post to the Houston Convention. If he's already a Legionnaire, fine—but take a college veteran along—preferably the president of the particular college veterans club.

This seventh suggestion brings up another point. The American Legion had excellent publicity from Portland at our last National Convention. The one negative thought that ran through most of that publicity was that there were not enough Vietnam veterans present.

Very soon each one of our Maine posts will be preparing for District Conventions and for the Department Convention to follow. I would like to urge each of you to make every effort to see that one or more Viet-Vets from your post is at those conventions.

There are two words you are going to hear quite frequently in the months ahead. The first one is "action" and the second is "visibility." Every department, every district and every post is going to be urged to develop relevent action-type programs that, because of their timeliness and importance, will be highly visible in the community and to the veterans who have not yet joined. And for the veterans my age, I hope that you already have several Vietnam veterans active in your post so that they can be "visible" to others.

There are 2,700,000 wonderful Legionnaires. They come from World War I, World War II, Korea and Vietnam. But if we are going to grow most of our recruitment must be with this newest group of veterans.

In summary let me say that our primary missions are clear:

1. We must continue and intensify our efforts to place every job-hunting veteran in adequate employment.

2. We must encourage and assist as many as possible to get back into school or into training programs.

3. We must make our legislators know that both the new veteran and America is being short changed by their refusal to make present GI benefits equal to those of World War II or Korea.

4. We must develop mutual programs as equal partners with college veterans clubs near us.

5. We must evaluate our post activities to be sure they are needed, visible, and attractive to all veterans with special emphasis on the group from which future growth will come.

6. We must insure that our newest Legionnaires are, in fact, equal partners and are assuming positions of leadership.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, Time magazine, Newsweek magazine, and the rest of the mass media have been proclaiming in the past few months that public broadcasting has come into its own right. Millions of Americans have begun to look regularly to public broadcasting for quality programing both in education and entertainment fields. Sesame Street, the Forsythe Saga, Masterpiece Theater, Turned-on Crisis and a host of other shows are testaments to the great strides public broadcasting has taken since 1967. In that year, the Congress passed the Public Broadcasting Act creating the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

At that time, the Congress authorized $9 million to be appropriated to enable the Corporation to come into being. According to Senate Report 91–869:

This was intended to be "seed money" pending a long-range financing plan to be submitted by the Administration.

To date, however, the present administration has not submitted such a plan. President Nixon has this year stated in this proposed budget for fiscal year 1972:

Legislation will be proposed to provide an improved financing arrangement for the Corporation.

The Congress has waited since 1967 for an administration plan. We are still waiting for the plan. One can read about proposals supposedly in the works at the Office of Telecommunications Policy. One hears of rumored studies said to be underway at the Federal Communications Commission. And still the Congress waits. We see massive reorganization plans for the entire executive branch, grandiose revenue-sharing proposals, and master plans for health insurance, but just rumors in the field of long-term financing for public broadcasting.

In 1970 I introduced a bill requesting the Federal Communications Commission, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to each undertake a study of the question of long-range financing and to report to the Congress the findings of their studies by October 1, 1970. Although the legislation was not passed by Congress, I requested each of these governmental agencies to submit the studies regardless of the outcome of the bill so that the Congress could benefit from their research and move closer to a resolution of the long-range finance problem. I am sorry to note that only the Corporation for Public Broadcasting bothered to take the time to furnish the Congress with such a report.

As a result of the CPB report, I introduced H.R. 19143 on September 10, 1970. This bill was designed to provide permanent financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting through an excise tax on radio and television receivers, plus Federal matching grants.

I have received a number of comments in reaction to H.R. 19143 and many suggestions on ways to improve it. I am today introducing a new bill which omits the excise tax provision. This legislation would establish a trust fund on the books of the Treasury. Money would go into the trust fund through a two-for-one matching program. The bill sets maximum monetary limits for the years 1973 through 1977.

My bill is designed as a step toward providing long-term financial support from the Federal Government for the CPB in a manner that will avoid extraneous interference and control of the broadcasting and programing functions of public broadcasting. A number of studies have pointed to the need for such independence on the part of public broadcasting. If we do not guarantee this independence, we cannot hope to see quality shows dealing with timely subjects presented on public broadcast channels.

I have stated a number of times that Americans deserve a system of public broadcasting which will not be exposed to the pressures which a commercial system cannot easily resist. Public broadcasting has the potential to make education more productive and more meaningful to a wider range of the American public. A public broadcast system which is dedicated solely to the public interest has a much greater opportunity for informing and educating all Americans. But if we want to lead the world in the education field, we must be prepared to be innovative and appropriate the funds necessary for quality instruction. Clearly the United States should increase its investment in instructional technology based on the conviction that technology can make education more productive and more meaningful.

In House Report 91–1274, the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee said:

The full promise of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting cannot be achieved until a plan for permanent financing of the Corporation can be developed and put into effect. This is an undertaking that demands the best efforts of both the Administration and the Congress. The beneficiary will be the people of the United States.

I believe the Congress is ready to do its part to pass such legislation. I hope the administration will do its share by either supporting my bill or by submitting a better proposal.

The corporation, the Congress, and the people have already waited over 3 years for an administration approach to long-term financing. We cannot afford to let another year slip by without passing legislation which will guarantee that public broadcasting will be funded adequately and in a way that is free from political pressures and interference.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of my bill for the RECORD:

H.R. 7443

A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide permanent financing for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Broadcasting Financing Act of 1971".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that in enacting the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 the Congress declared that it is in the public interest and furthers the general welfare to encourage the growth and development of noncommercial educational radio and television broadcasting which will constitute an expression of diversity and excellence and be responsive to the interests of the people both in particular localities and throughout the United States;

(2) that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting was established pursuant to the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 (Public Law 90-129) under the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act in order to facilitate the development of educational radio and television broadcasting and to afford maximum protection to such broadcasting from extraneous interference and control;

(3) that the achievement of the goals of the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967 will require significant financial support from local, State, and Federal Governments as well as from the private sector; and

(4) that financial support from the Federal Government should be made available in such manner as will avoid extraneous interference and control of the broadcasting, and programing functions of public broadcasting, stimulate greater support from other sources and enable the establishment of financial stability while insuring that the Congress will fulfill its responsibility to supervise the proper utilization of Federal funds.

SEC. 3. (a) Section 396(k) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396(k)) is amended to read as follows:

"(k) (1) (A) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Public Broadcasting Fund (established by paragraph (3)) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to twice the amount by which non-Federal public broadcasting support for the second fiscal year preceding such fiscal year exceeds $50,000,000; except that the amount so appropriated may not exceed $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 3, 1974, $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, $120,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and $140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977.

"(B) The amount of non-Federal public broadcasting support for a fiscal year shall be certified by the Corporation to the Department of HEW within 180 days after the close of such fiscal year. The Comptroller General may audit the procedures used to determine the amount of such support.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) Non-Federal public broadcasting support for a fiscal year is the aggregate amount of—

"(i) donations, gifts, and contributions of money or other property received during such fiscal year by public broadcasting recipients from any persons other than States, political subdivisions thereof, or educational institutions, and

"(ii) money or other property received by public broadcasting recipients from States and political subdivisions thereof and educational institutions (except in connection with the sale of property, or rendition of services, which are not related to the provision of educational television programs), in determining the amount of non-Federal public broadcasting support, any money or property received by a public broadcasting recipient from the United States or from another public broadcasting recipient shall be excluded, and any property received shall be valued at fair market value.

"(B) The term 'public broadcasting recipient' means

"(i) the Corporation

"(ii) a noncommercial educational broadcast station, or

"(iii) any person (including an agency of a State or a political subdivision thereof) the principal activity of which is providing pro-

grams or services to noncommercial educational stations and which is exempt from Federal income taxation by reason of section 501(c)(3) or is an agency of a State or political subdivision thereof.

"(3)(A) There is created on the books of the Treasury of the United States a special fund to be known as the Public Broadcasting Fund. The Public Broadcasting Fund shall consist of such amounts as may be appropriated to such fund in accordance with paragraph (1) or otherwise deposited in such fund in accordance with law.

"(B) All moneys received into the Public Broadcasting Fund shall be paid to the Corporation at the commencement of each fiscal year to be used solely for the expenses of the corporation and shall be available therefor until expanded.

"(C) The Secretary of the Treasury shall report to the Congress not later than the 31st day of December of each year on the income, disbursements, and status of the Public Broadcasting Fund during the preceding fiscal year."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply with respect to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1972.

RESOLUTION URGING PRESIDENT TO RELEASE PUBLIC WORKS FUND

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, today 11 additional colleagues have joined me in introducing a resolution urging the President to release appropriated public works funds now held by him. This bipartisan resolution has gained much support and interest from my colleagues since I first introduced it in March. The total number of cosponsors come to 79, representing 36 States. I thank my colleagues for joining me.

It is time for Congress to speak up and express our concern and that of our constituents, over the questionable constitutional procedure employed by the President in freezing Public Works funds already authorized and appropriated by the Congress. I have written the President urging that he release these funds by April 19, 1971.

If these funds are not released by the time we return on April 19, 1971, then I think we should seriously consider following the suggestion of Senator MANSFIELD, and the House should study the possibility of a suit in the U.S. Supreme Court to compel Presidential compliance with the Constitution on this matter.

I am certain the Court, which has had no hesitancy in showing us the errors of our ways congressionally, would, if our construction of the unconstitutionality of such line item vetoes proves correct, then that same Court should have no hesitancy in directing appropriate orders to the executive branch.

Since there is some question concerning the outcome of such a suit by Congress against the President, we should proceed at the same time with the passage of our resolution urging Presidential action to halt the freeze of such public works funds.

TIRE RETREAD INDUSTRY SEES THREAT

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from Mr. George Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, bringing to my attention a problem which has arisen in the rubber retread industry. The purpose of Mr. Burger's letter was to transmit a letter he had received from Mr. Raymond P. Hawkinson, Jr., of the Paul E. Hawkinson Co. in Minneapolis, which for years has been a leader in the tire retreading business.

Because of the general interest in tire safety, I include the correspondence in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., March 31, 1971.

The Honorable ANCHER NELSEN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN NELSEN: I want to thank you for your letter of March 30th re the March 18th communication directed to me from the Paul E. Hawkinson Company.

There are few institutions of this kind existing in the rubber industry today. Through their nationwide operations they have built up a vote of confidence for their products, both in passenger and commercial use, with no exception. For the record, this opinion was also expressed during the critical days of World War II, by the then president of the Union Pacific Railroad, on loan to the War Production Administration, crude rubber stock pile division. He recommended that the Hawkinson System be used exclusively as a conservation measure, during the rubber shortage. Then, secondly, the invaluable services rendered by the Hawkinson Company through it's agents, to the Navy Department, during the same period, on the aircraft tires problem.

You are to be complimented for your closing paragraph, and I quote:

"The last paragraph of your letter indicates the retread problem will come before Mr. Staggers' committee for approval or disapproval. For this reason I am pleased to have the background material so I will have some information on the subject when it is considered in committee."

In view of this important statement, and as the subject matter is of considerable importance, it is my hope and trust, solely as a matter of information to all your colleagues, that you will insert in the Record this letter and the letter of March 18th, directed to me, from the Paul E. Hawkinson Company (see enclosure).

With highest regards,

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President in Charge.

PAUL E. HAWKINSON CO.,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 18, 1971.

Mr. GEORGE J. BURGER,
National Federation of Independent Business,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BURGER: In the Department of Transportation's currently-proposed amendment (Docket No. 70-29) to Standard 109 covering new passenger tires, they suggest several things which appear to threaten the very existence of passenger tire retreading. Where passenger tires go, can truck and bus retreading be far behind? Among these suggestions:

(1) That manufacturers subject sample new tires to stringent new tests to determine their structural adequacy in terms of high-speed and endurance requirements, using the results of these tests to label all new passenger tires with the designation that they may be retreaded once, twice, or with the words "Not to be Retreated."

(2) That retreaders brand the tire with an X each time the tire is retreaded.

(3) That a six-year age limit be placed on casings eligible for retreading (the effective date of these three proposals being tentatively set for January 1, 1972).

The Paul E. Hawkinson Company, as an independent business serving the retreader and others who make up this industry, must add its voice to those who most emphatically and sincerely urge that the Department abandon the unfair and potentially self-defeating provisions found in the proposed amendment.

We recognize, of course, that the spirit behind the amendment, namely, a desire to protect the safety and welfare of the retread user, is in the best interests of both the general public and the industry at large. Nevertheless, we do not believe any of the above provisions will provide the safety benefits their writers envision. Instead, the provisions of this proposed amendment seem more likely to eliminate the retreading of passenger tires; and by so doing, put most of the nation's independent retreaders out of business. This, in turn, will force these motorists who have driven millions of safe miles on retreaded tires to buy new tires at higher prices!

In the last 10 years, over 350 million passenger tires have been successfully retreaded. The retread is well established in the marketplace and the repeat sales of retreads testify to the effectiveness of today's retreader and the quality of his product. Retreads provide car owners and truck operators with economy, safety, and satisfaction. The Department of Defense is one of the country's largest users of retreads and has conceded that the savings realized through the proper use of retreads is an important factor in maintaining the required mobility of defense forces within reasonable budget limitations.

About 10 years ago, the Rubber Manufacturers Association launched a vigorous and active campaign to eliminate "cheapie" tires from the replacement tire field. The RMA attacked so-called third, fourth, and fifth line tires and most of its members refused to deal in this shoddy level of merchandise. The RMA pressed for voluntary industry standards which has helped rid the market of most poor quality merchandise. The RMA policy of long standing is that "All Tires Should be Retreadable!" A "SUPER" level quality casing is not necessary for a successful retread. A casing must be sound to be successfully retreaded and this can be determined only upon careful inspection by the retreader before he approves the casing for the retread process. If a tire is to be permitted to be sold marked "Not to be Retreaded" we must reach the conclusion that that tire at some point in its wear is no longer safe! If it reaches a marginal level of safety at 50% or 75% of its wear, it should not be permitted on the highways; if the casing is adequate through the life of the original tread, there is no reason why a new tread cannot be added!

The requirements of Docket No. 70-29 place the independent retreader solely at the mercy of his competitor for the replacement tire market, "THE NEW TIRE MANUFACTURER!" If most new tires used as original equipment on automobiles and available in the replacement market are labeled "Not to be Retreaded," the supply of casings for

the retreader will disappear. Most new tire manufacturers are obviously more interested in the new tire market than the retread market, and market casings that are not available for retreading will lead to only one predictable result!

Recently developed market statistics establish that a survey of 5,000 of the nation's retreaders showed an investment in equipment approximating 568 million dollars, and a continued supply of retreadable casings is essential to the continuation of these thousands of small businesses across the country.

Independent tire dealers employ some 80,000 people with another 30,000 being employed by manufacturers of retread equipment and supplies. Manufacturers now project the sale of 120 million dollars worth of equipment over the next 5 years to the retreading industry. The threatened extinction of this industry is thus of major concern to a large segment of American industry as well as to the economy.

The retreading industry is a pollution minded industry as for years we have been re-cycling a used product, "THE WORN TIRE!" What with the government's concern for pollution, what do they intend to do with the millions and millions of worn tires every year if this amendment is passed?

It seems clear to us, therefore, that this proposal must be withdrawn. At the same time, this Company would like to support the Department's efforts to assure a continuing supply of casings that will be suitable for repeated retreading. To accomplish this, it will be necessary to develop data on the retreadability of all new tires and the elimination of new tires which do not meet a standard of quality which would justify the retreadability of a tire. It is the sincere desire of the Paul E. Hawkinson Company to cooperate with and advance the objectives of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, and we extend to the Department our firm assurance of complete cooperation in these undertakings. We cannot, however, support regulations based upon unverified test requirements nor regulations which permit the apparent opportunity to market new tires of questionable or marginal safety. We are firmly opposed to Docket No. 70–29!

Yours,

RAYMOND P. HAWKINSON, Jr.
V–P Design & Production.

ONE SOLITARY LIFE

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday I attended services at my church, the North Broadway United Methodist Church in Columbus, Ohio. Dr. William E. Smith, the senior minister, presented what I thought was a particularly outstanding sermon. During the course of the sermon, he referred to an article appearing in the Baltimore Sun entitled "One Solitary Life." The quotation so moved me that I felt it should receive widespread attention and deserved a lasting place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

ONE SOLITARY LIFE

Here is a man who was born in an obscure village, the child of a peasant woman. He grew up in another village. He worked in a carpenter shop until he was thirty, and then for three years, he was an itinerant preacher. He never had a family. He never went to college. He never put a foot inside a big city. He never traveled 200 miles from the place where he was born. He had no credentials but himself.

While He was a young man, the tide of popular opinion turned against him. His followers ran away. One of them denied him. He was turned over to His enemies. He went through the mockery of a trial. He was nailed upon a cross between two thieves. His executioners gambled for the only piece of property he had on earth while he was dying, and that was a coat. When He was dead He was taken down and laid in a borrowed grave through the pity of a friend.

Yet all the armies that ever marched and all the navies that ever were built and all the parliaments that ever sat, and all the kings that ever reigned put together have not affected the life of man upon this earth as has that One Solitary Life!

HELP OUR NEIGHBORHOOD PROGRAM

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, recently one of the daily newspaper in my district carried a story about Tony Ramirez and his Harlingen, Tex., community committee.

Tony Ramirez is remarkable in that he has organized the Harlingen Community Committee on his own initiative—initiative that has become so infectious that it has spread to others who are offering their time and effort to help Tony with his do-it-yourself, help our neighborhood program. I commend this splendid article by Mr. Glenn Eberhard, the feature writer for the Valley Morning Star of Harlingen, to your attention:

EDUCATION VENTURE GEARED TO DO THE JOB

(By Glenn Eberhardt)

"Give a man a fish and he can eat for a day; teach him to fish and he'll eat for a lifetime.' That may be an old Chinese proverb but it could well be the motto of Tony Ramirez and his Harlingen Community Committee.

Ramirez, a 40-year-old wholesale meat truck driver, believes that almost anyone who wants to earn his own way can do so if he will only try. He also believes government handouts do not encourage productivity and, with the aid of local people and businesses, he has set out to prove the correctness of his beliefs.

"Most poor people are poor," Ramirez says, "because they have nothing to sell; no land, no skills. We can't give them land and if they are given money it is soon gone and they are poor again. That means we have to give them skills they can sell, so that is what we decided to do here."

"Here" is an unused city fire station on North Commerce St. Used during the day as a "multi-purpose center" for Cameron County Community Projects Inc., at night it becomes a somewhat unorthodox schoolhouse.

The Harlingen Community Committee itself, had its roots in the local poverty agency; its members being elected periodically from the ranks of CCCP clients.

The Committee's school, however, is completely divorced from the federal apparatus, Ramirez says.

"We don't want OEO money," the chairman explains. "If we take that, then we have to follow guidelines and somebody else would be running this."

So, without the usual pipeline to the taxpayers' pockets, the little school with no name survives on the generosity of private businessmen and individual citizens who share Ramirez' twin beliefs.

The building, of course, is provided by the city of Harlingen as are most of the furnishings. The city, in the person of some of the commissioners and City Manager John Clary, also provides considerable moral support staving off attempts to have the building put to some other use and rounding up material aid.

Teaching skills are provided by private citizens, many of them staff members at Texas State Technical Institute, who serve without pay.

Equipment is donated by local businessmen, loaned by TSTI or the city, purchased sometimes, just appears.

The students, numbering from 50 to 150 on any given evening, come chiefly from the Fair Park section, although many come longer distances.

"Transportation is a problem," Ramirez said, "but a couple of generous gas station operators have been helping us."

"We're beginning a course in upholstery and a local firm is letting us have the material at cost," Ramirez added. "A banker and one of the savings and loan places have been helping, too. There are lots of people in this town who want to see their fellow citizens get started."

A typical evening last week found about 20 students at the school. They ranged in age from their teens to grandmothers and in education from illiterates to high school students. They were all there with one purpose: To learn the skills necessary to earn their own way in modern society.

On hand to teach were a group of instructors from TSTI, headed by Archie Rosales, director of instruction at the state school. They had all put in a full day at their regular jobs and were destined to put in a few more hours teaching people others might think are unteachable.

Rosales explained the TSTI involvement this way:

"Many of these people could take courses on our campus but first they have to meet the minimum academic requirements—a fourth grade education. In this way we can prepare them for our regular program. Others, for one reason and another, can't get to TSTI. Perhaps they work at odd hours maybe they are too shy. At any rate they want to learn."

"Some of the young people are dropouts," Rosales went on, "others are in school but need additional help. Some just want to learn something extra, such as typing."

"Many of the older students are enrolled in the adult basic education courses offered by the Harlingen public schools," Rosales said. "In that case, we try to supplement what they are learning there."

On this particular night there were classes in government with Jose Munoz explaining municipal organization basic English under Eugene Campos; reading, with Gilbert Leal using a language master borrowed from TSTI; typing under the direction of three young ladies themselves students in secretarial courses at TSTI and high school math designed to prepare the student for the general educational development tests.

On other nights there are classes in sewing, upholstery and even driver education.

Beginning next month, Ramirez hopes to install a cooking class. The Harlingen Family Welfare Service will donate the food and Miss Virginia Perez, a nutritionist will do the teaching.

According to Miss Perez, who has worked with the Extension Service nutrition program many poor people waste much of the food they get from government programs simply

because they do not know how to prepare it. In some cases, they are not even sure what it is they are receiving.

Tony Ramirez and his friends are looking for more students and, of course, for more interested people who want to help.

"The only kind of people we are not looking for," Ramirez said, "are those who want to burn things down. The people that come here to learn and those that come here to teach are people who want to build, not destroy."

"After all," he mused, "if we wreck what we have, there will be nothing left for any of us."

OUR DEBT TO GREECE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, throughout the year 1971, our fellow Americans of Hellenic descent are commemorating the sesquicentennial of Greek independence. It was in 1821, a century and a half ago, that Greece's long struggle for freedom began. Not until 1830 was independence from Ottoman rule finally achieved.

What is so special about Greek independence? A hundred nations have become free since the American colonists established the Republic in 1776.

During the early 1800's, most of the countries to the south of us severed their ties with Spain, Portugal, and France. World War I resulted in the collapse of long-intrenched dynasties and the birth or rebirth of nations on the Continent of Europe. The generation that has elapsed since the end of World War II has witnessed the founding of threescore new countries.

The globe is covered with nations that have secured their independence since the American Revolution. What is so special about Greek independence?

I will answer the question by asking another one. Where would America be without Greece?

The political system by which we govern ourselves and protect our fundamental rights, the Christian gospel of salvation and moral conduct, the scientific knowledge that has enabled us to achieve miracles, the fine arts that have enriched our lives, and even the very language that we speak—all these came to us, in whole or in part, by way of Greece.

Popular government—call it democratic or call it republican—had its origin two millenia ago in ancient Greece.

It was to the Greeks that the Gospel of Christ was first delivered by the missionaries whom the Saviour sent forth and it was to the Greeks that many of the epistles were addressed.

A scientist would be poorly educated indeed if he were not familiar with the contributions of Archimedes, Euclid, and Pythagoras, to name but a few of Greece's many brilliant scientific leaders.

The section of our Nation's Capital that contains most of the important Government buildings would become a ghost town if all the examples of Greek architecture were suddenly removed.

The most eloquent congressional orator would be tonguetied if he had to refrain from using words of Greek derivation.

Besides enriching our lives in many ways, Greece has sent us thousands of her finest sons and daughters. They and their descendants have demonstrated their gratitude for America, its freedoms, and the opportunities that it offers by giving it their best in return. They have served America loyally and well through war and peace and through prosperity and adversity.

Mr. Speaker, as they observe the 150th year of Greek freedom, let us all rejoice with them. Let us also hope that Greece, the homeland of their ancestors, will be able to maintain its freedom for many years to come.

FREEDOM SPEAKS OUT

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of judging a "Speak Out For Freedom" essay contest conducted by the Highland Sertoma Club of Chattanooga, Tenn. There were many fine entries in this contest and from them was chosen the prize winning effort by Miss Anne Norman, 4626 Cloverdale Loop, Hixson, Tenn.

Miss Norman writes well and speaks well on a subject of importance. In placing her essay, "Freedom Speaks Out," in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I pay tribute to her ability and at the same time, commend the Highland Sertoma Club for sponsoring this worthwhile program for Chattanooga young people. The essay follows:

FREEDOM SPEAKS OUT

Come walk with me through the streets of your America, to the places that you all know so well. Come with me to the playgrounds of your children, to the schools of your youth, and to the businesses of your adults. Come with me to your state, your city, your town. Look for me in your own home, and there I will be found. I can be found anywhere in this America of yours, for I am Freedom.

I am present everywhere, represented in many forms and by many names. I am at many times a motivation to your people, and it is because of me that many changes are made in your society. Your young people use me as their justification in advocating violent change. And it was for me that George Washington and his forces starved and froze that terrible winter at Valley Forge. It was in my name that the people in Harlem revolted against the conditions, and it is I that enable the "hippies" to exist. Yet, it was to preserve me that you declared war on Japan after Pearl Harbor.

Time and time again throughout your country's history, you, as Americans, have fought to save me from extinction. No matter where I have been in danger, nor what the cost could have been, you have rescued me by rushing to my defense.

What did you save? You are now at a point in history where you must decide for yourselves what I am and what part I have played in your history.

In 1776, I was glorious. I was a lofty, breathtaking conception completely new to the world as a way of life. I lived only in the minds and hearts of those who dared to dream until you Americans decided that I was yours for the taking. So you fought for me and won, with me as your basic principle; you set up the greatest, most nearly perfect government ever in the history of the world.

Then, in 1860, I appeared in a different form. As in 1776, a group of people claimed me and attempted to break away. In this terrible conflict, a nation was ravaged and its people disunited. When the conflict was resolved, a decision had been reached concerning me. In effect, it meant that you realized I had to stop somewhere.

Now, let us span the gap of years and visit the campus of Kent State. As in so many cases in this age, your young people attempted to do as they wished, when they wished; saying they could because they possessed me. They attempted to make my name ring once again with the universal acclaim it had in 1776. But, they failed. Several students were killed, and many more were injured. You call it senseless? You say I had nothing to do with it? Oh, I know I am Freedom, the shiny, golden word from your nation's illustrious past, but are all things in my name justified? Remember 1860.

Remember Pearl Harbor? You rallied quickly and mobilized for war when I was threatened. Yet, I am the very same freedom that the "hippies" claim as their reason for existing and attempting to destroy your set way of life.

Perhaps you disagree. You think I am concerned only with the events you think about in capital letters—the proud events. Sorry. Look again. There are many activities today using me as an excuse to operate, and they are succeeding because you look at me through tinted glasses.

You see, I'm not an infallible rule of living. Just because I exist in your country does not mean that I will always guide you the right way. I am not the force that keeps you on the right path, but merely the torch that lets you search out the right path. You see, I am not everything; yet, without me, you can do nothing. I am yours to use, to protect, or to abuse.

Because I am a part and not a completeness in myself, I must have a purpose. I must be controlled and channeled. For while I am not life itself, I am the best way of living. Just because I am named, a cause is not justified. Just because I am possessed, an act of violence and aggression is not excused. I can be an inspiration and goal for your great leaders, or a source of propaganda for demagogues.

Your ancestors molded me into a glorious tradition. It is your duty to preserve that tradition. And preserve it you must. For I am FREEDOM.

PUBLIC OPINION IN JOHNSTOWN AND THE CALLEY TRIAL

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, in order to gage local public opinion on the Calley trial and decision, in the Johnstown, Pa., area in my congressional district, radio station WARD conducted a

1-hour telephone poll on the morning of April 2. The results confirmed what has been revealed from the national polls: Lieutenant Calley was unfairly singled out by the Army for vilification, retribution, and punishment.

The station gave its listeners 1 hour, between 9 a.m. and 10 a.m., to voice their opinion. The question posed was: "Are you for or against the guilty verdict in the My Lai court-martial of Lt. William Calley? Vote 'yes' if you agree with the guilty verdict, vote 'no' if you disagree with the guilty verdict."

Nine hundred ninety-three voted "no," six voted "yes."

REPEATED FLOODINGS IN ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, because of the geographical diversity of the State of Alaska, one of the natural hardships we experience frequently is repeated flooding.

Many areas in Alaska experience floods that cause disastrous effects on people and communities. The Tanana Valley flood in August of 1967 is one example of the seriousness of this problem and the hardship it heaps on the people of Alaska.

To this date, the Chena River flood control project has not been completed. If we are to stem future tragedies we must act quickly to help people save their lives and property. As the season for floods draws near it is imperative that the Chena River flood control project be completed as quickly as possible.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Urging the Rapid Construction of the Chena River Flood Control Project

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas after the disastrous Tanana Valley flood of August 1967, a flood control project was undertaken by the United States Army Corps of Engineers in conjunction with the Fairbanks North Star Borough; and

Whereas to date this project has not been completed and weather conditions again point to a possible repeat of that disaster in the spring of 1971; and

Whereas now, as before, the residents in the area are helpless to protect their property from large-scale flood damage;

Be it resolved that the United States Corps of Engineers is urgently requested to accelerate the design phase, and proceed as rapidly as possible with appropriation and construction of the Chena River Food Control project.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Stanley R. Resor, Secretary of the Army; Lt. General William F. Cassidy, Chief of Engineers, United States Army; Colonel E. L. Hardin, Jr., District Engineer, United States Army Corps of Engineers; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel; U.S. Senators, and to the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAMS

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1971, I sent a letter to the President urging him to restore vital funds for some of the major federally supported summer youth programs. A copy of the letter with the list of cosignees follows:

APRIL 2, 1971.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In recent summers, the Federal government has greatly assisted the youth of America by providing a substantial number of work opportunities through the Neighborhood Youth Corps, as well as providing funds for inner-city recreational and transportation programs. This assistance has been exceptionally helpful to America's cities in developing sorely needed employment, educational, and recreational opportunities for our nation's disadvantaged youth.

Thus, we are deeply distressed by reports of severe cut-backs in these programs. We understand that the summer Neighborhood Youth Corps, while ostensibly at the same position level, is actually being cut back through the reduction of each position's duration from 10 to 8 weeks. We understand as well that the Administration is not planning to repeat either the Recreational Support or the Transportation Programs at all.

In the strongest possible manner, we respectfully urge you to increase the number of summer Neighborhood Youth Corps positions to 630,000 nationally, and fund them for ten 32-hour work weeks. We also respectfully urge you to use the powers of your office to insure the repetition of both the Recreation Support and the Transportation Assistance Programs. We would further respectfully request that you announce these expanded program levels as soon as possible in order that local program administrators might carefully plan the most effective use of these funds.

Sincerely yours,

Dan Rostenkowski; Hale Boggs, Majority Leader; Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr., Majority Whip; Bella S. Abzug, Joseph Addabbo, Frank Annunzio, Herman Badillo, William A. Barrett, Nick Begich, Bob Bergland, Mario Biaggi, Richard Bolling, John Brademas, Frank J. Brasco, James A. Byrne, Charles J. Carney, and Shirley Chisholm.

George W. Collins, William R. Cotter, Joshua Eilberg, William D. Ford, Donald M. Fraser, Richard Fulton, William J. Green, Seymour Halpern, James M. Hanley, Michael Harrington, William D. Hathaway, Louise Day Hicks, Joseph E. Karth, John C. Kluczynski, Mike McCormack, and Spark M. Matsunaga.

Romano L. Mazzoli, Ralph H. Metcalfe, Abner J. Mikva, Patsy T. Mink, Parren J. Mitchell, F. Bradford Morse, John E. Moss, Morgan F. Murphy, Lucien N. Nedzi, Robert C. Nix, Claude Pepper, and J. J. Pickle.

Melvin Price, Richardson Preyer, Thomas M. Rees, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Robert A. Roe, Benjamin S. Rosenthal, William F. Ryan, Fernand J. St Germain, Paul S. Sarbanes, James H. Scheuer, B. F. Sisk, John F. Seiberling, Frank Thompson, Jr., Robert O. Tiernan, G. William Whitehurst, and Charles H. Wilson.

THE CALLEY VERDICT

HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the eyes of the Nation have been on the Calley verdict. Amidst the uproar and the emotion, there have been calm voices, too, which have put forth steady and restrained assessments. When the uproar has run its course, I think that the following two assessments will have withstood the test of time in terms of balance and insight.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit for the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues a column by Judd Arnett of the Detroit Free Press and an editorial which appeared in the Detroit News.

I include the article as follows:

CALLEY VERDICT INDICTS ENTIRE CONCEPT OF WAR

With mingled guilt, sorrow and shame I have been thinking, as doubtless you have, of Lt. William L. Calley Jr., convicted of killing an indefinite number of civilians during the My Lai massacre.

The evidence seems irrefutable that Lt. Calley, then barely 24 years of age, is guilty as charged, for surely he shot and killed civilians, women and children as well as men, under circumstances for them which might now best be described as helpless. He was on a mission which did not develop in intensity or danger as anticipated, yet still he ran amok. That is the simple part of it and one can therefore agree with the military court in its findings.

But my sense of guilt, sorrow and shame far transcends these bare bones of evidence, for in essence William Calley represents that part of our past which has become unacceptable in the present, but in the interim society neglected to bring him up to date.

The truth is that what William Calley did at My Lai was accepted—yea, approved!—in this country less than 100 years ago when the Indians were being cleared off the Great Plains, and the lust, brutality and bloody arrogance of it were condoned as late as World War II, with some spillover into the Korean conflict.

I have been reading John Toland's splendid work, "The Rising Sun," which treats upon the Pacific war from the Japanese viewpoint, and in it we come to the initial American disappointment with the performance of the B–29.

That bomber, by far the largest then aloft, had been engineered to destroy the industrial capacity of the Japanese, but early raids ranging to altitudes of 30,000 feet had been ineffectual. Then Gen. Curtis LeMay, a hero of the air war in Europe, was brought to the Pacific.

It was his decision, and no one in authority disputed it, that high-level pin-point bombing of industrial targets should be abandoned in favor of low-level saturation tactics, wholly dependent on incendiary devices. "Fire bombing," we were to call it, and it was worthy of the name.

For on the first night, after pilot planes had drawn a huge "X" in downtown Tokyo with incendiaries, wave after wave of B–29s homed-in on the target. In the conflagration which followed, it was estimated that more than 72,000 Japanese civilians died.

And that, of course, was just the beginning. Eventually, much of urban Japan was cinderized, with the vast bulk of casualties occurring among non-combatants. There is

no record of American outrage at such tactics.

In Europe, the Allies have never been able to present a logical case for the late-war saturation bombing of Dresden, in which literally tens of thousands of civilians were killed. Dresden had been largely by-passed up until that cataclysmic decision, and then it was obliterated. Why? The question has been bouncing around for a quarter of a century, although never to the point of court martial for those who turned the hungry tiger of war loose on a weakly defended target.

Back in the Pacific, it was standard procedure for Marines and GIs to "shoot everything that moved" during invasions of such bastions as Saipan, Tinian, Okinawa and Iwo Jima.

Combat troops operated on the theory that everyone was an enemy until proven otherwise and there was no outcry in this country against such a policy. Later, in Korea, it was difficult at times to tell the difference between "friendlies" and "unfriendlies," and the presumption is widely shared that "mistakes" occurred.

The argument might be made that in the case of World War II we were fighting a war of survival, where as such has not been true in Vietnam, but the trouble with this is that the Army obviously neglected to impress upon William Calley that while his survival might be involved, the nation's wasn't, and therefore the ground rules had changed.

At My Lai, as far as a portion of public opinion is concerned, he was at least one war too late.

Leading a company of misfits, operating under orders he either misunderstood or accepted too literally, Lt. William L. Calley Jr. came to My Lai and to cold-blooded murder. So says the jury, and evidence sustains the verdict. But the case is not closed: The jury will remain out on the rest of humanity until an end is put to war, which is evil beyond description.

DESPITE PUPIL REACTION: CALLEY STILL NO HERO

The Calley jury is getting a raw deal. The nation has gone on an emotional jag following the verdict and sentence. In the process, there has been a tendency to make a hero out of a murderer. Thus six hours, five of whom knew at first hand the pressures in the field under which Calley cracked, have been thrust into the role of villains.

Calley is no hero. In this drama, his is an anti-hero role. In the wide spectrum of protest opinions have varied: Calley was only obeying orders, implicit or explicit; he was only doing what others before him had done; if not a scapegoat, his ordeal placed him in an heroic role; worst of all, the verdict against him was a condemnation of the American role in Vietnam.

The question the six jurors had to answer was: Did Calley with premeditation slaughter a group of civilians, including men, women and children? What the unthinking flag-waving protesters, with their "Free Calley" banners, forget is that if Calley, found guilty by due process of our laws, were freed, Americans would be admitting that such slaughter could be national policy.

The protesters can't have it both ways. The charge to the jury did not permit the jurors to have it both ways. As one juror said, "Calley was given every benefit of every doubt." The real pressure on these six men came from no rock-ribbed higher Army command trying to clear the Army's name. The real pressure was having to assess whether a man should be hanged, jailed or acquitted.

Their legal guideline was that American soldiers do not murder. Their finding was that Calley had done so, not once but 22 times.

There will be debate, also, over the intervention of President Nixon in announcing personal review and decision before any final sentence is carried out. He, it is stated, will hold a "nontechnical and nonlegal review." It is claimed it will not reflect judgment on the merits of the case nor will it cast doubt on the fairness of the review procedures by the army.

But in citing the public outcry as prompting his action, the President identifies himself with the protesting some of which has been near hysterical, in contrast to the soul-searching deliberations of the jury, which had to follow what the laws directed and could not weigh emotions of the public in balance.

There is reason to be worried also how the President's intervention will affect the interim decisions of military review before the final decision comes to his scrutiny.

EASTER

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker—

Welcome, happy morning!
Age to age shall say.

So runs the refrain of one of the earliest and best loved Eastertime hymns, witnessing to the rejoicing characteristic of the Easter festival for millions of believers. For Christians, Easter celebrates the resurrection of Christ, the great and central affirmation of Christian faith. Its religious meaning is clearly stated by St. Paul:

If you then have been raised with Christ, seek the things that are above.

For those who are not Christians, Easter remains a season of joy and glad release, marking the springtime renewal of the earth. The Easter spirit and the many happy customs associated with it have become a part of the psychological, commercial, and community life of all Americans of every faith and creed who are touched by its annual celebration. The roots of the Easter festival run deep into history.

Behind its present religious significance we can discern an even more ancient pagan celebration marking the new life which the spring sun brought to earth at this time. These origins can be found in the very name of the feast, which derives from the Norse word for the season of the rising sun and new birth, Ostar, often misinterpreted as the name of an Anglo-Saxon goddess. The old custom of lighting Easter bonfires recalls this ancient rite of welcoming the spring sun.

In truth, Easter is closer to the venerable Jewish feast of the Passover, and its traditional religious name, Pascha or Pasch, comes from the Greek—and Latin—forms of the Hebrew word for Passover, Pesakh, the "passing-over." So it is that the oldest and greatest of Christian holy days is intimately associated with the deliverance of the people of Israel from the bondage in Egypt as told in the great narrative of the Exodus.

As Americans we rejoice in such pleasant Easter customs as the traditional Easter Monday egg-rolling on the White House lawn, the wearing of new clothing, and the cheerful Easter Parade. But, more than these things, we share in the inner significance of the Easter holiday—the celebration of new hope for man, the assurance of immortality, and the affirmation of the deathless quality of life at its noblest. In these things, Easter speaks with the accents of eternity, and its message extends to the whole family of man.

CAPT. KATHRYN DUPREE

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Alameda Times Star for March 29, 1971 carried a story about an Alameda girl who has made good in the Army, Capt. Kathryn Dupree, whom I knew when she was in grade school.

She is now the commanding officer of Ft. Sill's Women's Army Corps Battery. Captain Dupree was an excellent student and a dedicated American. She came by this naturally because her father is an ex-serviceman and her mother has always been extremely active in veterans' affairs.

This very competent young lady worked very hard to complete her education, and is a credit to her parents, to her community, and to her nation. I am happy to have known her and her parents these many years.

ALAMEDA HIGH GRADUATE NOW WAC CAPTAIN AT FORT SILL

FORT SILL, Okla.—Under some circumstances, a total of two inches of height can make a big difference. It did for Kathryn J. Dupree.

Today she is captain and the new commanding officer of Ft. Sill's Women's Army Corps Battery.

Standing a total of four feet 10 inches tall, Capt. Dupree missed the Navy by two inches. "You have to be five feet tall to join the Navy," she explained.

An Alameda High graduate whose parents still live here, Capt. Dupree received an invitation while a junior in college to see what the Army was all about. That summer (1968) she went to Ft. McClellan, Ala., for four weeks as a corporal.

"I looked at the Army and the Army looked at me," she said with a smile. At the end of the four weeks, Capt. Dupree returned to college for her senior year as a corporal in reserve status.

"I've always wanted to join the armed forces, and I liked the Army," she said.

Receiving a bachelor's degree in bacteriology and immunology from the University of California at Berkeley in June, 1969, she subsequently was commissioned a first lieutenant on July 29 of that year.

In December, 1969, she was selected as a distinguished military graduate of the WAC Officer Basic Course. One of the most impressive honors bestowed on Capt. Dupree happened that month—she was selected to lead her graduation parade.

For the past year, Capt. Dupree has been executive officer of the WAC Company at Ft. Gordon, Ga. She took the reigns of Ft. Sill's WAC Battery early this month.

"I reported with my own foot stool," she laughed. The women at Ft. Gordon made her

a green and gold foot stool (the Women's Army Corps Colors.)

While at Ft. Gordon, Capt. Dupree finished a two-week course in chemical, biological and radiological instruction. She also became the first woman officer to take the U.S. Army Military Police Drug Investigation Course.

Adding to her list of credits, Capt. Dupree is also taking the Civil Affairs Advanced Career Correspondence Course.

The service life is not new to Capt. Dupree. She is the daughter of what is known in the Navy as an "old salt." During her father's career in the Navy, Capt. Dupree covered quite a bit of territory. "Washington, Oregon and Hawaii are the only states I haven't been through," she said.

After graduating from Alameda High School in Alameda, Calif., in Jan. 1958, Capt. Dupree picked up stakes and moved to Tehran, Iran, where she worked in the accounting section of the U.S. Embassy.

Returning to the states in 1959, she started classes at Merritt College. After two years of working nights and going to classes on days, Capt. Dupree received an associate of arts degree.

At that point, she transferred to the University of California at Berkeley. Then she received her invitation to see what the Army was all about, and Capt. Dupree wasn't sure what to do.

"I wanted to go on and become a doctor, but scholarships don't cover the cost involved. It's hard work to work your way through medical school," she said. "The invitation was sort of a decision-maker. I can use every bit of experience—everything I've ever learned."

Capt. Dupree believes that leadership is accomplished by example. "For instance when I asked my girls to shine their shoes I expect to have my shoes spit-shined."

Capt. Dupree received the Army Commendation Medal before reporting to Ft. Sill. She earned the medal for meritorious service while stationed at Fort Gordon.

Capt. Dupree is the daughter of Mrs. Sarah W. Booth, 2138 Alameda Ave., and Gordon P. Dupree, 917A Santa Clara Ave.

WHITNEY YOUNG: WE WILL ALL MISS HIM

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the past few weeks have brought to America two occasions for sorrow—the death of Whitney Young, and the anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King. These two great men, both leaders in the continuing struggle for justice and equality for black Americans, differed in life even as they did in death. Dr. King appealed to the conscience of a Nation; he dared to dream and to demand that his dream come true. He awoke the pride of a people. And he died by an assassin's bullet.

Whitney Young went downtown. He toiled tirelessly to reach the men who held the power to make good on the promises evoked by the Constitution and by the civil rights movement of the 1960's.

He died a long way from home, in a foreign land where he had gone to meet with men like himself, seeking real solutions to real problems.

His death, like Dr. King's, deprives us of a messenger, but not of the message. Like Dr. King, Whitney Young devoted his life to doing everything he could to make the American dream a reality for black Americans. It is now left to the country to do all it can. A Nation with a conscience would build no lesser a memorial to the cause for which Whitney Young lived. We will all miss him.

PLIGHT OF RURAL AMERICA

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker. I join with many of my colleagues in a continuing effort to focus attention to the plight of rural America.

By no means do we seek—or is it our intention—to detract in any way from the problems of our city brethren. The fact is that in my estimation the problem is more acute in the rural areas, since it is the problem of the rural areas that has compounded the city problem.

As our brothers leave the farms and journey to the city with the hope of a better life—or at least more of an opportunity than they had in the rural areas—they overcrowd the cities, they overburden the governmental services and all the facilities and more often than not end up in worse circumstances.

Too many times people tend to apply a remedy to the local problem, not realizing that the actual cause of the problem is far away. And so we keep hearing pleas for increased expenditures for the cities, while the flow of people continues into the cities.

We must and I say very emphatically, we must attack the problem at its source.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I know that many people have many ideas as to what causes the problem and there are, I am sure, as many answers. So what I say today is my personal opinion and my humble recommendations are again my personal views. I speak for no group nor for any person but myself.

Let us look for awhile at our city brothers and compare their plight to that of rural America. Regardless of any other problem our city brothers have, they have available at least the basic facilities and, in most instances, laws on zoning or housing to assure the minimum services of water, lights, sewer, and gas or at least supplies of coal or fuel oil.

Such is not the case in rural America. We have a terrible problem even for these basic necessities. There are many settlements—some are called colonis in my area—that have no facilities at all for sewerage disposal—and no reasonable expectation to secure any under the existing programs which are, in the major part, limited to cities and towns or at least incorporated areas.

The several Federal agencies dealing with this problem must meet this need. I urge strongly that they begin at least to look at the possibility of adding this area of concern to the existing programs or recommending appropriate legislation for that purpose.

Again our city brothers have, for the greatest part, domestic water available for home consumption and laws making certain requirements for water purity, also Federal programs for grants and loans to provide these facilities. We of the rural areas have a very limited area of Federal participation and never enough money to even take care of those areas that want to participate.

It is a shame to have to tell you that we still have many of our citizens in my area who must drink water from irrigation ditches and canals. Many must carry water in tanks or barrels for miles to have any water in their homes.

This should not be so in this day and age. I again urge the respective agencies to at least take a look at this terrible problem, and I again strongly recommend the appropriate legislation be recommended to make available grants for this type service. I say this because the greater majority of these people are below the poverty level and as much as they would like to help themselves, they are unable to do so.

They are not doing this by choice, they have no alternative. We cannot, we must not allow this to continue. As we speak of priorities the plight of these people should be uppermost in our plans.

Continuing these efforts, we now go to power and light. There is no problem, I am sure, in any municipality. We do have the REA, providing a very excellent service to Rural America, but we still have the problem that they do not have sufficient funds to provide the service everywhere that it is needed. As fine a service as the REA and the several public utility companies provide, we still have plenty of room for improvement.

And so the list continues, Mr. Speaker, reciting the problems of rural America and the areas in which they are deficient. Such areas are farther away from a doctor or a hospital, more often than not they do not have the necessary resources for either medical attention or medicine. Their children are farther away from the schools or other educational facilities. The same applies even to the few Federal programs available to them.

It becomes a problem of accessibility because of the concentrated location of these facilities in the cities.

Finally, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I would like to mention a most serious problem in the rural area—and this is employment.

I know that the Government cannot solve this problem, but it should help wherever possible. These our rural brothers in the much greater majority are decent, hard working citizens. The much greater majority are devout Christian families. Their children are not by and large those who are frequently in trouble.

Rural America is the grassroots of our country and it is very unfortunate that this vast segment really is suffering a plight not of their own making. I know of no one who is poor by choice.

Now, my colleagues, I do not want you

to get the impression that we have not been trying to correct these deficiencies, nor would I want you to get the idea that these people have not tried to help themselves. Let me assure you neither is the case. The reason for this talk is to ask your help, to strongly recommend that the several agencies revise their programs, and if necessary, recommend corrective legislation.

This is to respectfully ask you my colleagues, to look to the plight of rural America and to let us join the problems of our city brothers in order that we might work together to make truly a better life for all Americans.

FDA—FRIEND OR FOE OF THE PEOPLE?

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution calling upon the Government Operations Committee to fully investigate the procedures followed by the Food and Drug Administration before banning the use of intravenous—IV—solutions manufactured by Abbott Laboratories.

A recent article, April 2, in "Science" published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science entitled "Food and Drug Administration: Is Protecting Lives the Priority?" raises some extremely serious questions as to exactly how and based on what informational sources are decisions made within the FDA.

Mr. Bazall, the author of the article indicates that as early as January 1971, the Federal Center for Disease Control, the Public Health Service unit, responsible for monitoring outbreaks of infectious disease, informed FDA officials that there was something involving Abbott's IV solutions which was causing widespread blood poisoning.

The FDA on March 11 issued some precautionary instructions to users of Abbott's IV solutions and finally on March 22, after public attention had been drawn to the problem by Ralph Nader and Dr. Sidney Wolfe of the Medical Committee for Human Rights, banned the use of the solution in question.

No one at the present time really knows how many people were affected by the contaminated solution. The CDC studied eight of the 8,000 hospitals that used Abbott's solution and documented 150 cases of blood poisoning and nine deaths.

There is no way of knowing what a full-scale investigation will reveal but the American people have a right to know whether or not the FDA is working for or against their interests.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I am inserting Mr. Bazall's article and a copy of the resolution in the RECORD:

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION: IS PROTECTING LIVES THE PRIORITY?

In January officials of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) knew that the use of bottled intravenous feeding solutions manufactured by Abbott Laboratories had somehow led to an outbreak of blood poisoning and several deaths. Yet they took no action. In early March, the FDA found out that a large percentage of the Abbott solutions were contaminated with the infectious bacteria responsible for the blood poisoning. Yet they did not ban the products. They only recommended that certain precautions be taken when the solutions were given to patients. Not until 22 March did FDA recommend that hospitals stop using the Abbott products. And then only after consumer-advocate Ralph Nader appeared on national television denouncing the agency for its failure to act.

The intravenous (I.V.) solutions (mostly combinations of dextrose and salts in water) are used in virtually every hospital to feed nutrients to critically ill patients. Until the ban Abbott Laboratories supplied 45 percent of the 250,000 bottles of I.V. solutions administered daily to patients in the United States.

The magnitude of the epidemic brought on by the Abbott products is unknown. The federal Center for Disease Control in Atlanta (CDC) carefully documented 150 cases of blood poisoning including nine deaths in only eight hospitals. But over 8000 hospitals were using the Abbott products at the time the contamination was discovered. A spokesman for CDC told *Science*, "We have no way of knowing the full extent of the problem, but you can extrapolate a guess."

A decision by FDA officials to ban any product involves complex consideration, many of them subjective. And from the vantage point of hindsight, the FDA can make an easy target for critics. Nevertheless, the case of the Abbott's I.V. solutions involved enough irregularities and a sufficient number of deaths to warrant close scrutiny. Whether or not anyone acted incorrectly, the incident is likely to result in congressional hearings and another round of criticism of the FDA.

Included among the irregularities is a curious history of violations involving Abbott's I.V. solutions, none of them resulting in prosecution by the FDA. In 1969, FDA inspectors found hairline cracks in some bottles of the Abbott solutions, which resulted in contamination. Abbott agreed to recall the damaged bottles and improve its manufacturing techniques. In 1964, FDA first cited Abbott several times for mislabeling its I.V. solutions, then, later in the year, because two lots were discovered to be moldy, and finally because the caps on the bottles were shown to leak.

The House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, while investigating the 1964 series of violations, discovered that high FDA officials in Washington had suddenly ordered an end to the investigation of Abbott Laboratories. During an inspection of Abbott's plant in North Chicago, two FDA field inspectors received a phone call from their superior ordering them to "get out of the plant by noon." The investigation was thus precipitously concluded. And no satisfactory explanation has been offered.

The death of a 28-year-old woman on 5 July 1970 at the Medical College of Virginia in Richmond called the first attention to the current problem. Although hospitalized for hepatitis, the woman died from blood poisoning (septicemia). And the same rare bacteria found in her blood were growing in her bedside I.V. feeding bottle. Richard J. Duma of the college's department of internal medicine, while investigating the death, found that two other patients had recently contracted blood poisoning from the same organism. Duma and two colleagues, John F. Warner and Harry P. Dalton, then sampled all of the I.V. units in use in the hospital. Thirty-five percent of the solution bottles were contaminated with the same organism. The hospital's entire supply was manufactured by Abbott. "I had a lot of trouble getting people to believe that so many of the bottles were contaminated," recalled Duma.

Despite the extent of the problem, unopened bottles of the I.V. solutions showed no signs of contamination. "We concluded that the source of the contamination was at the bottle cap," said Duma. "But we were unable to tell whether the bacteria were coming from the manufacturer or getting into the bottles after they were opened."

As soon as he was sure of his results (in late July), Duma notified FDA, CDC, and Abbott. CDC, the Public Health Service unit responsible for monitoring outbreaks of infectious disease, immediately dispatched a representative to the hospitals. Pending the investigation by CDC, FDA took no action. And Abbott only replied that the product was manufactured with adequate quality control. Meanwhile, Duma concluded that he had best get his results published in order to alert others to the potential danger. Duma's findings appeared in the 4 February issue of the *New England Journal of Medicine* (285, 257).

In early December, three CDC investigators, Dennis Maki, Conrad Fulkerson, and Frank Rhame, began a thorough study of the epidemic in the Virginia hospital. At first they assumed that the contamination originated outside of the bottled solutions. Accompanying the bottled solutions are disposable kits to deliver the liquid slowly into the patients' veins. And contamination could enter the system from the air or from a nurse's hand as she sets up the apparatus.

"We had regarded the prepackaged sterilized products as inviolate," said Fulkerson, "particularly since the unopened bottles showed no contamination." thus they searched, with no luck, for some source of the bacteria in the hospital.

NATIONWIDE EPIDEMIC

Late in December, however, the CDC investigators discovered that the problem went beyond the Virginia hospital. Through a chance conversation with a friend in California, Maki learned that a similar outbreak of blood poisoning with the same rare bacteria had occurred at Orange County Hospital. Then on 5 January, St. Anthony's Hospital in Denver reported 24 cases of blood poisoning and one death, again from blood poisoning due to the same organisms. Later in the month, Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit reported 45 cases and eight deaths.

Since the Medical College of Virginia used the Abbott products exclusively, no evidence had conclusively linked the Abbott solutions and the infections. But each of the newly discovered outbreaks involved the Abbott I.V. solutions. Furthermore, the CDC investigators had "cultured out" the I.V. solutions at a hospital that didn't use Abbott and found no contamination or infection. Thus, while they still didn't know how it was happening, the investigators realized that something about the Abbott products was resulting in blood poisoning. "Epidemiologically, it was damned suspicious," said Maki.

The decision to remove a product from use rests not with CDC, but with the FDA. All through the investigation, George Blatt of FDA's Office of Compliance kept tabs on the CDC findings. Blatt does not believe that the relation discovered in January between the disease and the Abbott products warranted any action by the FDA and, indeed, FDA did nothing at the time.

"You don't take legal action against a firm," Blatt told *Science*, "until you have evidence that can stand up in court. You have to define where the problem is. And all you had at the time was an association of the disease with the product." He emphasized, however, that the decisions regarding action against Abbott were made not by him, but by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Charles E. Edwards.

But, in spite of the illnesses and deaths

resulting from the products, Edwards says he knew nothing of the problem. In an interview with *Science*, both Edwards and his associate commissioner for compliance, Sam Fine, insisted that the first they heard of the difficulties, other than what had been published in the *New England Journal of Medicine* was 11 March. That was after the discovery of the contaminated bottle caps.

Blatt told *Science*, however, that "Of course, Fine and Edwards knew of the investigation all along." But when told that they denied knowing about it, he replied, "I report things and I write memos. But someone above me makes the decisions about who sees them."

In any event, immediate action became imperative with the discovery of the guilty germs in a space between a plastic liner and an aluminum disk in the Abbott solution's bottle cap assembly. By 10 March, the CDC investigators were convinced that a certain portion of the Abbott I.V. fluids had left the factory contaminated. They surmised that the bacteria escaped into the solution if the bottle was shaken so that the fluid washed over the bottle cap liners.

On 11 March representatives of Abbott, FDA, and CDC met in Atlanta. The next morning David Sensor, the director of CDC, Edward J. Ledder, the president of Abbott Laboratories, Surgeon General Jesse Steinfeld, and Commissioner Edwards met in Washington to discuss the problem. That afternoon Edwards and Sensor announced at a press conference that a ban was not feasible and that "special precautions must be taken . . . to reduce the risk of septicemia from the use of Abbott Laboratories' intravenous infusion products." The precautions included gentle removal of the bottle caps, changing of the I.V. apparatus every 24 hours, and watching for the first signs of blood poisoning.

They also announced that "these products will be replaced as rapidly as possible by Abbott." A spokesman for the FDA insisted that Abbott representatives at the meetings came only to supply information and had nothing to do with the decision.

SHORTAGES OF ALTERNATE SUPPLIES

In explaining his decision on 13 March not to ban the use of the contaminated solutions, Edwards told *Science*, "You've got to understand that all we had at that time was very preliminary data. We believed that the precautions could allow the solutions to be used safely." Edwards also emphasized that FDA didn't have accurate information about the availability of replacement products from Abbott's competitors. And since Abbott was supplying 45 percent of the critical solutions, he could not simply order hospitals to stop using the Abbott products. "We might have killed more people by banning the Abbott solutions than by allowing their use," added Fine.

Yet FDA officials acknowledge that they did not even check on the availability of solutions from other manufacturers until after the 13 March announcement. Thus while FDA met with Abbott on 12 and 13 March, Abbott's three competitors, Baxter Laboratories, Cutter Laboratories, and American Hospital Supply, heard from FDA a few days later. When on 19 March government specialists did complete a suprvey of the competitors, they concluded that, for the most part, hospitals' stocks of Abbott solutions could be replaced. "The reason for the delay," said Edwards, "was that we didn't know of the problem until 11 March. After that we acted as fast as possible."

Although the FDA had declared that the Abbott solutions could be used safely, the Army disagreed. On 15 March, the Army Surgeon General issued a worldwide notice ordering all Army medical facilities "to suspend from immediate use and issue all Abbott intravenous solutions." The Army and the FDA differed in their actions, according to one medical officer, because the Army wasn't depending solely on Abbott products. And "because in the military services we never take a chance with a product that might be faulty."

On 19 March, Sidney Wolfe, a Washington internist and member of the Medical Committee for Human Rights, heard from a physician friend in New York. Wolfe's friend claimed that the extent of the infections caused by the Abbott solutions in his hospital exceeded the number claimed by government officials. He also claimed that the FDA-recommended precautions did little to reduce the incidence of blood poisoning.

After investigating the problem, Wolfe contacted Ralph Nader, who agreed to send a joint letter to Edwards demanding a ban on the product. The letter sent the following Sunday (21 March) alleged that ". . . there is a clear mandate from the data the CDC has collected to order Abbott intravenous products off the market and thereby *insure* the end of this epidemic of blood infections and death."

Nader and Wolfe were particularly critical of one of the FDA precautions that read: "At the first suspicion of septicemia which might be associated with contaminated intravenous fluid, all existent IV apparatus should be removed. . . ." Claiming that "it is a form of malpractice to wait until a patient develops evidence of the blood infection," the letter said, "the recommendation is a cowardly repudiation of the ethic of preventive medicine."

In response to an appearance on national television news by Nader and Wolfe publicizing their letter, Edwards defended his 13 March decision. But the next day he essentially followed their recommendation and banned the use of all Abbott I.V. solutions, except for emergency situations.

Listing the reasons for the change of decision, Edwards included new evidence regarding the exent of the epidemic, availability of alternative suppliers, and the ease by which bacteria can find their way into the I.V. solution. After 13 March, while evidence of new cases of blood poisoning was pouring into CDC headquarters, the three investigators who had located the contamination were working 20 hours a day trying to find the mechanism of the contamination. They found that one need only twist the cap, not shake the bottle as they had thought, to release the bacteria. Thus they concluded that the Abbott solutions were unsafe under any conditions.

Abbott Laboratories issued a press release stating that "it will co-operate with the FDA" and emphasizing that the I.V. solutions represented only 8 percent of the company's total sales last year. Beyond that, however, company officials refuse to discuss the matter.

Even though all the pieces of the puzzle weren't in place until the third week in March, FDA officials clearly had sufficient information to take action and save lives before then. One might ask why FDA officials believe that a strong association between a product and a serious infection is insufficient reason to take action against the product. Or, why, at the very least, they had not investigated the availability of alternative supplies of the I.V. solutions at the first suspicion of the Abbott products.

Only a congressional investigation can provide the answer to those questions, since FDA tends to regard the specifics of its regulatory decisions as privileged information.

DIRECTING THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATION TO INVESTIGATE THE FAILURE OF THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION TO TAKE TIMELY EFFECTIVE STEPS TO BAN THE USE OF CONTAMINATED INTRAVENOUS SOLUTIONS MANUFACTURED BY ABBOTT LABORATORIES

Whereas as early as January 1971 the Food and Drug Administration was notified of blood poisonings and deaths resulting from the administration of intravenous solutions manufactured by Abbott Laboratories, supplier of almost half of such solutions administered to patients in the United States;

Whereas despite evidence of numerous, widespread occurrences of blood poisonings and deaths from the administration of such solutions, the Food and Drug Administration took no action until March 13, 1971, and then only to recommend certain precautionary procedures in the use of such solutions;

Whereas not until there was national publicity indicating the seriousness of the problem did the Administration ban the use of such solutions;

Whereas it is clear that only a congressional investigation can provide the answer to why the Food and Drug Administration failed in this case to act promptly and effectively to save patients' health and lives: Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That the Committee on Government Operations, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the failure of the Food and Drug Administration to act promptly and effectively against Abbott Laboratories to protect the health and lives of patients who were given contaminated intravenous solutions supplied by Abbott Laboratories.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandas, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the House, before the last day of the first session of the 92nd Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

EARTHQUAKES IN PANAMA

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th of January 1971, there was an earth disturbance in the Canal Zone and in a contiguous area in Panama. This was, perhaps, the most serious tremor in that region since 1882. Panama, as a whole, is supposed to be much less susceptible to earthquakes than the countries of Central America to the northwest.

In the earthquake shock of last January, it is of significant importance that a careful inspection was made under the supervision of Governor Leber, of the Canal Zone, to ascertain whether or not the locks and the canal were in any way damaged. The result of such inspection revealed no cracks or other injury to any of the locks or to the Panama Canal as a whole.

In Panama City, the tremors occa-

sioned more damage, perhaps, than in any other portion of the isthmus, but apparently, without loss of life.

It was most gratifying that all the lock walls and chambers and other like installations of the canal were not in the least marked by the January visitation. This speaks well for the builders of the Panama Canal in the designs for the operating structures, and is eloquent testimony to the value of the route chosen for the existing canal.

It also constitutes assurance that the third locks-terminal lake plan for a parallel set of larger locks, as provided for in the pending bills in the House and Senate, authorizing such construction, is a feasible solution of the problem of increased capacity of the present canal.

In the official periodical of the Panama Canal enterprise, the Panama Canal Spillway, of March 19, 1971, there appears a most informative discussion of earthquakes and their application to the canal and Panama. Because of popular interest in the subject involved, I quote as a part of my remarks, the carefully written and scientific discussion of the subject, as follows:

EARTHQUAKES

A tall tale much circulated during the 1920's was that as the earth revolved on its axis, it needed oil to lubricate the bearings and since men were punching holes in it and extracting the oil put there for this purpose it was beginning to creak and groan and this was causing earthquakes. The dire prediction was that if the oil companies didn't stop digging oil wells the earth was going to stop rotating due to lack of oil for the bearings.

This tale was told in jest but from earliest history men speculated as to the cause of earthquakes and many theories were advanced before scientific knowledge was available. Some insisted that giant tortoises, moles, hogs, or whales lived deep inside the earth and their restless movements brought on the tremors. The Hindus, at one time, maintained that the earth was supported on the backs of elephants and shakes, could, of course, be expected.

We now know that earthquakes may be caused by a number of things. The movement of a train, the jolt from a landslide, a dynamite explosion or heavy thunder may produce a miniature local earthquake but the so-called seismic disturbances, like the ones that occurred here January 19 and 20, are usually caused by a slipping or settlement at fault lines in the earth rocks due to overstressing at some locality of the earth's surfaces.

A fault is a fracture in the earth's crust accompanied by a displacement of one side of the fracture with respect to the other in a direction parallel to the fracture. Places subject to earthquakes have usually had many periods of seismic activity in the past which have resulted in these deep vertical faults. Some of these fractures may be traced for many miles. In California the San Andreas Fault, recently well publicized in the calypso song, "Day by Day," reaches from the Gulf of California to the coast north of San Francisco. Seismic instruments have been set up along this fault in an effort to obtain understanding of the rate of strain accumulation and what signals, if any, precede a major shock. Studies of continental drift, the interaction between the earth's rotation and seismic activity, and other fundamental studies are being carried out in an attempt to better understand earthquakes.

There is, as yet, no way to predict where and when an earthquake will occur. Still, people in areas where there are frequent tremors are often heard to say such things as "it is perfect earthquake weather" when the sky appears hazy even though all available evidence indicates that there is no connection between weather and earthquakes.

An earthquake may be caused also by the sudden eruption of a volcano which sets up earth vibrations. In this case, the earthquake shocks usually precede the actual eruption. The biggest quakes, however, are not accompanied by volcanic action.

The first indication of a heavy earthquake is usually a distant subterranean thunder that seems to come from directly under one's feet. In a second or two, the ground swells into a low ridge moving like a wave on the sea. Some people are affected by nausea, like seasickness. Ponds of water may disappear and disagreeable earth odors may be noticed.

The source of an earthquake shock may be miles below the surface of the earth. The motion is transmitted longitudinally and transversely in waves like those of sound and light. The speed of the movement of these waves will vary as they move away from the source, called the "epicenter," according to the elasticity and density of the rocks it passes through, varying from a few hundred feet a second to as high as 5 miles a second. The waves move slower and get further apart the farther they get away from the source. The quake is less violent the farther one gets from the epicenter although the markings of the seismic instruments may show plainly many thousands of miles away.

A small room in one corner of the basement of the Administration Building at Balboa Heights provides local information about earthquakes which occur in this part of the world. The sensitive equipment there is a part of a global earthquake recording network spanning six continents and including a total of 125 stations in 65 nations and islands.

Here, by using several seismographic instruments placed in proper geographical relationship to the earth, the various vibrations coming from an earthquake are recorded simultaneously. Using these recordings the seismologist then is able to determine the direction from which the vibrations came, the distance they have traveled before reaching the seismograph, and the severity of the earthquake at its point of origin. By comparing data from a number of different locations, much more extensive information can be accumulated.

Small tremors or after shocks usually follow an earthquake. One such shock was felt on the Isthmus January 27 a week after the heavier quake which had registered between 5 and 5.5 on the Richter scale. The after shocks often cause renewed anxiety and people begin anticipating another heavy quake.

After the earthquake of September 7, 1882, reported to be the worst ever to occur on the Isthmus, many people began standing several narrow neck bottles upsidedown on a table every night before they went to bed so that the slightest shake would upset the bottles and serve as a kind of earthquake alarm.

Except for the 1882 earthquake, which caused extensive damage, Panama has been fortunate in comparison to her Central and South American neighbors. Ralph Z. Kirkpatrick, Panama Canal chief hydrographer in 1923, in discussing Panama said: "Her ancient and unbroken old Spanish Flat Arch, and the old masonry arched bridge and old towers in Old Panama, standing frangible but unbroken for over 300 years, told a reassuring story to the practical engineers who were looking for a safe site for an Isthmian canal—better than could have the best seismologists from theory. One of the fortunate things nature did was to put a sort of seismic safety valve, as it were, over 100 miles from the nearest part of the Canal, in Panama Bay. In the general location of the 100 fanthom depth line in Panama Bay there seems to be submarine palisades, running from the west coast of Colombia along the bed of the ocean nearly to Costa Rica. The occasional little jolt that is felt in Panama and the Canal Zone is nearly always from away out there; the safety valve is working to take up the undue earth stresses that have mounted up a little high since the last earth readjustment."

Reassuring as this is, however, the recent tremors have caused interest in what to do in the case of an earthquake and here are suggestions offered by the U.S. Environmental Science Service Administration:

WHAT TO DO DURING, AFTER THE SHAKING

During the Shaking:

1. Don't panic. The motion is frightening, but unless it shakes something down on top of you, it is harmless. Keep calm and ride it out.

2. If it catches you indoors, stay indoors. Take cover under a desk, table, bench, or in doorways, halls, and against inside walls. Stay away from glass.

3. Don't use candles, matches, or other open flames, either during or after the tremor. Douse all fires.

4. If the earthquake catches you outside, move away from buildings and utility wires. Once in the open, stay there until the shaking stops.

5. Don't run through or near buildings. The greatest danger from falling debris is just outside doorways and close to outer walls.

6. If you are in a moving car, stop as quickly as safety permits, but stay in the vehicle. A car is an excellent seismometer, and will jiggle wildly on its springs during the earthquake, but it is a good place to stay until the shaking stops.

After the Shaking:

1. Check your utilities, but do not turn them on. Earth movement may have cracked water, gas, and electrical conduits.

2. If you smell gas, open windows and shut off the main valve. Then leave the building and report gas leakage to authorities. Don't reenter the house until a utility official says it is safe.

3. If water pipes are damaged, shut off the supply at the main valve.

4. If electrical wiring is shorting out, shut off current at the main meter box.

5. Turn on your radio or television (if conditions permit) to get the latest emergency bulletins and the locations of safe shelters.

6. Stay off the telephone except to report an emergency.

7. Don't go sightseeing.

8. Stay out of severely damaged buildings; aftershocks can shake them down.

EMPLOYMENT

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Cox, president of Ross Laboratories, Columbus, Ohio, called my attention to an article in the Wall Street Journal for March 1, 1971, which I found most interesting and revealing. For those of my colleagues who missed it, the information contained therein is as follows:

Employment within the United States during 1970 was up approximately 730,000 over 1969. Sound strange?

The facts surrounding this phenomenon are that although unemployment as calculated on a percentage basis rose to a year end high of 6.2%; there were 730,000 more

Americans employed at the end of '70 as opposed to '69. The reason for the upward trend in the percent unemployed was that the civilian labor force grew faster than the demand for labor. The labor force increased approximately 2 million in total while the increase in jobs was only 730,000. On a monthly basis this amounted to a 165,000 per month increase in the labor force as compared to 60,000 available jobs.

During the 1970's, an estimated 41 million workers will enter the labor pool. Most of these workers, it is estimated approximately 50%, will be in the 25–34 age bracket.

A JOINT HOUSE-SENATE COLLOQUIUM ON INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to announce plans for a Joint House-Senate Colloquium on International Environmental Science, to be held on May 25–26, 1971, in the Old Supreme Court Chamber of the Capitol. This colloquium will be held under the auspices of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The purpose of this 2-day meeting is to discuss the status of scientific information as a basis for pending decisions on environmental problems which are worldwide in scope. The meeting will be open to all Members of the Congress and will provide a critical opportunity for them to meet with a number of leaders from governmental and scientific organizations working in environmental matters.

Key participants who will take part include: Mr. Maurice Strong, Secretary General of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment; Mr. Christian A. Herter, Jr., Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Environmental Affairs; Mr. Russell E. Train, Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality; Dr. Francesco di Castri, vice president of the Special Committee for the International Biological Program; Dr. Bengt Lundholm from the Swedish Natural Science Research Council; and Dr. W. Frank Blair, Chairman of the U.S. National Committee for the IBP. Dr. Thomas F. Malone, vice president of the International Council of Scientific Unions and Deputy Foreign Secretary for the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, will serve as rapporteur for the proceedings.

The format for the colloquim will consist of morning sessions, from 10 a.m. to 12:30 p.m., on each of the 2 days, with invited participants presenting brief remarks and engaging in general discussion with the Members. More extensive prepared papers and supporting material will also be provided by the key participants.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of environmental management and quality are increasingly global in scope. We have long since passed the time when any one nation can solve alone the problems that confront it. Recognition of this fact has been manifested in the present plans to hold a United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in 1972. It is also manifested in the very nature of the problems with which Congress must deal—problems of ocean dumping, air pollution, pesticides in water, and a host of others. That pollutants know no national boundaries is a fact we have come to realize only too clearly in recent years.

We in Congress are increasingly bearing the burden for difficult and complex decisions relating to the environment. At the same time, our own organizational structure tends to fragment many of the programs as well as issues that confront us. Both Houses of Congress are involved in environmental affairs in virtually every one of its committees. In the operations of executive agencies, in appropriations approval, and in agreement on foreign treaties and arrangements, the Congress affects the role of our Nation in contributing to the resolution of national as well as international environmental problems.

Thus, the adequacy of the scientific information base which undergirds such decisions is of critical importance to all Members. The device of a Joint House-Senate Colloquium offers a timely and efficient means of acquainting a broad sector of the Congress and the general public with the status, needs, and opportunities of international and environmental science.

The rationale for the colloquium is that environmental pollution, resource management, and environmental quality are recognized as parts of a major public policy issue which is the proper relationship of man to his natural surroundings. Society is reexamining its attitudes, values, and activities, and changed programs and alternative life styles are being suggested.

Many of these problems are global in character while others are ubiquitous—sharing common causes and solutions. Environmental issues transcend arbitrary political boundaries. The working out of solutions to these complex problems in an optimum manner is one of the most difficult tasks to confront civilization. The decisionmaking process, in order to arrive at the best course of future action for all nations, must have the maximum possible information bases.

Both the House Science and Astronautics Committee and the Senate Commerce Committee have sought to develop these bases in their own way over many years.

The House Science Committee has actively sought to expand this information base in broad scientific areas from space exploration to environmental science. This committee has sought to further the aims and impetus behind our own international biological program—IBP—in an effort to provide the baseline data for future environmental decisionmaking. It has encouraged and supported increased activity in international environmental surveillance through our space program. It has also provided support to expanding scientific attaché programs of the State Department, to the basic and applied research programs of the National Science Foundation, and to the multiplicity of programs of the National Bureau of Standards. In addition, it has fostered improved international understanding and opened new channels of information concerning national and international science policy through its annual meetings with its panel on science and technology.

In 1967, it cosponsored the first House-Senate Joint Colloquium on the Environment with the Senate Insular Affairs Committee, which resulted in the influential Congressional White Paper on the Environment.

As you are aware, Mr. Speaker, promotion of international environmental science is a matter of personal commitment to Senator MAGNUSON, as evidenced by his sponsorship of Senate Resolution 399 last year, in support of a World Environmental Institute.

Similarly, the Senate Commerce Committee has played an active role in furthering the interests of international environmental science through its advocacy of oceanic and atmospheric programs. The committee has fostered stronger Federal organization for national and international participation in these areas.

In addition, the committee has sought to remedy ocean oil pollution through its handling of the implementing legislation for the Convention on the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil. The committee also actively pursues a broad range of environmental legislation, concerning pesticides, mercury and other toxic metals, low polluting vehicles, air pollution from aircraft, powerplant siting, urban and other international environmental problems.

The coming joint colloquium represents a continuing effort on the part of some of us to bring to the Congress an integrated, multidisciplinary, systems aproach to problems of a particularly complex nature. In that respect, perhaps, its form and mode may be as important as its substance.

LIFE LINES REVIEW WONDERS ABOUT CBS OBJECTIVES

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Keith Kathan, editor of Life Lines, has written a review of the CBS program, "The Selling of the Pentagon," in the April 7 issue of his publication.

In the article he poses an interesting question relating to the motives of CBS in producing the so-called documentary.

I want my colleagues to read Mr. Kathan's review and for that reason I am inserting it at this point in the RECORD:

A FIRST AMENDMENT CRISIS?

THE SELLING OF THE PENTAGON

(By Keith Kathan)

Who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord?
or who shall stand in his holy place?
He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart;
who hath not lifted up his soul into
vanity, nor sworn deceitfully.
Psalms XXIV, Verses 3–4

Anyone who was conscious while watching CBS's "Selling of the Pentagon" and who was acquainted with the above passages from the Bible could surmise that CBS–TV News is standing in a Bolshevik bawdy house.

Trying as hard as objectivity will allow, I cannot call this program anything less than a Communist propaganda film. The script and the feeble yet arrogant CBS reply to the program's critics were self-defeating and I got the impression that CBS has a passionate death wish. Not for itself, but for freedom of the press.

What was the point CBS was trying to make? CBS said that the Pentagon is an unchecked bureaucracy and this documentary would shed light on this runaway monster called the Pentagon. But the claim doesn't hold water, because too many points made by Correspondent Roger Mudd indicated a seething dissatisfaction with anything olive drab. Mudd said Pentagon films show "an obsession with monolithic communism." Mudd thus ignores the one billion people behind the iron curtain who got gobbled up by a monolith and blandly disregards Russia's record of genocide and militarism which is apparent from Ukraine to Suez, westward to Havana.

What, one would ask, is wrong with national defense? What is wrong with "selling" the view that the Pentagon is in the business of shooting guns and driving tanks and steering ships where such activity is required by the Constitutional prerogative of Congress? Presumably, judging from the CBS repetition of the word, *propaganda* is what is wrong; ergo, one would surmise, CBS–TV would have the Pentagon shut its trap. But ah, this would also mean Pentagon spokesmen could not go around bad-mouthing communism at Rotarian dinners—a practice which the CBS script treated with the finality of a Houndawg rocket.

It keeps coming back, when you review the script: CBS is mad because we have a Pentagon which is obsessed with monolithic communism. Then you remember the other documentaries—the ones favorable to Castro, to the Tax-Spend-Elect socio-economic views of socialists, indeed to the War on Poverty, HEW, and other bureaucracies whose runaway nature makes the Pentagon look like an also-ran. CBS is the chicken thief posing as a pillar of society.

U.S. Rep. F. Edward Hébert, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said the film clip of him and a former prisoner of war was obtained under false pretenses, a claim which CBS News Boss Richard Salant tried to refute, but in the refutation only issued another abstractive inexactitude. He referred to the last paragraph of a letter of permission, written to CBS, as CBS's right to use the film in any way it wanted. Not so. CBS all along had told Hébert's office it wanted the film only in context of telling of the story of prisoners of war. The last paragraph merely gave permission to use all or a portion of the film clip.

Hébert said: "Wittingly or unwittingly, deliberately or undeliberately, this was one of the most un-American things done on TV. It was an un-American activity." Hébert was, I think, saying in his own southern gentlemanly way, that this was nothing less than a Communist propaganda film.

There is a little more to this whole disgusting chapter in TV journalism. CBS employs a tactic rarely understood by the people. In revealing that CBS Anchorman Cronkite has narrated Pentagon "propaganda" films and admitting CBS has aided Pentagonian propaganda in other ways, it assumes the listener will conclude the network has nothing to hide, hides nothing and is therefore to be believed. But as *Life Lines* has proved in print over the years, and as Vice-President Agnew stated: "(Viewers) cannot rely on CBS documentaries for facts." Thus, we see we have come full circle. CBS dons the halo of saintly newsgatherers, piously castigating the Pentagon for propaganda, while propagandizing against the military and employing every conceivably dirty journalistic trick known to mob psychologists.

I am bothered by a continually nagging question: could it be that CBS News is trying to create a constitutional crisis over the First Amendment, that it is trying to maneuver critics into the untenable position of defending themselves as destroyers of freedom of the press? The only such critics are conservatives and anti-communists. If they can be discredited, what opposition to Communist propaganda on television would be left? Those last remnants of a free press in Eastern Europe and Havana cry out from the grave:

"None."

Why, one *must* ask, does CBS stage news events, praise Castro and echo Kremlinesque phrases like "obsession with monolithic communism"? Why? It seems self-destructive on the surface. Why would CBS continually seek criticism or become a corporate Jerry Rubin if not to create crisis? CBS doesn't need the money, and has shown it can weather any criticism: all you do is admit a mistake here and there, and refute everything else. Result: you come out smelling like a rose, and only you know you have been researching in the out-house. If anyone fights back, tell everybody the critics are fascists who want to destroy freedom of the press.

I think that CBS worked for the other side, yes, I mean the Communists, in telecasting this program. Just as it did in its pro-Castro documentaries and the "Hunger in America" documentary—the latter emulating the editorial policy of the *Daily World*. If this keeps up, frequency would become the dictating factor as to whether one could call CBS the Communist Broadcasting System. If the lady persists, do you not call her a courtesan? I share these thoughts with members of one of America's largest clubs, "The Horrified CBS Watchers Society." No other explanation—discredit, create a crisis—seems rational or logical.

As a newsman who has talked with network reporters who left the networks because of staged and manipulated news, I agree with Spiro Agnew who said of CBS in the context of its telecast of "The Selling of the Pentagon" that CBS "has reached a level of irresponsibility which should no longer be tolerated."

How to end the irresponsibility is the problem. And no one knows that better than a snickering CBS News Department.

COMMERCE UNDER SECRETARY, ROCCO SICILIANO, AN OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in a few days Under Secretary Rocco Siciliano will be leaving his position as the No. 2 man in the Department of Commerce to assume new duties and responsibilities as president and chief administrative officer of the T. I. Corp. of California. During his more than 2 years as Under Secretary of the Commerce Department, Rocco has been an outstanding public servant and the effort which he and Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans have put forth since their appointment by President Nixon has contributed significantly to strengthening the role of the Department of Commerce in the affairs of Government and business.

Rocco has had a distinguished career in the Government service, legal profession, and in business. From 1953 to 1957, he served as Assistant Secretary of Labor and then was named Special Assistant to President Eisenhower for Personnel Management. In 1959 he joined the Washington law firm of Wisconsin, Cragun & Barker, and in April 1965 he became president and chief executive officer of the Pacific Maritime Association in San Francisco. He has made many significant contributions in these past 2 years and his understanding of maritime affairs made him a key figure along with Secretary Stans and Assistant Secretary for Maritime Affairs Andrew Gibson in putting together a program to revitalize the American merchant marine fleet.

On March 31, the Under Secretary made his last public speaking appearance before the San Diego Union's Ninth Annual Investment Clinic in San Diego, Calif. He spoke of the contribution which business has made to the American enterprise system and his remarks were particularly perceptive in pointing out the danger of public attitudes and political attacks upon that system. Business, he pointed out, used to be a most respected part of our national life, but today it is being attacked "both for doing and for not doing on matters of the environment, on consumer affairs, and on social involvement."

He goes on to say:

This time in which we live may be described astrologically as the Age of Aquarius, but in fact it is the Age of Technology—and if the achievements of this century seem spectacular up to now, I submit that we have only had a taste of what lies ahead in the last 29 years of this century.

Waging the battles which must be won to preserve our environment will require the development of unprecedented new technology, and in this lies the whole new frontier of economic opportunity, both for business and for its investors.

Developing the resources of the seas which cover two-thirds of the earth—which must be done to meet the needs of a world population that may double in the remainder of this century—holds promise of another new economic bonanza waiting to be harvested by industry and investors.

The whole thrust of our national effort to rebuild our cities, to expand our industry, to raise our standard of living and to increase our international trade lies in the growing development of exciting new high technology.

While we regret the administration is losing the services of this outstanding citizen, we are indeed pleased that he will be returning to California, where I know he will make a valuable contribution in his chosen field.

I insert in the RECORD his remarks before the San Diego audience last Wednesday:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ROCCO C. SICILIANO

This is the last opportunity I shall have to speak publicly as the Under Secretary of Commerce.

I am pleased to deliver my valedictory here in California, because like so many Americans this is where my roots have been transplanted in the adult years of my life, and this is the state to which I shall return in just a few days to begin a new private career.

SERVICE

The public service which I am now concluding marks the second time I have personally had the honor of participating in the work of the United States Government.

During the Administration of President Eisenhower I was privileged to see first-hand the great skill and patience and leadership which he brought to bear in the affairs of the Nation and the world to secure conditions of prosperity and peace.

During these past two years I have been equally privileged to share with the Administration of President Nixon in a commitment to the same goal under conditions which are often new, always complex and sometimes baffling.

Some of these conditions are matters which I would like to discuss here with you today.

COMPLEX

If any one fact is apparent from the Washington viewpoint today, it is this: that almost no aspect of our national life—or of the world around us—takes place without effect on the rest of the country or the rest of the world.

The environment, for example, affects political decisions on economic matters such as the SST, and in turn this will affect the welfare of a city, the progress of the aerospace industry, our balance of payments, and perhaps even our competitive position in an East-West race for technological leadership of the world.

So each action breeds its reaction. The world is not only shrinking in size with improvements in our systems of transportation and communications, but the smaller it gets the more complex its workings become.

The world which used to tell time by Big Ben now does so by the compact watch on our wrist.

FORWARD-LOOKING

This complexity being so, it is increasingly difficult to forecast the future, or even to predict its trends, with any reasonable degree of assurance.

Yet investors must look ahead by definition. When you make an investment, you are really buying a piece of tomorrow more than you are buying a share of today.

Since I am still cloaked in the mantle of public service, it would not be prudent for me to suggest specific opportunities for you to consider as you buy into the future.

Also, skilled economic analysts can look ahead with far more precision than I.

However, I would like to share with you a last look from Washington at some of the conditions which bear heavily on the working of our economy and our society today—some of the factors which will affect the investment climate in the near future and in the years to come.

ECONOMY

The first condition I would like to consider is the general state of the nation's economy.

As we all know, President Nixon inherited a set of economic and fiscal conditions which had their roots far back into the 1960's. Both inflation and unemployment were inevitable consequences of the public economic mismanagement which extended over most of the last decade.

Inflation and unemployment have not been solved as easily or as quickly as anyone expected. But as consequences of those calamitous years, they have also not been as severe as they might have been.

LONG-TERM

Today we hear the economy described as sluggish, slow to recover, and unresponsive.

But these observations often are the result of looking at the short-term individual indicators, rather than long-term trends. We have come too close to the trees to see the forest.

There are too many experts ready to predict the imminent failure of an orderly economic resurgence every time there is a stutter in the GNP or a stammer in the Consumer Price Index.

The fact is that the general state of the economy today is healthy.

The rate of inflation is less than it was a year ago, and far less than it was two years ago.

The rate of unemployment is declining. President Nixon's goals for reduced unemployment and a 4½ percent rate of inflation by mid 1972 are realistic, and they are attainable.

On a long-term basis, examining almost every major, significant, important indicator, the trend is upward. In the last 10 months alone the stock market has recovered more than 40 percent of its value from the low points of last year.

If you take even a longer view than the year past or the year ahead—if you look ahead to a decade of intelligent fiscal and monetary policies, as contrasted to the policies of the '60s—it becomes very clear that this nation's economy has no place to go but up.

GROWTH

The American affluence has only begun to make itself felt.

The fundamental fact is that we are growing in affluence and in numbers, and as consumers we have great and expanding spending abilities.

Our production capacity also is growing in its ability to satisfy our appetites and our pocketbooks.

Furthermore, we are buttressed on every side by protections against financial disasters, both personal and national. We have created systems of public and private insurance to protect almost every conceivable asset and every institution in the nation, so that regardless of the monthly or yearly fluctuations in our economy the general upward trend will never again suffer a 30's-type of major dislocation.

In short, the American enterprise system is strong and the American economy is in excellent condition.

ATTITUDES

The second factor which I would like to discuss briefly is the political condition surrounding the enterprise system in which you are investors.

On this point I am not quite so sanguine.

A major fact of American life over the past 10 years has been the conditions of change—in our social attitudes, our living standards, our position in the world at large—economically as well as politically—and in our attitudes.

We have changed our outlook on just about everything from crewcuts to women's skirts, and the public attitude has perhaps changed most sharply toward American business.

It used to be a most respected part of our national life. Today business has come under attack.

It is attacked both for doing and for not doing—on matters of the environment, on consumer affairs, and on social involvement.

Some of this criticism undoubtedly has been justified in the past, and may still be.

DAMAGE

But it is also certain that some of this criticism is in response to the popular complaints of fashionable zealots, who sometimes appear to seek not so much the correction of bona fide ills in our society as the destruction of our profit system and the corporate structure which sustains it.

These attacks leveled against business have been far reaching and perhaps far more damaging than many may realize.

The damage often lies not so much in the injury inflicted by each attack, but in the erosions which occur from this constant, relentless chipping away at the system. It is being increasingly worn down and fenced in.

CONTRIBUTIONS

Much of this may be the fault of business itself.

It has not done an adequate job of telling the public all that it is doing to cleanse the atmosphere and to help resolve pollution problems, many of which are not only the creatures of industry but also of government or the public itself.

Business has not done enough to tell the story of what it is doing to assure the consumers of the country better and safer products, with warranties that are meaningful and services that are valuable.

And business has really done very little to make the nation aware of its enormous contributions to help solve some of our most pressing social and economic problems, particularly involving the needs of our minority peoples and our cities.

POLITICAL CLIMATE

As a result of these criticisms and these failures, a political climate has developed in recent years which is increasingly hostile to the American enterprise system in general and to American business in particular.

Instead of being able to look ahead to problems that must be resolved 5 or 10 years in the future, or to problems that must be resolved many years in advance—with full consideration of all the options—we now find business often in the position where it must fight intensive short-term defensive battles in the political arena, with its options narrowed and limited to the lesser of two evils.

This is no way to run a railroad or a free economy.

RESPONSE

Slowly but surely industry is beginning to respond to this political pollution of the economic environment. If it is able to restore a balance to public attitudes, the investment climate in the years ahead will not be jeopardized by these considerations.

But it seems to me that the best investments available today are in those companies which take the lead not only in fighting the immediate political battles, but in genuinely striving to build a better society, one in which American enterprise is held responsible for its actions and in respect for its achievements.

OPPORTUNITIES

On the other side of this coin is the great opportunity that lies ahead for business—and consequently for the investor—in dealing with the problems of our cities, our environment, and in meeting the concerns of our consumers and our needy Americans.

This time in which we live may be described astrologically as the Age of Aquarius, but in fact it is the Age of Technology—and if the achievements of this century seem spectacular up to now, I submit that we have only had a taste of what lies ahead in the last 29 years of this century.

Waging the battles which must be won to preserve our environment will require the development of unprecedented new technology, and in this lies the whole new frontier of economic opportunity, both for business and for its investors.

Developing the resources of the seas which covers two-thirds of the earth—which must be done to meet the needs of a world popula-

tion that may double in the remainder of this century—holds promise of another new economic bonanza waiting to be harvested by industry and by investors.

The whole thrust of our national effort to rebuild our cities, to expand our industry, to raise our standard of living and to increase our international trade lies in the growing development of exciting new high technology.

WORLD TRADE

In that thought lies the third condition affecting our economic environment which I would like to discuss with you.

It is the position of the United States in the commerce of the world.

In the public mind and perhaps in much of our business community, there has been a complacent confidence over the years that we could have almost any share of the world's markets that we wanted, together with a feeling that we really did not want or need very much.

Our own domestic markets have been so burgeoning over the past 30 years that American business has felt little inclination to compete in the markets of the world, particularly taking into account all of the problems of language, foreign exchange, political uncertainty, transportation and other difficulties involved in a growing export trade.

As a result, a relatively small 4 percent of our GNP has gone into the channels of international commerce, while other nations have pursued their own very aggressive export expansion efforts, often with their industries and governments working very closely together to create subsidized, monopolistic competitive forces.

CHANGES

As many other nations have grown with remarkable speed in world trade, several things have resulted.

First, with the spectacular growth of the Common Market and Japan, the United States is no longer the world's only economic superpower.

Second, the United States has been recognized by all of our competitors as the foremost market of the world and the great influx of imports in a wide variety of goods and commodities in recent years has had a jolting effect on some key elements of our domestic economy.

Third, the loss of our position of superiority, coupled with the growth of serious import problems in certain commercial areas, has seriously and adversely affected our balance of trade and balance of payments positions.

Fourth, to meet those problems, we have had to undertake our own extensive export expansion program. In its initial phases it has been remarkably successful, and we expect that our exports will continue to grow at a very healthy increase of about 10 percent a year into the foreseeable future.

PROBLEMS

However, American goods and commodities—and American investments—are faced with a wide array of discrimination, restraints, restrictions and regulations in most of the trading areas of the world.

As a government policy, we have undertaken a major effort to enlist the cooperation of other nations in reducing or eliminating these non-tariff barriers to trade.

If we succeed in this effort, we will have achieved something far more historic even than the Kennedy Round of tariff reductions, and I believe we will then cross the threshold into a new age of unprecedented international trade.

INVESTMENTS

But to do so—to realize this potential—there must first be created a far better investment environment than exists today in much of the world.

In recent years it has become increasingly fashionable in other nations to subject American firms to harassment, seizure or an infinite variety of restrictions and limitations.

If there is a modification in this hostile international attitude, then the great potential markets of the world will be opened more fully to the investments of American firms and multi-national companies. Not only will we realize the great benefits of expanded markets, but the developing nations in particular—now so short on investment capital—will realize the tremendous progress which can result when American dollars are put to work within their borders.

Again, no one can foresee the future with assurance.

TECHNOLOGY

But I would also like to reiterate my confidence in the future of American technology, oriented abroad as well as to our domestic needs.

If we review the trends of American international trade in recent years, however, not all signs are that optimistic.

First, our global commerce in agricultural products and commodities is holding fairly steady, with a slight surplus in our trade balance.

Second, our trade balance in raw materials—minerals and fuels—is in a deficit condition, considerably larger than our surplus in agricultural products.

Third, in most low-technology manufactured items—shoes, textiles, steel and others—we have gone from a healthy trade surplus 10 years ago to a severe trade deficit today which is getting increasingly worse, with no hope for a reversal in that trend.

It is only in the fourth area—in high-technology items—that the United States continues to run a substantial trade surplus with the rest of the world.

Even here, however, we are seeing the signs of new competition which could ultimately threaten our leadership. We have begun to lose a share of the world's electronic markets, and our dominance in aircraft production also has been threatened, particularly by the decision to abandon the SST, a decision which could, some now say, cost us a $12 billion deficit in our balance of payments in the next decade alone.

Nevertheless, it appears that as foreign trade becomes more significant to our own economic considerations, technology will become the most promising investment in the area of international commerce.

PRESIDENT'S PLANS

The final point affecting our economic environment, which I would like to make briefly is this:

We are heading toward improvements in the substance and in the structure of our Federal Government which will benefit the nation in many ways, for many years to come.

In the first two years of his Administration, President Nixon proposed a broad spectrum of reforms to deal with many of the specific problems he inherited.

Now he is turning to the long-range needs of our society—how to re-orient the spending of our revenues, how to redirect the whole concept of our staggering welfare burdens, and how to restore city and state governments to a point where they can really bear a significant responsibility in meeting the needs of our society.

As it is today, most levels of government have become supplicants in Washington; many of them have become almost totally dependent, and some could be described as indigent.

We need to restore, reconstruct, restructure, and strengthen government at all levels—so that our fundamental balance of powers between Federal, state and local governments shall not be lost beyond recall.

This is what the President is seeking to do.

Simultaneously he has proposed a major reorganization of the Federal Government in order to accommodate these improvements in its services, activities and its direction.

His reorganization proposals have attracted little interest outside of Washington. They may seem almost like a mechanical matter.

Yet the fact is that if his reorganization plan is approved by the Congress, the nation will have realized an historic renovation of the Federal system which will make all of the substantive improvements possible, with new efficiency.

What is sought here is really the first significant grasp on the fundamental nature of our government, since its course was altered so radically almost 40 years ago.

If this change of direction is achieved, if better government is brought into tune with the basic, significant long-range needs and issues before the country, there can be no doubt that the economic climate of America will improve, and the investment environment in which we live will hold new promise and opportunity for the people of our land.

REGULAR U.S. MAIL SERVICE REQUESTED

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the residents of St. George Island, Alaska, are often forced to do without mail service for months at a time. Because of its location, its remoteness from other areas, vital communication links are greatly impaired by this poor service. Because other types of communication on the island are so poor, the citizens of St. George must rely on U.S. mail service. The people of St. George are in such desperate need of postal facilities that they are willing to donate their own labor. The least we can do is provide regular shuttle mail service.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 14

Relating to the mail service at St. George Island

Be it resolved by the legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the people of St. George Island are forced to do without mail service for months at a time other than an occasional air drop of first class mail; and

Whereas this lack of any sort of regular mail service creates an intolerable situation for all persons living on St. George Island; and

Whereas the people of St. George Island have, with their own donated labor, constructed an air strip which has the capacity to accommodate twin-engine aircraft; be it

Resolved, By the Alaska State Legislature that the United States Post Office Department is respectfully requested to institute regular shuttle mail service from St. Paul Island to St. George Island or from any other point that may be appropriate.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable Winton E. Blount, Postmaster General of the United States; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U.S. Senators, and to the Honorable Nick Begich, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

INSPIRING REVIEW AND STATEMENT OF HOPE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, we were proud to have in Canton last week for the commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the independence of Greece a distinguished former general of the Greek Army, now a resident of the United States, Hon. Orestis E. Vidalis.

His remarks to those assembled at St. Haralambos Church were an inspiring review of the history of independence in Greece and a statement of hope that freedom will again be restored in that ancient land. I include the speech with my remarks as follows:

THE HELLENIC NATIONAL PERSONALITY

(By Orestis E. Vidalis)

We gathered here today to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the national rebirth of Greece.

Your participation in this historic celebration is a demonstration of your earnest longing to pay tribute to the land of our great ancestors.

I feel honored and moved for the invitation you extended to my family and to myself to join you in this unique opportunity for reflection and meditation.

The 150th anniversary of the nation's rebirth is more than an occasion for festivity. It is a historic landmark. The living generations have a duty to pause at these landmarks and think.

Today we, the Greeks, all over the world, have a double duty to perform. First we are called upon to honor the memory of our forefathers who in 1821 offered the nation the continuity of its historical course. Secondly, we must attempt to rise above temporary short-range considerations and identify the long-lasting values and the major weaknesses which have in these 150 years and can in the future affect the destiny of the nation.

Nations throughout the world are striving to develop an "image" which will identify them in the international environment.

Modern Greece is the fortunate bearer of a great name and of a unique "image" developed long ago.

This "image", this "identity", this "personality" of the Greek Nation is the fundamental bond that connects the past with the present and will assist Greece in carrying the message of Hellenism deep into the future.

This image was created 500 years before Christ. In a little town on the far western border of the then settled and civilized world, a strange new power was at work. Something had awakened in the minds and spirits of the men there. Something was to impress the world so deeply that the slow passage of the long period of time would be powerless to wear away its influence. A new civilization had arisen in Athens, unlike all that had gone before.

Civilizations of the ancent Orient were dominated by the denial of mind and by the subjection of the individual to the powerful group. Thier political regime was the reign of force.

Hellenism laid the foundations of new ideals. It discovered truth and virtue. It glorified the mind. It preached high regard for the dignity and value of man. It conceived freedom as an end. Freedom, in accordance with the Greek definition, is opposed to both blind obedience and anarchy. Hellenism combined these new ideals together and discovered democracy, which was offered to man as a supreme goal. Hellenism rendered man 'free" from despotism as an internal order.

These ideals constitute the substance and the spirit of the Hellenic National "Personality." This is the "image" we inherited from our ancestors.

This "personality" has illuminated generations of Hellenes and led them to unique achievements of the mind.

This "image" illuminated again the course of Greece towards the rebirth of the nation in 1821.

For 400 years of oppression, the captive people had felt with the sensitivity of their Hellenic souls the infinite greatness of their cause. How clearly the poet describes the impact of the Hellenic heritage in the minds and hearts of the enslaved people:

"I hear within my being, deep
Those thrice-great, mighty
Fathers of Hellas
They spoke alone—those dreadful
moments
The immortals"

Under the influence of this heritage three basic elements cooperated, struggled and won in 1821.

First: the spiritual efforts of the Church and of the intellectuals of the Nation, who helped keep alive in the Hellenes the consciousness of their obligation for the restoration of the Nation's freedom and sovereignty.

Second: The contribution of Philhellenes who believed in "Hellas" as a "Spiritual necessity" of mankind. They sacrificed comforts, wealth, and even their lives in order to restore Greece in a free and Hellenic environment.

Third: The determination of the simple people, who dared and won, with no means, no organized hierarchy, without assistance, and with an unfriendly Europe. The Greek Revolution was primarily the result of moral causes which enlarge the nation's intelligence and awaken its feelings. The simple Greek felt he was prepared to climb the rugged paths of virtue and self-sacrifice.

The enslaved Hellenes naively believed that European Monarchs could see more clearly their just cause which was as great as the history of Hellas. They were deeply disappointed when the then great powers pronounced statements like these: "We shall ignore every change that is made by force of arms in the interior state of the Nation", were the words of three Monarchs; the Czar, the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia. "The Greeks could not have found a worse moment to revolt", wrote Richelieu. "It is a deadly poison which endangers the body of society in its most sensitive areas," pronounced Metternich. Even Pope Pius the VII, stopped at Ancona, the Greek "ambassadors" who were dispatched to deliver a message to the assembled monarchs of Europe in Verona. He was fearing for his own safety which he believed was threatened by the Hellenic Movement.

Despite all adversities and despite their frustration from an unfriendly attitude in Europe, during the last days of March 1821, Bishop Germanos, incarnating the will of the captive Nation, raised the flag of the revolution, that bore the Cross and the symbol "Freedom or Death."

"Freedom or Death", the oath of the enslaved, are two symbolic words which opened his soul to a message, sent from the depths of time by his ancestors, that "Greece enslaved, under any form, is not Greece".

This message to the Hellenes, is the contribution of the uprising of 1821 to the reconstitution of the "image" of the Hellenic Nation.

One hundred and fifty years have gone by since those days of March 1821. One hundred and fifty years of privation, adventures, sacrifices, but great achievements. Wars, destruction and famines strengthened instead of weakened the souls of a people dedicated to nationhood, religion and family.

Greece had to fight a series of wars, very costly in blood, in the course of which the country acquired the territorial and population basis indispensable for her transformation into a viable modern state. The tremendous release of popular energy in the half century between 1897 marking the beginning of the last phase of Ottoman decolonization and 1950 closing the period of World War II can only be understood as a modern epic.

Greece was a nation in arms for decades on end.

During these decades the people of modern Greece respectful of their heritage have always supported the side of freedom, in all major world confrontations.

Despite the collective devotion of the people of Greece to the task of transforming the little territory that was Greece in 1821 into a self-sufficient nation, modern Hellenes, through hard individual efforts achieved throughout the world great recognition and respect, as scientists, artists, businessmen, architects, sailors, etc.

During this century we have also witnessed the successful story of the Greek immigrant in this impressive, sometimes frightening but prosperous vastness of the United States.

The first immigrants, practically illiterate, penniless, simple villagers brought to America no institutions except those of religion and family and an instinctive and powerful pride in their glorious heritage.

With these intangible tools and a determination to succeed, they struggled in the face of many obstacles and they presented the country of their adoption with new generations of extremely successful citizens in practically every field of endeavor.

They became loyal citizens of this country, but they also wanted to preserve the Hellenic tradition in the United States. To them, this was more than natural since they observed the closest relationship that exists between Hellenism and Americanism. They thus introduced great institutions like the Greek-Orthodox Church, The A.H.E.P.A., etc.

The Greeks in this country fully demonstrated their ability to constructively contribute in this free and highly competitive society.

Their presence and their efforts in this country constitute a perpetual bond not only between the two cultures but also between the people of the two countries.

The table of achievements of modern Greece is endless. The successful story of modern Greece, has been clouded by one major national weakness from which we have badly suffered during these 150 years of our modern life as a nation. This agonizing weakness, stems from the fact, that some of the modern Greeks have failed to understand the meaning of Hellenism. They have not properly conceived the "personality" of our Nation and have demonstrated a lack of trust in the people of Greece. For a Greek, lack of faith in the people of Greece is contrary to our heritage.

As a result, during the 20th century we have witnessed twenty-two times the intervention of force in the political process. This practice resulted in several dictatorships, a disastrous civil war, and the most damaging drawback of our National life, i.e., the perpetuation of the political irresponsibility of the people of Greece.

Experiments of governing by force without the consent of the people have as a rule led to easy and immediate solutions of some short range problems as is the enforcement of law and order. They have, on the other hand, failed to create conditions of long-term stability and continuity in the political life of the country. Each new regime of rule by force has justified its presence by claiming that the people of Greece are "immature".

These regimes failed to understand that maturity is developed by trial and error and it is always the end result of the exercise of responsible freedom in a democratically organized society. They also failed to realize that the people of Greece have been exposed to all alternatives from the extreme right to the extreme left of the political spectrum. Modern Greeks have, therefore, gained an experience and maturity very few people around the world can claim today.

This is the past—A glorious heritage, a miraculous rebirth, a continuous and epic struggle against all outside elements that have threatened the Nation, but an inadequacy to meet the responses from within.

The past as the present are beyond our control. The future, however, depends on what we do today.

Any Greek has the right to ask himself today this question: "What are the alternative courses of action for Greece in the future?"

Obviously, there are three courses available.

First, the continuation of the practice of the last 150 years with short periods of democratic experience followed by frequent interference of rule by force, with at least one dictatorship in every generation.

Second, a permanent dictatorship which, according to Plato, is the internal order where "Free men as well as masters are a few, but the people speaking generally and the best of them are miserably degraded and enslaved".

Third, the creation and maintenance of conditions that will allow the people of Greece to become once and for all the only sovereign authority responsible for the future of Greece.

The selection among these three alternatives is not a political problem. It is the gravest national issue of our times, and I suggest that no Greek is entitled to remain indifferent or apathetic in front of this issue.

Aware of my responsibilities towards the Nation and particularly towards our younger generation, I will attempt to define my choice of the proper alternative. I will in this manner define what I believe Greece of the future should be in a world environment that is drastically changing every day.

In our era where technology has eliminated geographical distances and has increased the interdependence among National entities, competition for survival is in process. The greater the internal cohesiveness, the stronger and better understood the national objectives and the more concrete and substantial contribution of each Nation in the struggle of man for a better and more humane future, the greater is the chance of its survival.

In this world, where man is still facing Totalitarianism of one kind or another, in a world where the war of ideas endlessly continues, in this decisive transitional period of humanity, Greece should remain Hellas and offer once again the ideals of Hellenism to mankind.

In this world Greece is not a big country today. But it is not small either, since none is small in the world of ideas.

Ancient Athens was a small town when her spirit prevailed.

Rome conquered Greece by force, yet eventually she was conquered by the Greek spirit.

The enslaved Greeks of 1821 were powerless to face the massive Ottoman Empire, yet the Greek spirit led them to resurrect the Nation.

The Greeks were few, and practically alone, when they faced Fascism and Nazism.

And last but not least, the Greek people, exhausted from a long enemy occupation during World War II, were again the first to check communist expansion in Europe in 1949 with the assistance of this country.

Bigness as a measure of material power was never an element in Greek life.

Greatness as an element of spiritual achievement has always been a part of Hellenism.

The problem of modern Greece is to regain its "National personality", maintain it at all costs and improve it. This will occur only if all, Greeks and friends of Greece alike, decide to respect the Greek people as the only responsible sovereign authority for the preservation of the destiny of Greece.

This will occur only if the Greeks, who imitate prototypes foreign to Hellenism, realize that this attitude is a tragic over-simplification in the process of solving very complex problems, connected with our race. And while copying others does not solve our long-range problems, it does serve as an argument of those who maintain that there is no continuity in Hellenism.

If there was a need to learn from lessons of other nations, I suggest we could follow the examples of great soldiers of the Western World in our century who above all respected the people of their countries. These great leaders felt throughout their public lives that they had one obligation to inspire confidence not in themselves but in the people of their nations.

We, the Greeks, certainly cannot survive relying on the achievements of our ancestors while disregarding the "unique Hellenic ideals" created by them.

The Great Challenge of modern Greece is to transform the Hellenic ideals into reality.

Then, Greece will recover its own "personality" and will be able to fulfill the mission of Hellenism.

Then the "image" of this democratic society will reflect itself beyond the Iron Curtain, beyond deserts and seas.

Then Greece will decisively accomplish her mission in the world today. This will be a tremendous contribution in the efforts of our Free World.

It is this Greece of the future that all mankind respects.

It is this Greece that you should feel proud of, as bearers of the same ideals and traditions in another land.

It is this Greece we should all insist on and strive to re-create.

It is this Greece we should entrust to our younger generations.

It is this Greece that the warriors of 1821 had visualized.

And it is this Greece they had in mind, when they wrote on our first flag "Freedom or Death".

HEAVEN AT HAMPSHIRE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in the short time of its existence, Hampshire College has already attracted national attention as a resut of its daring and imaginative approach to the challenges of higher education. Though it has been opened for only 7 months, its wide-ranged student body, dedicated faculty, and innovative courses have drawn eight applicants for every one available admissions slot. It is destined to become, I am sure, one of the most prestigious educational institutions in the country.

I am proud to have played a part in the establishment of Hampshire College, which is located in the First District of Massachusetts. The April 5th issue of Time magazine contains an excellent article on the college's aims and achievements and I am pleased at this time to insert it into the RECORD.

HEAVEN AT HAMPSHIRE

The U.S. has a rich tradition of experimental colleges that start with high ideals but soon drift into dogmatism, anarchy or extinction. Massachusetts' seven-month-old Hampshire College hopes to be different. Created by the academic establishment, which vows to make it work, the school is thriving as a model of well-planned radicalism.

Founded by its well-known neighbors (Amherst, Smith, Mount Holyoke, the University of Massachusetts), Hampshire is their testing ground and showcase for lively ideas. To revamp admission standards, the college does not require high school diplomas. Of this year's first 268 students, 42 had top College Board scores of between 700 and 800, but another 28 got in with low scores of 300 to 500. Hampshire invites applicants to submit "anything that can tell us something about yourself." Last year it received hundreds of oddities ranging from homemade rugs to loaves of bread. The winners were chosen, says Admissions Director Van Halsey, partly for such personal qualities as "a tolerance for ambiguity, a lot of self-confidence, and some self-direction."

SELF-TEACHING

Once accepted, Hampshire students can take a year off before entering college. But the campus, atop a high meadow overlooking the Connecticut River valley, is hard to stay away from. The one dorm constructed so far is coed and co-genus: pets are permitted. Hiking trips substitute for intercollegiate athletics. The college inaugural convocation included a kite-flying festival—and a recent brochure spoofs the lack of campus history by putting photographs of the event in Victorian-style frames. Students are not labeled freshmen, sophomores, juniors or senior. Instead, they can spend as long as five years taking courses in three "divisions"—the first stressing techniques of advanced learning, the second concentrating on one or more disciplines, the third consisting of an independent study project. The only requirements are one term in "human development," ranging from sexual roles to the *I Ching*, plus another in "language and communication," a rubric for topics from grammar to the possibilities of "extraterrestrial intelligence."

Seeking new ways to goad restless students, Hampshire is brimful of "relevant" interdisciplinary studies. One environmental course, for example, pulls together the geography of Mount Washington, the works of Thoreau, the migration of the Mormons, and computerized mathematical simulations of ecological systems. Hampshire has also been a pioneer in letting students work on their own for a month in midwinter. This year one girl simulated blindness for two weeks in a self-designed psychology experiment; Holly Lyman, daughter of Stanford University President Richard Lyman, taught herself to weave.

Such freedom is alloyed with year-end examinations that are graded "distinction," "pass" or "fail." Those who flunk can design their own remedial program and try again, but Hampshire intends to expel students who fail to make academic progress. Says Sociology Professor Robert von der Lippe: "By putting a lot of responsibility on students to learn by themselves, we admittedly raise their anxiety, but that's the idea. If you can learn to be your own teacher, then when college ends the process of education can continue." To forestall ossification among the young faculty (average age: 32), professors have no tenure—only three- to five-year contracts.

DUTY AND REVERENCE

Hampshire is run by President Franklin Patterson, 54, a soft-spoken, firm-willed former director of Tufts University's Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs. Appointed four years before the first students arrived, Patterson had ample time to cull 50 faculty members from nearly 1,000 applicants and decide how to spend a $6,000,000 start-up gift from Harold F. Johnson, a publicity-shy New York lawyer and Amherst alumnus.

Patterson expects Hampshire's "hospitality to contemporary life" to be tempered by two "ageless virtues: duty and reverence." The college catalogue warns that academic life must be "hierarchical." Students are not allowed to abolish Hampshire's year-end exams, have no power over faculty appointments, do not sit on the board of trustees. A major continuing problem is money. Hampshire is still scrambling for $22.5 million to teach and house the new classes that will enter each year until enrollment reaches 1,500. With the cost of a year at Hampshire due to hit $4,300 next fall, students have already accused Patterson of running a rich man's college.

Elite or not, Hampshire seems to be turning its students on. "Last night I got high just writing a proposal for independent study in biology," says Jeff Maguire, a student from Old Greenwich, Conn. With eight applicants for every place, Hampshire has already become one of the hardest colleges in the U.S. to get into.

LIEUTENANT CALLEY

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday in the Sunday Times in the city of Scranton, a seasoned reporter addressed an open letter to me concerning the case of Lieutenant Calley and the war in Vietnam. This is a man whose writings are well respected by the people of our community and by his own colleagues in the newspaper profession. His column is, indeed, most moving.

I insert that letter here in the RECORD so that each of my colleagues may have an opportunity to read Mr. Joseph X. Flannery's thoughts. I assure you the time in doing so will be well spent.

The letter follows:

Congressman JOSEPH M. McDADE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: I'm taking the liberty of writing to you and publishing the letter at the same time because I'm dealing with an issue of great importance—the fate of Lt. William Calley, Jr.

I have often dealt with you as a newsman talking to a public official, but now I'm writing to you as one of your constituents in the 10th Congressional District. And my purpose is to implore you to get involved in the Calley case.

Now I realize that it's easy for people to spout off about a "lousy verdict" after they ignored most of the evidence presented during a trial of more than four months. I for one believe that the trial was a sincere attempt to get at the truth of what actually happened at My Lai, South Vietnam, on March 16, 1968.

But what upsets me is the concentration on the "what" instead of the "why" of My Lai.

Let me make myself clear at the outset: I'm unhappy with the Calley verdict not because I think it is not supported by the facts in the case but rather because it is grossly unfair to try to solve our national conscience by pinning all of our sins on one scapegoat. It is explained in the Bible how a single goat was once singled out for such a ceremony and was made to carry off the sins of an entire tribe into the barren wilderness—and eventually to his death.

So we convict a 27-year-old officer for slaying 22 Vietnamese civilians. Yet The New York Times reported just last Sunday that 150,000 South Vietnamese civilians have been killed by American troops and bombs or by Vietnamese troops using American weapons during the past six years.

This horrible figure, coupled with the fact that all charges against Maj. Gen. Samuel W. Koster, the divisional commander of troops at My Lai, have been dropped makes Calley look an awful lot like the Biblical goat being banished to the wilderness of an Army stockade for the balance of his life.

I can't for a moment condone what was done at My Lai. Some pictures I have seen of bodies in ditches, dead tots along the roadways, terrified mothers clutching their children and other such things have tied knots in my stomach. I think of my family and your family living in such comfortable surroundings while nameless families in other parts of the world are slain so wantonly.

But let's not conclude that in our years of warfare in Vietnam the only bad thing we did occurred at My Lai and the only bad soldiers were Calley and a few of his associates. I read somewhere recently that an average of 68 civilians a day are being killed by friendly forces—mainly through bombings and shellings of areas suspected of harboring the enemy in South Vietnam.

The lofty reason we have for fighting the war—saving a part of the world from communism—sounds nice here at home because most of the horrors of war are filtered out when they are converted from the actual event to words describing the event. But what worse fate could have come to the residents of My Lai if they had fallen totally under communism? Could they possibly have suffered less?

What we must do is to quicken the pace of our departure from South Vietnam. If the people of that country have the will to fight communism, let them do it. If they don't, then we are in a war that could never be won in any case. In either case, let's stop killing them in the name of a noble cause that may mean more to us than it does to them.

As a congressman, I implore you to introduce or back any resolution in the House that would ask President Nixon to set aside the Calley conviction. I ask this while knowing that he is probably technically guilty of every offense. But every one of us share a tiny bit of his guilt and he cannot carry off that many sins into the wilderness.

And finally I ask you, as my congressman, to do everything in your power to speed up our departure from Vietnam. America is sick of the whole business.

Regards,

JOSEPH X. FLANNERY.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the guest editorial in the Davenport Times-Democrat on Saturday, April 3, points to one of the problems facing our elder citizens.

Mrs. Herbert Neumann of Davenport works with our senior citizens. She knows their concerns. Housing is one that ranks high on the list. This is why it is my own belief that funds for low rent housing for the elderly should be released soon.

Mrs. Neumann's thoughts are worth sharing with all House Members.

The article follows:

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

(By Mrs. Herbert O. Neumann)

A letter to me from a group of aged citizens has prompted this plea to the people of our community: Help to provide good low-cost housing for our elderly citizens now.

The service of delivering hot meals to older folk throughout this community has opened doors for some of us into some nice homes—but also to many dreary quarters. It has opened our eyes to the crying needs of those forced to live in the substandard housing.

The following excerpts are from the letter addressed to me as a result of a feature article in the Times-Democrat about our Meals on Wheels Program:

"We, several of the Golden Age Bracket, are very interested in the article about Meals on Wheels, mainly the statement about the need for better housing for the elderly.

"Oh, how we wish someone would really help us. We are writing to you as you have had first-hand sight of the places available for Social Security people . . .

"Many of us have no relatives and want to manage on our own and not depend on others. Some said there was no parking area, but most folks on social security can't afford cars.

"We are not finding fault with Social Security. That is a Godsend to us. Another would be homes which would not take most of the check for rent.

"It seems to us that a large building would not only help us but our city. One roof could protect many, be a home with comfort and companionship and yet each have their own apartment, instead of dives they can afford to rent.

"Davenport is our home town and we want to live in the downtown area. We will be out in nursing homes soon enough.

"A Golden Age Group."

Most concerned citizens are aware that there is a great need for low-cost housing for these people. They realize our community has dragged its feet in doing something about this situation. Many people of Davenport are not aware of the fact that about 6,000 older persons live in and near the downtown area and pay high rent for housing in this area.

During the winter sub-zero weather one meal recipient wore his overcoat and boots because his apartment was so cold; another had the burners lit on his gas stove, which could be very hazardous. One woman with poor health is living at the top of two flights of narrow, dark, steep stairs. One man refused a small portable TV, saying it would be stolen as soon as he left his apartment. Do we really want our older people to live like this?

Some of these people have tried to bring their need before the public, especially those involved in the "housing business," and have been "tuned out." Many oldsters receiving Social Security, Old Age Assistance or welfare fear it will be taken from them if they complain or ask for better places to live in. Others are just too old, tired or discouraged to care.

Some neighborhood groups are trying hard to improve their own situations. A reorganized Committee on Housing and Urban Renewal is again reorganizing to see what can be done to obtain financial assistance in obtaining this type of housing.

It will not solve the problem to question

why our city officials did not act much sooner, or why developers and realtors had not felt concerned enough to meet these needs. It's time for citizens who care enough to get involved, to urge those we have elected to provide housing for the aged.

For years I have traveled about promoting the work of the women's organization of my church, urging them to serve God by serving others. Becoming the volunteer chairman of the meal service program two years ago was the first time I directly served others in my community. It has been a joyful experience, but not one to quiet one's conscience. The need of the aged for good nutrition, transportation, housing, new interests and love are great. They are precious in God's sight. Let's make their latter years their best, not full of worry about what tomorrow might bring.

PORTSMOUTH—A PARTNER IN OUR NAVAL SHIPYARD COMPLEX

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, since November 1964, the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has been operating under a cloud imposed by a directive issued by the then Secretary of Defense McNamara ordering the yard closed by 1974. Personnel policies have been keyed to planned phaseout with modernization nonexistent and ordinary maintenance of plant equipment drastically curtailed. Thus, for 7 years the yard has been unable to operate at optimum effectiveness.

Portsmouth is a vital link in our national defense posture in that it is inextricably bound to the maintenance of our nuclear submarine fleet. In recognition of this fact, and the need for retention of Portsmouth's expertise now and in the future, the President on March 24 advised that "the McNamara order closing the yard in 1974 will be rescinded."

The salutory effects of this welcome announcement are taking hold very rapidly as evidenced by the following excerpt from the Portsmouth Periscope, which offers highlights from a recent visit to the shipyard by Rear Admiral Sonenshein, commander of the Naval Ships Systems Command.

The article follows:

SHIPYARD WITH A FUTURE: PORTSMOUTH AGAIN FULLY ACCREDITED MEMBER OF NAVAL SHIPYARD COMPLEX

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is once again a full fledged member of the Naval Shipyard family. President Richard M. Nixon Wednesday, March 24, rescinded the order to close Portsmouth by the end of Fiscal Year 1974. The Defense Department announced the planned closure of Portsmouth November 19, 1964, with operations to be gradually reduced and work terminated over the 10 year period.

Rear Admiral Nathan Sonenshein, Commander, Naval Ship Systems Command, visited Portsmouth Monday, March 29, and expressed his pleasure on President Nixon's decision to cancel the closure order when he addressed management officials and officials of exclusively recognized unions in the Auditorium.

He reviewed this Shipyard's efforts over the past seven years to improve performance, citing the progress Portsmouth has achieved in certain areas and urged everyone to continue to strive to make PNS competitive with other Naval and private yards.

"I have every confidence that you can become a competitive yard. And I want to assure you that you'll have my support and the support of all the people in my Headquarters in moving in that direction," Admiral Sonenshein added.

MODERNIZATION PROGRAM FOR PORTSMOUTH

Admiral Sonenshein stated that Portsmouth will be included in the Shipyard Modernization Program. "We plan to engage an engineering firm to assist in developing a shipyard modernization program comparable to that developed for all the other shipyards. We expect to have this underway in very short order. It is our hope to fold Portsmouth into the Shipyard Modernization Program in a timely manner so Portsmouth can keep pace with the other yards." He stressed, however, that realization of these plans would depend upon the availability of funds and Congressional approval of such projects.

PORTSMOUTH ACCOMPLISHMENTS SINCE 1964

He pointed out that this Shipyard, since 1964, has improved its ability to estimate the actual cost of work. "You have made a major improvement in estimating the actual time to accomplish overhauls and conversions. You are now striking very close, but still the need for improvement is very clear.

"The Design Division, I'm happy to see, has made a major reduction in the mandays involved in the SSBN643 as compared to the 609, the 619 and the 635. In fact, these reductions are dramatic and reflect true cost savings which again puts this Shipyard in the lead for the Cost Reduction Program.

"The Supply Department has improved the availability of material from 70 per cent at the start of the overhaul in 1966 to 95 per cent this year. The sil brazed pipe joint deficiencies rejection rate dropped from 10 per cent in 1964 to less than 2 per cent in 1970. That's great—tremendous—and leads the parade, as a matter of fact, compared to other yards. The UT inspection surveillance audit deficiency rate dropped from 8 per cent in 1965 to almost zero in 1970. Again, a sign that things can be done when people want to, when they apply themselves, when they are well motivated and well led. And I could go on with others here—in hull structure welding, the percentage of rejection dropped down to less than 2 from a high of 9½.

"If these are the kinds of things this Shipyard can do, I am much encouraged—much encouraged for the future. I would expect that with the removal of the threat of closure, that you should—your people—the people you lead—should have higher morale and should have higher productivity—and I think you can do it. Of course this won't just happen automatically—by my talking and your talking. Every man and woman in this Shipyard will have to pull together, under your leadership, to achieve that.

"Given all these factors—the elimination of the closure order, the ability to reinstitute the MILCON planning for the future, the ability to assign a workload here on the basis of a continuing capability—I have every confidence that you can become a competitive shipyard. And I want to assure you that you'll have my support and the support of all the people in my Headquarters in moving in that direction. God-speed to you all," Admiral Sonenshein concluded.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR CITIES AND STATES

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, on March 4 I went before the House to comment on the urgent fiscal crisis facing our State and local governments and to offer an interim proposal for meeting that crisis at the same time Congress and the administration work out a long-term approach.

I was extremely gratified at the response. Several of my colleagues participated in a colloquy to further develop the proposal, strong editorial support came from the news media, and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means was kind enough to offer the services of his staff in drafting the actual legislation.

The proposal I made was that we take the administration's general revenue-sharing formula, double the proposed amount to provide $10 billion in each of the next 2 fiscal years, put the program on an interest-free loan basis, and give the cities and States 50 years to repay the principal.

As I view it, this proposal is attractive from several points of view. First, it meets in a very affirmative way the immediate and serious needs of our cities and States on an affordable basis. Second, it involves relatively little in the way of a Federal investment, since the government would be absorbing only the interest charges. And finally, it gives Congress and the administration the opportunity to work out a long-term solution to the fiscal problems of State and local governments on the basis of a 2-year experience under this program. We would be able to see how a revenue-sharing-type program would work and how the States and cities would set their spending priorities.

The bill I am introducing today is based on the general revenue-sharing formula but it has several innovations. I have strengthened the civil rights compliance provision by giving primary responsibility to the Department of Justice instead of to the Treasury. And the bill includes provision for a periodic audit of the program's operations by the Comptroller General of the United States.

I am pleased that 23 of my colleagues have cosponsored this legislation, including 14 Members of the New York delegation. The cosponsors are Congressman ROBERT NIX of Pennsylvania, Congressman DON EDWARDS of California, Congressman ROBERT DRINAN of Massachusetts, Congressman JOSHUA EILBERG of Pennsylvania, Congresswoman ELLA GRASSO of Connecticut, Congressman MICHAEL HARRINGTON of Massachusetts, Congressman RONALD DELLUMS of California, Congressman HENRY HELSTOSKI of New Jersey, and Congressman JAMES ABOUREZK of South Dakota.

The New York cosponsors are Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, the head of our delegation and dean of the House, Congressman HUGH CAREY, Congressman SEYMOUR HALPERN, Congressman JOSEPH ADDABBO, Congressman BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL, Congressman THADEUS DULSKI, Congressman BERTRAM PODELL, Congressman OGDEN REID, Congressman JONATHAN BINGHAM, Congresswoman SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, Congresswoman BELLA ABZUG, Congressman WILLIAM F. RYAN, Congressman CHARLES RANGEL, and Congressman JAMES SCHEUER.

I present for inclusion in the RECORD

the text of the Intergovernmental Emergency Advance Act of 1971:

H.R. 7367—A bill to amend the Second Liberty Bond Act to authorize the United States to borrow $20,000,000,000 to make intergovernmental advances during the next two fiscal years to States and local governments, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 101. This Act may be cited as the "Intergovernmental Emergency Advance Act of 1971".

AUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL BORROWING

SEC. 201. The Second Liberty Bond Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"FEDERAL BORROWING FOR INTERGOVERNMENTAL ADVANCES TO STATES AND LOCALITIES

"SEC. 28. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to issue from time to time obligations of the United States the proceeds of which shall be available only for the purpose of making or continuing intergovernmental advances as provided in the Intergovernmental Advance Act of 1971. The various issues and series of the obligations issued under this section shall be in such forms, shall be offered in such amounts, and shall bear such rate or rates of interest, as the Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time prescribe.

"(b) The aggregate face amount of obligations outstanding under this section at any time shall not exceed $20,000,000,000, of which not to exceed $10,000,000,000 may be issued before July 1, 1972. The obligations issued under this section shall be subject to the limitations imposed by section 21 of this Act."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 301. (a) For the purposes of this Act—

(1) except where otherwise indicated, the term "fiscal year" means the fiscal year of the Government of the United States;

(2) the term "general revenue" means general revenue from own sources, as defined and used by the Bureau of the Census, provided that in the case of the District of Columbia it shall include the Federal payment authorized under section 2501(a), title 47 of the District of Columbia Code (81 Stat. 339);

(3) the term "Governor" means the chief executive officer of each State or his delegate;

(4) the term "local government" means a municipality, county, or township (but does not include independent school districts or special districts) as such terms are defined and used by the Bureau of the Census;

(5) the term "personal income" means personal income as defined and used by the Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce;

(6) the term "population" means total resident population as defined and used by the Bureau of the Census;

(7) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate;

(8) the term "Attorney General" means the Attorney General of the United States or his delegate;

(9) the term "State" means the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia; such term includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the possessions of the United States;

(10) the term "Bureau of the Census" means the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce;

(11) the term "units of government" means all units of local government (including independent school districts and special districts) as such terms are defined and used by the Bureau of the Census;

(12) the term "major municipality" means a municipality with a population of 2,500 or more as reported by the Bureau of the Census;

(13) the term "major township" means any township—

(A) with a population of 2,500 or more as reported by the Bureau of the Census, and

(B) the employment ratio for which is not less than one-half of the average employment ratio of all major municipalities in such State; and

(14) the term "employment ratio" means a fraction the numerator of which is the total number of employees of any major municipality or major township as reported by the Bureau of the Census and the denominator of which is the population of such governmental unit.

(b) Where appropriate, the definitions in subsection (a) shall be based on the latest published reports of the Department of Commerce, and on the internal revenue laws in effect, on the date of the enactment of this Act. The data used in applying these definitions shall be the latest published data referable to the same point or period of time. The Secretary may, by regulation, change or otherwise modify the definitions in subsection (a) in order to reflect any change or modification thereof made subsequent to such date by the Department of Commerce or by a revision of the internal revenue laws.

ADVANCES TO THE STATES

SEC. 401. (a) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, each State (other than a State referred to in subsection (c)(2)) is entitled to an advance as determined by the Secretary equal to—

(1)(A) $10,000,000,000 plus (in the case of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973) any amount not distributed during the previous fiscal year pursuant to subsection (b), less

(B) an amount equal to 10 percent of the sum of the amounts described in subparagraph (A), and

(2) multiplied by the factor for such State.

(b) Except as provided in subsection (f), each State which has filed an alternative formula under section 501(c) shall receive an amount equal to the amount described in subsection (a)(1)(B) multiplied by the factor for such State.

(c)(1) The factor for each State (other than a State referred to in paragraph (2)) shall be obtained by—

(A) multiplying such State's population by its revenue effort, and

(B) dividing the product obtained in subparagraph (A) by the sum of such products for all such States.

(2) For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and each possession of the United States is entitled to an advance which bears the same ratio to $10,000,000,000 as the population of such Commonwealth or possession, as the case may be, bears to the population of all the States. Subsection (b) shall not apply to any State referred to in the preceding sentence.

(d) For purposes of subsection (c)(1), the revenue effort of each State for any fiscal year shall be obtained by dividing—

(1) the total general revenue derived by such State and all of its units of governments by

(2) the total personal income for such State.

(e) The amount determined under subsection (a) or (c)(2) of this section shall be paid by the Secretary to each State at such time as the Secretary may determine during any fiscal year, but not less often than once each calendar quarter. A pro rata portion of the amount described in subsection (b) shall be paid by the Secretary for each calendar quarter to which an alternative formula applies, at such times as the Secretary may determine during any fiscal year but not less often than once each such quarter.

(f) The District of Columbia shall receive its share of the amount described in subsection (b) notwithstanding the requirements of section 501(c)'

(g) All computations and determinations by the Secretary under section 301 and this section shall be final and conclusive.

(h) Any advance under this Act shall be repaid (without interest) ratably over such period, not in excess of 50 years, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the governmental unit to which the advance is made. Amounts so repaid shall be deposited in the general fund of the United States.

(i) No State shall be entitled to an advance under this Act for any fiscal year if the total general revenue derived during such year by such State and all of its units of government from taxation does not equal or exceed the total general revenue derived by such State and all of its units of government from taxation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

PAYMENTS BY STATES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

SEC. 501. (a) The local governments of each State shall be entitled to receive an amount equal to the advance to such State pursuant to section 401(a) or (c)(2) multiplied by a fraction the numerator of which is the sum of the general revenues of all units of government of such State and the denominator of which is the sum of the general revenues of such State and all of its units of government. Such amounts shall be computed by the State on the basis of the latest data available from the Department of Commerce at the beginning of the fiscal year.

(b) Within thirty days after receipt of an advance pursuant to section 401(a) or (c)(2), each State shall advance to each of its local governments an amount, computed on the basis of the statistical data used in subsection (a) of this section, equal to—

(1) the amount determined under subsection (a) of this section, multiplied by

(2) the ratio of each such local government's general revenue to the total general revenue of all local governments in such State.

(c) To encourage States to take the initiative in strengthening the fiscal position of their local governments and to maximize flexibility in the use of the advances authorized by this Act for meeting the particular needs of differing State and local fiscal systems, the Secretary shall accept an alternative formula for the allocation of funds as required by subsection (a) of this section (and any modification or termination of such formula) if requested by the State, provided such formula (or modification or termination of such formula) is—

(1) enacted by the State in the same manner as authorized in such State's constitution for the enactment of State laws, and

(2) approved by a formal resolution by more than one-half of the governing bodies of each of the following classes of government in such State:

(A) major municipalities,

(B) counties, and

(C) major townships.

In each such class of government, approval must be by governing bodies representing a majority of the population in such class. A statement of such formula indicating approval thereof in accordance with this subsection (including a certification by the Bureau of the Census which enumerates major municipalities, counties, and major townships included in the classes referred to above) shall be filed by the Governor with the Secretary not later than ninety days pre-

ceding the first calendar quarter to which such formula would be applicable. The provisions of such formula shall govern the use of funds allocated by this Act to local governments and shall apply for the period stated therein.

(d) Except when a formula has been adopted pursuant to subsection (c), a State's aggregate payments to all of its local governments for such State's fiscal year (from all sources other than amounts received under this Act) shall be an amount which represents not less than the average proportion of such State's general revenues received by its local governments for the three fiscal years of such State next preceding the date of enactment of this Act, unless such State demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary that there has been a transfer from local governments to the State of financial responsibility for the direct support of facilities or services previously the responsibility of local governments.

(e) It is the intent of the Congress in enacting this Act—

(1) to make the credit of the United States available to the States and to the local governments for an emergency period in the manner and to the extent provided in this Act,

(2) that the program provided by this Act is to be construed as borrowing by the United States coupled with intergovernmental advances to States and local governments, and is not to be construed as general purpose borrowings by the States and local governments from the general public or from private sources of the kind generally provided for in limitations on the authority of States and local governments to incur indebtedness; and

(3) that the Secretary and each State will cooperate in order that, to the maximum extent feasible, advances pursuant to this Act to the local governments of such State will not come within limitations on the authority of such local governments to incur indebtedness.

QUALIFICATIONS

SEC. 601. Participation by a State in the program established by this Act shall constitute a waiver by the State of its immunity from suit by its local governments pursuant to this Act. The Governor shall, on behalf of the State and any local government which may receive any advances pursuant to this Act, give to the Secretary such assurances as he may require that such State and its local governments will—

(1) use such advances for its governmental purposes;

(2) use such fiscal and accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure (A) proper accounting for advances received by such State and its local governments, and (B) proper disbursement of amounts to which the local governments are entitled;

(3) provide to the Secretary or his representatives, on reasonable notice, access to, and the right to examine, any books, documents, papers, or records as he may reasonably require for the purposes of reviewing compliance with this Act; and

(4) make such reports to the Secretary as he may reasonably require, including any computations made pursuant to section 501.

POWERS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 701. (a) The Secretary is authorized to prescribe reasonable rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this Act and to request from any Federal agency statistical data and reports and such other information which he may deem necessary to carry out his functions under this Act, and each Federal agency is authorized to furnish such statistical data and reports and other information to the Secretary to the extent permitted by law.

(b) If the Secretary determines that a State has failed to comply substantially with any provision of this Act, other than section 1101, or any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto—

(1) he may refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted; or

(2) after giving reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the Governor of such State, he shall notify the Governor that if such State fails to take corrective action within sixty days from the date of such notification, further advances to such State in excess of the amounts to which the local governments of such State are entitled under section 501 shall be withheld for the remainder of the fiscal year and for any subsequent fiscal year until such time as the Secretary is satisfied that appropriate corrective action has been taken and that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is satisfied, the Secretary shall make no further payments of such amounts. In the case of the failure of the State to comply, for a period in excess of six months after the expiration of the sixty-day notice, the Secretary shall forthwith cancel any advances withheld pursuant to this paragraph for the current and for any subsequent fiscal year and shall reapportion and pay such canceled advances to all other States then entitled to receive advances under section 401 in proportion to the original installments paid to such States for the fiscal year to which such canceled advances pertain. Such advances to all other States shall be considered advances made pursuant to section 401.

(c) If an advance to a State is withheld or canceled pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall continue to advance to such State the amount to which the local governments of such State are entitled, as determined pursuant to section 501, and such State shall continue to distribute such amounts among its local governments pursuant to section 501.

(d) When a matter is referred to the Attorney General pursuant to subsection (b)(1), the Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

(e) The Governor shall be responsible to the Secretary for determining that local governments within his State have complied with the provisions of this Act, other than section 1101, and the rules and regulations issued pursuant thereto. If, after giving reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the chief executive officer of a local government of such State, the Governor determines that such local government has failed to comply substantially with any provision of this Act, other than section 1101, or any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto, the Governor shall forthwith notify such local government that if it fails to take corrective action within sixty days from the date of such notification, further advances to it under this Act will be withheld for the remainder of the fiscal year and for any subsequent fiscal year until such time as he is satisfied that appropriate corrective action has been taken and that there will no longer be any failure to comply. The Governor shall forthwith notify the Secretary of his action.

(f) In the event of a failure by such local government to comply for a period in excess of six months after the expiration of a sixty-day notice issued by the Governor pursuant to a determination under subsection (e), the Governor shall forthwith cancel any advances withheld for the current and for any subsequent fiscal year and shall reapportion and pay such canceled advances to all other local governments of such State then entitled to receive advances pursuant to section 501, in proportion to the original advances made to such local governments for the fiscal year to which the canceled advances pertain.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 801. (a) Any State or local government which receives a sixty-day notice under section 701 may, within sixty days after receiving such notice, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State or local government is located, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a petition for review of the Secretary's action. A copy of the petition shall forthwith be transmitted to the Secretary; a copy shall also forthwith be transmitted to the Attorney General, who shall represent the Secretary in any litigation.

(b) The Secretary shall file in the court the record of the proceeding on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. No objection to the action of the Secretary shall be considered by the court unless such objection has been urged before the Secretary.

(c) The Court shall have jurisdiction to affirm or modify the action of the Secretary or to set it aside in whole or in part. The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. However, if any finding is not supported by substantial evidence, the court may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous actions. He shall certify to the court the record of any further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(d) The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification, as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

(e) In the event that judicial proceedings are instituted pursuant to this section, the Secretary shall after the expiration of the six-month period provided in section 701(b) or 701(f), or the point in time when any judicial decision becomes final and the time for appeal or rehearing has expired, whichever period is later, cancel, reapportion and pay any advances withheld pursuant to section 701 for the current and for any subsequent fiscal year.

(f) For purposes of this section, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Governor of a State, whichever is appropriate.

REPORTS

SEC. 901. (a) The Comptroller General of the United States shall make interim reports on the operation of this Act on or before January 1, 1972, July 1, 1972, January 1, 1973, and July 1, 1973. Each such report shall include (but shall not be limited to) a report with respect to—

(1) the way in which the pass-through the State to the local governments under section 501 is functioning in each State, and

(2) the division each governmental unit receiving advances under this Act is making of such advances between amounts expended or proposed to be expended for capital purposes and amounts expended or proposed to be expended for operating purposes.

(b) The Secretary shall report to the President of the United States and to the Congress as soon as practicable after the end of each fiscal year on the operation of this Act during such fiscal year.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 1001. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the administrative expenses required to carry out the functions of the Government of the United States under this Act.

NONDISCRIMINATION PROVISION

SEC. 1101. (a) No person in the United States shall on the ground of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity funded in whole or in part with advances under this Act.

(b) (1) Whenever the Secretary determines that any State has failed to comply with subsection (a) or an applicable regulation, he shall attempt to secure compliance by voluntary means. If the Secretary determines that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, he shall have the authority to (A) refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted; (B) exercise the powers and functions provided by title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d); or (C) take such other action as may be provided by law.

(2) Whenever the Secretary determines that a local government has failed to comply with subsection (a) or an applicable regulation, he shall notify the Governor of the State in which the local government is located of the noncompliance and shall request the Governor to secure compliance. If within a reasonable period of time the State fails or refuses to secure compliance, the Secretary shall have the authority to (A) refer the matter to the Attorney General with a recommendation that an appropriate civil action be instituted; (B) exercise the powers and functions provided by title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d); or (C) take such other action as may be provided by law.

(c) Whenever any individual or group (public or private) files a petition with the Attorney General charging that any State or local government is engaged in a pattern or practice in violation of the provisions of this section, the Attorney General shall afford such individual or group an opportunity to be heard.

(d) When a matter is referred to the Attorney General pursuant to subsection (b), or whenever he has reason to believe that a State or local government is engaged in a pattern or practice in violation of the provisions of this section, the Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court for such relief as may be appropriate, including injunctive relief.

CALLEY CASE

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the most recent development in the Lt. William Calley case is the disclosure of a letter written by Army Capt. Aubrey M. Daniel, who served as prosecutor in the trial, to President Nixon. Although he has said to members of the news media that he did not want publicity from the letter, Captain Daniel sent a copy to Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN and others. The letter was made public immediately, as I am sure Captain Daniel knew it would be.

I respectfully request that the letter I wrote to Captain Daniel today be part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Unlike the Captain's avowed intentions, my purpose in having this letter inserted in the RECORD is so that it may receive as wide public attention as possible.

I include the letter as follows:

APRIL 7, 1971.

Capt. AUBREY M. DANIEL,
Judge Advocate General Corps,
Fort Benning, Ga.

DEAR CAPTAIN DANIEL: Shame on you! Why were you not honest enough to admit that you sent copies of your letter to President Nixon to Senators such as George McGovern in order to gain publicity for yourself and your letter.

When you sent the copies of the letter you knew what would be the inevitable result—Publicity—For you to now state that you did not want any publicity about the letter indicates that at least on this point, you are not telling the truth.

Further, for you to state that the President did damage to the military system of justice by declaring, in response to public concern, that he, as Commander-in-Chief, would make the final decision in the Calley matter—this is absurd! This is the President's duty under the law and it is improper for you to criticize the President for his stating that he was not going to shirk his responsibility as the final appellate authority. The public was entitled to a statement from the President, and, by his speaking out, he affirmed that the system of justice which makes the President the final authority will continue to function.

I can only conclude the following from the limited knowledge I have of your actions:

1. You are so emotionally involved in the Calley matter that you cannot view it except in the narrow perspective of the prosecutor.
2. That you acted irrationally in writing the letter and sending copies to the President's political enemies.
3. By sending to the President's political enemy, Senator George McGovern, copies of the letter you wrote President Nixon, you knew that he would make the matter public at once.
4. That you are not truthful when you state, as reported by the press, that you did not want publicity on this matter.
5. That you do not believe in our system of law which makes the President the final appellate authority and grants him power as Commander-in-Chief to place a member of the military under house arrest in lieu of the stockade.
6. That you have done a disservice to our orderly system of law by condemning in a public manner the President for his having assured the public he will carry out the duties of his office.

It is too bad for our country that you acted so immaturely.

Yours very truly,

FLETCHER THOMPSON,
Member of Congress.

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS JOIN COURT SUITS TO CONTINUE CROSS-FLORIDA BARGE CANAL

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, to correct an unconstitutional administration decision to halt construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, many national organizations are going to court to overturn the stop order.

The Canal Authority of the State of Florida has reported that a national campaign is being developed not only through the courts but directed to the general public to point out the consequences of closing down the one-third completed Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

Already, the executive director of the Department of Natural Resources for the State of Florida, sponsor of the canal, has said:

There are more problems involved if the canal is dead than if it were going to continue.

The actual costs to stop the project, for which $60 million has already been appropriated, would be between $15 and $20 million. Instead of improving the ecology of Florida, an abandoned canal area would become in part a wasteland and in part an area of 50-foot lots with open sewers: and in neither case any wildlife or ecological protection.

The country needs the Cross-Florida Barge Canal for national defense reasons, for its economic benefits and the environmental approvements it will bring to Florida. The White House should make these suits unnecessary by rescinding its order; and, if it wishes, submitting repealing legislation for open debate and appropriate action.

I enclose in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article from the March 27, 1971, Florida Times-Union of Jacksonville, Fla., which reports on the national interest in continuing the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

SUIT AGAINST CANAL CUTOFF GAINS SUPPORT

Support for a lawsuit the Canal Authority of Florida has filed against the federal government for halting work on the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is coming from many directions, Authority Chairman L. C. Ringhaven says.

Ringhaver said the groups which have indicated they are actually joining the suit are headed by the nation's most powerful water resources organization, the Water Resources Congress.

Others are the Arkansas Basin Development Association, Ohio Valley Improvement Association Inc., Texas Water Conservation Association, Gulf Intracoastal Waterways Association, Florida Waterways Association, Canal Counties Association, Jacksonville Port Authority, Marion County Chamber of Commerce and Jacksonville Chamber of Commerce.

Ringhaver said other groups and individuals are fighting for the project in other ways. Most prominent among these, he said, is the Propeller Club of the United States which is undertaking a nationwide effort to "focus attention on the project and the action taken by the President."

Ringhaver said some national interests fear their own projects could be next if "the strength of the forces for environmental progress does not counteract the power of those who oppose all change and development."

The meeting of the Cabinet in Tallahassee next Tuesday could end the hope of six Florida counties and the state of ever recovering from the federal government any of the $12 million they have spent on the canal, Ringhaver said.

Ringhaver said a vote by the Cabinet to approve the permanent halt of the canal would be taken as a breach of contract by the State of Florida.

He said this would tend to eliminate the opportunity for Florida or the counties to succeed with any future claim against the federal government for abandoning work in various unfinished stages.

"The six counties already have paid almost $100 percent of their part of the agreement with the federal government and are due some sort of return on their investment," he said.

He said a remedy for the counties can be achieved through the courts if the state does not make the mistake of breaching the contract itself.

The biggest loser, according to Ringhaver, would be Duval County, which has paid $6.5 million in the agreement and has received "not one iota in return."

CHERRY BLOSSOM FESTIVAL

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Cherry Blossom Festival is consistently a source of pride to both the residents and visitors of our Nation's Capital City. This year's festival in particular, was of special importance to me because one of the two bands that represented the State of Massachusetts was from Somerset in my 10th Congressional District.

It was my pleasure and privilege to welcome the Blue Raiders marching band of Somerset High School, and show these fine young people the Nation's Capitol. Their presence in Washington and participation in the Cherry Blossom Parade was a source of pride to me. I think all who had the good fortune to enjoy their performance agreed that these young people performed in the finest tradition of Cherry Blossom Festivals, both past and future.

Borden, Carol; Remy, Thomas; Harrington, Glen; Doucette, Susan; Medeiros, Denise; Teasdale, Mary; Grace, Kathy; Aballo, Brian; Desrosiers, Joe; Renaud, David; Chace, Melanie; Freitas, David; O'Keefe, Brad; Souza, Antone; Renaud, Valerie.

Botelho, Roger; Cummings, Bob; Pond, David; Freve, Paul; Grace, Micky; Langfield, Chris; McVey, Bruce; Mullen, Susan; Simmons, David; Nunes, Donna; Gouin, Donna; Clark, Lisa; McGrady, Jayne.

Campbell, Gayle; Bienvenue, Louise; Sherman, Cheryl; Frado, Cindy; Bothelho, Kathy; Heap, Joanne; Dube, Donald; Profio, Melanie; Wright, Cheryl; Langlais, Janine; Brouillard, Cathy; Dowty, Scott.

Teasdale, Nancy; Fernandes, Jo-Ann; Murphy, John; Robinson, Heidi; Hodasa, Lance; Ray, Frank; Chace, Bill; Dionne, Donald; Chace, Holly; Furtado, Ronald.

Greenberg, Ellen; Lempke, Steven; Motta, Rick; Nogueira, Ronald; Andette, Janine; Horden, Dottie; Mullaney, Claire; Conroy, Monica; Mills, Ellen; Fisher, Beth; Coates, Louis; Stukas, Beverly.

Greenberg, Alan; Bowers, Jeff; Miller, Donna; Forrester, James; Sandler, David; Helfenbein, Marsha; Zusman, Lawrence; Cordeiro, Steve; Hebert, Louis; Boulanger, Richard; Ford, Mike; Nunes, Edmond; Saurette, Bob.

Paradis, Gloria; Quin, Steven; Miller, Sue; Peloquin, Raymond; Farrell, Steve; Gesner, David; Lafond, Susan; Lesh, Kellie; Mullen, Debra; Perry, Debra; Murphy, Elizabeth; McDonald, Sue; Shahdan, Deanna; Giocable, Anne; Turcotte, Anne; Marsocci, Amy; Fortin, Pauline; Murphy, Luce.

Frasse, Renee; Hamilton, Nancy; Parent, Donna; Rapoza, Lynn; Bond, Mary; Leonard, Karen; Norman, Barbara; Peterson, Cindy; Gitlin, Phyllis.

Gomes, Helen; Mitchell, Linda; Pereira, Denise; Robillard, Denise; Furtado, Linda; Connors, Bonnie; Gardella, Nancy; Spence, Caroyln.

Schultz, Barbara; Mulready, Donna; Swidzinski, Linda; Souza, Ann; Silvia, Joyce; Lynch, Brenda; Gorham, Cindy; Sabra, Robin.

Band director—Mr. Robert Perry. Mr. Perry's wife, Elaine and two of his children, Robert, Jr. and Leslie Ann, also attended.

Chaperones: Mrs. Bruce Maggs, Miss Florence Lemaire, Mr. David Cucinotta, Mr. Daniel Maloof, Mr. Bruce Maggs, Miss Loretta Nowacki, Mr. Raymond Borges, Mr. Jack Driscoll, Mrs. Anna Danielson, Mrs. Eleanor Gorham, Mr. Kaiser Shahdan.

Trip coordinator—Mrs. Mary Zablocka.

CALLEY CASE

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the case of Lt. William L. Calley, Jr., and the great outpouring of concern over his conviction is the subject of a lengthy and thoughtful editorial appearing in the Jackson Citizen Patriot, Jackson, Mich., on Thursday, April 1, 1971. As we as a Nation seek to find how truth and justice can best be served in this tragic situation I believe that many of the points this editorial raised must be carefully considered and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I include the article as follows:

CALLEY CASE REFLECTS A TROUBLED AMERICA

The great national debate which has raged since the massacre at My Lai was brought to the public's attention has taken a new turn with the guilty verdict brought by a military court against the principal figure in the tragedy, Lt. William L. Calley Jr.

The talk and the soul-searching will continue until final disposition of the case which may take as much as five years as all avenues of appeal are exhausted.

A consensus on the fate of Lt. Calley and of the victims he, according to the court, murdered at My Lai is impossible because so many conflicting views have at least a grain of validity.

The court, after a lengthy review of the mass of testimony produced during the trial, held that Lt. Calley was guilty of premeditated murder. It found his understanding of his orders to be no justifiation for what he did and what he ordered other members of his platoon to do. At this moment, the finding of the court stands as the official decision of the military on the behavior of Lt. Calley and is the controlling policy on any other cases of a similar nature. The primary decision is, of course, subject to review.

The morality of the My Lai incident is complicated beyond all belief by factors which are new to America in time of war.

The most unexpected development in this wake of the court's decision is the rolling wave of support for Lt. Calley.

At the time the killings came to light there was a very loud outcry for punishment of whoever was guilty. The inference was that hanging was too good for anyone who had anything to do with the incident.

Today, however, even persons who are deeply opposed to the war, and who see it as basically immoral, are questioning whether Calley should be held personally responsible for the "evils" of the system.

Therein, perhaps, lies the source of the confusion. The Vietnam War is like no other in America's history. As a nation, we are trying to rewrite not only the rules of war, but our standards of moral conduct in an armed conflict.

A comparison with World War II is inevitable and perhaps odious.

In the great conflict against the Axis powers the national commitment was unreserved. The armed forces were a true cross section of America. There were no pockets of resistance to the conflict such as exist today.

Men who heard the call to the colors through the draft or enlistments and women who volunteered for service, did what they were told.

The natural leaders boiled to the top in most instances and filled leadership posts in the armed force which was expanding at an unbelievable rate. The total commitment by all socio-economic groups, made it possible to forge a multi-million man fighting force out of civilians.

The same conditions do not exist today. In a recent column in Newsweek Magazine, Stewart Alsop pointed out that recruiting practices of the armed services today, along with the student deferments granted to men who might form the leadership needed in the kind of a war being fought in Vietnam, are leaving the tedious business of combat to men taken in the draft. Alsop asks if the ending of the draft might leave the armed forces with no fighting men at all.

The draft brings many capable men into the service. They become good soldiers and leaders and serve with distinction without questioning their duty to do so.

But the system also makes it necessary to promote men beyond their capabilities. Whatever else may be said about Lt. Calley he did not display the ability to command. He was a victim of the system as were those in positions of responsibility who put him in charge of a platoon at My Lai and issued orders he seemingly could not interpret in the context of the realities of the situation.

Thus the penalty he is being asked to pay seems in appropriate. Perhaps it is the inherent good judgment of the mass of American people which is inspiring the protests at the verdict of the military court.

In any event, we, as a nation, are trying to rethink the morality of war and military actions in light of a war which is not at all popular with the masses.

Because an obvious majority of the people regard the war as a national error or tragedy, if not patently immoral, they are trying to impose standards of conduct on military forces which would not have been given a second thought in the heat of World War II.

Saturation bombing in Europe and even the dropping of atomic bombs on Japan, were accepted as moral and necessary because they promised an early end to the war and the saving of both American and enemy lives. That innocent civilians were killed was more or less incidental.

The killings could be justified by the bombing of Britain by Hitler's forces. That was the way war was. We paid the enemy back in his own coin. The question of morality seldom arose.

It emerges today, to a great extent, because there is a tendency to try to make war somehow moral and to forget that it takes two to make a bargain. We try to elevate our own moral standards with respect to war with no reciprocal response from the enemy.

We forget that what happened at My Lai wouldn't put a patch on the genocide practiced by the North Vietnamese under the late Ho Chi Minh. The deliberate liquidation of literally thousands of South Vietnamese teachers, village officials, and other natural leaders was a part of the Communists' grand plan to dominate Southeast Asia. It was carried out with precision—and with little protest from the international community, including persons in America who now deplore America's involvement in the war and the immorality of My Lai.

The immorality of war, in general, has become dominant in American thinking in the

course of a conflict which is unpopular. Deeds which would have been accepted without question in World War II or earlier encounters have become great public issues.

Inherent in all debate is the utter desire of the people to see an end to war and killing—an admirable urge, to be sure.

But in view of the inability of America to make a unilateral decision to end war and to impose our standards of morality on all mankind, the debate and the indecision will continue.

Where it all will come, no one can guess.

Meanwhile, every commander who goes into combat may need to have a lawyer by his side to tell him what he can, and cannot do, in keeping with the precedent set by Lt. Calley's fate.

MISS IRENE PARSONS NAMED CIVIL SERVANT OF YEAR

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the most capable civil servants in our Federal Government was recognized recently by AMVETS for her many years of outstanding dedicated public service.

In 1965, President Lyndon Johnson appointed Miss Irene Parsons to the high position of Assistant Administrator of Personnel in the Veterans' Administration.

She is one of the most outstanding women in our government and supervises the personnel policies of over 170,000 Federal employees in the Veterans' Administration.

Miss Parsons is a veteran of World War II having served as an officer in the Coast Guard. She is a graduate of the University of North Carolina and also holds the degree of Master of Science in Public Administration from George Washington University.

In 1967, the University of North Carolina awarded Miss Parsons an honorary Doctor of Laws degree in recognition of outstanding administrative abilities and superior government service.

As Chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and as a longtime member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I take pleasure in calling the attention of Members to the recognition given Miss Parsons.

As part of my remarks, I include the text of AMVETS citation which accompanied the Silver Helmet Civil Servant of the Year Award presented to Miss Parsons on March 27.

CITATION

The 26th Annual National Convention of AMVETS, assembled in New York City, New York, on August 26, 1970, did unanimously resolve that its "Civil Servant of the Year Award" be presented to Irene Parsons, Assistant Administrator for Personnel, Veterans Administration.

Whose unique career reflects a dedication to veterans and a concern for the equality of man.

The responsibility of directing personnel policies for 170,000 federal agency employees is a heavy one. When the mission of that agency is to carry out America's commitment to her veterans, the role becomes vital. This is the daily pursuit of Irene Parsons.

Success for this gentle woman did not occur instantaneously. It was achieved through diligent work, the application of a brilliant mind and nourished by a deep concern for her fellow man.

Miss Parsons is a native of the Tarheel state, a graduate of the University of North Carolina and holds the degree of Master of Science in Public Administration from George Washington University. During World War II, she served as an officer in the Coast Guard SPARS.

Following the war, she joined the Veterans Administration—a young veteran, a woman, on the threshold of a challenging career.

In the ensuing years, she progressed to responsible positions in the Federal Career Service—and Irene Parsons certainly put it all together. In 1965, she became the Assistant Administrator for Personnel of the Veterans Administration by appointment of the President of the United States.

Her leadership has brought honor to her agency and has been recognized many times. Perhaps the impact of Irene Parsons can best be summed up by mentioning two honors of special importance to her.

The Honorable Olin E. Teague, Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Commitee, has noted in the Congressional Record that Irene Parsons has made the VA personnel operation one of the most successful in government and "her personal efforts to advance equal employment opportunity have been cited as contributing greatly to the Veteran Administration's exceptional accomplishments in these programs."

In 1967, her alma mater, the University of North Carolina, awarded Miss Parsons an honorary Doctor of Laws degree, in recognition of her administrative abilities, superior achievements and outstanding service to the Government of the United States.

AMVETS are proud to join in the recognition of this lady, and with our award goes our gratitude on behalf of America's veterans.

It is a personal privilege to present the Silver Helmet, AMVETS' highest award, for the Civil Servant of the Year to Miss Irene Parsons.

CIRCUIT COURT EXECUTIVE STANDARDS ARE ISSUED

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Board of Certification created by Congress to certify persons eligible for the position of circuit court executive has now promulgated standards for certification as required by the new law. Because of the wide interest in court reform, I believe it important that the proposed standards and the accompanying memorandum be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

TENTATIVE STANDARDS FOR CERTIFICATION OF CIRCUIT EXECUTIVE

The Board of Certification, created by a recent amendment to Section 332, Title 28 (Public Law 91-647) acting in accordance with Subsection (f) of the amended act has promulgated the following standards for certification for appointment to the office of circuit executive.

An applicant must:

1. Possess executive ability, demonstrated by substantial experience in progressively more responsible management positions in government or the private sector;

2. Have experience in modern business and management techniques, including use of automatic data processing;

3. Have demonstrated capability to plan and conduct studies designed to improve the management of the business of the circuit court and of the district courts within the circuit, to prepare recommendations and reports to appropriate higher authorities and to implement such recommendations when approved.

4. Possess a very high degree of judgment, understanding and tact; exceptional ability to meet with and maintain proper relationships with other courts and officials of the state and federal governments, and with members of the bar and the public;

5. Possess ability to conduct conferences and meetings, and to express himself clearly in writing and orally before the council, the judges of the courts and representatives of government agencies, industry and the public;

6. Detailed familiarity with court procedures is not indispensable. Formal training in court management and managerial experience is particularly relevant.

7. Possess creative leadership, planning and organizing ability, initiative, decisiveness, dedication and independence to make significant contributions toward productive change in methods of operating.

8. Have acquired an undergraduate degree; a graduate degree in business or public administration or a degree in law is desirable.

MEMORANDUM TO ACCOMPANY THE STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

These standards have been established to the end that a circuit executive shall be fully competent to perform all the duties committed to him by the statute and such other duties as may from time to time be delegated to him by the Circuit Council. It is contemplated that the circuit executive shall act as the arm of the Circuit Council to conduct or supervise all delegable functions of court business. With the cooperation and assistance of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and The Federal Judicial Center, he will collect, compile and analyze statistical data and will prepare and present reports and recommendations based upon such studies and data to enable the council to make all necessary orders for the effective expeditious administration of the courts within the circuit. It is contemplated that this cooperative effort will result in an integrated working relationship between the Circuit Council, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts and the Federal Judicial Center. The maintenance of this relationship is deemed to be essential to the efficient operation of the courts and the administration of justice.

DR. MILTON PEARL SPEAKS ON PUBLIC LAND LAWS

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, some months ago we had the distinct pleasure in my State of Oregon of having Dr. Milton Pearl, then the Director of the Public Land Law Review Commission, speak at a conference of the Association of Oregon Counties.

Dr. Pearl is an extremely knowledgeable and able man and he spoke on a subject of major importance to our

whole section of the country. His remarks were provocative and I intended to insert them in the RECORD immediately after they were made. Through an oversight, this was not done at that time. I take pleasure in rectifying that oversight at this time and in calling these remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

REMARKS OF MILTON A. PEARL, DIRECTOR, PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

The difficulties that we have in obtaining significant public land laws is capsulized in a conversation I had the other day with a mid-westerner who has, however, travelled quite a bit through the western public land states. He started this phase of our dialogue by saying that there were adequate recreation lands available without the construction of new access roads for that purpose, that if it is intended to assist lumber companies he was certainly opposed to it, and finally if the purpose is to allow residents to reach their homes or ranches he, as a taxpayer, resented it.

He went further and said that on a recent trip that took him through Idaho and Utah he was "appalled" to hear of the large amounts of money we are spending to deliver mail to remote areas. "If people choose to live in such areas," he said "they should accept as part of the price of living there that they will not receive government services."

We did not have time to pursue our discussion to the logical nth degree. But I suspect that he would have you—officials of the county governments that have responsibility for furnishing most government services, ignore people in remote areas, possibly tell them to move, or maybe go in and force them out. We know that you cannot do any of these things; we know that the Federal, State, and local governments must serve these people to some degree out of concern not only for their welfare but for the welfare of the rest of us whose lives are affected by everything that goes on in the world around us.

Carried to the proverbial nth degree I wonder if our mid-western observer would have you ignore the commission of a crime, possibly murder, if committed on remote public lands? How about sanitary facilities or a large enough police force to see that there is no pollution?

No matter which way you turn, short of just keeping people out of these areas, it is going to cost you money. Some people do not understand that you, local government, have responsibility for policing these public lands and that you incur other burdens by reason of Federal ownership of the public lands. As a matter of fact in this enlightened era I have met people who were unaware of the fact that the United States makes no payments either of taxes or in-lieu-of taxes to support the units of government in whose jurisdictions the lands are found. For the record, for the benefit of those who may not know, we note that no Federally owned property can be taxed without the consent of the United States.

To compound your problems the Public Land Law Review Commission has recommended that the bulk of the public lands should remain in Federal ownership and that in most instances where the states have ceded legislative jurisdiction to the United States the Federal government should return such jurisdiction to the states—really to you the counties.

In view of these recommendations, the Commission concluded that the United States should make some payment to compensate the states and its subdivisions for the burdens imposed by reason of Federal ownership. While there are many recommendations, of the 400 made by the Commission that are of direct concern to you, and all 400 should be of interest to all, it is the recommendations that flow from the decision to compensate for tax immunity on which I will concentrate our discussion today. In doing so I will assume that all of you have read the report and the recommendations and confine my remarks to the implications of the recommendations and their impact with specific application to the unique situation existing here in Oregon.

We have, in the many meetings at which I have spoken to date, heard nobody take exception to the idea, as expressed in the report, that "If the national interest dictates that lands should be retained in Federal ownership, it is the obligation of the United States to make certain that the burden of that policy is spread among all the people of the United States and is not borne only by those states and governments in whose areas the lands are located." We find several separate paths when we start discussing how to do this.

It seems only logical to me that generally the payments made should have some relationship to the burdens borne by state and local governments because of the Federal ownership. This is the position of the Commission. And this is the position, in my opinion, that is going to be persuasive with the Congress—if, in fact, we are going to be able to persuade the Congress to do anything to alleviate the financial plight of states and counties within whose borders there are large Federal land holdings.

Returning to the states and counties a portion of the receipts from public land and resource sales and leases—revenue sharing—is not in any way related to the burdens of Federal land ownership. I make this as a statement of fact and not merely a restatement of a conclusion reached by the Commission. I make this statement knowing that our research shows that the two largest revenue sharing programs—for the sale of National Forest timber and of public land oil and gas—had their genesis in the desire of Congress to compensate states and counties for the fact that the lands from which these resources were to be sold would not go into private ownership and on to the tax rolls as previously contemplated. However, I also know from our research that there was no scientific basis, or even an attempt to develop a scientific basis, to determine what the amount of shared revenue should be and whether the amount agreed upon would in fact compensate for the loss involved.

The Commission, as you all know, recommended that generally, for the reasons I have stated and others, revenue sharing programs should be repealed and replaced by a system or systems of payments-in-lieu of taxes with the United States receiving a public benefits discount from what private owners would pay in taxes if the property were on the tax rolls. In some instances it is possible—maybe even probable—that payments would be less, even if full tax equivalency were paid, than is made through shared revenues. But on the whole payments would be greater and in the aggregate might be as much as $60 million a year more than paid at present even if the Commission's proposal for a discount is adopted.

This situation has naturally made unhappy those whose payments might be reduced. So two months ago, when we were here in Portland at the Discussion Forum, the idea was advanced that possibly the United States could adopt a dual system; share revenues where there are resources to sell but make payments related to regular tax payments where there are no such sales. The other day at a conference we were told that the Federation of Rocky Mountain States has supported this position and then suggests that the states or counties should have the option of choosing the system under which they wish to operate.

Examining this idea realistically it just does not seem to me that you can get the Congress—the people of the United States—to accept it. In addition to the question of burdens, there is, first, the fact, relied on heavily by the Commission and stressed by many citizen groups, that revenue sharing tends to generate pressure for sales without giving primary consideration to good conservation practices. Secondly, and maybe of greater importance, I have never heard of a statute giving options to recipients of payments solely on the basis of having the recipient make an election of the plan that will pay the most money.

While there are other aspects of significance in the other public land states, let us today examine only that of significance to you, to Oregon. This revolves, of course, around the O&C counties.

We—neither in our research program nor the Commission in its deliberations—studied the O&C counties and whether any of the recommendations should apply to O&C counties. The question remaining then is whether the O&C counties are so unique as to enjoy the separate status they have had in the past and thereby not have applied to them the policies made applicable to Federally owned lands generally. The fact is that sooner or later this question must be faced and you should prepare now to face it and to present a united front in doing so.

When the bill establishing the Public Land Law Review Commission was taken up by the subcommittee on public lands of the House Interior Committee there was immediate and unanimous agreement that the history of the O&C lands and their attendant problems were so different from those of the public lands generally that O&C should not be part of the Commission's study. In recognizing this difference there was implied an agreement that O&C lands should be reviewed periodically but separately.

Similar recognition of the different status of the O&C lands has been given over the years in the Executive Branch by the Bureau of the Budget and in Congress by the Appropriations Committees. Your Congressional delegation has had to keep alert, and I can testify to how hard they have worked at it, but they have been successful in maintaining so far the level of Federal revenues either shared or re-invested in the O&C lands.

The main point is that this special status has been recognized. A new examination must be made of whether that status should continue. I offer no answer today but suggest that you examine history and prepare your case accordingly with all Oregon united. Let us see what some of that history discloses.

Oregonians in and out of Congress have argued that public domain lands in Oregon are basically unlike other public domain because the United States did not purchase this territory but acquired it rather by discovery and settlement. This line of reasoning then apparently goes on to the assumption that must have been made when Oregon joined the Union that the Federal government would, as it did in other instances, devote part of this public domain to development.

The grant to the Oregon and California Railroad was such a development step. Oregonians have always held that the failure of that venture did not in any way cost the Federal government anything but it did, obviously, hamper the state. Some pointed out that the United States actually made a profit by selling even-numbered sections of land along the right of way at double the price other lands brought. Further, the United States, in the 1866 grant, required free transportation of its property and troops—a right estimated to have had a value of $2 million by 1916.

You will recall that the failure of the Oregon and California Railroad was caused by the violation of that part of the grant

that required the sale of small lots to actual settlers. The abrogation of this part of the contract at a minimum hampered the development of western Oregon. Following extensive litigation, title to the lands was revested in the United States by Act of Congress in 1916. The opinion of the Supreme Court and the legislative history of the revestment Act have both been subject to interpretation and debate.

Suffice to say at this time that the Act, which carried a revenue sharing formula, has been claimed by many to have been designed to carry out the original purpose of the land grant by dedicating the lands to the further development of the State of Oregon. The inclusion of a revenue sharing provision indicates that in 1916 the Congress did not try to equate payments to the State and counties with tax losses.

The loss to the State in the failure of the railroad was discussed by Representative Sinnott of Oregon in debate on the revestment bill:

"Who can estimate the loss to my state? What monetary consideration can recompense us for the past michief and damage? The injury to my State by the loss of homes, of schools, and development is an injury that is incalculable. The loss and injury to Oregon is irreparable."

You are all familiar with the fact that the 1916 Act did not fulfill its purpose and of the history of the 1926 and 1937 Acts. I need not dwell on them; they are extensions of whatever the original purpose and revestment were.

The next move is yours. I submit to you that you cannot have, at your own choice, the best of whatever would you choose. The only way you can logically seek an exception from whatever the general rule is, is to demonstrate that there exists a unique situation. The road ahead may be rocky but it is not necessarily impassable.

CALLEY VERDICT

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, at this writing, I have received over 200 letters on the Calley matter, three of which support the verdict. The others, deploring the charges, verdict, and sentence urge clemency or pardon. They fall into four general categories:

First, letters from parents asking if their teenage sons can look forward to a criminal penalty if they enter the armed services;

Second, letters from men, frequently veterans, pointing out that all war is hell, and that no man should be held accountable for his reaction to the abnormal stress of battle;

Third, letters suggesting that the Vietnamese are "not like us", have no regard themselves for life, and are dangerous, "even the babies", and

Fourth, letters that consider Calley merely a man obeying an order, the responsibility for which lies with one or more superiors. One such letter named as guilty the four Presidents who have served during our Vietnam involvement. Some writers assert the verdict hurts the country, and a few say they are ashamed to be Americans because of it.

Because of these letters, the anguish they represent, and the issues they raise, I feel obligated to respond to them all before this House.

First, if the evidence before the soldier jurors was accurate, does the verdict hurt the country? Is not it rather the act that provided the evidence that led to the verdict that has hurt the country? And should not a great people whose faith is founded on the Judeo-Christian ethic reserve their shame for the act itself, rather than its condemnation?

In my view, when the events at My Lai became a matter of public knowledge, by means of personal accounts and photographs, the American army itself, its citizen soldiers and the values they committed to battle, went on trial, both here and abroad.

This was true of North Vietnam's Army when the Hue murders were discovered. The difference is that the American Army felt obligated to examine the facts, to judge, and to sentence. Had it not done so, the honor of its own traditions, of the society it defends, and of the men who have died defending it, would have been diminished, and very much so. It was agony for the jurors to hear the evidence and find it led relentlessly to a conclusion of guilty as charged for the murder of defenseless men, women, and children. And it is agony for the Nation to hear that verdict. We recoil from this image of ourselves, and we should. To salve this wound is our desire because we shared in its making and its pain.

Significant to me, and strengthening, is that in this long, arduous conflict in Vietnam, the standard of conduct of our fighting men has been extraordinarily high. Had they been sent to kill helpless civilians the shameful job would have long since been completed. But they were not. By the tens of thousands, from the cities and farms of America, drafted or enlisted, they have, with very few exceptions, observed not only the so-called "laws of war," but the simple dictates of human conscience which they learned from their parents, their schools, and their heritage. Many died doing so. What would their sacrifice mean were it equated with the conduct this case involves?

It is suggested that bombing and artillery have also resulted in the death of noncombatants. The difference between a tactical or strategic bombardment that sheds innocent blood, and the systematic killing of defenseless civilians at gunpoint must be clear both in reason and in justice. The principal ingredient of any criminal charge is intent. In this respect the indiscriminate North Vietnam rocket attacks on populated areas may be contrasted with the precise instructions American pilots must observe in pinpointing military targets.

Now what is to be done? With no wish to prejudice appellate procedures or their results, it is certainly conceivable, should the conviction stand, that the ordeal of the trial, the sentence, the verdict, and appeals, together with the attendant publicity, and the indelible memory of the ditch at My Lai, will have served, if anything could serve, to fulfill the normal objectives of criminal jurisprudence regarding penalty: rehabilitation of the offender, and deterrence of similar offenses. As for the defendant, what more can be asked of him in this life? If conscience sleeps, what sounds disturb it? Should it awaken, what silences comfort it?

The trial itself, far from scandalizing our society, ennobles it. The greatness of America is enhanced by this tortured effort, absolutely unique and unprecedented, to cleave in war to the very values she cherishes in peace.

It is late to caution in the words of the Lord, "Judge not, that ye be not judged," because at Nuremberg we did judge. We saw the mote in our brother's eye. This trial proves we have the strength and the grace to cast the beam from out own.

Last week, in part with the implications of this case in mind, I voted first to shorten the draft, and failing that, to end it. I feel the time has come for the Congress to reclaim its power to determine the necessity of committing young Americans to war. I say the time has come; let us seize it before it goes. We have given 10 years of our best in treasure and blood to help an Asian government draw its people together behind a common purpose. We cannot provide the purpose itself, or cement that people to it. We have done what was in our power to do. And that power must now be brought to bear on problems that will not be solved anywhere but here in our America. Yet to the mothers whose sons have gone, or who may yet go, I offer my solemn conviction that history will confirm in them a new kind of heroism, one for which civilization itself can only be grateful, the power and the will to preserve, throughout the inhumanity of war, the humanity of man.

SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM NEEDS DRASTIC OVERHAULING

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, I know many of my colleagues share the opinion our national social security program needs a drastic overhauling. The cost of the program last year was $40.6 billion, far beyond original expectations, I am sure. Its recipients now number more than 26 million and, despite a 25-percent increase in benefits over the past 2 years, more must be done to provide them with a raft in today's inflationary flood. I support additional help for our senior citizens and intend to continue to introduce legislation giving them the benefits that they so desperately need.

However, in the desire to help these 26 million Americans, we in Congress must not become blind to the plight of those who ultimately pay the bill for legislated increases in the program. It is the productive American who picks up the tab and, with the tax bites now being taken from his paycheck, he himself is hard pressed to exist. Gross earnings are whittled away by deductions for social security, Federal income tax, State income tax, local wage taxes, county taxes, school taxes, per capita taxes and sales

tax. The list is almost endless and unbearable.

I have proposed a bill which will help the productive worker of today and the retired worker tomorrow. It permits the worker today to deduct his social security contribution from his Federal income tax.

I believe the social security payment is a double tax on the worker. He has no choice in most cases whether he wants to contribute or not. It is a mandatory contribution. It is a tax. He pays not only the social security tax on a certain portion of his earnings, but he also pays Federal income tax on the same amount.

This is double taxation and unfair, if not unconstitutional, particularly in view of the fact that this once insignificant contribution has grown to a tax of the first magnitude. When the program was conceived more than 30 years ago, the cost was a mere 1 percent from employer and employee on the individual's first $3,000 in earnings. That amounted to $30 each for a total tax of $60.

By 1970, the base taxable salary had risen to $7,800 and the tax rate to 4.8 percent. This means the worker and his employer last year each paid $374.40 or a total of $748.80 into the fund. This year, the tax rate went up to 5.2 percent, raising payments of employer and employee to $450.50 each or a total tax of $911.20.

Just a few weeks ago, the taxable base salary was increased to $9,000, effective January 1, 1972, and based on the present 5.2 percent tax rate it means next year the employer and employee will "contribute" $468 each or a total of $936 to social security.

Furthermore, increases in the tax rate are already scheduled for the future. The rate is due to go to 5.6 percent for 1973–75; 5.85 percent for 1976–79; 5.95 percent for 1980–86 and 6.05 percent from 1987 on. I would like to emphasize these are legislated increases but already there are proposals to raise the tax rate as high as 7.6 percent. Obviously this is going to put an additional strain on the employer and employee and any future increase in the taxable base salary will only add to their problems. In view of this, I have grave fears the social security program designed to give the retired worker a source of income in his later years might collapse under the continuing pressure brought to bear on the productive worker who supports it financially. The program contains the threat of becoming a Frankenstein, turning on the very people it was created to help.

I hope my colleagues support my proposal to give those paying into social security a tax break, easing their load and still providing the social security recipient with a source of income.

WELL-DESERVED PRAISE FOR OMAHA'S VA HOSPITAL

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from one of my constituents in Omaha which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues. It concerns Omaha's Veterans' Administration Hospital and was sent by George Randol:

. . . I was admitted to the VA Hospital in June, 1970, after suffering what I thought was a sprain to my left leg. My leg was discolored, swollen and quite painful. I passed out in the admitting office. The doctors found I had ruptured an arterial aneurysm. An operation was performed on June 7.

Then it became necessary to operate again because of a breakdown of the walls of the artery and profuse bleeding that could have been terminal. Then on June 12, it was determined that the circulation of the blood to the damaged member could not be re-established. The situation was explained to my wife, and it was decided that an amputation was necessary. During this period I was delirious and unaware of what was going on. I recognized no one, not even my wife, who was at my bedside each day.

Then came several months of intensive care. Whirlpool baths every day. Physical therapists doing everything they could to prepare me for the day when I could walk using a prosthesis. This was a dreary outlook. I saw so many people in physical therapy much worse off than I get up and walk. I had a lot of care from many people: physical therapists, doctors, nurses, orderlies and attendants.

There were so many who passed through the facility during my five month stay, requiring special and intensive care to live. But their needs were met with an unselfish dedication by staff people on duty and on call after hours.

Being in the surgical ward several months, I saw the halls filled with equipment being pressed into service for someone needing vital care. Some after surgery and some before. I would say the Veterans Administration Hospital has a reputation in this part of the country for being the top facility in the area, and they live up to their reputation. That is why I'm alive.

The praise which the VA hospital gets in Mr. Randol's letter is well deserved. The Veterans hospital in Omaha has an excellent professional staff—one of the best in the VA hospital system. They maintain an extremely close relationship with the University of Nebraska and Creighton University Medical Schools in Omaha, and that relationship provides an outstanding opportunity for the training and development of physicians in Nebraska.

I thank Mr. Randol for bringing his example to our attention. I am glad to see an excellent institution getting the applause it should get.

PREDICTION OF GEN. CURTIS E. LeMAY

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, as my constituent, Mrs. Carl W. Seiler, of Savannah, Ga., so well stated in her recent letter to me, the enclosed prediction of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay should be made available as food for thought to every citizen in our country. The General LeMay article follows:

[From the Santa Ana (Ga.) Register, Feb. 24, 1971]

LeMAY PREDICTS RUSSIAN "YIELD-OR-ELSE" ULTIMATUM

(By Len Davis)

Retired Air Force Gen. Curtis E. LeMay Tuesday predicted that within 18 months Russia will serve a "capitulation-or-else" ultimatum on the United States, and that President Nixon will have no choice but to surrender and succumb to Soviet demands.

He would not speculate on what the "demands" would be, other than complete withdrawal of American forces in Vietnam.

Asked to define the words "or else," LeMay replied:

"Nuclear weapons."

Interviewed at the South Coast Gun Club, Santa Ana, the 64-year-old former Air Force chief of staff said "while the United States is wasting money on TNT for use in the jungles and rice paddies of Southeast Asia, Russia is spending money on what today is the finest strategic weapons system in the world.

"We have become a second-rate power," he said, "and our whole military establishment is rapidly going downhill because our weaponry—both offensive and defensive—is outmoded and the general public lacks the proper spirit and respect for our nation's leaders."

The former head of the Strategic Air Command (SAC), who built from the remnants of World War II an all-jet bomber force manned and supported by professional airmen dedicated to the preservation of peace, had this to say about the nation's defense capabilities:

"We lack superiority which, to win," he said, "should be overwhelming—more than is actually needed.

"It isn't just the money that is being misspent or not budgeted," he added, "It's the whole basic philosophy of our people, which needs a greater demonstration of patriotism and a stronger manifestation of confidence in the leadership of our country—at all levels."

He attributed the "sorry state of our nation" to "the growing Communist menace" and said racial troubles and draft protests, for example, "are all Communist-inspired.

"Like it or not," he said, "we are at war with the Communists—and we'd better do something about it, fast, before it's too late.

"All they (the Communists) have to do is infiltrate our police and military organizations to the point where they are in control," said LeMay.

"The rest will be easy, and they'll take over our country," he added.

LeMay urged the American people to "stand up and shout down the radicals, learn their tactics so you can combat them, and support our men in uniform.

"Quit tearing things down. Quit believing everything that's told us. Investigate. Read the history and development of Communist methods and see how they apply to what's happening across our land today. Then act accordingly," said LeMay.

He said the American people "would be derelict in their duty to believe we have a strong national defense system.

"That's what we're told," he said, "but it's not so—really.

"And I know," added the four-star general under whose leadership at SAC for 10 years plans were laid for the development and integration of the nation's intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) capability.

URBAN MASS TRANSIT MONEY

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the need for mass transit moneys in our metropolitan areas has reached crisis proportions. This crisis takes on added significance when we consider that nearly 70 percent of our population lives in the urban areas of our Nation. It has been estimated that the capital needs in just 19 major metropolitan areas in the next decade will be nearly $18 billion, while operating costs for mass transit in these metropolitan areas will amount to an additional $10 billion.

It was precisely because of a congressional recognition of the mass transportation crisis that the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1964 was amended and passed by a resounding margin during the second session of the 91st Congress. This act, which commits Congress to a $12 billion investment in mass transit over the next 10 years and provides $3.1 billion in grants for the next 5 years, is certainly inadequate in view of the known mass transportation requirements.

At the same time, the scarcity of funds in comparison to the serious needs in this area underscores the importance of allocating funds authorized by this act to those metropolitan areas which are strangling to death because of totally inadequate mass transit systems.

The Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act as it passed last session contains a provision which limits the amounts of moneys that one State may receive to 12½ percent of the authorized funds. In the first year alone, the requests from several States have either exceeded or are about to exceed this arbitrary limitation. This limitation is especially unrealistic and counterproductive in view of the fact that the mass transit crisis most seriously affects States with large metropolitan areas.

While we will not be able to provide all of the needed moneys under present programs, I think it is imperative that we remove existing limitations under this legislation to permit the Department of Transportation to make grants where they are most needed. For this reason, I have introduced a bill today to eliminate this arbitrary limitation on the Secretary's granting authority, in the hope that this bill will now permit the Secretary of Transportation to make grants of Urban Mass Transit moneys to the areas in which they are needed regardless of any arbitrary formulas.

I am pleased to announce that I was joined on this bill by 25 of my colleagues: Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. LENT, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. FORSYTHE, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. WOLFF, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. VANIK, Mr. FISH, Mr. KEMP, Mr. PODELL, Mr. CAREY, Mr. REID of New York, and Mr. BELL.

THE CONSCIENCE OF AMERICA

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the best editorials I have read on the recent verdict finding Lieutenant Calley guilty in the slaying of 22 Vietnamese civilians has been written by Mr. Ed Jenison, editor of the Paris, Ill., Beacon-News.

Mr. Jenison has succinctly pointed out that this event which has so troubled the conscience of America should not allow us to abandon the goals of an honorable solution to the Vietnam war and to forsake the President in his attempt to achieve these goals.

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to place Mr. Jenison's editorial in the RECORD:

THE CONSCIENCE OF AMERICA

Few events in modern day history have distressed the American public as much as the verdict finding United States Army Lieutenant William L. Calley, Jr., guilty in the slaying of 22 Vietnamese civilians at My Lai at the height of the war against the invading North Vietnamese. Easing the emotional crisis somewhat has been the prompt and welcome order of President Nixon to release Lt. Calley from the army stockade pending appeal of his sentence to life imprisonment.

No one condones the shocking nature of the facts in the case as they have been confirmed in documented testimony prior to and during the extended court martial proceedings at Fort Benning, Ga. At the same time, it is obvious that the overwhelming majority of Americans feel the tragic incident was a product of the conditions of warfare, and not the fault of an individual man in uniform.

Reaction has been immediate, widespread across the nation and typically reflected here. Those who have served their country and the cause of freedom on the fighting front have recognized what those who have never been there do not—in war there is no margin for mercy. Innocents many times have been victims. History is replete with examples. And in the present conflict, these incidents have been multiplied by enemy use of the indistinguishable civilians, including youngsters, as agents of destruction.

Right here at home there have been two significant manifestations of popular sentiment. Keith Tingley, editor of our neighboring and recently-established Chrisman Leader, editorialized this week with a powerful insight into the feelings of most of us.

"I am a peace-loving man," he observed, "but war is a different story, and there is no easy way to kill an enemy. I realize that I am just a small potato out here in the sticks running a country newspaper . . . but that still doesn't, in my mind, keep me from believing that Lt. Calley 'got a rotten deal.'"

And from another local source, David Long, a conscientious citizen and World War I veteran, has addressed a letter to the editor of the Beacon-News, published yesterday, in which he reflects concern based on the reactions of one who has known what it means to be under enemy fire.

Not since the 90 men of the intelligence ship USS Pueblo were captured by the North Koreans and subjected to months of imprisonment before their release has public sentiment been so aroused and so unanimous. The continuing struggle for the preservation of freedom half a world away has always suffered from some reservations from some people, and the unfortunate My Lai incident only served to intensify that unrest.

Even so, most Americans will not permit individual incidents, no matter how unfortunate or inopportune, to divert them from a clear understanding of the issues involved.

The fact remains that the sharp conflict between the Communists and the Free world inevitably drew the armed forces of the United States into combat with the enemy in Vietnam nearly a decade ago. In the ensuing years upwards of a half a million gallant young Americans found themselves on a distant battle front to stem the tide of a desperate and dedicated enemy force. Thousands of them gave their lives for their country and an ideal that has transformed this land from a band of colonies to a citadel of freedom.

Has that sacrifice been in vain? We trust not. Must it be continued? We hope not. The truth of the matter is that President Nixon has long recognized what many did not—that under the circumstances American involvement must steadily be reduced and ultimately removed. In the two years of his administration he has moved steadily toward this goal, with a courage not always matched by his colleagues in the Congress or his countrymen at large. New emphasis has been placed on the role of the South Vietnamese themselves in the defense of their homeland. And continued emphasis has been placed on a definite schedule for return of United States fighting men to their homes and their families. As a result, U.S. involvement is decreasing where in former years it was increasing. But the rate of withdrawal has been weighed carefully to preserve the gains won by gallant sacrifice, and to heighten the hopes for ultimate peace.

The public reaction to My Lai must not be allowed to become an excuse for abandonment of goals long held to be essential to the future security of those who would remain free. The inescapable tragedies of war must not panic an enlightened citizenship into surrender. In the language of free people, and those who would become free, there is no such word.

At the moment there is need for understanding, patience and perseverence. There is need, too, for patriotic support of a President in the White House who bears burdens perhaps unsurpassed since the time of Lincoln, when a nation was at war with itself.

President Nixon has on his hands a war he "inherited." It may have been popular at its inception. Now it is not. Yet it is not in the nature of the President to blame the past. He accepted the situation as he found it, and has since sought what all Americans want—a way out, with a hope for future peace.

Neither My Lai, nor the emotional explosion that has followed the trial of Lt. Calley, should be allowed to detour the American course toward a solution of the problem of our times—how to live in peace with a world in turmoil. We have the leadership, if we will follow it. We have the courage, if we will use it. And we must have the faith, or we will lose the greatest present opportunity for preserving freedom, as Americans have come to know it, for our neighbors around the world now and ourselves in the future.

Next week is Holy week, with Christians around the world turning to their religion for comfort and hope and salvation. Prayer is an integral part of the observance. It is timeless, but timely as well. Surely it would not be out of order to suggest that prayer might well be turned to the present.

Why not, then, a national expression of unanimity in prayer for the guidance and counsel of a President sorely beset in the White House with our problems and our welfare? Where next in Vietnam is our problem but his responsibility. It is awesome in terms of present results and future threats. His courageous course still points the way to the

only apparent hope for return, in our time, to the enduring aspiration of Americans of all political complexions for peace with honor, security and tranquility in our time.

THE FAMILY STABILITY ACT OF 1971

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing the Family Stability Act of 1971, H.R. 7388.

In the 91st Congress the administration introduced the family assistance plan which passed the House but failed to pass the Senate. In the closing days of the second session it became evident that this measure, with a $1,600 basic grant level for a family of four, was unacceptable to welfare recipients, the public, and Members of the Senate. The administration's bill (H.R. 1) has been reintroduced in the 92d Congress and referred to the House Ways and Means Committee. That committee, according to newspaper reports, is considering a plan for family assistance with a basic grant of $2,400 for a family of four, with food stamps being cashed out.

Such a beginning level appears to be thoroughly inadequate for the needs of an American family today faced with rising prices in an inflated economy. A recent Gallup poll, January 10, 1971, indicated that Americans believe that it would take more than $6,500 a year to maintain any kind of minimum decent standard of living today realistically considering costs. When the poverty level today stands at $3,743 to provide mere subsistence for a family of four, it is inconceivable that a Nation with the economic resources of the United States would be willing to expect that poor families try to exist on $2,400.

In legislation I am introducing today, the grant level for a family of four would begin in 1972 at a rounded-off poverty level—$3,600 and move up in orderly steps until in 1976 it reached the lower level adequate standard of living as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

A zone cost-of-living factor would take care of the geographical differential thus equalizing payments made to recipients of various regions and to those of urban and rural settings.

The Family Stability Act of 1971 would be federally administered and in fiscal 1973 would cover all payments of 41 States. By 1976 Federal benefits would have surpassed present payment levels in the other nine States with the entire program federalized. In the intervening years those States making payments higher than $3,600 would make up the difference until the catch-up period is completed. The legislation I am proposing today would cover all poor people and include individuals under 65 and couples without children. Eligibility would be determined on the basis of a written application subject to verification by random scientific audit. The working but underemployed poor—that group most discontented in our society according to the Kerner commission report—would be included in coverage under this plan. Any recipient would be better off working since he would be able to keep 40 percent of his earnings. When total income reaches $6,000 a family would go off of welfare.

Under the proposed bill able-bodied heads of families would be expected to accept suitable employment or receive training for the same. Employment is not considered suitable if the position is vacant due to a labor dispute, the wages are below Federal or State minimum levels or prevailing wages, whichever are higher, or if suitable child-care arrangements cannot be made. Decisions as to the latter would be in the hands of welfare mothers and in no case would mothers of preschool and school-age children be forced to work against their will. Too often in the past we have criticized the poor of the inner city for inadequate family supervision, for letting their children run wild in the streets, but at the same time we have not made appropriate provision for child care or for mothers to remain in the home if they themselves prefer to rear and nurture their own children. This measure would permit the latter positive alternative.

Another important section of this bill protects the rights of recipients. Fair hearings will be provided if there is any disagreement with respect to eligibility, the number of persons in a family, or the amount of benefits. Appeals may be made to an appeals board and then to a Federal court. While appeals are in process, benefits would not be cut off.

The legislation I am introducing today is backed by a broad spectrum of national groups which have come together in support of a campaign for adequate welfare reform now. Their members include: the League of Women Voters, the National Council of Churches, the National Council of Negro Women, the National Association of Social Workers, the Friends Committee on National Legislation, the American Friends Service Committee, the Children's Foundation, the National Federation of Settlement Houses, the United Presbyterian Church in the USA, the Board of Christian Social Concerns for the United Methodist Church, the Board of Social Ministries of the Lutheran Church in America, the National Office of Black Catholics, the Board of Homeland Ministers of the United Church of Christ, the Churches Crusade Against Hunger, the National Federation of Social Work Students, and the Americans for Indian Opportunity Council.

This campaign has adopted certain goals and principles which form the basis for the bill here introduced. I request that they be printed at this point in the RECORD:

CAMPAIGN FOR ADEQUATE WELFARE REFORM NOW

The Campaign for Adequate Welfare Reform Now has one purpose: achievement this year of major welfare reform to create a new system of income maintenance assistance to meet the basic needs of all individuals and families in the United States who are unable to work, whose earnings are inadequate and for whom jobs are not available. Organizations and individuals in the campaign endorse the kind of welfare reform that satisfies most, or all, of the principles and goals set forth in this statement.

One. A new, unified and largely federally financed program of assistance, with strong and clear legal requirements and guidelines to assure equitable and efficient treatment and administration.

Two. Coverage for all poor people, based on need, regardless of reason for poverty, and including people employed at inadequate (substandard) wages, individuals under 65 and couples without children.

Three. Assistance grant levels starting close to official poverty levels, with provision for orderly steps to reach standards of adequacy for health and decency as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and with flexibility of grant levels to meet realistic variations in costs of living.

Four. Incentives and realistic aids to encourage those eligible for public assistance to move into job training and full employment—such as: jobs at no less than minimum federal wage or prevailing wage, whichever is higher; right to keep enough earned income to make working more attractive than relying solely on public assistance (with recognition that many people who have been trapped by the existing system may need as long as two years to make a full transition to self-support); day care services; and public service jobs where there is a shortage of private or other public sector jobs.

Five. Acceptance of declaration of need as sufficient to establish eligibility, with provision for periodic spot checks to determine accuracy of eligibility and payment (in the manner of Social Security and Income Tax programs); and guarantee of rights to fair hearing with representation.

Six. Protection against denial of assistance pending enrollment in a training program or acceptance of a job *and* against forced acceptance of training or a job, especially for any mother who considers *either* detrimental to the well-being of her children.

Seven. Top priority to availability of supportive service such as day care, counseling, family planning, health and legal services for the most needy—but with services for assisted people being of the same quality as for others who need such services but can pay for them according to ability.

Eight. Requirement for realistic participation by those benefiting directly from the program to influence the administration and general nature of programs.

Nine. Special protections to assure American Indians and migrants, citizens of Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands full and equitable participation in all assistance programs.

Ten. Requirement that notification of benefits and qualifications of entitlement be publicized by federal administering agencies in regular public media, and be made available to organizations of poor people.

THE PROPERTY TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1971

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am today joining my colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) in cosponsoring a bill to provide property tax relief for the low-income elderly who suffer disproportionately from the effects of inflation and rising taxation.

The proposal is modeled after the suc-

cessful Wisconsin Homestead Relief Act of 1964 which has been recommended for all States by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Four additional States have followed Wisconsin's lead, but I agree with my colleague from Wisconsin that this proposal should provide this relief on a national level by using the Federal income tax system.

Time and time again I have received communications from my constituents relaying the difficulties they encounter with a fixed income, increases in living expenses and taxes. In some cases excessive taxes have taken as much as one-third of their incomes, with no relief in sight.

The Wisconsin act's positive results indicate a viable vehicle of relief for the low-income elderly. In fiscal 1970 it provided tax relief of $712 million to 74,000 low-income elderly at a cost less than 1 percent of total property tax collections in the State.

The legislative proposal I am cosponsoring today would normally provide for credits against the Federal tax except for persons whose incomes are so low that they owe less income tax than the amount of relief due to them. Elderly persons in this category would receive direct funds calculated on income and property tax liability.

The tax relief would go to those over 65 with a total yearly income of $3,700 or less, with a limit of $330 in property taxes that can be used in computing relief. The refund or credit is intended to offset only that portion of the property tax that is well in excess of what can be considered a fair burden.

We rarely have the opportunity to observe in advance the outcome of legislation we propose. I urge this Congress to take full advantage of the success of a similar program at a lower level of government, and act promptly to remove an unfair share of the tax burden from a segment of our population that can least afford to shoulder that burden.

CULEBRA FOR THE CULEBRANS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I was dismayed to learn last Thursday of the administration's half-hearted decision to limit naval operations on Culebra, a small island 20 miles to the east of Puerto Rico. Instead of arriving at a firm decision to ban all military activities in the interest of Culebra and its citizens, the Defense Department has issued a vague and noncommittal decree, designed to appease its critics while continuing its callous disregard for the safety and livelihood of the 1,200 Culebrans. For nearly a quarter of a century now, the Navy has used Culebra as a dartboard, shelling the island from both air and sea with disastrous consequences. I had hoped for an immediate end to this cruel and insensitive affront to these Spanish-speaking Americans.

On March 29, I wrote President Nixon to this effect, urging him to discontinue all naval operations on the island. On April 1, Secretary Laird provided this rather disappointing response: he promised to begin development of nonexplosive ammunition and to limit use of explosives by January, 1972, to initiate steps to alleviate the ecological damage caused by the Navy's target practices, and to study the 'option' of ending all military activities on Culebra by June, 1975. Certainly, these are improvements over the present situation. But why must we wait indefinitely for a complete end to the use of live ammunition? And why does the Navy insist on staying until at least 1975 and then only entertain the idea of leaving? The question of Culebra is a simple one—whether the Navy is willing to compromise the safety and sovereignty of 1,200 people—American citizens, no less—in order to keep a convenient firing range. I am sure many of my colleagues join me in urging the Navy and the Defense Department to modify this decision by adopting a firm policy imposing an immediate ban on the use of live ammunition and by agreeing to leave Culebra as soon as is physcially possible. I insert into the RECORD both my letter to President Nixon and the Defense Department press release outlining Secretary Laird's decision:

MARCH 29, 1971.

The PRESIDENT,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to express my concern about the upcoming decision regarding continued Navy activities on the island of Culebra. Regardless of the recommendation embodied in the Navy report scheduled to be released April 1, I urge you to rescind Executive Order 8684 of 1942 and order the complete cessation of naval activities on and around the island.

You are no doubt familiar with the plight of the 1200 natives of this island some twenty miles off the east coast of Puerto Rico who desire only to live their lives in peace, free from aerial and offshore bombardment.

The continued naval bombing of the island has had profound effects on the lives and property of the Culebrans. Since the Navy first started using the island in 1901, there have been one civilian death, three serious injuries, and countless near-misses. Only last May some six mortar rounds were accidentally fired into Flamingo Bay off Culebra where several children were swimming. In addition, the naval presence has affected the island's economy; fishermen are often prevented from going to sea by naval restrictions and the constant exploding of shells has severely damaged Culebra's cattle raising industry.

It is no wonder that the Culebrans, who are American citizens, vigorously oppose continued naval operations on their homeland. Judicial and legislative recourse have so far failed. Both Congress and the federal courts have been reluctant to intervene on behalf of the Culebrans. For these people, Mr. President, you are the last hope for a safe and tranquil future.

The Navy argues that Culebra is a vital cog in the Roosevelt Roads-South Atlantic training area. But the issue cuts much more deeply. The question is whether the Federal government is willing to compromise the safety and livelihood of its citizens for the convenience of military target practice. How do we protect our citizens by bombarding them?

To continue naval operations in Culebra when such activity is both dangerous and vigorously opposed by the inhabitants, would be unconscionable. I urge you to return Culebra to the Culebrans.

Sincerely,

ABNER J. MIKVA,
U.S. Congressman.

APRIL 1, 1971.

FOR CORRESPONDENTS: Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird today forwarded to the Congress and the President a report on the weapons training now being conducted in the Culebra complex of the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Range. The report is in response to section 611 of Public Law 91-544.

Secretary Laird announced that, after reviewing the report, he has directed the Navy to initiate immediately a number of actions which will enhance the safety and well being of the residents of Culebra and reduce the irritants to them resulting from Naval training in the area.

These actions include:

Cessation of explosive bombardment of the Northwest Peninsula of Culebra by January 1, 1972.

Development of non-explosive rounds for Naval gunnery practice.

Opening of all of the Flamingo Beach for public use at all times except during ship firing.

Construction of a road to Brava Beach and a bath house there so that the Culebrans will have unrestricted access to a bathing beach at all times.

Cessation of removal of sand from Culebra's beaches and initiation of legal steps necessary to halt the unauthorized exploitation of ecological resources under Navy stewardship.

Provision of unrestricted sea and air corridors between Culebra and St. Thomas, Vieques and mainland Puerto Rico.

Stationing of a Spanish-speaking, U.S. Naval officer in Dewey and another in Isabel Segunda on Vieques responsible for Range Safety.

Initiation of those land surveys, training maneuver analyses, and engineering studies required to provide the option of moving by June 1975 to a suitable alternative to the target areas on Culebra.

Improvement of community relations on Cuelebra and Vieques in particular and Puerto Rico in general.

Enhancement of the economic benefits to Culebra and Vieques in particular and Puerto Rico in general.

These actions are of course subject to Congressional approval of any necessary funding.

The Secretary also stated that he will reappraise the Culebra situation and the alternative option(s) from the point of view of National Security and the best interests of the people of Puerto Rico by the end of 1972 in order to make a final decision where to relocate the Naval training target areas now on Culebra and whether any additional actions should be taken.

ALBERT J. RUFFO SERVED STATE WELL

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, just recently, Albert J. Ruffo received recognition from one of the largest newspapers in the San Francisco Bay area, the San Jose Mercury.

Albert J. Ruffo's beginnings were humble; but his Italian immigrant parents instilled in Al the spirit of self-improve-

ment coupled with a fierce belief in education and competition. Leaving behind him a versatile record of achievements, Al was appointed to fill an unexpired term as a member of the board of trustees of the California State college system, during which time he was twice chairman. Those years were probably the most difficult ever experienced by institutions of higher education in this country. It was fortunate that the largest educational complex in the country had a man like Al Ruffo to rely on.

The editors of the San Jose Mercury lauded Al Ruffo by writing:

ALBERT J. RUFFO SERVED STATE WELL

Albert J. Ruffo, San Jose attorney, former football coach and civic leader, has just completed nearly 10 years as a Trustee of the California State College System. He deserves a vote of thanks from citizens statewide.

Ruffo, whose term expired March 1, was one of three retiring trustees replaced last week by appointees of Gov. Ronald Reagan. During Ruffo's almost 10 years as a state college trustee, the system grew from 15 to 19 campuses with a corresponding rise in student enrollment.

It was during Ruffo's tenure, too, that the larger state colleges, such as San Jose State, were upgraded academically and expanded into new areas of graduate-level education. The net result is that today a number of state colleges, notably including San Jose State, are universities in everything but name.

Albert J. Ruffo, attorney, former San Jose councilman and mayor, served his home community well. When the call came to serve the people of California as a state college trustee, he served them with great dedication and distinction.

In honoring Al Ruffo, it goes without saying I also honor his remarkable wife, Marianne, and their five children.

In brief, the profile of this ideal trustee includes the devotion of husband and father, the skill of an athlete, engineer, lawyer, and the dedication of civic official and professional leader. In all these fields is Al Ruffo respected and admired.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in calling Albert J. Ruffo a friend and a constituent. On behalf of the people in my district and the State of California, I thank him for his service on the board of trustees of the California State college system.

CHARGE OF MEMBERS' WIRETAPPING NEEDS INVESTIGATION

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I append herewith a letter which I have sent today to the chairman of our committee with reference to an investigation by the Subcommittee on Investigations of the full House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the charges made that the FBI has tapped Members of Congress' telephones. I am hoping that our subcommittee can hear this matter as soon after the recess as is possible and that any party wishing to appear at that hearing may come and give such information as may be in the public interest. But since charges have been made that the FBI has tapped the telephones of Members of Congress—and this is a serious charge—it is in the public interest that we have a forum for a hearing so that we can determine the truth of these charges.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 7, 1971.

Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On Monday of this week, the Gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Boggs, made a very serious charge against Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. On the floor of the House, he used these words: "When the FBI taps the telephones of Members of this body and of Members of the Senate . . . it is way past time, Mr. Speaker—that the present Director thereof no longer be the Director."

These are, indeed, serious charges. You will recall that in the Bernard Goldfine case in 1958, we established the precedent that the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was the proper forum for investigation of electronic surveillance. The matters involved in the charges by the Gentleman from Louisiana are concerning electronic surveillance.

I am informed by the Attorney General today that it would be in the nature of a criminal offense to tap the telephones, under the 1968 Act, of Members of Congress.

According to last evening's Star, the Gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Boggs, is alleged to have said that he has "positive proof" that the FBI has tapped the telephones of Members of Congress.

I urge that a hearing on this matter be set down at the earliest moment after the Easter recess and that the Gentleman from Louisiana have a full opportunity to present proof of these charges. This is a most serious charge which has been given not only nationwide but worldwide publicity. A full airing of these charges would be in the best interests not only of the FBI but of all of this country. Our Subcommittee would be rendering a public service in having these hearings and I would hope that they would be open to the public and to the press.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. SPRINGER.

PLUNDERING OF NATIONAL FORESTS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the forest lands of the Nation are being systematically destroyed by unsound forest practices that encourage indiscriminate timber harvesting to the detriment of environmental quality. Private and public forest lands of the Nation are plundered with little concern for the consequential damage to recreation, watershed, wildlife, range and forage, fisheries, esthetic and other values.

Recent newspaper articles and television news reports have graphically described the devastation that has rained down on some of our national forests through the practice of clear cutting of thousands of acres of steeply sloped lands.

It is time to call a halt to these unsound forestry practices. Such practices are detrimental to our environment and to the timber harvesting industry. We need to encourage timber harvesting but only where it is in furtherance of the principals of the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act and the National Environmental Policy Act.

Today, with Congressman SAYLOR of Pennsylvania, Congressman WILLIAM D. FORD of Michigan, Congressman HECHLER of West Virginia, Congressman KARTH of Minnesota, Congressman MCCLOSKEY of California, Congressman NEDZI of Michigan, and Congressman REUSS of Wisconsin, joining as cosponsors, I am introducing a bill which builds upon the 1960 Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act (16 U.S.C. 528 et seq.). That important legislation has never been fully complied with by the National Forest Service. If there was compliance, I feel sure we would not have the problems today which we face in the national forests.

Some of the principal features of the bill are:

It declares that the public has a right to enjoy a healthy human environment and to expect that the Federal, State, and local governments will utilize all practicable means to protect that right and enhance the quality of our environment.

It provides for the establishment of criteria by the Secretary of Agriculture for the purpose of the States designating non-Federal commercial forest lands for timber harvesting and management.

It provides for the establishment by the States of standards for timber harvesting and land management of such designated lands and plans for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of such standards.

It provides for Federal enforcement of such standards and plans.

It provides for the licensing by the States of foresters pursuant to criteria established by the Secretary of Agriculture.

It directs that all timber harvesting on Federal forest lands, except those lands within the National Park System, the National Wildlife Refuge System and the Wilderness System, shall be conducted in accordance with the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act and that all timber harvesting operations shall not impair multiple use values. Timber harvesting, to the extent permitted on the excepted lands, is controlled by statutes applicable to those lands. None is permitted in wilderness areas.

It provides for the establishment of timber harvesting and land management plans for all such lands.

It provides limitations on clear cutting on Federal forest lands. Upon enactment, clear cutting will not be permitted except in accordance with promulgated timber harvesting and land management plans. Even then, the appropriate Secretary must find that clear cutting is a sound forest practice when applied to particular forest lands. Further, existing clear cutting contracts will be reviewed within 45 days after enactment where such work has not begun or is not substantially completed. Such work will be halted pending such review.

It provided that timber harvesting be by competitive bidding and that fair market value of timber products be obtained.

It provides export restrictions.

It establishes a Federal forest land trust fund for land acquisition and for environmental quality improvement.

These funds will be used equitably for enhancement and protection of recreation, water quality, fish and game management, esthetic and other multiple use values.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation also provides a mechanism which will enable the public to play a greater role in the carrying out of timber harvesting and land management operations on Federal forest lands, and on non-Federal commercial forest lands. This public participation will afford important safeguards against the unsound practices which have been so prevalent in the past and which continue to this day.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed Forest Lands Restoration and Protection Act of 1971 appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

H.R. 7388

A bill to provide for comprehensive management of the nation's forest lands through the application of sound forest practices, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Forest Lands Restoration and Protection Act of 1971".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. When used in this Act, the term

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture;

(2) "timber harvesting and land management plan" means a comprehensive plan for the harvesting of timber and the managing of commercial forest land by using sound forest practices and taking into account the particular ecological conditions encountered (including soil, climate, vegetative cover, and topography);

(3) "fully mature tree" means a tree which has attained at least 95 per centum of its maximum potential height growth, has grown its maximum volume of high quality wood, and whose merchantable portion is capable of being manufactured into high grade lumber;

(4) "sound forest practice" includes, but is not limited to, protection of site quality, prevention of erosion particularly on steep slopes and in areas of unstable soil, selection for harvesting of fully mature trees wherever consistent with the biological requirements of the tree species, limitation of clearcuts to small openings to maintain as much contiguous forest cover as possible, growth of timber on long rotations, prompt reforesting after harvest or after fire or any other disaster, prevention of the degradation of any waters, and to follow even-flow principles;

(5) "even-flow" means perpetual yield of approximately equal annual amounts of timber of the same or improving quality in quantities which do not decline and which may increase;

(6) "small forest landowner" includes any person who owns, leases, operates, or otherwise controls no more than 5,000 acres of designated commercial forest land;

(7) The term "person" includes an individual, partnership, corporation, company, association, firm, society, joint stock company, Indian tribe, State, municipality, and political subdivision of a State;

(8) The term "cooperative management unit" means an association or group established under State law of small forest landowners who harvest timber and manage designated commercial forest lands under a single timber harvesting and land management plan;

(9) "commercial forest land" means any forest land capable of growing continuous crops of fully mature trees on an even-flow basis after application of sound forest practices consistent with the purposes of this Act;

(10) "forest products" means any renewable material including trees, shrubs, and flowers or other plant life which are sold from forest lands;

(11) "forest lands" when referred to in section 3 and Title II of this Act includes all federally owned or administered forest land as that term is defined in the Act of March 29, 1944 (16 U.S.C. 583f);

(12) "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation or communication among the several States, or between a place in a State and any place outside thereof, or within the District of Columbia or a posession of the United States, or between points in the same State but through a point outside thereof, or which affects commerce; and

(13) "State" includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

FINDINGS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 3. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the environmental quality and productivity of the Nation's forest lands are rapidly deteriorating to inadequate and unregulated timber harvesting and land management procedures and measures;

(2) the public has a right to enjoy a healthy human environment and to expect that the Federal Government, the States and local government will utilize all practicable means and measures to protect that right and enhance the quality of our environment;

(3) multiple-use values relating to recreation, watershed, wildlife, range and forage, fisheries, esthetic enjoyment, and preservation of wilderness are not being adequately taken into account with respect to the management of the Nation's forest lands;

(4) a maximum sustained yield of high quality timber products in an even flow from the Nation's forest lands is not occurring; and

(5) approximately four-fifths of the Nation's commercial forest lands are privately or otherwise nonfederally owned and that much of these lands are not being optimally managed through the application of sound forest practices.

(b) It is, therefore, the purpose of this Act to create and maintain an effective and comprehensive ssytem of regulation and use of all forest lands in the Nation through a program where timber harvesting and land management will be carried out only on forest lands already in, and suitable for, commercial production of timber products so as to assure that:

(1) the environmental quality and productivity of forest lands are restored, enhanced, and maintained;

(2) multiple-use values are effectively taken into account with respect to the management of such lands; and

(3) the goal of maximum sustained yield of high quality timber products is achieved consistent with such multiple-use values.

TITLE I—COMMERCIAL FOREST LANDS

CRITERIA FOR THE DESIGNATION OF COMMERCIAL FOREST LANDS

SEC. 101. (a) Within forty-five days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register proposed criteria for the designation by the States of commercial forest lands located therein. Such criteria shall be consistent with, and in furtherance of, the purposes of this Act.

(b) After a reasonable time for interested persons to submit written comments thereon (but not later than ninety days after the initial publication of such proposed criteria), the Secretary shall promulgate such criteria with such modifications as he deems appropriate. Such comments shall be available for public inspection.

(c) The Secretary shall from time to time review, and, as appropriate, revise such criteria in the same manner as the initial criteria was developed.

STATE DESIGNATION OF COMMERCIAL FOREST LANDS AND STANDARDS FOR TIMBER HARVESTING AND LAND MANAGEMENT

SEC. 102. (a)(1) Each State shall, after reasonable notice and public hearings, designate all lands located in such State (within six months after criteria are promulgated under section 101 of this title) which are already in, or suitable for, consistent with the criteria promulgated by the Secretary under section 101 of this title, as commercial forest lands, except that such designations shall not apply to any Federal forest land. In addition, each State shall, after reasonable notice and public hearings, adopt within nine months after the enactment of this Act, and submit to the Secretary (A) standards for timber harvesting and land management of designated commercial forest lands, and (B) a plan for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of such standards (hereinafter referred to as the "plan").

(2) The Secretary shall, within four months after the date required for submission of standards and a plan under paragraph (1) of this subsection, approve or disapprove such standards and plan or any portion thereof. He shall approve such standards or any portion thereof, if he determines that they were adopted after reasonable notice and hearing and are consistent with the purposes of this Act. He shall approve such plan or any portion thereof, if he determines that it was adopted after reasonable notice and hearing and that—

(A) it provides for the attainment of such standards as expeditiously as practicable;

(B) it provides necessary assurances that a designated State agency has or will have (within one year from the date of approval of such plan) adequate funding, authority, and trained personnel to carry out and enforce such standards and plan;

(C) it provides effective measures, including, but not limited to, land use controls, to insure maintenance of such standards after they are attained;

(D) it provides for periodic reports by persons subject to such plans on the timber and land management operations conducted by such persons, which reports shall be available to the public;

(E) it provides that each person who owns, leases, operates, or otherwise controls all or any portion of any designated commercial forest land and who conducts or plans to conduct timber harvesting thereon shall submit to the appropriate State agency (with four months after the approval of such standards) an effective timber harvesting and land management plan prepared by a licensed forester for all or portion of such person's land consistent with such approved State standards and plan, except that where more than one person owns, leases, operates, or otherwise controls such lands and conducts or plans to conduct timber harvesting thereon, each such plan shall be coordinated to insure that it is so consistent;

(F) it provides (i) for periodic review and, where appropriate, revision, after public hearings, of such standards or plan, or both, to achieve the purposes of this section, (ii) for revision of such standards or plan, or

both, whenever the Secretary finds on the basis of information available to him that such standards or plans are substantially inadequate to achieve the purposes of this Act; and

(G) it provides such other information as the Secretary may require to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(3) The Secretary shall, in accordance with the procedures and requirements of this subsection, approve any revision of such standards or plan.

(4) The Secretary may, whenever he finds it necessary and publishes his finding, extend the period for submission of any plan or portion thereof not to exceed 6 months.

(b) The Secretary shall, after consideration of any State hearing record, promptly prepare and publish proposed regulations setting forth such plan or portion thereof, if (1) a State fails to submit standards or a plan for implementation, maintenance, and enforcement of such standards within the time prescribed, or (2) the standards or plan, or portion thereof, or both submitted is determined by him not to be in accordance with the requirements of this section, or (3) the State fails, within 60 days after notice by him or such longer period as he may prescribe, to revise such standards or plan as required by this section. If such State held no public hearing associated with adoption of such standards or plan, he shall provide an opportunity for such hearing within such State on any proposed regulation for such State. He shall, within 6 months after the date required for submission of such standards or plan, promulgate any such regulation unless, prior to such promulgation, such State has adopted and submitted standards or plan which he determines to be in accordance with the requirements of this section. Such standards or plan promulgated by him for any State shall be the standards or plan, or both, applicable to such State in the same manner as if such standards or plan had been adopted by such State and approved pursuant to this section, and shall remain in effect until such State submits such standards or plan and it is approved under this section.

(c)(1) A petition for review of any action of the Secretary approving such standards or plan, or both, may be filed in the United States court of appeals for the circuit which includes the applicable State. Such petition shall be filed, within 30 days from the date of such approval by any interested person praying that it be modified or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of the petition shall forthwith be sent by registered or certified mail to the Secretary and thereupon he shall certify and file in such court the record upon which the approval complained of was issued, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm or set aside the determination complained of in whole or in part. The findings of the Secretary with respect to questions of fact shall be sustained if based upon a fair evaluation of the entire record at such hearing.

(2) Such approved standards or plans with respect to which review could have been obtained under this subsection shall not be subject to judicial review in any civil or criminal proceeding for enforcement under this Act.

TIMBER SUBJECT TO ACT

SEC. 103. (a) Beginning on and after the date established by section 102 of this title for designating commercial forest lands in each State, no person shall sell, offer for sale, deliver, or introduce any timber into commerce which was harvested from any land in such State other than from designated commercial forest lands.

(b) Beginning on and after the date established under section 102 of this title for the approval of standards and a plan for each State, no person shall sell, offer for sale, deliver, or introduce any timber into commerce which was harvested on a designated commercial forest lands in such State in violation of such standards or plan, or both.

(c) Any person who knowingly violates subsection (a) or (b) of this section shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both, except that if the conviction is for a violation committed after the first conviction of such person under this title, punishment shall be by a fine of not more than $25,000, or by imprisonment for not more than three years, or by both, one-third of said fine shall be paid to any person who gives information leading to a conviction and he may sue for the same.

FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT OF STANDARDS AND PLANS

SEC. 104. (a). Whenever, on the basis of information available to him, the Secretary finds that violations of an applicable standard or plan approved by him under section 102 of this title, he shall notify the person in violation and the appropriate State of such finding by certified mail. If such violation extends beyond the 15th day after receipt of such notice, he shall issue an order requiring such person to comply or he may bring a civil action in accordance with subsection (b) of this section. Any order issued under this subsection shall state with reasonable specificity the nature of the violation, specify a time for compliance which the Secretary, taking into account the seriousness of the violation and any good faith efforts to comply, determines is reasonable. A copy of any such order shall be sent to the appropriate State and all orders and notices and related data, information, documents, and material shall be available to the public for inspection.

(b)(1) The Secretary may commence a civil action for appropriate relief, including a permanent or temporary injunction, whenever any person—

(A) violates or fails or refuses to comply with any order issued under this section; or

(B) violates any standard or plan for more than 15 days after receipt of notice thereof under this section.

(2) Any action under this subsection may be brought in the district court of the United States for the district in which the defendant is located or resides or is doing business, and such court shall have jurisdiction to restrain such violation and to require compliance. Notice of the commencement of such action shall be given to the appropriate State agency.

INSPECTIONS, MONITORING, AND ENTRY

SEC. 104. (a) For the purpose of (i) developing or approving or assisting in the development of any standards and any plan for the implementation, maintenance, and enforcement thereof or (ii) determining whether any person is in violation of any such standard or plan—

(1) the Secretary shall require the person who owns, leases, operates or otherwise controls any designated commercial forest lands to (A) establish and maintain such records, (B) make such reports, and (C) provide such other information as he may reasonably require; and

(2) the Secretary or his authorized representative, upon presentation of his credentials—

(A) shall have a right of entry to, upon, or through such lands or in any premises in which any records required to be maintained under paragraph (1) of this subsection are located, and

(B) may at reasonable times have access to and copy any records and inspect such lands and timber operations conducted thereon.

(b) Each State shall develop and submit to the Secretary a procedure for carrying out subsection (a) of this section in such State. Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit the Secretary from carrying out this subsection in a State.

(c) In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Secretary may issue subpenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of relevant papers, books, and other documents, he may administer oaths. Any records, reports, or information obtained under this title shall be available to the public, except that upon a showing satisfactory to the Secretary by any person that records, reports, or information, or particular part thereof to which the Secretary has access under this title if made public, would divulge methods or processes entitled to protection as trade secrets of such person, the Secretary shall consider such record, report, or information, or particular portion thereof confidential, except that such record, report, or information may be disclosed to other officers, employees, or authorized representatives of the United States concerned with carrying out this Act or when relevant in any proceeding under this Act. Witnesses summoned shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States. In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena served upon any person under this subsection, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the United States and after notice to such person, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony before the Secretary, to appear and produce papers, books, and documents before the Secretary, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

LICENSING OF FORESTERS

SEC. 105. Each State shall establish requirements for the licensing by the State of all foresters working within the State in accordance with criteria to be established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall publish within four months after enactment of this Act criteria for the licensing of foresters and shall provide an opportunity for public written comment thereon. Such criteria shall be promulgated by him within three months after such publication. The Secretary shall from time to time review, and, where appropriate, revise such criteria in accordance with this section. Such comments shall be available to the public.

COOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT UNITS

SEC. 106. The Secretary shall cooperate with the States in providing technical assistance to small forest landowners whose commercial forest lands are within a cooperative management unit, in the development of timber harvesting and land management plans, and in otherwise assisting such landowners in carrying out the requirements of this Act.

TITLE II—TIMBER HARVESTING AND LAND MANAGEMENT ON FEDERAL FOREST LANDS

SEC. 201. Where timber harvesting on Federal forest lands is permitted, it shall be conducted in accordance with the principles and requirements of the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act (16 U.S.C. 528 et seq.) and this Act. All such timber harvesting operations shall, to the fullest extent possible, not impair the multiple-use values relating to water quality, recreation, range, and forage, watershed, wildlife, and plant life, including habitat for populations of rare, endangered, disjunct, narrow range, endemic, or unique associations of species, fish, esthetics, and preservation of wilderness. Whenever the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, in the case of Federal forest lands under his jurisdiction, finds that such values are or

will be impaired on any such land, he shall not permit timber harvesting to begin or to continue until effective means and measures are developed to prevent such impairment and are reviewed by the public.

TIMBER HARVESTING ON FEDERAL LANDS

SEC. 202. (a) Beginning one year after the enactment of this Act, timber harvesting on Federal forest lands shall be conducted under timber harvesting and land management plans promulgated under this section.

(b) The Secretary or, in the case of Federal forest lands within the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, the Secretary of the Interior shall publish proposed plans for the harvesting of timber on Federal forest lands where such harvesting is permitted. Such plans shall be consistent with, and in furtherance of, the provisions of this Act and the Multiple Use and Sustained Yield Act. Such plans shall be published for all such lands within each State or region. Within forty-five days after such publication, the appropriate Secretary, whenever there is sufficient public interest in any such plan, shall hold a public hearing thereon. After considering any oral or written comment thereon, such Secretary shall promulgate each such plan with such modifications as may be appropriate within six months after such publication. Each such plan shall be reviewed at least every three years and, if appropriate, revised, after notice and public hearing.

(c) (1) The Secretary or, as appropriate, the Secretary of the Interior shall not enter into any contract or other arrangement for the clear cutting of any Federal forest land or portion thereof, until a timber harvesting and land management plan is promulgated for such land.

(2) After such plan is promulgated, the appropriate Secretary, before entering into any such contract, shall find, and publish his findings, whether clear cutting of any part of such forest lands is a sound forest practice. In making this finding he shall among other matters consider:

(i) the effect of clear cutting on all other resource values and the environment;

(ii) the compatibility of clear cutting with the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity of the forest lands and the integrity of the environment;

(iii) the practicability of reforestation and other work to restore forest lands which are clear-cut; and

(iv) all feasible and prudent alternatives to clear-cutting.

(3) The appropriate Secretary shall, within 45 days after enactment of this Act, review each contract or other arrangement to clear-cut timber on any Federal forest land where such work has not begun or is not substantially completed. Pending such review, such work shall be halted. If based on such review, he finds and publishes his finding that such work does not constitute a sound forest practice he shall terminate such contract. Such termination shall be subject to applicable provisions of law relating to the payment of damages, if any, for such termination.

(d) In entering into any contract or other arrangement for timber harvesting on Federal forest lands, the appropriate Secretary shall do so by competitive bidding and shall require that the fair market value of the timbers be received by the United States. He shall also provide that it is the responsibility of said contractor to comply fully with the applicable policies and requirements of this Act, including, but not limited to, those requiring that harvested lands be restored and wastes removed. The Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register within 6 months after enactment effective regulations to meet the requirements of this subsection and afford an opportunity for public comment thereon. Such regulations shall be promulgated, after consideration of such comment, 4 months after such publication.

FEDERAL ENFORCEMENT ON FEDERAL FOREST LANDS

SEC. 203. (a) Any person who knowingly harvests timber in violation of any applicable plan promulgated under this title shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $25,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both. If the conviction is for a violation committed after the first conviction of such person under this paragraph, punishment shall be by a fine of not more than $50,000 per day of violation, or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or by both. One-half of said fine shall be paid to any person giving information which shall lead to a conviction and he may sue for the same.

(b) Any person who knowingly makes any false statement, representation, or certification in any application, record, report, plan, or other document filed or required to be maintained under this Act shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than six months, or by both.

(c) No Federal agency may enter into any contract with any person, who is convicted of any offense under section 103 of this Act or this section, to harvest timber on Federal forest lands. The prohibition in the preceding sentence shall continue until the Administrator certifies that the condition giving rise to such conviction has been corrected.

(d) Any person who conducts timber harvesting operations on any lands subject to such plans shall establish and maintain such records and make such reports as the appropriate Secretary shall require. Any records, reports, or information obtained under this section shall be available to the public, except that upon a showing satisfactory to the Secretary by any person that records, reports, or information, or particular part thereof, to which the Secretary has access under this section if made public, would divulge methods or processes entitled to protection as trade secrets of such person, the Secretary shall consider such record, report or information or particular portion thereof confidential, except that such record, report, or information may be disclosed to other officers, employees, or authorized representatives of the United States concerned with carrying out this Act or when relevant in any proceeding under this Act.

NATIONAL FORESTS: PRIMITIVE AREAS

SEC. 204. (a) All areas within the national forests which fall within the definition of "wilderness" as defined by section 2(c) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131) but are not, as of the date of enactment of this Act, classified as a "primitive area" or "wilderness" area by such Act because they fail to satisfy the acreage requirement of such Act, are hereby given "primitive area" status and shall be managed under the provisions of such Act as a "primitive area", if such area is at least three thousand contiguous acres, or at least one thousand two hundred and eighty contiguous acres if adjacent to a presently designated "wilderness area" or "primitive area".

(b) The Secretary shall, within ten years after the date of enactment of this Act, review, as to its suitability or nonsuitability for preservation as "wilderness", all areas whose classification is changed to "primitive area" as a result of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed to abrogate any contract in existence on or before December 31, 1970, to harvest timber in a national forest.

EXPORT RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 205. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no logs or unfinished forest products from Federal forest lands or from designated commercial forest lands shall be exported from the United States during any calendar year, unless the Secretary shall find, after public hearings with adequate notice in the Federal Register of such hearings, that the Nation's projected timber supply needs for each of the five consecutive years thereafter can be satisfied entirely by domestice supplies.

FEDERAL FOREST LAND FUND

SEC. 206. (a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the "Federal Forest Land Fund" (hereinafter referred to as the "Trust Fund"). The Trust Fund shall consist of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Trust Fund as provided in this section.

(b) (1) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Trust Fund amounts equal to the net proceeds accruing to the United States from the sale of forest products by the United States.

(2) The amounts appropriated by paragraph (1) shall be transferred at least monthly from the general fund of the Treasury to the Trust Fund on the basis of estimates made by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amounts, referred to in paragraph (1), received in the Treasury. Proper adjustments shall be made in any amounts transferred to the extent that prior estimates were in excess of or less than the amounts required to be transferred.

(c) (1) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to hold the Trust Fund and to report to the Congress not later than the first day of March of each year on the financial condition and the results of the operations of the Trust Fund during the preceding fiscal year and on its projected expected condition and operations. Such report shall be printed as a House document of the session of the Congress to which the report is made.

(2) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to invest such portion of the Trust Fund as is not, in his judgment, required to meet current withdrawals. Such investments may be made only in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the United States.

(d) Amounts in the Trust Fund shall be available in addition to all other appropriated and other funds, to the Secretary for making expenditures to complete the national forest system, to complete the acquisition of inholdings, including those affecting recreational programs which have been authorized by Congress, to enlarge tree-planting operations on Federal Forest lands, and to carry out other activities to improve the environment within Federal forest lands.

OTHER LAWS

SEC. 207. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to Federal forest lands within the National Wildlife Refuge System and the National Park System.

EMPLOYEE PROTECTION

SEC. 208. (a) No person shall discharge or in any other way discriminate against or cause to be discharged or discriminated against any employee of any timber harvesting operation or any authorized representative thereof by reason of the fact that such employee or representative (1) has notified the Administrator or his authorized representative of any alleged violation, (2) has filed, instituted, or caused to be filed or instituted any proceeding under this Act, or (3) has testified or is about to testify in any proceeding resulting from the administration or enforcement of the provisions of this Act.

(b) Any such employee or representative who believes that he has been discharged or otherwise discriminated against by any person in violation of subsection (a) of this section may, within thirty days after such violation occurs, apply to the Secretary of La-

bor for a review of such alleged discharge or discrimination. A copy of the application shall be sent to such person who shall be the respondent. Upon receipt of such application, the Secretary of Labor shall cause such investigation to be made as he deems appropriate. Such investigation shall provide an opportunity for a public hearing at the request of any party to enable the parties to present information relating to such violation. The parties shall be given written notice of the time and place of the hearing at least five days prior to the hearing. Any such hearing shall be of record and shall be subject to section 554 of title 5 of the United States Code. Upon receiving the report of such investigation, the Secretary shall make findings of fact. If he finds that such violation did occur, he shall issue a decision, incorporating an order therein, requiring the person committing such violation to take such affirmative action to abate the violation as the Secretary of Labor deems appropriate, including, but not limited to, the rehiring or reinstatement of the employee or representative to his former position with back pay. If he finds that there was no such violation, he shall issue an order denying the application. Such order shall incorporate the Secretary's findings therein. Any order issued by the Secretary under this subsection shall be subject to judicial review in accordance with this Act. Violations by any person of subsection (a) of this section shall be subject to the provisions of section 203 of this Act.

(c) Whenever an order is issued under this section, at the request of the applicant, a sum equal to the aggregate amount of all costs and expenses (including the attorney's fees) as determined by the Secretary of Labor to have been reasonably incurred by the applicant for, or in connection with, the institution and prosecution of such proceedings, shall be assessed against the person committing such violation.

REPORT

SEC. 209. The Secretary and the Secretary of the Interior shall on September 1 of each year submit to the Congress a report on the actions taken by each under this Act during the preceding fiscal year. Such report shall include a detailed description of all timber harvesting contracts or other such arrangements on Federal forest lands and a statement of any findings made by each concerning any clear cutting permitted under such contracts, and a statement of the actions, including legislative recommendations, which are necessary to more fully carry out the purposes and requirements of this Act. The report shall also set forth the sums accruing to the Fund established by this Act and the actions taken with such sums. The report shall also describe in detail the actions taken or not taken by each State to carry out the purposes and requirements of this Act.

A POLICEMAN'S PRAYER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the many dedicated policemen and policewomen in this country face daily pressures and dangers which are frequently unappreciated by the American people. A policeman does not know, when he begins his workday, whether he will be called upon to investigate a robbery, help a lost child, calm a riot, or merely direct traffic. He must maintain a flexible mental attitude which most of us would find difficult to match.

To help him through his difficult days, sometimes fraught with unexpected dangers a policeman must be able to call upon great resources of inner strength. The New York State Parkway Police Benevolent Association recently distributed "A Policeman's Prayer" which expresses this need, and I would like to include this prayer and the names of the group's officers at this point in the RECORD:

A POLICEMAN'S PRAYER

Dear Lord, be with me on my post
This day and every day.
Grant that each weary mile I patrol
may ease a brother's way.
Let me be kindly to the old
And to the young be strong,
But let me triumph over those
whose acts are cruel or wrong.
And when my own last summons comes
And I stand in Your Court,
Lord, may my rest with You be long,
My punishment be short.

NEW YORK STATE PARKWAY POLICE BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION

President, William F. Rupp; First Vice President, George J. Koch; Second Vice President, James P. Hallinan; Treasurer, Richard Borchers; Secretary, Edgar J. Lawrence. Chaplains, Father Arthur Kane, Reverend John W. Bardsley, Rabbi H. Judah Hurwitz. Trustees, Walter Henry, Anthony Guzowski, Albert Stocker, Grover Weickert. Counsel, Richard Hartman.

GSA POLLUTION REDUCTION EXPERIMENTS SUCCESSFUL

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the prime objectives of our Nation's technology is to devise a way to cut down and finally eliminate pollution from the internal combustion engine. Our scientists and technologists engaged in this important research have come up with various solutions to the problem. One approach has been to find a fuel capable of being burned clean in our internal combustion engines, with but slight and inexpensive engine modification. There have been several fuels advanced by their proponents as being the answer to our problem, but up until now we have had no large-scale testing in practical, everyday use in a large number of vehicles.

The General Services Administration has supplied this vital, missing factor. Following a successful experimental conversion of 24 vehicles—sedans, light and medium trucks—at the motor pool at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Los Angeles, it has converted a total of 344 vehicles to a dual-fuel power system. The experiment was so successful that the GSA now plans to convert more than 1,000 additional vehicles to run on clean-burning natural fuels, including liquefied natural gas and liquid petroleum gas, by August 1971.

Not only has the agency been in the forefront in the search for a viable alternative to the problem of pollution from exhaust emission of vehicles running on standard gasoline fuel by demonstrating reductions of as much as 87 percent of the three chief pollutants, but it has offered to share its natural gas refueling facilities and to provide private fleet operators with conversion and inspection manuals and driver training information.

An interesting report has been written under GSA sponsorship titled: "A Report on the General Services Administration's Dual-Fuel Vehicle Experiment—Pollution Reduction With Cost Savings." It reports the detailed results obtained in their first experimental fleet conversion to the dual system at the VA Hospital in Los Angeles, and I recommend it to anyone who is interested in a practical application of the progress we have made in vehicle pollution abatement.

Also, in an encouraging example of government interdepartmental cooperation, the new Environmental Protection Agency has enlisted the GSA for further help in the experimental use of clean-burning fuels, so we can look forward to additional breakthroughs, in the near future.

I commend the General Services Agency for its service to the search for a pollution-free fuel—one which offers a viable alternative to scrapping the internal combustion engine. Any and all forms of transportation should be available to our citizens, and they should be able to choose that form which best fits their needs without running the risk of further polluting our environment.

OHIO HIGH SCHOOL BASKETBALL

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, little national attention focuses on high school basketball and less still on those teams which are not at least State champions. I would like to call attention to one of those teams which, nevertheless, deserves more than local recognition. I refer to the East Technical High School Scarabs of Cleveland who, led by coach John Chavers, have highlighted Ohio basketball over the years.

In 1958 and 1959 East Tech took two consecutive State championships but since has been unable to capture the title. This year, led by senior center Freddie Beamon, the captain of the Scarabs, East Tech faltered in the semifinals of the class "AAA" tournament after an heroic comeback effort that marked one of their finest exhibitions of skill and teamwork. Other starters for the Scarabs last season were junior forwards Robert Lukas and James Abrams and guards Lawrence Bolden and Sam Walker. Walker was the defensive standout of the team.

Since its championship in 1959, East Tech has participated in the State championship tournaments six times, reaching the semifinals and the finals three times each. The team has had strong

support from the other students and the school's principal, Mr. Joseph Smith, whose leadership and loyalty was acknowledged when the team presented its trophy to him on their return to Cleveland.

Undaunted by his team's loss, Coach Chavers is already looking to next year's season. In an article by Dick Zunt which was published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on March 29, 1971, he indicated that prospects are excellent for an even greater season in 1972. I am proud to have such a team in my district and will continue, as I have in the past, to give them my hearty support.

The article follows:

CHAVERS OPTIMISTIC OVER TECH'S '72 OUTLOOK

(By Dick Zunt)

"We have high hopes of coming back next year as seven of our players are juniors," said East Tech coach John Chavers Saturday, in Ohio State's University's St. John Arena.

Chavers had just received a plaque from the Ohio High School Athletic Association for his team's appearance in the semifinals of the 49th Ohio basketball championships.

He and his two junior forwards, James Abrams and Robert Lucas, had accepted the plaque on behalf of the team, the Tech fans and the school administration.

Chavers also thanked the Tech fans for their allegiance to the team. He spoke over the arena public address system.

Tech had lost its semifinal contest, 76–69, to Dayton Dunbar Friday night.

In addition to Abrams and Lucas, the third starter returning next season is sophomore guard Lawrence Bolden.

All-Ohio senior center Freddie Beamon put on a tremendous 29-point show in defeat. Guard Sam Walker, the other senior starter, held Dunbar's high-scoring Bill Higgins to eight points in the first half Friday, but Walker's defensive efforts cost him his fourth personal foul when the second half was only nine seconds old.

Walker then had to sit out most of the second half, while Higgins broke loose for 20 of his team-high 28 points to spark the Dunbar triumph.

Walker went back into the game with 6:40 left in the fourth quarter, but fouled out with 4:30 remaining. His absence left Higgins with room to roam. Walker, during the season, always had been assigned to the opponents' top scorer. His defensive maneuvers were hard to top.

Walker will be missed. Chavers will have to find another defensive whiz from among his returnees.

Kevin Chambers, up from the junior varsity is another Tech sophomore. He's 6–3.

Juniors back are 6–5 Michael St. Clair, 6–5 Nathaniel Washington, 6–4 Charles Morris, 6–1 Van Glenn Neal, and 5–8 Ralph Harrison. The remaining Tech tourney team member is senior Ronald Thomas.

Bolden played an outstanding game in the Dunbar defeat. He sizzled home 16 points and twirled a number of pin-point passes to waiting teammates, especially to Beamon, who wore his all-Ohio honors well.

Abrams started fast, scoring eight of his 12 points in the first quarter, but he was whistled for his third personal foul with 2:36 left in the second period, and wasn't very effective thereafter.

Lucas tallied only four points, and the foul-plagued Walker, two, both far below their season averages.

Many fans still are puzzled over Tech's tremendous start, which had Dunbar reeling, 21–10, in the opening minute of the second period.

With two of the Wolverines' starting "money" players, the Cash brothers (6–7 Cornelius and 6–5 Lorenzo) on the bench with three fouls apiece, Dunbar took the play and the lead away from Tech.

Higgins pumped home a field goal 17 seconds before halftime, and took a 32–30 lead to the dressing room.

Tech erased an eight-point third period deficit with a string of points to tie, 46–46, but then missed the possible go-ahead free throw.

Late in the fourth quarter, the Scarabs uncorked a four-basket barrage to slice a 73–61 disadvantage to 73–69 with 1:06 to play But, at this point Tech called time out and never did get its momentum back.

For the sixth straight time (1960–61–62–63–67 and this season) a Tech team has failed to win the big school championship. Three of these trips ended with semifinal defeats, three others with championship game defeats.

Saturday, Chavers thanks the Tech fans. "They're the best," he said. The team will try to be the best, next year.

OUR TEXTILE TRAGEDY

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD today the following interim report, from the Greenville, S.C., Piedmont of April 1, 1971, on the tragic condition of our American textile industry. For 3 months now, I have faithfully filed regress reports on this subject in these pages, but my efforts seem to have done little good. What the textile industry is offered is the phony panacea of unilateral voluntary trade restrictions, when what is really needed is legislation of an enforceable nature which will place the interests of American business first in the priorities of its Government's concerns. That is as it should be, as the government of Japan has very clearly realized, when it comes to protecting Japanese interests. Just why we in Congress should have such trouble in coming to a like realization is beyond me. Soon, however, if we are to believe the similar reports in these pages about the woes besetting other large industries due to unfair foreign competition, this Nation will become, not its own producer, but a landscape of warehouses and distributing points which sell only the goods of other nations. Present troubles are serious enough for predictions about the future to be this grave. It is time to act, here, in this House, on behalf of an exquisite American economic calamity that is already upon us:

OVER 27,000 SOUTHERN TEXTILE WORKERS JOBLESS BECAUSE OF MILL CLOSINGS

(By Charles S. Taylor)

ATLANTA (UPI).—Across the South, the lights behind the blue windows of the textile mills are going out, darkened by a slumping economy and a deluge of cheap Asian imports.

Since January of 1969, when the economic effects of foreign shipments, principally from Japan and Hong Kong, first were felt, 50 textile mills in the South have closed their doors. Others, while managing to stay open, drastically trimmed their payrolls.

The mill closings have sent more than 27,200 Southern workers home to collect unemployment pay, or to find other lower-paying jobs. Even some salaried workers and management personnel find themselves looking for employment.

The textile industry in this country, heavily concentrated in the Carolinas, Georgia and Alabama, is the South's leading employer, with more than 550,000 workers, not counting those in apparel production.

Plant closing also are occurring in the New England textile belt, which has about 30 per cent of the industry.

In North Carolina, the nation's leading textile producer, 30 plants have gone out of business. Thirteen plants closed in South Carolina, and seven in Georgia and Alabama.

In 1970 alone, this meant the loss of 10,700 jobs in North Carolina, 6,100 in South Carolina, 6,300 in Georgia and 1,200 in Alabama. Several thousand more were laid off in 1969 and the first few months of this year.

The major indices used to measure the U.S. textile industry provide a stark outline of what has happened. In 1970, production was down 3.5 per cent compared to 1969. Sales were off .5 per cent, profits down 31 per cent and employment 3.3 per cent.

While textile leaders describe foreign imports as the major reason for the downturn, they also cite a generally sluggish U.S. economy.

Large financial layouts for control of air and water pollution have been made by some mills, especially those with dye and finishing operations. Bibb Manufacturing Co. of Macon, Ga., which reported a loss of $7.2 million in 1970, had to spend more than $1 million cleaning up water pollution at six plants.

Imports, however, were the major culprit. Last year they hit a new record level of more than four billion square yards, according to the American Textile Manufacturers Institute (ATMI). Dollar value of the imports totaled $2.4 billion—an increase of more than 11 per cent over 1969, which had been the record year for imports.

In contrast, American-made textile exports in 1970 totalled only $768 million. This left a textile trade deficit of $1.6 billion.

Hourly earnings of textile workers last year averaged $2.47 and employes took home a pay check averaging $99.54 weekly. With the loss of 27,200 jobs in the southeastern textile industry, this has meant a $140,400,000 blow to the economy of the region, offset somewhat by unemployment compensation and the fact that some of the furloughed workers moved into other jobs.

In small communities the plant closings have been critical blows.

"They just closed up, the shades pulled and the lights out," said Mayor J. P. Phillips after the Handley Mill closed at Roanoke, Ala., last November, putting 844 people out of work in a city of 5,060 population.

"We just don't close the operation of a $90,000 weekly payroll without it hurting the community. The plant had been in continuous operation for more than 50 years."

Mrs. James Brown, a textile worker for 19 years, was one of 500 persons left jobless when Aragon Mills of Aragon, Ga., closed. She later got another job making $51, half her weekly textile pay.

"Thirty-five to 40 per cent of the people in the mill were ready to retire," said Mrs. Brown. "Most of them had a lot of seniority. Some lacked two months of being able to retire."

A millhand at Lyman, S.C., who was laid off five months ago, now works at a service station making two-thirds of his textile pay. His wife supplements his income by working as a telephone operator.

"I don't feel any bitterness toward the mill," he said. "It wasn't their fault that I got laid off really. It was those Japanese imports. They have got people over there who don't work for much pay at all and they can just send them over here real cheap."

Fifty workers were laid off at a large textile mill in the South Carolina Piedmont last month.

"I've worked for them for 13 years and I think I deserve better than this," one of them complained. "We were told the layoff will not be permanent, only temporary, but I've still got to make a mortgage payment and buy groceries. What do they expect me to do."

The textile industry insists it must have import quotas written into law. It has the support of the Nixon administration.

Chairman Wilbur Mills of the House Ways and Means Committee, who fears a trade war would result from legislated quotas, favors instead a voluntary agreement he personally worked out with Japan to limit the growth of its exports to the United States.

The U.S. industry insists the voluntary agreement would help little if any. Without Mills' support in Congress, however, the industry has little hope of seeing any kind of quota written into law.

One industry leader, privately expressing a view held by many of his colleagues, moaned the other day that "we're just going to have to live with the Japanese imports."

The industry's best bet for the future, many feel, is technological.

Donald F. McCullough, the Collins and Aikman chairman who recently stepped down as president of ATMI, said "considerable progress is being made with new products, better technology and modernization." There particularly have been encouraging developments, he said, in machinery and new products in the area of knits, textured yarn, weaving and fabric dying and finishing.

He predicted gradual improvement in the textile market in 1971. And looking beyond to the whole decade of the '70s, he predicted a market growth by more than 40 per cent by 1980 with sales reaching $30 billion.

The market will be there, said McCullough. "The question is, who is going to get it? Americans or foreigners?"

"We have always been the most modern industry in the world, but even with our technological superiority, we find it extremely difficult to compete with 10 cent-an-hour wages."

Frederick B. Dent, head of Mayfair Mills at Arcadia, S.C., and chairman of the International Trade Committee of ATMI, contends the American textile market "is the only free market in the world."

"Other nations protect their industry with various types of trade barriers," he said. "Japan, for example, currently has 80 specific import restrictions which are in violation of international trade agreements.

"While refusing to reach an agreement with the United States, the Japanese government has entered into bilateral textile agreements with 11 other nations."

The new president of the ATMI, John Reeves, predicted the situation will get worse without import restrictions.

"The cutbacks in the textile industry have made the impact of the overall economic recession particularly acute in the Southeast," he said.

"The current level of imports is the equivalent of 400,000 textile-apparel jobs. Just think what even one fourth of these jobs could do to stir the economy of the Southeast, the New England states and our apparel manufacturers."

Reeves said "it is quite clear that Japan has no intention" of restricting its textile shipments to this country, "unless Congress passes legislation which would establish the mechanism for reasonable, negotiated agreements.

"Without clear and decisive action by our government, we can only look for conditions to get worse."

GLOBAL POVERTY AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, Dr. John E. Rielly, senior fellow at the Overseas Development Corp., delivered a fine statement on the response of the developed nations to global poverty and underdevelopment. Dr. Rielly, a former foreign policy assistant to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, gave the opening lecture in a month-long conference on international justice, development, and peace, which began March 15 at St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make available to my colleagues, John Rielly's excellent statement.

The statement follows:

GLOBAL POVERTY AND UNDERDEVELOPMENT: THE PRESENT SITUATION AND THE RESPONSE OF THE DEVELOPED NATIONS

(By John E. Rielly)

It is a great pleasure to return to the campus of St. John's University where I spent four of the most peaceful and satisfying years of my life. I am especially fortunate to be able to return to speak to you on a subject which has occupied much of my professional life for the past ten years, a subject which remains central to international affairs in the twentieth century. The specific topic which I have been asked to address at the opening of this Conference on International Justice, Development and Peace is "World Poverty and Underdevelopment: the Present Situation and the Response of the Developed Nations."

It is especially gratifying to see this group focusing on these issues. For today they represent central issues of international affairs which call for a judgment by the Christian and Jewish communities. The judgments you make—the message you carry can make a decisive difference in the actions taken by governments—here and abroad.

In this paper I will begin with a brief summary of the situation in the developing countries and will then devote the greater part of the discussion to the question of the relationship between the developed countries and developing countries, giving special attention to the relationship between the United States and the developing countries.

When I refer to the developing countries, I refer to South and Central America, the Middle East, Africa and Asia (excepting Communist China). You will note that I do not use the term "third world"—because I do not believe such a thing exists. Finally, I assume in this discussion that Latin America is a less developed part of the Western world, and despite the fact that it shares some of the problems of other developing continents, it has more in common with Europe and North America than with Africa and Asia.

The subject of developing countries has been covered by a number of reports during the past two years. We have had the Pearson Report, commissioned by the World Bank issued in October, 1969; the Tinbergen Report or the U.N. Commission for Development Plan issued in 1970; the Jackson Report on the U.N. development program issued in 1970; the Prebisch Report on Latin America; and the Peterson Report of March, 1970 which reviewed the U.S. development assistance effort. While the reports vary in emphasis and coverage, they all conclude that the situation in the developing countries is getting worse. And all agree that the developed countries have an obligation to do more to assist the developing countries.

Although some of the reports focus on the whole relationship between developed and developing countries, most of them focus on the aspect of governmental aid. According to their estimates, the real value of concessional aid was reduced by more than 50% between 1962 and 1968. International governmental aid has represented only .4% of the developed world's GNP. The United States' share has fallen even more precipitiously. The U.S. gave over 2% of its GNP to the Marshall Plan at a time when per capita income here was only 40% of its present level. Today we give slightly less than one fifth as much aid as a percentage of our GNP at a time when our income is 2.5 times higher than it was in 1948.

What are the facts about the developing countries themselves? According to the World Bank, per capita income levels per year in developing continents as of 1968 were as follows: Asia $110; Africa $130; Latin America $370; Middle East $330. This compares with the average per capita income in the United States of $4,000; Canada $2,500; Germany $1,900; United Kingdom $1,800.

The above figures disguise the fact that if the average income for Africa is $130 per year there are literally millions of people living on half of that. The same is true for other areas of the world. And there is fear that the actual standard of living of millions of people is lower in 1971 than it was in 1960.

Despite these depressingly low income figures for the developing continents, their gross national product grew at an unprecedented rate during the last decade, averaging 5% annually. A higher average growth rate in the 1970's of 6% is likely and should increase the total GNP for the developing countries from $300 billion in 1970 to approximately $600 billion in 1980.

However, given other trends which I will describe later, the doubling of GNP will still leave hundreds of millions of people in abject poverty. According to present population trends, the present figure of 3.5 billion people in the world will reach 7 billion in the year 2000, and 15 billion by the twenty-second century. Two-thirds of the world population now lives in the developing countries (including China); by the year 2000 it will be approximately four-fifths. By 2000 at present rates the per capita rate for the United States will be $8,000 to $10,000 per year. Yet a continuation of even today's exceptional growth rates in the developing countries indicates that at least one half of the developing world will still have a per capita income of only $200 a year by the year 2000.

A second major problem for the developing countries in the next three decades is the rapidly growing unemployment problem which is a by-product of the population explosion. With a constant or increasing birth rate and declining death rate, a country like India, for example, now has 100,000 net new entrants into its labor force each week, a figure which will rise to 140,000 net each week by 1980. In a significantly more developed country, like Columbia, 12 to 14% of the present urban working force is openly unemployed and an additional 10 to 12% is so underemployed that they can effectively be categorized as out of work. This unemployment problem is made worse by the increasing use of capital intensive technology and the increasing rate of rural migration to urban areas.

Of the 500 million people expected to be added in this decade to the population of developing countries, approximately 170 mil-

lion will represent additional entrants to the labor force. Given present population trends, patterns of technological dissemination and urban migration to the cities, the problem is likely to get worse before it gets better.

Unemployment is particularly acute among young people, and among people in the incredibly fast-growing urban centers. During the First Development Decade, most poor nations saw a tremendous increase in unemployment despite a growth in GNP that was sometimes spectacular. Clearly, a further increase of GNP by itself is no answer to this explosive problem. In addition, unemployment presents an especially harsh threat to political stability in the 1970's. The President of the World Bank, Robert McNamara, has stated that matter boldly: "The marginal men," he says, "the wretched strugglers for survival on the fringes of farm and city, may already number more than half a billion. By 1980, they will surpass a billion, by 1990 two billion. Can we imagine any human order surviving with so gross a mass of misery piling up at its base? A by-product of the population explosion, the unemployment explosion will require tremendous creativity and resourcefulness throughout the 1970's if Development Decade II is to have any meaning to human society."

This gives a brief sketch of the conditions of the developing countries, one that does not adequately convey the total picture of widespread hunger, deprivation, absence of educational opportunity, unequal distribution of wealth, the prevalence of disease, not to mention political repression and shocking social inequity in many countries.

What do developing countries need? It is clear that they need more food, more jobs, better distribution of income, new labor-intensive technologies, better access to health and education on the part of all. This means that developing countries need more resources. Even more important it means in many cases, they require a redistribution of resources within the society.

Just to meet the employment problem alone, most developing countries will have to grow at a rate of 6.5% to 8%, not a likely possibility for many of them. Unemployment might, of course, be ameliorated through a distribution of poverty through subsidized rural public works that are labor intensive. However, this would not result in an increase in income per head. Alternatively, a totalitarian system could possibly establish full employment and raise the standard of living but at a very high price in terms of political and social liberty. The best alternative is to achieve a high growth rate with a strong political and social system which can redistribute benefits at the same time the economy is growing. This will require a heroic effort for most countries. To achieve a growth rate of say 7% requires a gross investment of 25% of GNP. If external resources could finance 30% of this investment, 70% must still come from internal sources. This would require an increase in the savings rate by 40%. What this means is that if a country like India grew by 5.5% for the next three decades and the United States grew by 4%, the average income in the U.S. would be $10,000 as opposed to $200 in India. If India grew 7% a year for the next three decades, her per capita income could be $400 per head by the year 2000 which would reduce the rate of inequality from 1 to 50 to 1 to 25. And for India, the difference between $200 and $400 is the difference between poverty and a tolerable standard of living.

Thus it is clear that the developing countries need more resources. They must create part of these themselves, but part must be received from external sources. Although it is difficult to mobilize the level of resources internally that will be required, one should emphasize that the developing countries did better during the last decade than did the present industrialized countries in their comparable periods. If the developed countries respond appropriately, the developing countries could achieve better than a 6% growth rate in the 1970's.

What else must the developing countries do? First, they must acquire a capacity to feed themselves. Through the possibilities held out by the Green Revolution, there is a good chance that the amount of food needed can be grown. Whether the right distribution can be achieved is something else again.

One thing we have learned in the course of the First Development Decade is that the high growth rates prescribed by economists mean little unless there is some change in the benefit distribution system, some attempt made to increase the access to the benefits of economic growth.

I have briefly described here the situation in the developing countries today. The next question that arises for us in the United States is "Why should we be concerned"? This is the most basic—and most difficult question—why should we bother at all? Though the reasons may be obvious to this group here today—they are by no means obvious to many Americans.

There is a profound sense in which helping the developing countries is no longer a legitimate topic of political conversation in the United States. Favorable references to it in the Congress are limited to a select group of individuals who either have a long-standing commitment or nothing really to lose. In political campaigns, expousing development assistance may not lose many votes for a candidate in most parts of the country, but nowhere will it gain him any either. It is largely a non-issue in American politics.

Before the political work of carrying forward a U.S. role in development can get very far, development assistance has to become a live issue again, with a new rationale that can excite widespread attention. Otherwise, we can expect only "benign neglect"—or worse—and will continue to see development experts talking to one another, but rarely finding a wider audience.

It is clear to anyone who samples opinion either in Congress, in the Executive Branch, or in the country as a whole that the old rationale for overseas development assistance is not persuasive with many people. First, it is no longer possible to invoke the fears of Cold War, or the argument that the world will inevitably be divided between the United States and the Soviet Union. Not only did the practical applications of that narrow theory frequently fail—when countries like Egypt learned to use this argument to aid their own development but undermined the Cold War argument that "neutrality" was impossible—but also the waning of the Cold War itself reduced the importance, both at home and abroad, of wooing people in the poorer two-thirds of the world. Regrettably too many people who supported development for other reasons were content to lean on this Cold War rationale without building support on other foundations as well. They found it was convenient, politically attractive, and did the job—for a time. Inevitably, their efforts were left high and dry, both intellectually and politically, when the Cold War arguments lost their punch. Quite simply, Cold War rhetoric is dead as a means for extracting money from the American public to help poor foreigners.

Second, a new school of thought in the United States began to emerge during the trauma of the Vietnam War. There began a general turning away from interest and commitments in the world, and a call for "putting our own house in order first." Necessarily, development assistance was reduced in the concern for reordering priorities.

Third, some revisionist historians made a simplistic connection between U.S. economic involvement in the developing world. the growth in U.S. military responsibility for protecting particular regimes, and the prospect that we would have to fight other wars like Vietnam in the future.

Fourth, there has emerged a growing concern among some Americans—probably including some of you—about problems of "imperialism"; the impact of advanced societies on primitive ones; and the problems inherent in the export of Western values. There is no doubt that direct involvement in the development process raises real dilemmas for a responsible U.S. policy: a small example was provided by the kidnapping and murder of a U.S. AID official who was helping to train police in Uruguay. As innocent as his activities may appear, they essentially represent a political act of support for the government in power.

To our cost, we have found that direct bilateral assistance, whether for security or for development purposes, too often involved us directly in the fate of particular governments or regimes than is healthy either for those nations or for ourselves. Large aid missions in the field have led in many cases to an overpowering U.S. presence, thereby breeding resentment and hostility. Our motives have become suspect even when they are well-intentioned. We have often failed to resist what the French philosopher, Henry Dumery, called "the temptation to do good; the insistence that not only must virtue be achieved—but our particular version in our particular way."

The inadequacy of the old ideas suggests that a different rationale for development assistance must be created during the 1970s if the U.S. is to play a major role in the poor countries, and to overcome the backlog of discredit that has been built up during recent years.

What are some of the basic arguments for a U.S. role in development assistance?

1. *Violence and order.* An important argument for any foreign policy is always that it is somehow in our direct national interest. The Cold War no longer suffices; Vietnam has made us wary of unconsidered involvements. But there is a very real sense in which the United States is deeply and permanently involved in the world. We remain—whether we like it or not—the nation chiefly responsible for preserving some semblance of order in the world. This does not mean that we must intervene in every other country where we think our interests are threatened—or in every other country to preserve order. But it does mean that we, as the most powerful nation on earth, must take seriously threats both to ourselves and to the overall system of international relations. This is a role that we inherited by chance but have now continued largely by choice. Even if we choose to depreciate this role, it is one for which we will continue to be held responsible by others in the coming years.

It can be argued further that this general sense of international order is threatened by what is happening in poor countries; by threats of chaos, internal warfare, and conflict between neighboring states that ultimately could have profound effects on the rich countries of the world.

Directly, this disruption and violence in poor countries may not threaten the United States for some time. But it may. In the Middle East, the rise of uncontrolled violence has complicated a long-standing conflict there that we have not been able to ignore in our overall concern with international order. This new violence, like the old, is partly a product of a failure of economic, political and social development.

This failure is having corrosive effects. Our illusion of safety, like that in Europe before 1914, is being destroyed by acts of violence and intimidation that reach below small developing countries. These acts of violence, including aircraft hijackings and international kidnappings, are not confined to the developing world; but they increas-

ingly dramatize its problems and the urgency of finding solutions.

Indeed, the rising tide of violence throughout the poor countries of the world threatens our ability to trade, to travel, and to invest. And unless we help stem this tide by helping these countries develop, our world may be far less congenial for the rich countries than it is today.

This last point does not necessarily imply that our helping poor countries to develop will lead them to take their place in international society without threatening it. In the short run development assistance can even contribute to disruption, as expectations rise to exceed what is possible. After all, revolution and disorder are classically problems of states and people on the rise. Nor is it clear that our long-run interest in a stable world implies opposition to all violence in developing countries particularly where it can lead to the evolution of societies that rest on a firmer basis of popular support.

It is here that we encounter a subject which has been a source of increasing concern in the Christian churches, both Protestant and Catholic. Put simply—How should Christians respond to a situation in which overthrowing the existing economic and social order—by means that include violent action—appears to be the only alternative to the perpetuation of injustice? Related to this question is the growing concern for indigenous cultures and traditions. Will they be crushed or replaced by the values implicit in the cultural standardization that has come to be associated with technological expansion and economic development? There is a widespread concern that "development" as it has been traditionally defined by advanced countries and the international agencies represents at best an inadequate solution to developing country problems and at worst a manifestation of Western economic imperialism.

Many of you here are familiar with reports published the last three years by SODEPAX—the Committee on Society, Development and Peace set up in 1968 by the World Council of Churches and the Vatican, acting through the Pontifical Commission for Justice and Peace. The titles of the reports published after several recent SODEPAX conferences suggest the trend of Christian concern: "The Challenge of Development" (Montreal: 1969) of "In Search of a Theology of Development" (Cartigny: 1969); "Peace—the Desperate Imperative" (Baden: 1970); "Liberation—Justice—Development" (Tokyo: 1970); "Partnership or Privilege" (Cartigny: 1970).

All of these reports reflect a single dominant view: that the recipe for the developing countries, as advanced by traditional development economists—is unsatisfactory. The SODEPAX reports reflect the view widely disseminated by the late Louis Lebret that development must be seen as a social process involving ethical values, a process implying ultimately a concept of what man is. Development must be seen within a humanist perspective, and development economics must become a "discipline covering the passage from a less human to a more human phase."

Working from the framework developed by Lebret, many Christian thinkers have come to reject "development" as an adequate concept and have begun to speak of "liberation," of "justice" and "revolution". A report of the National Council of Churches issued only this month speaks of "World Justice, Liberation and Development". One of the most influential younger Latin American Christian theologians, Gustavo Gutierrez, speaks of a "theology of liberation." Gutierrez accurately describes the views of a growing number of Christian thinkers—and not only in the developing countries—when he says:

"Development should attack the causes of our plight, and among the central ones is the economic, social, political, and cultural dependence of some peoples on others. The word 'liberation', therefore, is more accurate and conveys better the human side of the problem."

We do not have to adopt Gutierrez's term "liberation" to appreciate his concern for the human aspects of social and economic development. It is this concern that was expressed by Pope Paul VI in a passage in his encyclical, "The Development of Peoples". Here the Pope speaks of "building a world where every man, regardless of race, religion, or nationality, can live a fully human life, free of the servitude that comes from other men and from the incompletely mastered world about him."

Nor need we share all of Gutierrez's analysis concerning the manipulation and control of poor nations or poor people by international economic groups—groups pictured as "oppressors" and "exploiters". We can still accept another of his central points: The need for a fundamental redistribution of political, economic and social *power* within society, and a restructuring of the international economic system. At the present time, this economic system concentrates a disproportionate share of the world's wealth in a few countries.

I believe this is the central message of Christian thinkers today as they view the international scene—that justice requires a fundamental reordering of society; and that such a reordering can be accomplished by deliberate political action by an aroused and politically conscious people. This reordering of priorities, which is required to guarantee a minimal level of material goods and human rights to all people, must be accompanied in developed societies as well as in the poor countries of the world.

I am encouraged that at least one of the major reports on international development—that of the Committee for Development Planning of the UNDP (the Tinbergen Report) explicitly recognizes the need to be concerned about the *distribution* of wealth—not just its overall increase. This report states:

"The world community cannot sit idle when a part of its population lives in great comfort and even affluence while much the larger part suffers from abject poverty, and when this disparity is increasing instead of diminishing."

It went so far as to recognize that "there will be cases necessitating a sacrifice in the pace of growth in order to prevent social injustice."

Thus the international establishment is being prodded increasingly to modify its approach to the problems of world poverty, to go beyond the traditional goal of accelerated economic growth. The response of the international community so far—particularly the rich countries of the world—is less encouraging.

2. *Interdependence.* A second reason for our being concerned about the developing countries is the growing interdependence of the world. The question of Amreican self-interest in the process of development also has a wider economic and political dimension. There is an international system of trade to be protected and expanded; this can be a stable and expanding international system only if the developing nations are brought into it in ways that are mutually beneficial. It is quite obvious that the United States will play a central role in shaping this system, for good or ill. In fact, by not acting to extend preferential tariff treatment to developing country goods, or by raising new barriers to them, we will have a profoundly discouraging effect on the ability of developing countries to help themselves. And our concern to promote a stable and productive international economic system militates for our giving evidence of good faith to the poor countries of the world. They have little bargaining power: only we have the power to decide whether they will be able to play an active and positive role in the worldwide system.

It is also clear that some problems facing the world will have to be solved in common over the long run, or not solved at all. There is already an awakened consciousness in the United States about the problems of preserving the environment, and tentative attempts to do something about them. At some point the cooperation of the developing countries will have to be enlisted. In fact, it will one day become necessary to protect what is truly a global interest in preserving the environment as a way of protecting our own national self-interest.

3. *Morality.* For many of you the moral rationale for U.S. involvement in development will be most persuasive. One need not share the Christian and Jewish religious tradition to recognize the force of moral arguments. They even make some appeal to those "hard headed" statesmen who are concerned about self-interest. Many of them also accept that the structure of international relations rests upon a sense of common interest that demands some moral concern for mankind in general.

This point applies particularly to those young Americans who are most concerned about America's moral stance in the world; who wish our foreign policy to be based on more than simple power-politics; who see America's role in the developing countries to be "imperialistic"; and who have many of the same concerns as some of the Christian writers referred to above.

4. *Example.* Finally, it is worth citing the example set for us by others, particularly by the other 15 members of the Development Assistance Committee (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development), which includes the U.S., Canada, most of Western Europe, Japan and Australia. In politics as in business, competition can be an effective spur for Americans, particularly if it is put in terms of our own self-interest. And in the realm of development assistance, we are clearly being out-distanced. We lag far behind other rich countries in terms of the percentage of GNP transferred to poor countries. Today we rank 11th out of 16 DAC countries in direct governmental aid, and 16th out of 16 in total net aid and private investment.

The example set for us by Europeans and Japan is also a challenge to exercise in the realm of development assistance the sense of leadership that has held such a significant place in American political goals since the War. This is particularly true of our sense of leadership in promoting the orderly growth of international society. Few Americans, directly confronted, wish their country to be second-rate, or to be seen abroad as defaulting on its responsibilities.

These four points represent only a partial list of arguments for an active U.S. role in development assistance. Although none are conclusive, they do point to the new direction in which efforts to stimulate attention, concern, and political support can profitably be directed.

I have described briefly the situation in the developing countries and have offered several reasons why we in the United States should be concerned. I would now like to address the final question: what should be the response of the developed countries—and more specially what should be the response of the United States. Indeed, what should we do?

First, we must recognize that international economic issues will henceforth increasingly rival diplomatic and security problems as the principle substance of American foreign policy. This shift in priorities reflects the existing accommodation between the super powers, the development of detente, the changing pattern of economic relations throughout the world and the new attention paid to economically-backward states as sources of anxiety and conflict. Until now

there has been very little recognition of this trend in the U.S.

President Nixon has finally recognized that economic issues are an important part of foreign policy. And the establishment in February 1971 of a White House Council on International Economic Policy is a step in the right direction. Whether this Council will in fact result in a change in priorities will depend in large part on the ability of Mr. Peter Peterson (formerly President of Bell and Howell), the President's choice for the job, to prove a match for Messrs. Kissinger and Erlichman in White House bureaucratic competition.

But despite the creation of this new Council, the President and his advisors have still not balanced traditional security issues with economic considerations to the extent they need to do.

In the last year, this led to a near collision with Japan on trade questions and has fueled fears in Europe of a trade war between the U.S. and the EEC. And this Presidential neglect has been responsible for preventing the emergence of a clear policy vis-a-vis the developing world. Mr. Nixon has still failed to recognize that what we do today to help poor countries help themselves will reduce the chances that we will be required tomorrow to help defend them with guns and soldiers.

Secondly, we must recognize that the military instruments of American foreign policy have a more limited applicability today. In particular, we cannot much longer pretend that there can be military answers to economic and social problems. This awareness should be reflected in the resources devoted to the military budget. In presenting the Nixon Doctrine as a main outline of American foreign policy, the President has expressed his intention of reorienting America's role in the world by reducing our active role abroad and avoiding military intervention wherever possible in the future. Until now, most analysis has focused on the military aspects of this, particularly on the question, "how do we get Asian boys to fight Asian wars?" However, for the Nixon Doctrine to succeed, we cannot construe our task simply as one of helping others to fight their own wars. It is clear that we must also have to take seriously the means required by individual countries to cope with the conditions that breed threats to their security. These means largely center around the difficult and ill-defined processes of economic and social development. So far, therefore, the Nixon Doctrine has failed to meet its real test—the test of economic development that could make recourse to arms unnecessary.

Clearly, we need to change direction and stop defaulting on our own self-interest. How many of us realize, for example, that the war in Vietnam—a useless, tragic war—has cost us more than all the foreign aid we have provided for the entire world—including the Marshall Plan.

The prospects for change are not bright. According to present estimates, the federal budget will increase during the next fiscal year by $20 to $25 billion. In view of the urgent need to address domestic problems and widespread opposition to much of our involvement abroad, it is most unlikely that the Administration will increase the total resources devoted to overseas programs. Given the present political climate in the country, a substantial increase in American bilateral or multilateral assistance to the developing world would almost certainly have to come from reductions in other parts of the budget devoted to overseas programs—for example, in the continued high level of military expenditures.

Until now there has been no basis for believing the Nixon Administration plans to move in this direction. It is still placing top priority on the acquisition of improved nuclear weapon systems. For the next fiscal year, the Administration has proposed an increase in the military budget of about $2 billion. It comes at a time when the deescalation of the Vietnam War could make funds available for non-military expenditures overseas. By reallocating only a small fraction of potential defense savings—perhaps $1 billion—we could undertake a sizable expansion of our overseas development effort. So the second thing we must do is to deemphasize the military aspects of American foreign policy and reduce the military budget.

Third, we must also focus attention on the continuing problem of arms sales to developing countries. At present we continue to give and sell arms to developing countries beyond their requirements beyond any requirements of the Nixon Doctrine. Senator Proxmire in his recent hearings has documented the magnitude of military assistance—at some times exceeding by some billions of dollars our meager economic effort. Worldwide expenditures on defense now total approximately $200 billion per year. Thirty percent of this represents expenditures by the developing world. In this latter figure, about $5 billion represents hard currency payments by poor countries for arms. Arms purchases clearly divert resources that these countries could use to develop themselves economically. They can even contribute to conflicts in which the U.S. and other developed countries may become involved. So the third prescription is to curtail arms sales to developing countries.

Fourth, it is becoming increasingly clear that in determining our relations with many of the developing countries of the world, trade is more important than aid. Approximately 80 per cent of the total financial flows from rich nations to poor nations is accounted for by trade, not aid. The U.S. imports 10 billion of commodities and manufactures per year from poor countries. The European Common Market imports $12 billion. Total exports from poor countries amount to $50 billion in 1970.

For many countries trade is the real engine of development, and exports represent the chief means for earning the foreign exchange they need to finance their own economic development. The ability to increase exports to the developed world is seen as the best way to avoid the problems of foreign involvement and tutelage that go along with foreign aid programs.

Therefore, President Nixon's proposals on trade have a special importance for development policy. He has indicated in his recent foreign policy message that he will ask Congress to eliminate import duties on manufactured products exported from the developing countries. This would implement the general preference scheme which has already been approved by both the OECD and the United Nations' Conference on Trade and Development. At the same time, however, the President may be required to deal once again with import quota legislation on such products as textiles and shoes, which if implemented, could undercut many of the liberalizing provisions of the preferential tariff scheme. Protectionist policies came very close to becoming enacted in 1970 in part because of the Nixon Administration's unwillingness to take a strong stand against it. The failure by the White House to oppose these protectionist measures early and vigorously brought us very close to leading to a major crisis in American international affairs. I believe the President must recognize the importance of trade policy and will be prepared to spend the political capital required to preserve the access of developing country goods to American markets. The establishment of the White House Council on International Economic Policy is one indication of some progress by the President in recognizing the importance of trade.

Fifth, we must move to reinvigorate the U.S. multilateral and bilateral foreign assistance effort. We must be prepared to meet the goals stated by the Pearson and Tinbergen Commission Reports which call for a contribution from developed countries equal to one percent of GNP in development assistance. Until now there has been little indication that the Nixon Administration is prepared to make this commitment. President Nixon has, however, put forth some sensible proposals for reorganization of the U.S. development effort, proposals following closely the recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on "Foreign Assistance for the 70's" chaired by Mr. Rudolph Peterson. We should move to implement the President's recommendation that U.S. assistance designed for purposes of short-term security, such as assistance for Southeast Asia, should be separated from that designed primarily for humanitarian or development purposes.

As a way of avoiding excessive involvement by the United States government in the internal affairs of developing countries, we should also move to implement the President's recommendation that more of our development resources flow through multilateral institutions—such as the World Bank and regional banks.

Multilateral institutions will not have all the answers to the difficult problems of development. But they will be able to provide a framework within which the pursuit of short-term political goals at the expense of long range objectives is minimized.

Sixth, we should take a thoughtful look at the President's recommendation to invest our remaining bilateral development aid in three new institutions which would replace the existing Agency for International Development: (1) the International Development Corporation, which would be concerned primarily with transferring capital resources; (2) the International Development Institute, which would be concerned with the creation and transfer of technology and the application of new ideas in the developing world; and (3) the Overseas Private Investment Corporation which is now established which would assist in the channelling of private investments. Although these new institutions were proposed chiefly to win Congressional and public support for a new program, the negative response in Congress thus far suggests that changing the machinery for bilateral aid may produce very limited benefits.

More important, for development institutions to be effective there must be assurance of long-term funding. The test of the President's commitment to development will be his willingness to insist on multi-year appropriations, his willingness to expend the political capital required to push this through.

The question of the President's commitment to development remains the key uncertainty surrounding his recent recommendations about reforming the U.S. development structure. He alone is able to help Americans to understand both their political and moral responsibilities in the developing world. Only the President has the ability to commit the American people to a program of development assistance that will confirm our understanding of the facts of a changing world. Only he can lead us to continue playing a useful and necessary role beyond our borders.

So far, he has not done so. So far his statements fail to strike the note of urgency and commitment that is going to be required if the proposed administrative changes are to work. The President has so far given no clear lead, nor proposed any concrete objectives for the new institutions to reach. In this respect, it should be explicitly added, he is following the pattern set by President Johnson who also gave a low priority to development. These are some of the actions which we in the United States should take if we are to fulfill our responsibilities to the developing countries. In pursuing these objectives, we must always remember that because we are the world's wealthiest and most power-

ful nation, there is much that we can accomplish.

But after a decade of anguish and unending war in Indo-China we should better appreciate what Dennis Brogan has called "the myth of American omnipotence." We should perceive the folly of earlier efforts to "build the Great Society in Asia" and similar formulations of American cultural imperialism. President Kennedy, we remember, is revered throughout the world—and especially in the developing continents of the world—not so much for what material results he achieved as for the attitude he conveyed. What can be accomplished in a material sense in a short period of time will always fall short of expectations. What is more important is that leaders be prepared to give some evidence that progress is being made, that material betterment is on the way, that there is sound reason for believing that the unmet material problems of society will be solved in the future.

For American leaders cooperating with those in developing societies, it is essential to convey an understanding and respect for the traditions and culture of some nations, a willingness to help combined with a recognition that others may have answers—and not just problems.

In cooperating with leaders and peoples from developing countries, we would do well to approach them in the spirit of the counsel offered by a distinguished graduate of St. John's University, Eugene J. McCarthy.

Speaking of the task of the Christian in political life, he said the following: A man should "make his decisions in the hope that by these decisions an imperfect world may become somewhat more perfect: or that at least if he cannot make an imperfect world less imperfect, he can save it from becoming even less perfect, or finally, from becoming entirely evil and perverted. He can try to prevent degradation, prevent decline, and, if possible, to move things forward and upward toward right and justice."

HUD RELOCATION REVIEW DELAYED AGAIN

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, it is my painful duty once again to stand up and report to the Congress that the Department of Housing and Urban Development has failed to submit a review which they promised to give the Congress long ago. That review—which was a nationwide analysis of relocation problems in urban renewal programs—was due by the first part of this year. The very latest date in a whole series of promised delivery dates was March 31—a full week ago.

Although Congress has passed fair and reasonable laws regarding relocation—the kind of enabling laws which empower HUD to assure equitable, humane treatment of all parties directly involved in any urban renewal program—and HUD has issued comprehensive regulations pursuant to these laws, the breakdown, as so often happens, occurs in the administration of those laws and regulations. Many complaints have reached me of the attitude of indifference at HUD local and regional levels . . . an attitude which evidently extends up through the Department at the very highest levels.

I have received various excuses each time a promised deadline passed without any action from HUD. I was told that the local offices had not yet submitted their reports due to relocation problems—an ironic explanation, at best—and I was told that shifting jurisdictions at the Washington level had further delayed administrative review; and I was given other excuses—too many excuses.

I have been patient, we have been patient, and those who have suffered from brutal uprooting have had to content themselves with the dry bread of our patience. The time has come when we can no longer afford to be patient. I cannot condone nor defend any longer to my constituents the glaring oversight of this report. Too many have suffered from inaction. This matter has been dragging on while HUD has been begging off, and the time has come for the Congress to demand action. Congress needs this survey of the effectiveness of relocation throughout the United States so that we will have some direction for relief of the relocation problems.

I respectfully request the Department of Housing and Urban Development to comply with the request of Congress.

BRUCE SAGAN, OUTSTANDING WEEKLY PUBLISHER

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, Bruce Sagan, president of Accredited Home Newspapers of America, was recognized in a recent issue of the Editor and Publisher, as one of this country's finest weekly newspaper publishers. Mr. Sagan's newspapers have made a significant contribution to the Chicago area; the neighborhood newspapers have created a king of decentralized forum for the communities which make up Chicagoland, due primarily to Mr. Sagan's willingness to let the public be heard. In a metropolitan area of over 6 million people, that is a great achievement. I am pleased to insert into the RECORD a copy of the article commending him on the fine job he has done.

BE FLEXIBLE

(By Craig Tomkinson)

When Bruce Sagan bought his first Chicago weekly 17 years ago, the paper's coverage ended at 59th Street. Sagan says the paper was so local in coverage that an A-bomb explosion on 60th Street wouldn't have been news—but the fallout on 59th would have been.

This anecdote, and others, were included in a two-hour talk Sagan gave before a New England Press Association session last week in Boston. His topic was, "How we meet the competition."

Sagan is one of the most successful weekly newspaper publishers in the country. His Economist Newspapers group has circa 300,000 free and paid circulation in Chicago and environs. Another three papers are owned in the Newport Beach area of California. Sagan is currently president of Accredited Home Newspapers of America.

If one counts flags, Economist has 28 newspapers—some free, some paid. Some of these are name replates, others are page replates and still others are totally different.

But it isn't total circulation or number of newspapers Sagan is concerned with. His Boston talk indicated his concern is still with local coverage and flexibility. In short, what works for one paper isn't necessarily a panacea for all his papers.

NEEDS THE ORGANIZATION

Sagan doesn't eschew the organization in favor of the independent. He said that individual newspapers in chains need the strength offered by the large organization but must maintain the individual viewpoint of a local publication.

He averred that using the organization structure enables weaker newspapers to survive in less profitable areas and it enables local papers to take unpopular positions without fear of economic retaliation.

To maintain separate coverage and separate identity for its Chicago papers, Economist has seven separate editorial offices.

Unlike publishers who give editors free reign in expressing editorial opinion, Sagan feels it's hypocritical to have two of his papers expressing opposite editorial views on the same topic. Where differences of opinion, occur, Sagan's takes priority. Editors can, he said, express opposite views in signed columns if they wish.

He told his audience that newspapers should not only mirror public sentiment but also lead. "Not to say something is taking a negative position."

Sagan demonstrated one aspect of flexibility when he noted that at one time his papers dealt only with non-controversial matters. "Now we deal with conflict and now we have unhappy readers. The key to success is not to make everyone mad at the same time."

Sagan is flexible in his definition of "competition" too. His definition, as he outlined it for his audience, goes beyond the traditional idea that a newspaper's competition is first, other newspapers, and secondly tv, radio, etc.

He said that newspapers "compete for time" with anything else that may distract a reader. All other forms of communication, from the print media down to gossip, all vie for time and are competitive. He cited too the obvious competition for the advertising dollar, "classifieds especially."

"The primary concern of the advertising department," he said, "is how to get more business," then went on to advocate flexibility in reaching customers.

"We have two sets of customers, the readers and the advertisers. Create the opportunity, he admonished, "for readers to use you. Promote!"

Economist Newspapers, he explained, is involved in many different forms of promotion, then humorously noted how it was a commentary on the times that this year the mother of an illegitimate child "had no compunctions" about claiming the "first baby of the year" prizes. His attorney advised letting her have them. "Some promotions," Sagan added, "are obviously fraught with danger."

On a more serious note, Sagan outlined Economist's rather extensive yearly recipe contest in which a major prize is given away—a trip for instance.

THOUSANDS OF RECIPES

Thousands of recipes are received and the top 125 are compiled into a book, complete with ads, with the grand winner on the front page. It's circulated with the papers. The contest also provides the papers with a good stock of recipes to run throughout the year.

Another major promotion of the Economist papers is an annual home show for advertisers and non-advertisers alike. Both buy booth space for the event, and are required to take a three quarter page ad in a special section for the show.

"The show," Sagan explained, "generates reader interest and has an impact on the community because thousands of people attend."

The show has another worth. Because it is held in a shopping center hall and draws large crowds, the Economist group picks up all printing and production of shopping center sections because of the good will created with the center.

It might be added that contract printing is big income for Economist. It prints daily the Mid-West edition of the *Christian Science Monitor* on its four-unit, with half deck, Goss Metro offset press.

Sagan got much attention when talking about classified sections, which he feels "sell more newspapers than anything else."

The audience heard him say that classified ads "are a rising proportion of newspaper income."

He sees as a main competitor for weekly newspaper classifieds, the telephone book's Yellow Pages. He pointed out too, that the Yellow Pages "are a good source of leads."

He advocated a good, strong classified section because of its security. "Once you have a classified section it's hard for anyone to take it away. It is self-breeding and becomes a market place." He pointed out that the classifieds are not vulnerable to the whims of large display advertisers.

He suggested, as just one way to create a classified market, the selling of automotive ads limited to two lines, for a fixed rate of $2 to run until the car is sold. He wasn't trying to convince anyone this is a money getter in itself, but it serves to build up the section and create reader interest in the classifieds which he sees as a vital medium of communication.

Further stressing the need to create a market place for classifieds. Sagan related how giving away free boat ads in a dying California weekly he picked up, was the first step towards rescuing the paper through reader interest and participation.

Flexibility is evident in the way the classifieds are handled in each of Sagan's papers. In papers with weaker sections the sections are opened to many different types of ads—across column rules, small, large, etc., but in papers with stronger sections, the advertisers must accept rules set down by the papers, such as only single column ads limited to certain sizes. The latter is cheaper to produce, he explained.

Makeupwise, Economist newspapers shy away from the use of boxes, bold face types, and the like. Sagan explained that use of these gimmicks "interferes with the reader's ability to read the classified section and the advertiser may not be getting his money's worth with them."

The audience was curious about the rate of defaults Economist runs into with classifieds. Sagan gave a figure of "less than 2 percent" on transient "deadbeats."

He said he handles deadbeats first with letters from what he called "our phony collection agency", in reality the letterhead of an attorney. If they still don't pay, the matter is handed over to a real collection agency or taken to court. He noted that the latter will take place for bills as low as $20.

Demonstrating the pulling power of Economist classifieds Sagan related a story (he claimed was true) about two burglars who, upon hearing a certain family was away on vacation, placed a classified ad on Friday, broke into the family's home, and sold everything by Sunday.

NEWSPAPERS PRAISED FOR RESPONSE ON CALLEY CONVICTION

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the news of the conviction and life sentence of Lt. William Calley came at a period when the American people were saddened and sickened by the picture of stark horror that had been unfolded during the trial.

It was predictable that the public would react emotionally to the verdict. From the political left and right came a near-hysterical outpouring of pleas for Calley's release, that he and America be exonerated from the horrendous crime which had occurred. Their reasoning and reasons were many and varied, but they all sprang from the wellspring of pent-up emotion—shock, anger, disbelief, frustration, confusion, and sorrow.

When emotion had dissipated, logic took over, led by the reasoned coolness of the Nation's journalists and editorial writers, long seasoned by repeated exposure to the depths of human evil.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of America's news media, and their commonsense response to the hysteria which swept this country in the aftermath of the Calley verdict. I would like at this time to introduce editorials from three newspapers which have varying degrees of readership and influence in my district.

The first is the Dearborn Heights Leader, a widely read community weekly published in one of the largest cities in my district. The second is the Detroit News, the most widely read daily newspaper among my constituents, and the third is the New York Times, probably the best known nonlocal daily in Michigan.

The articles follow:

[From the Dearborn Heights Leader]

UNABRIDGED

(By Marg Webster)

If maturity is facing the consequences of one's actions . . . no matter how unpalatable . . . then this country of ours must be coming of age.

For six military, not civilian, jurors to find Lt. William Calley guilty of pre-meditated murder in the far-off village of My Lai is proof that we've turned a corner in our willingness to accept responsibility for horrors we create while decrying those of the enemy.

No country can be as lost as some might have feared these past, bleak war-embroiled months when it can create the system that gave birth to the Calley verdict.

We do not cheer the verdict. It is too serious a wound in our national honor for that. But we do take quiet satisfaction that not yet has this country gone down the path to self-deceptive actions parading under the guise of patriotism.

Calley has been found guilty . . . found guilty by a jury of his peers. Let no one forget that fact.

Still ahead is the trial of his superior officer. As are questions that thinking men and women everywhere must ask about our actions on that land turned battle-field halfway around the world. Questions we must ask of all our leaders, of the military establishment so entangled in all our affairs, questions we must ask ourselves.

Were we not the ones who, ashen-faced, asked a quarter of a century ago "how could those good burghers have turned their faces from Buchenwald . . . how could honest men dressed in military uniforms leave behind a leveled Lidice"? Now we must ask, not just what is the degree of Calley's guilt or Medina's or the generals in their paneled offices, or even our elected officials.

We must ask of ourselves our degree of guilt in not crying out against man's unbelievable cruelty to man.

We are ever haunted by the theory of columnist Stewart Alsop that since the turn of this 20th century our country has assumed the less agreeable features of whatever enemy it has met and conquered.

Carried to its ultimate conclusion, and he presents some interesting support for his thesis, we would become as unseeing, as uncaring, as wantonly cruel as the Nazi regime we battled so wholeheartedly.

And there would seem to have been growing proof to support his theory these last years darkened by our involvement in Viet Nam.

But the trial of Calley, a man caught up in the horrors of war through our national series of bungling events, proves one thing. We are able to look at ourselves and weigh our guilt. For Calley's guilt is yours and mine. And if we can say, and mean it, Mae Culpa . . . there is still hope for this great country built on principles drafted to withstand the venialty of men, the pressures of the military, the exigencies of the moment.

Calley carries our guilt, as we carry his . . . but the verdict also proves that we have not turned our faces from the mirror of the truth.

[From the Detroit News]

THE CALLEY VERDICT—ONLY HE IS GUILTY

The verdict that Lt. William Calley deliberately murdered 22 civilians at My Lai is not a verdict on the American conduct of the Vietnam war. It is the finding of a trial jury against one man for what he did in one Vietnam village on a given day.

Calley's attorney, George Latimer, declared: "Calley is the product of a system that takes a man out of his home and teaches him to kill. Parents will now be less willing than ever to send their boys to Vietnam."

The answer to that is on the record. For one Calley found guilty of a massacre there are many more than one million American non-Calleys who have been through the furnace of Vietnam and have observed the code of military conduct and honor. In a word, in what he is proven to have done Calley is unrepresentative of his country, his Army and the millions who have served in Vietnam.

Latimer linked to that plea the contention that Calley was a victim or scapegoat for a government that taught him to kill and then selected his judge, jury and prosecutor. That may trouble many of good conscience with no ax to grind. But that is the military system. To have arraigned Calley before a civilian court would not have provided a better alternative.

Five of the six officers were, as Calley was, enlisted men who had won commissions. All five, like Calley, had seen service in Vietnam. They knew the pressures and emotions of the battlefield. They knew the sort of confusing backdrop against which the war has been fought—something a civilian jury would have known only by hearsay. The sixth and oldest member was a World War II veteran. This was not a jury handpicked to whitewash its own Army, as protesters will say. No man on it was a West Pointer.

Calley himself declared at the trial, "I felt no remorse. I followed orders. The villagers

were all enemy to be wasted." No Army manual instructed him on those lines. The Nuremberg verdicts established such principles cannot be. And acceptance of the Calley code—that prisoners can be slain out of hand—would bode ill for those American POW's Hanoi refuses to release.

Calley, the pigeon, the lowest officer on the totem pole, was Latimer's description. The answer to that is the Calley verdict does not wrap up the My Lai killings. Three other officers await trial. One is Capt. Ernest Medina, Calley's immediate superior, charged with responsibility in the massacre. In that sense, the jury is still out. The issue of whether Calley was or was not obeying orders remains unresolved until a verdict is in on Medina, who denies he instructed Calley to slay as he did.

To repeat, Calley stands convicted as one man who did a series of acts in one day in My Lai. We can see the point Calley tries to make when he says: "People who have never experienced it will say war is hell. It is more than hell for those tied to it." Let all the armchair judges take note and all Americans await the final verdicts on My Lai.

[From the New York Times]

THE PRESIDENT AND MYLAI

No development in the whole tragic history of the Vietnam war has produced a more spontaneous outcry than the conviction of First Lieut. William L. Calley Jr. The protests have brought into unaccustomed unity such divergent national figures as Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama and Dr. Benjamin Spock to say nothing of millions of Americans not normally given to public expressions of outrage.

But the mass clamor in no way alters the correctness of the judgment reached by the court-martial after agonizing deliberation. Exoneration of Lieutenant Calley would have dishonored both the American military tradition and the solemn commitments this country has subscribed to under the Geneva and Hague Conventions on the rules of war.

On that basis, President Nixon's decision to intervene in the Calley case, first to order the officer's release from the stockade and yesterday to announce his intention to review the case and to make a final determination on the sentence, represents an unfortunate interference with the processes of military justice.

It would have been perfectly appropriate, if unusual, under established Army practices for the commanding general at Fort Benning to have ordered Lieutenant Calley released from the stockade and confined to quarters pending review of his conviction on charges of murdering Vietnamese civilians.

Similarly, it would have been quite proper for Mr. Nixon to have reviewed the case and its outcome at the end of all judicial proceedings. This could even have been considered his duty. But the precipitous manner in which Mr. Nixon publicly intervened over the heads of military authorities to make an exception that is not ordinarily granted to prisoners convicted of capital crimes and more especially his public announcement at this stage that he will himself make the final decision creates a prejudical atmosphere affecting all intermediate steps in the appeals process. He has now in his capacity as Commander in Chief identified himself with the intemperate public outcry against the initial court-martial.

With the White House admission that Mr. Nixon has acted in response to "widespread public interest" to provide a "different quality of review," it is all too clear that he bowed to intense public pressure, something he has repeatedly declared no responsible leader could ever do when it came to decisions involving the Vietnam conflict.

The President's moves at a time of high political fever undermine confidence in the impartiality of the outcome he will ultimately decree. This appearance of Executive partisanship has been reinforced by the ill-considered remarks of Vice President Agnew in an interview just hours before Lieutenant Calley's court-martial sentencing to life imprisonment was announced.

In an indirect but unmistakable reference to the Calley trial, Mr. Agnew said: "The point comes out to this: many of the people in America—particularly those of us who served in the service—understand that the rather abnormal fears and the conditions in a military operation are not subject to Monday-morning quarterback judgment by someone sitting comfortably in an office in Washington."

The men who passed judgment on Lieutenant Calley were not such Monday-morning quarterbacks. Six combat infantry officers, five of them veterans of Vietnam, unanimously found him guilty of murdering at least 22 unarmed civilians at Mylai. They acted after hearing months of testimony and deliberating for thirteen days. "To even consider that any American soldier would ever do such a thing is beyond my own comprehension," one of the jurors declared after the verdict. "I wanted to believe it didn't happen, that it was a hoax."

But Mylai did happen. A House Armed Services subcommittee long ago concluded that: "What obviously happened at Mylai was wrong. It was contrary to the Geneva Conventions, the Rules of Engagement, and the MACV directives."

The task of the President and other political leaders is not to sit as judge and jury in courts-martial but rather to address themselves forthrightly to the broader issues that the Calley trial have brought into agonizing public focus—the question of responsibility at higher levels for the acts committed at Mylai and elsewhere in Vietnam and the problem of ending a war that continues to inflict misery and death on the peoples of Indochina.

PASSOVER HAS SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE FOR RUSSIAN JEWS

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, this Friday evening marks the beginning of the Jewish holiday of Passover, commemorating the exodus of the Jewish people from Egypt where they had been slaves.

History has a habit of repeating itself, and as I review the Passover story, I cannot help but draw parallels to the current plight of Jews in the Soviet Union.

Just as in Egypt during Biblical times, the Jews in Russia today are denied basic human rights. They have been stripped of their cultural and religious identity by a nation that has repeatedly stated that it opposes organized religion.

Rather than continue to live in an atmosphere of such tyranny and oppression, many Russian Jews are desirous of emigrating to Israel. Lately, the Soviet Government has so consented, but only to a very small degree. The small number of Jews that has been allowed to leave Russia is but a minute fraction of those who have petitioned to emigrate.

The Passover season is a most fitting time for a reversal of this policy. An integral part of the Passover dinner, the Seder, intones "next year in Jerusalem." For Russian Jews this line takes on obviously added significance and is not simply an idle chant; it is an expression of their highest hope.

I sincerely hope that the Government of the U.S.S.R., in an exercise of humanitarianism, sees fit to relax its present policy on emigration. Next year, hopefully, the thousands of Russian Jews who have petitioned to leave Russia will be spending Passover in Jerusalem, as is their goal and their right.

THE PENTAGON'S PUBLIC RELATIONS

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the public relations activities of the Pentagon are once again in the news and have stirred wide controversy. Few people are as well qualified to comment on this subject as is Mr. Richard P. Taffe, a retired lieutenant colonel in the Army, who served in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs for 5 years. He spent an additional 4 years in the Office of the Chief of Information of the Department of the Army. In a recent issue of the Lowell Sun, Mr. Taffe described the functions of the Office of Public Affairs, and in view of his special qualifications to provide insight into its operations, I commend his article to the attention of my colleagues:

WHAT THE PENTAGON IS "SELLING"

(By Richard P. Taffe)

One of the most favorite targets for public criticism within the federal government is the military public relations program.

Over the years it has been charged with muzzling the press, lying to the public, withholding major news (particularly of an adverse variety) and propagandizing the military establishment.

It has been subjected to a wide variety of Congressional, Bureau of the Budget, media and general public scrutiny. It has had its funds hacked, seen major programs dumped, caused international rumblings, seen many careers capsized and been charged with building itself into a monstrous paper mill epitomizing the entire federal establishment.

Yet, it survives. It must be doing something right. Undoubtedly, it is one of the best known and least understood segments of the entire Department of Defense.

One of its present problems has to do with a blast levelled at the national television media by Vice President Spiro Agnew. He charged the Columbia Broadcasting System with distortion over the CBS show "The Selling of the Pentagon." The CBS attack on the Pentagon press operation is not the first time the fight hit national proportions.

Way back in the 1950's a legislator called the Defense public affairs office a bunch of hucksters with crossed tin horns instead of the national seal on the hats and typewriter keyboards instead of gold braid on their visors. He cut the information budget in half. He is, today Cong. F. Edward Hébert, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

During the Kennedy Administration, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Arthur Sylvester, took the brunt of

government criticism when the press accused the government of muzzling the press and being willing to lie to the public if necessary to save the country.

A look inside this organization shows an amazing number of directorates, divisions and sections, many of which grew out of specific demands of the public or the media itself, something often overlooked when the office is being criticized.

HENKIN IN TOP SPOT

The man currently holding the office—a presidential appointment—of Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) is Daniel Z. Henkin. Henkin is one of a long line of working newspapermen who have been named to the job. He was, for years, the Pentagon reporter for the Journal of the Armed Forces. He succeeds Phil G. Goulding, who moved into the job from a reporter's desk in the Pentagon for the Cleveland Plain Dealer after Arthur Sylvester left the job during the Johnson Administration. Sylvester, named by President Kennedy, had been for 25 years the Washington Bureau chief for the Newark News.

There are a number of special assistants sitting near the top boss in the office. One handles Congressional queries, another the White House briefing book, a third the audio visual arrangements for Pentagon press briefing, a fourth the background files on the Vietnam war. A small group at that level work under the staff assistant for public correspondence. This group handles answers to every letter written to any official in Washington which requires a military answer. In one week, for instance, they can crank out answers to maybe 15,000 letters from prohibitionist groups as to why beer is sold to soldiers or an equal number demanding the reasons why the United States went into Vietnam in the first place.

The most visible directorate is Defense Information, the link between the government's press room and the room right across the hall manned by the Pentagon "regulars," some two dozen top representatives of the wire services, the news magazines, the networks and several major papers.

The Information directorate is divided into several groups. In a typical day the Armed Forces News Branch might answer 1700 queries from news media all over the country; the Defense News Branch might put out half a dozen press releases on government contracts, the casualty lists and the citations of the most recent Medal of Honor winners, while at the same time, eliciting from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the other assistant secretaries of Defense and the State Department sufficient information to brief Henkin on top level government happenings so that he won't be too embarrassed with the questions levelled at him at the noontime daily news briefings.

In another division of this office, Audio Visual, film clips from Vietnam are being processed to delivery to the networks, the scripts of a motion picture or television show are being reviewed for accuracy or to determine the amount of logistical support the military can give to a producer and millions of still pictures (black and white and color) are being reviewed for release to the public.

The Magazine and Book branch spends most of its time researching facts for authors writing on military subjects who, otherwise, would have a great deal of difficulty in getting their historical, tactical or technical facts straight.

PROVIDES MEDIA TRAVEL

Another officer in this directorate is charged with providing news media travel—when approved. The military can provide travel to a newsman only on certain conditions. First of all, the mission must be declared to be primarily in the interest of the Department of Defense or in the national interest. Then it must be established that the newsman can't get to his destination to cover a military story via commercial air. This would include such places as Thule, Greenland, or Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. In addition, travel may be provided when it is imperative that a group of newsmen be kept together for purposes of covering the story.

Most "crisis" stories could not have been covered without the media getting airlift support from the military. For example, the pools of newsmen and photographers who flew in the Navy planes over the Russian ships removing the missiles from Cuba; the airlift of newsmen into the Dominican Republic; the flights to provide emergency support in the fighting in the Congo; or the airlift of newsmen into India when Red China invaded that country.

Most of the time it is the newsmen who wanted the ride, not the Department of Defense. As exceptions to this were such flights as those directed by the White House to move 52 selected newsmen into Vietnam during the early stages of that war; the hundreds of newsmen who were flown with the 2nd Armored Division from Texas to Germany during the famous "Big Lift" operation which demonstrated the ability of the United States to reinforce the NATO troops; or the annual flights to the South Pole which newsmen bid for each year during the "Deep Freeze" operations.

The second directorate in the office is aimed at community relations and seldom do newsmen become involved in its operations. It provides military exhibits, speakers, pamphlets or specialized news to every industrial veterans, civic, woman's and labor organization in the country.

The community relations directorate also run every aerial show, surface program (such as Armed Forces Day) and every program in the country in which a band, troop unit or protocol service are required. In its Projects Division, this directorate also runs a speakers bureau, writes speeches for high ranking government officials on military subjects and conducts a number of annual conferences and briefings.

CIVILIAN CONFERENCE

One of the events most criticized by CBS in the recent show was the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference. This is an event which has been conducted about 40 times since World War II. It entails inviting a broad cross section of the American public to witness the military might of the country in a week-long day-and-night gruelling show which covers as many as a dozen stops throughout the country. No more than two guests are invited from any one state or any one profession. They pay all their expenses except travel. Close coordination is effected by the JCOC sponsors and all the military services so as to take advantage of every good training event, firepower demonstration, fly-by or speaker scheduled to perform for other groups as part of their regular training.

The "graduates" of JCOC have formed into a private, non-profit organization called the Defense Orientation Conference Association and now numbers thousands of members throughout the country whose only annual "chore" is to attend a banquet or visit a military base to keep themselves posted on current military hardware.

The third directorate in the office is Plans and Programs which do just that. They may be working on plans for the news coverage in crisis areas in a dozen different areas of the world at the same time. This group works closely with the commanders-in-chief of the various unified commands so as to keep abreast of the military situation throughout the world and determine when and if special arrangements must be made for news coverage.

The last of the directorates are the so-called Pentagon censors. This is the Directorate for Security Review which is charged with the responsibility of clearing military utterances, press release, Congressional testimony, etc. to insure they do not violate national security.

TWO PROGRAMS SUSPENDED

Currently suspended because of the peculiar nature of the Vietnam war are two other programs which have been run by this office.

The first, unused since World War II, is field press censorship. With between 300 and 600 newsmen in Vietnam from as many as 44 countries, and with the country technically in a state of peace as far as even mail censorship is concerned, it would not be possible to effect any press censorship in Vietnam. Therefore, it has not been tried.

The other dormant program is also impossible to enforce in Vietnam and that is press accreditation. Written into the regulations during World War II it is set up to cover correspondents who would accompany U.S. military forces into combat and give them both the hospitality of the command and a semi-official military status in the event of their capture. More than 10,000 such accreditations were issued between World War II and about two years ago but the program is on a stand-by status at present inasmuch as any legitimate newsman can get to Vietnam with the price of a plane ticket and a visa from the Vietnam government.

The military services each have counterpart offices within their departments. The Chief of Information, Department of the Army, in addition to the public affairs functions such as those listed above, also handles the internal information for the Army. His office also runs the theater newspaper, such as the Stars and Stripes, and the Armed Forces radio and television stations located throughout the world. Charges of propagandizing keep cropping up in relation to the pamphlets issued by the Army. Several recent ones had titles like: "Eliminating Unnecessary Troop Irritant," "Frauds against Soldiers," and "Actions to End Discriminatory Practices in the Services."

THE HONORABLE CRISS COLE RECEIVED AMVETS SILVER HELMET REHABILITATION AWARD

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 27, 1971, AMVETS honored a great Texas statesman—the Honorable Criss Cole—by awarding him their Silver Helmet Rehabilitation Award in recognition of his unsurpassed dedication, superb contributions, and personal examples in assisting the handicapped to become self-reliant and gainfully employed. Criss was blinded by a Japanese handgrenade in November 1943 while serving with the U.S. Marines on Tarawa. He was later hospitalized at the Philadelphia Naval Hospital where he met and later married a lovely lady, Joanne Spica, who also accompanied him to the AMVETS award dinner. It was a great personal pleasure to Mrs. Teague and me to attend this function in honor of Criss who has had a most distinguished career in the Texas Legislature which was climaxed by his service as president pro tem of the Texas Senate. Criss has devoted much of his life to assist-

ing our Nation's young men and women and served as chairman of the Senate Youth Affairs Committee. On January 15, 1971, Senator Cole was appointed judge of the juvenile court of Harris County, Tex.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to include the full text of AMVETS citation which accompanied the Silver Helmet Rehabilitation Award honoring this great American:

CITATION

The 26th Annual National Convention of AMVETS, assembled in New York City, New York, on August 26, 1970, did unanimously resolve that its Rehabilitation Award be presented to the Honorable Criss Cole, President Pro-tem of the Texas Senate, in recognition of his unsurpassed dedication, superb contributions and personal examples in assisting the handicapped, especially, the young, in again becoming self-reliant and gainfully employed, thereby re-establishing their most important need—human dignity.

Although a Japanese hand grenade on the Island of Tarawa left him in total darkness since Nov. 23, 1943, Criss Cole, war veteran, author, legislator and Judge has never ceased his relentless drive to offer encouragement, guidance and most of all personal example to the physically disabled of the nation.

While partial to legislation affecting the handicapped, Judge Cole from the start of his legislative career in 1954, has served on all the important standing committees of the Texas House and Senate. An honorary member of Kappa Delta Pi for his contributions in the field of education, he has also been honored for his legislative accomplishments by the Vocational Agricultural Teachers Association of Texas, the Blinded Veterans Association, the Texas Association of Physical and Mental Rehabilitation, and was chosen for "The Outstanding Alumni Award" of the University of Houston Law School and in 1965 he was afforded the singular honor of being named by Governor Connally as the "Texas Handicapped Person of the Year."

The problems and afflictions plaguing the youth of the Nation, whether they be handicapped or not has for a lifetime been close to the heart of this courageous man and this prompted Lt. Governor Barnes to appoint him in 1969 as Chairman of a New Standing Committee of Youth Affairs in the Texas Senate.

On Jan. 15, 1971 Senator Criss Cole, lifelong fighter for the handicapped, the oppressed and above all the youth, was honored by Governor Preston Smith by being named Judge of the Juvenile Court of Harris County, Texas.

Judge Cole, AMVETS salutes you tonight as the recipient of the coveted Silver Helmet Rehabilitation Award.

REGULATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST SITUATIONS IN INSURED SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, following the Easter recess, the House Committee on Banking and Currency will be holding hearings on a broad range of issues involving conflict of interest situations in all types of federally insured financial institutions. In anticipation of those hearings, I am today reintroducing as a separate bill a measure which I sponsored last year as an amendment to the housing and urban development bill to clarify and expand the authority of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to regulate conflict of interest situations in insured savings and loan institutions.

This same proposal was agreed to in the committee last year as an amendment of mine to H.R. 19436, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, but was drastically changed on the House floor and was subsequently dropped in conference after the chairmen of the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees expressed a willingness and intention to hold hearings in their respective committees in this session on the issues raised by my amendment as originally offered.

GREW OUT OF AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE INVESTIGATION AND REPORT

My amendment last year on conflict of interest situations involving some savings and loans and their officials was one of a number of legislative proposals resulting from an investigation and report made by an ad hoc subcommittee on home financing practices and procedures created early in the last Congress by the Committee on Banking and Currency following disclosures of widespread victimization of low- and moderate-income families in the District of Columbia in the purchase of homes at terribly inflated prices from speculators, financed to a large degree by one insured savings and loan institution. Several of the legislative recommendations of the ad hoc subcommittee were enacted as part of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, which was signed December 31, 1970, as Public Law 91-609, but the proposal on conflict of interest situations, as I said, was not included in the final version of the bill.

Approximately a month ago, Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN, of the Committee on Banking and Currency, introduced, with eight cosponsors, a bill, H.R. 5700, which would prohibit by law numerous practices engaged in by officials of not only savings and loans but also banks and related institutions which are described in the bill as conflicts of interest. Chairman PATMAN has scheduled hearings on the subject matter of that bill and any similar bills following the Easter recess of the House.

Therefore, in order to have my original proposal formally before the committee for those hearings, I am reintroducing it today as a separate bill. Instead of prohibiting by statute a wide range of conflict-of-interest situations which have arisen in savings and loan management activities, my bill clarifies and expands existing authority of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to issue regulations covering these activities. This was the general approach taken by the ad hoc subcommittee in its report, which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 20, pages 26880-26889.

DISPOSITION OF AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The ad hoc subcommittee in the 91st Congress, of which I was chairman, included the following additional Members; the gentlemen from New York, Representatives JAMES M. HANLEY and FRANK J. BRASCO, and the gentleman from Kansas, Representative CHESTER L. MIZE, and until his resignation from the Committee on Banking and Currency to accept election to the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Maryland, J. GLENN BEALL, Jr. Senator BEALL participated in our hearings and investigation but not in the drafting of the final report. The report was signed by all of the other Members.

Among concrete legislative results of our study were the adoption by Congress of changes in the law to provide for regulation by the Fedreal Home Loan Bank Board of all insured savings and loans in the District of Columbia whether or not federally chartered, thus closing a serious loophole in the regulatory machinery; and extending to all insured savings and loans the protection of the criminal code provisions against false claims previously accorded only to federally chartered savings and loans.

A third ad hoc subcommittee proposal, calling for the establishment in the Department of Housing and Urban Development of an office of Special Assistant to the Secretary to advise and assist nonprofit organizations in sponsoring housing projects and programs, was also included in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970.

However, several of our recommendations were not agreed to in the full committee last year and have therefore not yet been enacted. One would prohibit, except under very limited circumstances, the use of straw parties in residential real estate transactions; others dealt with appraisals, settlement practices, and the disclosure on all deeds in federally related transactions of the actual consideration paid and the interest of the parties thereon. I intend to pursue these issues in connection with housing legislation coming before the committee in this Congress. I think they are essential reforms.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD WOULD SET STANDARDS

The bill which I have introduced today, Mr. Speaker, is intended to give to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board the clear statutory authority to carry out, through issuance of appropriate regulations, the following recommendations of the report of the ad hoc Subcommittee on Home Financing Practices and Procedures.

First, expansion of the definition of "conflicts of interest" for directors, officers, and employees of savings and loan associations, regulating their own involvement in the business of real estate for their personal gain through the use of their own or other savings and loan associations;

Second, additional and more realistic limitations on "single borrower" loans. These regulations should set firm limits on the portion of an association's total assets and the number of loans that can be made to single borrowers.

Third, establishment of criteria for the qualification of appraisers and the assignment of responsibility for faulty appraisals.

Fourth, regulation of the interest of di-

rectors, officers, and employees of savings and loan associations in title companies, settlement houses, appraisal organizations, and similar institutions who do business with savings and loans.

Mr. Speaker, the language of my bill is technical and legalistic, and has been described as too hard to understand. If it needs improvement on that score, I would certainly have no objection to changes, but not at the expense of destroying the effectiveness of the bill. I asked the technical experts in the Home Loan Bank Board who deal in this field of regulatory law to draft the kind of language necessary to give the Federal Home Loan Bank Board authority it maintained it does not now fully possess to carry out the ad hoc subcommittee recommendations on conflicts of interest. The Board itself did not support this language last year; in fact, it took no position one way or another on this section of H.R. 19436 until after it was amended on the House floor and, in my opinion as well as the Board's opinion, made completely meaningless. While the housing bill was in conference, the Board then came forward with some different language which it said was needed and which it would support, but the conferees decided to postpone the matter until this year.

The Board's belated amendment seemed to me to be much weaker than my original section. Hence, in the forthcoming hearings. I hope the Board will be prepared to tell us in detail why it objects to any specific provisions of my bill which its own version would change. In that way, we can get to the bottom of just what the problems really are in achieving effective regulation to prevent conflict of interest situations which could victimize savers in the association, or those who borrow from it, or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which is usually the ultimate victim of any serious management abuses in insured institutions.

TEXT OF BILL

Although its language will, I am sure, be virtually incomprehensible to most laymen, I include herewith, for the information of the Members who are interested, the text of the bill I have today introduced on savings and loan conflict-of-interest situations, as follows:

H.R. 7440

A bill to clarify and expand the authority of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to regulate conflicts of interest in the operation of insured savings and loan associations, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) The Federal Home Loan Bank Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board) is directed, to such extent as it may deem necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of members, investors, or borrowers, or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, to regulate relationships, including without limitation on the generality of the foregoing business, financial, or other transactions, between—

"(A) a member and another member;

"(B) a member or an affiliated person of such member or of another member and an investor in or borrower from any such member or another member;

"(C) a member and an affiliated person of such member or of another member;

"(D) a member or an affiliated person of a member, or an investor in or borrower from a member or an affiliated person, and a person from or through which services are or may be rendered (i) to such member or another member, (ii) to an affiliated person of such member or of another member, except where no member is involved and all affiliated persons involved are individuals, or (iii) to an investor in or borrower from a member or an affiliated person of a member; or

"(E) an affiliated person of a member and an affiliated person of such member or of another member, where the relationship involves or may involve any relationship described in subparagraphs (A) through (D) above.

"(2) The authority conferred by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall include authority to regulate with respect to the providing, under circumstances set forth in subparagraph (D) of such paragraph, of appraisal or valuation services or other services, including, without limitation by or on the foregoing, standards and requirements with respect to such services and with respect to qualifications for and conduct of persons providing or eligible to provide such services. In or in connection with the exercise of authority under this paragraph the Board is authorized to make provision for registers or rosters of eligible persons and for involuntary or other removal of persons therefrom.

"(3) In or in connection with the exercise of any function vested in or exercisable by the Board under this Act or otherwise, the Board (which term as used in this paragraph includes the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation) is authorized (A) to act through any corporate or other agency or instrumentality of the United States and utilize services, facilities, and personnel thereof, and any such agency or instrumentality is authorized to provide the same as requested by the Board, (B) to make payment therefor, and (C) to impose and collect fees and charges for the provision by the Board of services, facilities, or personnel to any person, and for purposes of this subsection the references in the last two sentences of subsection (b) of section 5B as now in effect to penalties shall be deemed to be references to such fees and charges. Any such payment or collection may be in advance or by reimbursement or otherwise.

"(4) As used in this subsection—

"(A) the term 'affiliated person' means—

"(i) a director, officer, employee, or controlling person of a member, or an attorney regularly serving, or a member or associate of a firm regularly serving, a member in the capacity of attorney-at-law;

"(ii) a member of the immediate family of any individual referred to in clause (i) above;

"(iii) a partnership in which any individual referred to in clause (i) or (ii) above is a general or limited partner;

"(iv) a corporation in which stock carrying 10 per centum or more of the voting rights is directly or indirectly owned or controlled by any one or more of the persons referred to in (i) through (iii) above, either alone or in concert; or

"(v) any person or class of persons with respect to which there is outstanding a determination by the Board by regulation or otherwise that it is necessary or appropriate in the public interest or for the protection of members, investors, or borrowers or the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation that such person or class be treated as an affiliated person, but the term 'affiliated person' as used in this subsection and the term 'controlling person' as so used shall not include any person or class of persons with respect to which there is outstanding a determination by the Board by regulation or otherwise that the exclusion of such person or class from the meaning of the term 'affiliated person' or the term 'controlling person' as so used is not inconsistent with the protection aforesaid and is necessary or appropriate in the public interest;

"(B) the term 'controlling person' means any person who, alone or in concert with another or others, directly or indirectly has the right to vote, whether by stock ownership or control, proxy holding, or otherwise, or any combination thereof, more than 25 per centum of the voting rights in a corporation;

"(C) the term 'firm' includes, without limitation on its generality, artificial persons and groups or organizations of persons;

"(D) the terms 'investor' and 'borrower' respectively include prospective investors and prospective borrowers;

"(E) the term 'member' includes any institution any of the deposits, shares, or accounts of which have any insurance by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and, to such extent and only to such extent as the Board may provide, includes the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation;

"(F) the term 'person' includes, without limitation on its generality, individuals and artificial persons and groups or organizations of persons;

"(G) the term 'regulate' or any derivative thereof includes prohibition; and

"(H) the term 'services' includes, without limitation on its generality, appraisal or valuation services, legal services, title services, title insurance, hazard insurance, credit insurance, and other insurance, settlement service escrow services, and trustee services.

"(5) The provisions of subsection (f) of section 5A and of subsections (b) and (c) of section 5B, all as now in effect, are extended to include this subsection, and for purposes of this sentence the references in said subsections to those sections shall include this subsection, the references in said subsection (f) to provisions of the National Housing Act shall be deemed to be references to those provisions as now in effect, and the references in said subsection (b) and (c) to institutions and nonmember institutions shall include members and shall include affiliated persons. In implementing or carrying out provisions of this subsection the Board may make classifications on the basis of the nature, characteristics, or location of members or affiliated persons or of investors therein or borrowers therefrom or on such other basis or bases as the Board may deem desirable in the public interest."

TECHNICAL EXPLANATION OF H.R. 7440

The following technical data on the above bill was given to me, Mr. Speaker, by the experts who drafted this language:

Paragraph (1) provides general authority in the Board to regulate the situations in which conflicts of interest most frequently appear or are likely to appear. This regulatory authority clarifies any existing regulatory authority with respect to institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and expands such regulatory authority to embrace Federal Home Loan Bank member institutions as well.

The regulatory authority under this paragraph is limited, however, in that it applies only to the relationships and transactions referred to in the paragraph. It does not extend, for example, to relationships or transactions between individuals (such as directors of the same association or a director of one and a director of another) where no member or insured institution is involved.

Under paragraph (5) of the new subsection, which extends to the new subsection

certain existing provisions of the Act, the Board would have authority to impose and collect penalties of as much as $100 a day on any member or insured institution, or affiliated person, who violated any rule imposed under paragraph (1).

Subdivision (D) of paragraph (1) is designed to grant clear regulatory authority where services, such as appraisal services, title services, and settlement services, are rendered to member or insured institutions or affiliates thereof, or to investors therein or borrowers therefrom. Paragraph (2) implements this authority by expressly authorizing the Board to regulate the providing of appraisal and other services, including the providing of standards and requirements for such services and for the qualifications and conduct of persons rendering the services. In this connection the Board would be authorized to provide for registers or rosters of eligible persons and for removal of persons therefrom.

Paragraph (3) authorizes the Board to obtain assistance from other agencies or instrumentalities of the United States and to impose user fees or charges. Assistance from other agencies and instrumentalities may especially be needed to make available to the Board the benefit of the expertise of other agencies, such as the Federal Housing Administration and the Veterans Administration, which have had long experience in the field of appraisals and related activities.

Paragraph (4) supplies definitions. Paragraph (5) extends to the new statutory provisions implementing and enforcement provisions already existing in other sections of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and contains other implementing provisions.

JEROLD C. HOFFBERGER—OUTSTANDING MAN OF INDUSTRY OF BALTIMORE

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, Jerold C. Hoffberger will be presented the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce award as Outstanding Man of Industry of Baltimore at a luncheon in Baltimore on April 13, 1971. I would like to add my congratulations to Jerry Hoffberger.

Jerry Hoffberger has been president and director of the National Brewing Co. since 1947. His many business interests cover the full spectrum of corporations in the Maryland area—from aerospace industry to the famous National Brewery. His ability to combine business with civic interests is unique, and his leadership has served many organizations in forming new and revitalizing existing civic institutions.

Jerry Hoffberger is a trustee of the Johns Hopkins Hospital and the Mercy Hospital as well as a director of Sinai Hospital. He is a member of the National Cabinet of the United Jewish Appeal and a Member of the Board of Associated Jewish Charities and Welfare Fund. Mr. Hoffberger also serves as a member of the National Committee of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee. He is a trustee of Goucher College, a member of the Executive Committee of the Greater Baltimore Committee, a director of the United Fund of Central Maryland, and a member of the Voluntary Council on Equal Opportunity.

These many activities indicate the intense interest Jerry Hoffberger has taken in his community, State, and Nation over the years. I congratulate him on receiving the Outstanding Man of Industry in Baltimore Award and know that his honor is more than deserved.

U.S. SANCTUARY TO SOUTH VIETNAMESE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, history records that every country that the free world has abandoned has, upon being taken over by the Communists, suffered a blood bath of its anti-Communist and nonconforming citizens; witness Red China and Cuba.

In each of these instances the vacuum created by withdrawal of U.S. influence followed by the genocide-like retaliation of the new Communist totalitarian state resulted in the execution and murder of millions of innocent men, women, and children, if for no other reason than they would not yield to the militant collectivist state.

In the matter of Cuba, American sympathy and guilt were felt mitigated by opening our immigration quotas to offer nearly a half million Cubans sanctuary and freedom in our great country. As to our friends, the Nationalist Chinese, our country sought to absolve our guilt by supporting a sanctuary on the Island of Taiwan to allow the free Chinese refuge from certain death by the Red takeover and aftermath.

Now Americans are being conditioned to accept the policy of our Government, and both national parties, that by withdrawal of our troops from South Vietnam peace will come to that war-torn land. Little or nothing is being said about the possible consequences to our non-Communist allies in that nation. It is possible that because of Vietnamization they may be able to stem the idea of the Bolsheviks from the north but it is also possible that because of infiltration, lack of national unity and inability to fully mobilize their people that that nation will be overrun by the Red hordes from the north. In case of defeat or overthrow, it must be obvious to all Americans that millions of South Vietnamese will be liquidated in the name of peace by the Communist conquerors.

The American people as well as our leaders owe a responsibility to the people of South Vietnam. It was the Americans who made the assurances that we would make South Vietnam safe from Communist aggression and control. It was the American leaders who have furnished the support and induced the people of South Vietnam to take a strong anti-Communist stand for individual freedom with the free countries of the West.

Certainly our responsibilities and our assurances have not been satisfied nor will they be fulfilled upon our withdrawal by merely continuing support in the form of military supplies.

In the words of King John the Good of France: "If good faith and the respect for the given word were to disappear from this world, they should at least remain on the lips and in the hearts of kings" and of Americans.

Few have the foresight to think ahead as to the possible consequences of a U.S. departure from Indochina. However, I think the vast majority of Americans do not want another blood bath at the hands of Communist barbarians anywhere on the face of this earth and especially directed against our friends and allies in South Vietnam.

To that end, and foreseeing the possible consequences of the failures of our leaders to follow through with our commitments I am today introducing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that our country offer sanctuary to all anti-Communist South Vietnamese who desire freedom and sanctuary from the bestiality and tyranny of the Communists.

I include the text of my resolution following my remarks:

H. CON. RES. 262

Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States offer sanctuary in the United States to anti-Communist South Vietnamese from the bestiality and tyranny of the North Vietnamese Communists

Whereas the United States is pursuing an announced policy of withdrawing its forces from South Vietnam leaving the South Vietnamese to defend themselves from their Communist enemy to the North; and

Whereas it is unlikely due to internal political pressure in the United States, that U.S. forces, once having been withdrawn, will again be committed in South Vietnam for the protection of the South Vietnamese people; and

Whereas it has been estimated that in the event of a Communist takeover of South Vietnam three million anti-Communist South Vietnamese would be liquidated; and

Whereas the United States because of previous assurances of protection to the people of South Vietnam from Communist totalitarianism, it is the moral responsibility of the United States, as the leader of the free world and as a firm believer in the rights of all men, expressed in the Bill of Rights of our Constitution and to protect the South Vietnamese people from genocide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that the Attorney General exercise his authority under present law and provide admission to the United States to those anti-Communist South Vietnamese who desire life, freedom and sanctuary from the bestiality and tyranny of the Communists.

BETH ANN HERMAN'S PRAYER

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Mr. Bernard H.

Herman, a constituent of mine from Fall River, Mass. Enclosed was a prayer written by his daughter, 14-year-old Beth Ann, who is a chaplain at her school. With her prayer, Beth Ann emphasizes the basic concept on which this Nation was founded—the belief that all men are one—and the realization that God sees us only as one. Her prayer seems to capture that vital optimism which is often needed today.

As I read this prayer, so simple and yet so full of meaning, I was deeply touched by her belief, and I felt that this prayer should be shared with others.

PRAYER FOR THE SENATE

O God, we stand before you not as individuals, but as one.

Though our faiths may differ, our feeling for humanity does not.

Guide us. Love us. Hear our pleas and nourish our minds with wisdom.

Bless us, O God, and bless the President and Vice President of these United States, which we hold so dear.

See us through victory and help us through defeat.

Bestow upon us your wish for a better, more peaceful world.

Help us, O Lord, to be good, truthful, and loyal to our country, our brothers, and most important, to ourselves. Amen.

IS RESHUFFLE NECESSARY?

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the main recommendations of the administration for domestic legislation is a massive shakeup of the executive department.

I was interested in the views on this proposal by one of my hometown newspapers, the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News, in a March 29 editorial:

IS THIS RESHUFFLE NECESSARY?

Of the "six great goals" on which President Nixon has focused his entire 1971 domestic legislative program, the one which has left us coldest from the outset is his conception of how to reorganize the federal executive establishment. Now he has submitted that plan in detail and it still strikes us as philosophically questionable, politically over-ambitious and needlessly provocative, and not likely to make much of a ripple in Congress anyway.

If there's a principle involved here, it could well be adapted from the Declaration of Independence's warning not to change long established institutions of government for "light and transient causes." That's what all this proposed tinkering seems to us to come down to—a revolutionary reshuffling of countless long-established agencies and interrelationships for reasons which, if not trivial, are far from being self-evident.

The President's purpose, as he said in his State of the Union message, is to organize the departments not by "narrow subjects" or by interest-group "constituencies" but around the "great purposes of government." Rather than scattering responsibility, he would "focus and concentrate" it so that "when we have a problem we will know where to go and the department will have the authority and the resources to do something about it."

But we're not so sure this is even good theory. Problem-solving in this sense is more the function of the White House and of Congress. The bureaucracy's primary function is not to innovate but to administer going programs, including such new ones as Congress may create. So organizing the bureaucracy around the "great purposes of government"—as the White House staff should certainly be organized—does not strike us as necessarily an improvement over organizing it by "constituencies."

In a complex society like ours, after all, there is something to be said for giving all the major interest-groups—farmers, veterans, labor, business, conservationists, teachers, etc.—a sense of access to that great impersonal machine in Washington, a sense that there is some agency down there that broadly represents "us." Is it really going to give us better government if we abolish the Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, Interior and other familiar old-line departments and regroup everything under such conceptions as "Human Resources," "Community Development," "Economic Affairs" and "Natural Resources"? We don't know any reason to assume so.

As for the biggest department of all those Mr. Nixon wants to create—"Human Resources"—we have already indicated our belief that he is moving here in exactly the wrong direction. Instead of adding yet additional agencies to the present unmanageable bureaucratic behemoth known as Health, Education, and Welfare, we think a far better case can be made for breaking this one down into its three separate components. Health, education and welfare are already the three fastest-growing domestic functions in the entire government, and each can easily justify departmental status in its own right.

Otherwise, while we have no great objections to the particular pattern of consolidations suggested, we do have doubts whether they are worth the controversy that is sure to attend each and every reshuffle of the familiar into a pattern which, to every bureaucrat and back-home constituency involved, will be at least mildly frightening because it is unfamiliar. President Nixon, in short, has given Congress a full enough plate of other legislative recommendations this year without adding this rather indigestible lump of agency reshuffling.

IMPLICATIONS OF LIEUTENANT CALLEY'S TRIAL

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague the junior Senator from Indiana (BIRCH BAYH), has today issued a thoughtful statement reflecting not only his concern for the next election but also his concern for the next generation.

It has been said that politics is the art of the possible, but that statesmanship is the art of making things possible. Senator BAYH'S statement should make possible a better than superficial understanding on the part of the public of the tragic case of Lieutenant Calley.

Since no one seems to dispute the facts in the Calley case, including his having thrown an individual baby into a ditch and shot it to death, it seems to me that the principal issue is whether the Lieutenant was following a lawful order in doing so. If he was, then it follows that such conduct reflects the official policy of the U.S. Government toward noncombatant prisoners immobilized and held in custody. If conceded that this is the official policy of the U.S. Government then it also would follow that the U.S. Government had repudiated its participation in the Geneva Convention on warfare.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker if, after careful reflection, the American people and their elected President really would wish to present such a policy and image to the world and, indeed, to history.

Do we really wish to concede to the Communist Chinese that this tragic court-martial represents nothing more than a scapegoat to official American policy?

People at times speak in haste. But is it not the President's role to act only upon careful deliberation?

President Nixon has written:

My philosophy has always been: Don't lean with the wind. Don't do what is politically expedient. Do what your instinct tells you is right. Public opinion polls are useful if a politician uses them only to learn approximately what the people are thinking, so he can talk to them more intelligently. The politician who sways with the polls is not worth his pay. And I believe the people eventually catch up with the man who merely tells them what he thinks they want to hear.

Mr. Speaker, the American public quite rightly has been outraged by the failure of Hanoi to comply with the Geneva Convention on treatment of prisoners. And it has been the position of this administration as well as all Members of Congress that world opinion is important in persuading Hanoi to comply with international law. Is it not a legitimate obligation of American political leadership to point out to the public the connection between treatment of civilians held prisoner by American forces, and Americans held prisoner by Hanoi?

And what of political interference with the judicial process? Should an executive, before whom petition for clemency might be expected, make official statements about litigation before that litigation is completed through legal appellate process? Or does this smack of a political or "people's" court?

President Nixon on March 11, 1971, said:

We all know how the drama of a courtroom often lends itself to exploitation and, whether it is deliberate or inadvertent, such exploitation is something we all must be alert to prevent. All too often, the right of the accused to a fair trial is eroded by prejudicial publicity. We must never forget that a primary purpose underlying the defendant's right to a speedy and public trial is to prevent star-chamber proceedings and not to put on an exciting show or to satisfy public curiosity at the expense of the defendant.

The only way justice can truly be done in any society is for each member of that society to subject himself to the rule of law—neither to set himself above the law in the name of justice nor to set himself outside the law in the name of justice.

We shall beccome a genuinely just society only by playing the game according to the rules, and when the rules become outdated or are shown to be unfair, by lawfully and peaceably changing those rules.

Mr. Speaker, Webster defines the word, "tergiversation" as:

First, desertion of a cause, party, religious faith, and so forth; also a shifting; equivocation; second, a shift, subterfuge, or evasion; and third, a turning of the back, as in flight.

As a Hoosier who believes in law and order and justice I am proud that my junior Senator does not like the word "tergiversation."

STATEMENT BY SEN. BIRCH BAYH

Mr. President, during recent days I have been asked many times about my reaction to the court martial verdict concerning Lieutenant William Calley.

I am not sure my answers have been satisfactory. They have not been satisfactory even to me. The truth is that I have been shaken both by the decision of the Court, and by the testimony that was placed before the Court, as by few other events in my life.

I share the deepest compassion for Lieutenant Calley. It seems somehow unfair, in this kind of situation, to reach out to this one soldier and say: "Guilty."

On the other hand, we cannot—we must not—stray from the elementary fact that this country of ours is more than just a collection of mountains, plains, rivers, farms and cities. What makes this country different, what makes it worth defending and dying for, has nothing to do with its natural treasures and material comforts. What makes America worth defending and dying for is what this country stands for.

I have in my mind two pictures: one of a man being singled out to bear an enormous burden of guilt; the other of bodies of women and children in a ditch.

This is a time for America to search her conscience. This is a time when we look to our president to show us the way. This is a time when we look to the chief executive for moral leadership, on questions that affect our nation and each of us individually. Unfortunately, the president has failed to meet his responsibility to provide that leadership.

In recent years there have been more than 100,000 courts martial a year, with a conviction rate of 94%. In not one of these cases has President Nixon asserted his legal right of review. Now, in what may well be the most disturbing case in the history of our military justice system, the President has involved himself in the judicial process by adding what his own staff has described as an "extra legal ingredient."

In cases such as the Calley case, there is a statutory review procedure. That procedure involves certain well defined steps to see that an injustice is not perpetrated, that an innocent soldier is not convicted. It provides for at least two independent reviews by high Army officials and two reviews by independent military courts. The president has disrupted that procedure by saying that he personally will intervene at some point in this statutory process. Can there be an objective review when the Commander-in-Chief has made his interest so clearly known to career officers under his command? I believe not. By his premature actions, the President has made a truly impartial review impossible.

I have asked myself repeatedly why the president would take such action. Reluctantly, I have concluded that the president is determined to play politics with the Calley decision and the entire Mylai tragedy. I realize the gravity of such charges. I do not make them lightly, but only after the most serious consideration.

When our minds were filled with horror at the tragic picture of Mylai, President Nixon told the nation that the incident was "certainly a massacre and under no circumstances was it justified."

Now that the polls and the mail pouring across his desk and mine show that the great public outcry against the Calley verdict, the President seems to have changed his mind.

One hundred fifteen servicemen have been tried for premeditated murder of Vietnamese civilians. Fifty-nine were convicted of murder, and 21 of lesser included offenses. In none of these cases did the number of deaths even approximate the number allegedly resulting from Lieutenant Calley's action. Yet the President did not act to remove these men from confinement pending appeal. He has not made known his intention to involve himself in the appeal process for a single soldier, sailor or marine in confinement in any of these cases.

A navy seaman from Des Moines, Iowa, was convicted of murdering a Vietnamese civilian woman by striking her with a hammer, and sentenced to 10 years at hard labor. The Secretary of the Navy reduced this sentence to 8 years, and the President did not choose to intervene.

A lance corporal from Lebanon, Indiana, was convicted by court-martial of the murder of five Vietnamese civilians, and sentenced to life at hard labor. In the course of review, the sentence was reduced to 20 years, which he is still serving. The President has not chosen to intervene.

A private from Florence, Pennsylvania, was convicted by court-martial of the murder of 12 Vietnamese civilians. He was sentenced to life imprisonment, and the President did not choose to intervene.

And so the record goes. In case after case the President said nothing.

Even though the individuals concerned in these cases were enlisted personnel, who could not be expected to have the judgment under fire that one could expect of an officer, the President did not assert his right of review.

If the President is truly concerned about the hardship and suffering that has been endured by an American soldier why did he not express similar concern when these and other servicemen were tried and convicted for murder.

I for one do not intend to stand mute and permit the President or anyone else to play politics with lives of American GI's or the lives lost in a horrible event half a world away.

But there is a second implication to the President's action, an implication far more ominous for the future of American fighting men. In the course of our national debate over the incident at Mylai and the Calley verdict, we must not lose sight of a principle long established in international law. The killing of unarmed, captive civilians, or prisoners of war, is clearly unlawful. This is not a principle new to our nation. It is embodied in the Hague Convention of 1907, and restated in the Geneva Convention of 1949. We are signatories to both these conventions. And we have clearly enunciated this principle in the United States Army Field Manual 27–10, "The Law of Land Warfare."

The right of safety for civilians and prisoners of war dates to the 17th century. The United States enforced this right at least as early as the Mexican American War. One of the most celebrated trials of the 19th century involved the conviction and execution of the commander of the Andersonville prison following the war between the States for crimes against prisoners of war. And following World War II, the United States prosecuted numerous cases involving the murder of prisoners of war. German defendants who had massacred 86 American prisoners captured at Malmedy during the Battle of the Bulge, Japanese defendants who had summarily executed the Doolittle flyers after a pro forma trial, and dozens of other defendants were convicted, and many sentenced to death, for the murder of United States prisoners of war.

I was not present at the Calley court martial. I did not hear the testimony nor have the opportunity to judge the credibility of the witnesses. But neither did President Nixon. No one who was not present can truly assess what is justice in this case.

A jury of his peers who sat in judgment found Lieutenant Calley guilty of the mass murder of unarmed captive civilians—women, children, and aged. If this verdict is upheld on appeal, then Lieutenant Calley is guilty under the law of the United States and international law, and—as difficult as it is for each of us—he must be held accountable for his crimes. To do otherwise would be to ignore the rule of law and the moral judgment of civilized men everywhere.

I am deeply concerned that the President's involvement in the Calley case might have the most serious implications for American prisoners of war in North Vietnam, by serving as an excuse for the North Vietnamese to perpetrate further hardships—even death—on American servicemen languishing in their cells. If the President, by his arbitrary intervention or otherwise, were to establish the precedent that those who intentionally execute unarmed captive civilians or prisoners of war should be exonerated, what is to prevent American prisoners or civilians, now or at some future time, from suffering a similar fate? Such a precedent would serve to undermine the legal and moral foundations upon which we have based our claims as to the proper and humane treatment to be accorded American prisoners of war.

We pride ourselves on being a government of laws, not men. The Calley case has aroused the deepest emotions among the American people—and understandably so. But it is precisely at such a time that we must trust in the integrity of our principles and the institutions that embody them—and not to the passions of the moment.

Perhaps the integrity of a legal system doesn't make for a stirring slogan, but that is what American soldiers have defended in past wars. That is what freedom is all about. In other countries perhaps, but not ours, it was possible for judgment to be manipulated by fear or favor of powerful individuals. Now we see that system undermined, not from without, but by the very Chief Executive who has taken his oath to "preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States."

Most of us today are concerned about the alarming increase in the rate of crime. We are concerned about law and order. Well, I happen to believe that law and order is taught by example as well as by exhortation. And I do not believe the President's action is designed to strengthen support for our system of law and order. It is far easier to talk about principles than it is to live up to them.

But there is a larger question involved. Where do we go from here? Where does the road from Mylai lead?

One path is toward a national outpouring of sympathy for Lieutenant Calley, an unwillingness to face the facts as they may finally be resolved in the judicial process, a bickering about who should or should not have been tried, and how they should be sentenced. I hope we will resist the temptation to hasty judgments and emotional responses.

In 1957, the late President Eisenhower was under heavy political pressure to abandon the commitment of our Status of Forces Agreement with Japan, so that we could prevent the Japanese from trying an American serviceman for the murder of a Japanese woman. Writing to a close friend at the height of the pressure, he noted:

"Right at this moment lack of understanding of America's international position and obligations accounts for the fact that we seem to be trying to make a national hero out of a man who shot a woman—in the back at something like ten to fifteen yards distance." General Eisenhower resisted the pressure and adhered to the law—and history has proved his judgment

correct. If the first impulse of the American public suggests that the murder of captive women, children and aged and prisoners of war by Americans should not be punished, I hope that we will reach a more throughtful conclusion in the course of careful reflection.

But if we are not to follow the easy path, what path should we follow? First, I urge the President to reconsider the importance of his action and to allow the normal statutory review procedure to determine the fate of Lieutenant Calley.

Second, I urge the military to examine carefully the record of Mylai and the events that followed. Let us be certain that Lt. Calley is not a scapegoat. Let us be certain that others who may have issued orders directly resulting in the Mylai tragedy are held accountable.

Third, and most important, Mylai is another painful chapter in a lesson we should have learned long ago. What happened at Mylai is another symbol of a brutalizing war and a bankrupt policy that continues the war. It is another symbol of the incalculable costs we are still paying, at home and abroad. We must bring an end to this war. We must turn our full and undivided attention to changing our policy and negotiating a settlement to the conflict, and an end to the killing.

While the appeals are still to be heard, the jury verdict is in on the case of Lieutenant Calley. The future will sit in judgment of how America resolves the legal and moral questions arising out of the Indochina War.

RED CROSS

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recently I had occasion to address the annual Bexar County Red Cross Awards dinner.

The great and monumental achievement of thousands of volunteers so often goes unnoticed.

I insert in the RECORD the text of my remarks and a statement of the annual service report of the Bexar County Chapter of the American Red Cross, and related statements:

STATEMENT BY HENRY B. GONZALEZ

There is probably no symbol or sign in the world that has greater recognition than the sign of the Red Cross. The Red Cross is universally known, and the wonder of it is that everywhere, to all who know it—and that is practically everyone in the world—see in it the same meaning: Compassion, mercy and help.

The Red Cross has never stood for anything else.

No one has fought a war in the name of the Red Cross. And no one has used it to advance a cause of any kind other than the one great cause of humanity, decency and concern for suffering human beings. This concern has transcended all ideologies, all political boundaries, all differences in race, religion and country, because no matter who you are, or where you live, compassion has the same meaning and is born out of the same spirit.

That is why the Red Cross has universal recognition, and why it has a universal meaning, and why it enjoys universal appreciation. In any place where there is concern for human needs. The Red Cross is a welcome sign.

This universal recognition, this universal appreciation of the sign of the Red Cross has all come about in a little more than a hundred years. This is an achievement that has no equal in human history.

This achievement is evidence of the power and force of the fundamental idea behind Red Cross. It is evidence of the brotherhood of man.

The brotherhood of man binds all men together and the sign of the Red Cross is simply a symbol of the unity of the human race.

The founder of Red Cross believed that wounded soldiers of whatever army should have decent and adequate medical care, because they were human beings first and soldiers second.

The power of that idea was soon translated into an organization that happened to be called Red Cross, and in less than a hundred years, this sign of human compassion has come to symbolize help in virtually every country of the world.

This is a sign that people turn to for help because they cannot help themselves.

And because humanity is plagued by more than the accident of war, the Red Cross has come to help in all manner of disasters, and has established itself throughout the world as a continuing universal service for people in distress.

Most of us think of the Red Cross as something that is always there when disaster strikes. It is seen as an endless source of blankets, bandages, hot meals, tents, and helping hands that somehow always show up first at the flood, the earthquake or the fire.

This instant presense is no accident. For the truth is that Red Cross is always around, always helping, always present—we just need it more when times are hard, and it is the one organization that is capable of instant action anytime, any place.

The heart of the American Red Cross is in its million and a half volunteers. We have three thousand volunteers here in Bexar County alone.

Most of the work goes unrecognized—the counseling for servicemen, the giving of something as free as time, or as precious as blood.

The work can be as simple as writing a letter, or as hard as coping with a disaster.

Disaster can happen in wholesale lots, in which case we see the whole panoply of Red Cross instantly at work, or in single cases, where we might accidentally see one person helping another. But whether we see Red Cross in a dark and stormy night arranging refuge and food for whole communities, or just in the form of some lone volunteer in a forgotten hospital ward, we know that it always is doing the same thing—extending a helping hand, one person to another, one human being to another human being.

It is the most important work on the planet, because it has to do with the survival of humanity. Yet it is work that ultimately can only be done on one level—person to person—and work that can only be done by a free and willing heart. There is no way to buy Red Cross; it has nothing to sell. There is no argument about what it means, or what it does, because there is no ideology to advance or defend under the sign of the Red Cross. You cannot buy something that is freely given, and no political system can capture or encompass the spirit of human compassion.

The secret of all this success is simple enough—most human beings want to help other human beings who are in distress. Red Cross provides a way that people who want to help can do so effectively. And it also provides a place where people who need help can go. It is simply an organization that says, "If you want to help, we need you; if you need help, you need us."

Red Cross is a device that effectively enables people to put their humanitarian impulse to work.

There is no other organization that can put as many people in the field when disaster strikes; there is no other organization that can talk to virtually any government and be heard; there is no other organization that can cross as many political boundaries; and there is no other organization that has helped so many people in so many ways as this.

That has all happened because the organization has never allowed itself to be used for anything other than the relief of human suffering, and the alleviation of human need. Its leadership has been humanitarian—and also straightforward and hardheaded.

I do not think that many of the Red Cross jobs are glamorous. There is nothing especially dramatic or attractive about going into a lonely hospital ward, or standing in a sparse office in a place that is invariably too hot, too cold, too wet, or too dry for comfort. But though handing out a blanket or a hot meal, or writing a letter may not be dramatic, it is work that has to be done, and the important thing is that it works—it does the indispensible and even the seemingly impossible tasks.

The crucially important work is the work that goes on every day.

It is the work that few people ever see, or even know about.

This is the work in behalf of health reform. This is the work that provides nurses where they are needed, that translates energy into action for hospital recreation, for social work, any number of activities. The important work is the work that goes into helping a community see one of its pressing problems—and solving it.

It was the Red Cross that really started the public health nurse program in this country.

Red Cross first invented Christmas Seals, and sold them as a means of raising money to combat tuberculosis.

It was Red Cross that undertook programs for health education, for nutrition education—and helped start the school lunch program.

Even though Red Cross is helping relieve a different disaster almost every day of the year somewhere in the United States, it is this constant, everyday work in local communities that really makes the organization the indispensable creation that it is.

The fact that local chapters do things that urgently need doing makes them vital to their communities; it provides an impulse for progress, and the record achievement is impressive indeed.

Because Red Cross does this daily, hard work. It has a capacity to respond to disasters—it knows what it is doing, and it knows more than any other organization how to get the job done.

This built-in capacity, all founded on simple human compassion, is the thing that puts Red Cross on the scene first when the going really gets rough.

It is not that the volunteers are seeking any glory, or that the organization has any well known secret, it is just that Red Cross means only one thing: people caring for people.

This makes it a boundless source of help, able to operate at any level, with jobs as simple as handing out a little coffee, or as complex as saving a life.

The Red Cross covers every kind of activity, from providing things as free as time, or as precious as life—all freely given, all desperately needed, all impossible to beg, borrow or buy.

In a hundred years, this poor planet has learned at least one thing: that the sign of the Red Cross is the sign of human care, human concern and human help, no matter where, no matter when. If there is any real universal organization, this is it—may it prosper and increase.

BEXAR COUNTY CHAPTER, AMERICAN RED CROSS

Service to Military Families Department serving military families, one of the largest departments in the U.S.—Military population and related personnel second only to San Diego. This department accomplishes so much—over 2,000 families given casework services each month—by a unique volunteer setup. In this department are 3 units of wonderful volunteers with tremendous skills, professional background give dedicated service. A veterans unit headed by Brigadier General Arthur Irons, who with three other retired military men, volunteer counsel veterans to help them adjust to civilian life; actively assist them in claiming benefits due as a result of their service to our country.

Another unique unit within Service to Military Families is Unit II whose volunteers give warm objective casework services to active duty servicemen and their families. These dedicated volunteers are invaluable in helping the wives of our men in Vietnam make the adjustment. Many wives, alone in the community, receive a warm, friendly, interested call from one of these volunteers weekly until the husbands' return. They are especially skilled since many are wives of retired military and have themselves faced the same problems.

Nursing Programs, Safety Programs and Youth Programs are reaching out into all areas of our city by virtue of dedicated volunteers used as teachers and instructors with many groups in all neighborhoods and schools. These services cannot be calculated as to value and constitute a medical self-help to better our community now and in the future.

Thousands of volunteers are trained yearly to work in our military hospitals, nursing homes, childrens shelter, as motor corps and to prepare the Christmas ditty or gift bags for our men and women in Vietnam and hospitalized patients at local military hospitals.

BEXAR COUNTY CHAPTER ANNUAL SERVICE REPORT

SERVICE TO MILITARY FAMILIES

(Chairman, Mr. Jack Costello; director, Mrs. Eleanor Penley; and expenditures, $154,463.87)

Trained volunteers and staff working together in the Service to Military Families Department gave service to 23,217 active duty military personnel and their families, or veterans and their families in the past year. Counseling in personal and family problems has been the most frequently requested service, with reporting to and for families, military, Veterans' Administration and Job Corps being second. In sequence, according to requested assistance are emergency leave and extension requests, assistance with government benefits, and financial assistance. Casework services totaled 34,140 with an additional 8,625 brief services being given.

Without the fine and dedicated efforts of volunteers, it would have been impossible to play this great a helping role.

Volunteers working in three defined units, casework, Veterans assistance, and the Reaching Out Program gave 12,193 hours of service. Requests for assistance to the Volunteer Veterans Advisors increased almost 100% in this year.

The Reaching Out Program of Red Cross was implemented by assignment of workers for specified time periods to two community centers. Project Free, and Good Samaritan Center. Concerted efforts toward active involvement in community organizations and activities were demonstrated by membership in social work organizations both civilian and military.

DISASTER SERVICES

(Chairman, Mr. Jeff Coffey; director, Mrs. Rosemary Childers; and expenditures, $7,655.26)

Volunteers were activated numerous times during this year. Nationally recognized disasters affected Bexar County Chapter.

Lubbock Tornadoes—over 600 health and welfare messages were sent and replied to relieve anxiety of families with relatives in the disaster area. This was possible by many volunteers manning phones on a 24-hour basis and the San Antonio Amateur Radio Club placing themselves on duty to relay messages. A staff member was loaned for casework services in Lubbock.

San Marcos floods needed a casework supervisor which our chapter made available. Three trained volunteers accompanied her and handled at no cost to National all accounting and registrar work.

Hurricane Celia saw the chapter sheltering over 700 persons who fled from the storm and giving individual casework services and needed financial assistance to over 250 persons to return to their homes. The chapter served as a communications center for all health and welfare inquiries into the hurricane devastated area. Through the volunteer services of Civil Air Patrol these messages were shuttled back and forth daily from Corpus Christi by air. Two staff members were loaned to National Disaster Services to assist with casework.

When Puerto Rico was stricken with severe floods and winds, a bilingual staff member was loaned to National ARC for casework.

Over sixty fires in Bexar County during 1970 saw volunteers and staff giving assistance to over 240 persons with food, clothing, shelter and assisting with relocation costs as necessary.

NURSING PROGRAMS

(Chairman, Miss Maxine Cadena; director, Mrs. Suzanne Harvey; and expenditures, $9,014.90)

More Mother, Baby Care and Home Nursing Courses are being presented in the schools and inner city. A Mother, Baby Care Instructor Course for R.N.'s just completed—with workshops for L.V.N.'s and Homemaking teachers set up for spring and summer.

Monthly Mother, Baby Care community classes are being held in the Chapter for expectant Moms and Dads, with excellent participation.

Two schools of Nursing conducted disaster nursing classes and also courses in Programmed Home Nursing and Mother, Baby Care.

Disaster R.N.'s and student nurses participated in both Celia and Ella disasters. Also Nursing Programs was presented a certificate for its aid in diphtheria immunization clinics.

Mothers Aide and Modified Home Nursing are not only being taught to elementary and lower Junior High, but are also required by Cadet Girl Scouts. These courses are being requested by churches, whose youth take care of infants in church nurseries.

Nursing enrollment in Bexar County is over 600, also L.V.N. participation and enrollment is increasing.

RED CROSS YOUTH

(Chirman, Mrs. John C. Craig; director, Mrs. Albertine Gibson; and expenditures—$5,214.29)

We look to the youth for the volunteer strength needed to carry the Red Cross Mission into the future.

The Mission of the Red Cross Youth is to involve young people of school age in the humanitarian work of the Red Cross.

Schools enrolled for service:
Elementary, 75.
Secondary, 42.
Colleges, 2.
Students, around 50,000.

Production: Place mats, tray favors, holiday decorations and gifts sent to the hospitals and senior citizen homes.

Entertainment: Children's homes, hospitals, and senior citizen homes.

International: Filled 198 Friendship Boxes, 13 Vietnam Holiday Friendship Kits, and prepared 2 albums on Texas for distribution to other Red Cross Societies.

Disaster: Youth collected $1,469.80 for Lubbock and Celia Disasters.

Summer Volunters: 170 worked in hospitals, children's homes, senior citizen homes and the Bexar County Chapter.

First Aid, Water Safety, Mother's Aide, Home Nursing and Mother and Baby Care taught in 41 schools.

SAFETY PROGRAMS

(Chairman, Mrs. Mildred A. Powars; director, Mr. Tom Spence; and expenditures, $13,-315.79)

Teaching first aid skill, swimming, lifesaving and small craft safety have been principal programs of the Red Cross for more than half a century.

The Bexar County Red Cross Chapter, during the past year has issued 12,227 certificates to people completing free first aid, swimming, lifesaving and small craft courses.

There are 822 trained volunteer Red Cross First Aid, Small Craft and Water Safety Instructors to provide safety programs to this community.

First Aid training not only teaches what to do when accidents occur, but makes us aware of hazards and how to prevent accidents. As part of a nationwide network there are more than 31 Highway First Aid Stations in Bexar County and 99 Mobile First Aid Units.

Graded courses, from beginner through advanced swimmer, are taught in swimming and lifesaving classes in our community. Small Craft courses, taught in a growing number, include rowing, canoeing, sailing and outboard boating.

"There are only half as many drownings annually now as in 1914."

The Bexar County Red Cross offers a continuous program of safety education through public media and cooperates in such efforts as National Safe Boating Week, San Antonio Safety Council School Safety Program, National Aquatic Schools, etc. Especially adapted safety courses are taught the blind and handicapped.

OFFICE OF VOLUNTEERS

(Chairman, Dr. George Thompson; director, Mrs. Lucille B. Hegar; and expenditure, $9,612.43)

This office is most involved in:

1. Recruiting, training, and placing volunteers in jobs throughout the county.

2. Keeping records and holding recognition. This includes transfer of incoming and outgoing volunteers.

3. Supervision of volunteers in Motor Service, Production, Office Volunteers, and Special Projects.

4. Ordering, issuing, and accounting for uniforms and insignia.

5 Assisting nearby chapters in activities as they may request.

During 1970, over 500 new volunteers were trained at 9 Basic Orientation Classes held at the Chapter and in Laredo, Del Rio, and Kerrville. In addition, Introduction Courses were given for board members, nursing students and others.

Volunteer drivers provided transportation for the ill, the aged, and the needy to hospitals, food stamp center, and to the Chapter and Doctor's appointments.

The Production Volunteers sewed layettes and hospital gift bags, as well as children's pajamas for one hospital.

Special Projects included preparing 405

emergency comfort kits for Peru and 2050 Vietnam Gift Bags made and filled for service personnel in Southeast Asia, and gift items for hospitalized servicemen locally.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Bexar County Red Cross needs	$309,286.00
Fair share of National Red Cross needs	191,152.00
Total 1970 Red Cross needs	500,438.00
United Fund allocation to Red Cross	320,000.00
Bexar County Chapter share (61.80%)	197,760.00
National share (38.20%)	122,240.00
1970 local budget expense	256,520.34
Bexar County Red Cross share of United Fund allocation	197,760.00
National grant	43,631.88
Total	241,391.88
Deficit	15,128.46

CHAPTER BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mr. Earl R. Behnsch, Mr. Hugo A. Bourdeau, Miss Maxine Cadena, Mr. Richard W. Calvert, Mr. Stanley L. Campbell, Mr. Bill C. Candler, Mr. Roy Clark, Mr. B. L. Cockrell, Jr., Chairman, Mr. T. Jeff Coffey, Jr., Mrs. R. W. Colglazier, Mr. John M. Costello, Mrs. John Craig, Mr. S. J. Davis, Mrs. Matt Garcia, B/ Gen Arthur Irons, Mr. Isaac L. Jones, Rev. Lavalle Lowe, Jr., and Mr. Reuben R. Lozano.

Rev. Canon Gerald N. McAllister, Mr. Robert S. McClane, Mrs. Charles K. Moore, Mr. Herb Nicholson, Mrs. H. K. Oppenheimer, Mrs. Ben S. Powars, M/Gen Frank Rouse, Mr. W. W. Rutledge, Mr. John R. Shaw, Mr. Bruce M. Smith, Gen. Robert M. Stillman, Mrs. Louis H. Stumberg, Dr. Geo. H. Thompson, Col. Henry W. Walker, Dr. H. Vincent Walker, Mr. Neil B. Walsdorf, and Mr. Raymond B. Wangler.

PRISONS AND JAILS: WHY WE DO WHAT WE DO

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, last week, along with some 40 of my colleagues, I introduced the Correctional Services Improvement Act—H.R. 7105. As I said at that time, it is hoped that the bill will spark a reevaluation of a number of practices followed in our criminal justice system which seem to go on without rhyme or reason. We go on building and operating prisons and jails around the country based on some model which has little basis other than custom and tradition. If we hope to prevent crime by rehabilitating criminals, we must introduce some rationality into penal practices.

A perfect example of the counterproductive effect of existing correctional practices is the system's failure to provide an opportunity for inmates to engage in meaningful work, to train themselves for gainful employment upon release, and at the same time to earn some kind of minimum wage which can be used to support their families and perhaps even to defray the costs of custody. By denying prisoners this chance, all we succeed in doing is enforcing years of idleness. We destroy any self-respect the prisoner might have by denying him any chance to help support his family—and perhaps keep them off the public welfare rolls. And equally foolishly, we increase the likelihood that upon release the prisoner will be unemployable, thereby increasing the likelihood that he will return to criminal activity.

We need fresh perspectives. We need to cast off old shibboleths which have interfered with effective penology. To that end, I commend to my colleagues the following article which appeared in the March edition of Judicature magazine, in which the author describes the operation of a very different kind of prison in Mexico. I especially call your attention to the practice by which outside employers are enabled to set up branch operations of their businesses within the prisons, employing prisoners and paying a normal wage. Why does not a prison like Jalisco exist anywhere in our country? Why do we spent 85 percent of our corrections funds on custody and only 15 percent on rehabilitation? Why do we do any of the things we do in penology? I submit that we have long ago forgotten why we do what we do. The article follows:

A MEXICAN PRISON

(By Richard M. Marsh)

Mexico consists of states, similar to the United States, and one of them is Jalisco, the capitol of which is Guadalajara. While on vacation in this city, a newly made acquaintance and I had a most unusual experience—an impromptu tour of Jalisco Prison.

Through my new friend's limited Spanish, and the local city bus system, we went from place to place seeking to visit a court. This process finally led us to the Jalisco Prison where we were told we would find the criminal courts. Once there, we abandoned our search for a court when presented with the opportunity to tour the prison. The prison was located in a generally residential section of Guadalajara, and the local bus dropped us off just a block from the front entrance. It was a walled enclosure covering approximately two to three square city blocks.

The buildings were of a Mexican style with adobe walls. We found rehabilitation methods and economic advantages considerably ahead of some of the things I observed in California prisons, even though my state is one of the most progressive in the nation.

The entrance led to an office and a very polite English speaking captain. We were turned over to two English speaking Mexican prisoners and one small, non-English speaking, 65 year old guard whose only weapon was a short crop.

Inside the prison we found a typical Mexican scene, structures around the walls, and in the center a patio or park-like area with grass, flowers, benches and trees. One of our prisoner-guides whom I shall call "Jose", spoke flawless English, and appeared to be about 22 years of age. He was due to be released in about 30 days, but we did not learn the crime that lead to his incarceration. The other prisoner, who I will call "Doc", spoke fair English, was about 37 years old, and was due for release in about four months. He had been a successful pediatrician in Guadalajara and was imprisoned for manslaughter. He said he had killed his wife in a drunken rage.

The tour started in the electrical fixture shop where we saw beautiful lamps being produced. The next stop was the silversmith, then the blacksmith, then the furniture shop, and on and on until we finally reached the rubber goods plant, the most impressive of all. Here I saw raw rubber for the first time, learned how it was processed, and saw the end results.

While what they were doing was impressive, the system as explained by "Jose" and "Doc" was even more so. After a prisoner is processed he is allowed to work in any shop he wishes where there is a job opening. He is paid a wage similar to such a job on the outside. The inexperienced start as apprentices and work up with corresponding pay increases. They work 40 to 44 hour weeks.

RUN AS A BUSINESS

The next surprise was that each shop is run by a businessman, not the government. This manager comes to work each day, handles the workers as any employees are handled, and sells the product outside in the open market. The businessman pays rent to the government for the facilities the same as if he were operating on the outside. You may wonder what the men do with their pay. They support their families.

Following the commission of the crime and the arrest of the defendant, the police have the witnesses talk to scribers. Scribers, who are in separate buildings and apparently independent from the police, take statements from the witnesses. The defendant is sent to the prison followed by the file of statements. The judges are right at the prison. A judge reads the file and determines guilt or innocence as well as sentence. The prisoner is interviewed, told the outcome, and offered a chance to appeal. "Doc" told me that all prisoners appeal, it costs nothing and the process is complete in two weeks. Speed is possible because the file already is typed up. The appellate court consists of a bank of three judges. They have the right to change the verdict and to raise or lower the sentence.

A PRIVATE ROOM

The defendant is in the prison during this process, which is completed quickly by our standards. Prisoners are first kept in dormitories (the violent ones are not sent to this prison) and if found to be cooperative are then assigned a room. "Doc" showed us his room, which was about the size of one of our cells, except that each man has a single room with no roommates. He can have anything he can afford including radio, television, or phonograph. He has and wears his own clothes. There were about 25 to 30 rooms in each building, and at the end of each of these buildings was a small kitchen with two inmate cooks. The meals are simple and each building has picnic-like benches outside the kitchen where the men take their food to eat. I was struck by the simplicity of the process.

While going through the grounds we passed a little dirt floor building with a metal corrugated roof and "Jose" and "Doc" invited my friend and I to have a cold soft drink of our choice. Naturally we did not let them pay but the price was very small. While sitting at the table having our drink, "Jose" and "Doc" explained some of the things to us.

The explanation of weekends came as quite a surprise. Each Saturday morning is children's day. The wives with the children, and the fathers can play with their children, take them to the Saturday morning movie, and buy them soda pop. (Remember, these men are working and can afford to do this.) At 1 p.m. on Saturday, the children leave, but the wives stay until Monday morning. Our guides confirmed that there is no homosexuality problem, and we now saw the wisdom of the seeming luxury of individual rooms.

"Doc" explained that the Mexican system was directed toward the ultimate release of the prisoner, so life there was directed toward that goal. The man lives, or is taught to live, a normal life except for going home at night. I jokingly asked if they had trouble with men not wanting to leave. He assured me absolutely not, the incentive to be free was a great motivation.

Two hours later my friend and I thanked

all concerned and walked out counting the simple but effective things being done in the Jalisco State Prison:

1. Punishment by imprisonment follows swiftly upon the heels of the crime;
2. The guilt or innocence phase was taken care of quickly, without fanfare—and every defendant had a genuine appeal, which regularly results in reversals;
3. Rehabilitation starts quickly, effectively and the motivation is right;
4. The men live as near normal as possible under the circumstances;
5. Prisoners who have not previously experienced normal, responsible lives, are exposed to such;
6. Prisoners earn livings, and their families are not on welfare;
7. Homosexuality ceases to be a problem;
8. Trades are taught;
9. A man keeps or gains his self-respect;
10. Prison-to-street transition is simplified;
11. The family unit is preserved and promoted; and
12. The system results in lower government cost and hence lower taxpayer cost.

BANK LENDS SUPPORT TO FIGHT DRUG ABUSE

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, drug abuse is today, for Americans, a national concern. The narcotics problem tragically involves many of our Nation's families—it is not restricted by race, income, or geography.

As pointed out by John B. Cummings, Jr., in a press release issued by the Fall River, Mass., National Bank in my 10th Congressional District, "Community-wide concern over the drug problem will not solve it. It will take action."

The Fall River National Bank has initiated a program designed to support community institutions in the attack on drug abuse. I think this innovative and civic minded effort will be of interest to my colleagues.

I include the article as follows:

During the past three months, the Fall River National Bank has successfully created a new image. The image is manifested by the word activator. The image is one of involvement and concern on the part of the bank and its staff with regard to local problems and projects.

The bank's advertising program has been centered around individual employees and their contributions to the community. The impact of the program has been termed very successful. The activator theme will continue but on a less concentrated basis.

The second phase of the program has already begun and will be emphasized in April. About one month ago, a poll was taken within the bank and everyone was asked to list what they felt was the area's number one priority. Almost unanimously, the top priority was drug abuse. This then became the key to the second phase of the bank's program.

The bank's theme is: "The Bank That Does More Than Just Talk", and now after ranking drug abuse number one, they decided to help fight it.

The objective of the bank and its staff is now to stimulate the involvement and money necessary to help fight drug abuse in the area. The first step was to obtain donations from within the bank. Directors, officers and staff have already made contributions. There will also be cake sales held with proceeds going to the same cause.

The second step was to develop a significant advertising campaign. In the past The National Bank offered china, glasses and stainless steel with new checking and savings accounts. No more. This year it was decided that with every new savings and checking account of $25 or more the bank would donate one dollar per account to local drug agencies to help local people.

The advertising program in the newspapers, radio and outdoor will be reinforced by a drug display and educational pamphlets within the bank.

The bank's total donation will be divided equally between St. Anne Drug Dependency Clinic and The Rubicon House.

Community wide concern over the drug problem will not solve it. It will take action. The Fall River National Bank hopes to be able to provide the necessary impetus to help curtail drug abuse.

Drug Abuse is a problem that touches each segment of society. It has no boundaries but is particularly prevalent among the young.

The Fall River National Bank is succeeding in breaking down the image of banks. "Banks and bankers have been given the stigma of being cold, indifferent and conservative", said David McIlwaine, Marketing Officer. "Perhaps this was justified at one time and in some cases even today, but we are very human, warm and concerned in our bank and we want people to know that beside receiving the professional advice they want, they will also find people who want to help, smile laugh and enjoy living like anyone else".

The bank and its staff are proud of the area and do all they can to make it better. The feeling is that Fall River has been good to them by providing them with education, employment and homes and they want to help now to make it better. "A bank has a grave moral obligation to the community in that it must give as much as it receives", said John B. Cummings, Jr., Marketing Officer. "If we as bankers do not meet this obligation then we have failed. We are trying to do more for the community all the time and this is only right. If our community is to grow and prosper, then we must take active leadership roles and put back as much as we have been given. We hope that our program to help fight drug abuse will contribute to the eventual elimination of the problem".

JOHN F. KENNEDY 50-MILE HIKE HELD APRIL 3, 1971, IN WESTERN MARYLAND

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, since 1963, one of the most anticipated sports events in western Maryland has been the John F. Kennedy 50-mile hike. Inspired by President John F. Kennedy and his family's penchant for hiking, the event began on a small scale attended by only a few hardy hikers. With the organizational skills of Buzz Sawyer and Guy Whidden and the enthusiasm of the returning participants, the hike has recently been doubling the number of hikers each year.

In 1970, there were approximately 300 entrants. This year on April 3, there were 600 entrants with 150 of them finishing the 50-mile course. In honor of the stalwarts who finished I include the names and addresses of the first 50 to finish and the names of the next 100 to cross the finish line. The times next to the names are the finishing times. I would especially like to congratulate Mr. Elton Torst of Harrisonburg, Va., who broke the old record by over 1 hour.

The list follows:

THE 50-MILE HIKE

Entrant, residence, and hour, minute, second

1. Elton Horst, Harrisonburg, Va. 6:15:42.
2. Sam Holland, Elverson, Pa., 7:42:03.
3.t Les Mentzer, Hagerstown, Md., 7:56:14.
3.t Allen Smith, Oberlin, Ohio, 7:56:14.
5. Jim Harrison, Baltimore, Md., 8:39:01.
6. Bill Walls, Greencastle, Pa., 8:39:59.
7. Craig Caplan, Frederick, Md., 8:41:22.
8. Ronnie West, Hagerstown, Md., 8:46:55.
9. Doug McAbee Williamsport, Md., 8:50:50.
10. Arthur Carey, Narberth, Pa., 9:04:20.
11. Bob Maronic, Hagerstown, Md., 9:13:09.
12. James Draper, Smithsburg, Md., 9:15:51.

9:15:51.

13. Donnie Minnick, Hagerstown, Md., 9:17:43.
14. Dan Beisel, Frederick, Md., 9:25:59.
15.t John Devlin, Blue Ridge Summit, Pa., 9:27:13.
15.t James Martin, Hagerstown, Md., 9:27:13.
17. Donna Aycoth, Hagerstown, Md., 9:29:48.
18. Eric Kleinspehn, Frederick, Md., 9:36:51.
19. Dave Bergman, Hagerstown, Md., 9:40:46.
20. Leonard Reddick, Union Bridge, Md., 9:49:35.
21. Bruce Driggers, Hagerstown, Md., 9:51:28.
22. Steven Thomas, Frederick, Md., 9:59:18.
23. Dan Dawson, Hagerstown, Md., 10:03:24.
24. Steven Vaughn, Braddock Heights, Md., 10:05:08.
25.t Goodloe Byron, Frederick, Md., 10:13:10.
25.t Shane Hutton, Frederick, Md., 10:13:10.
27.t Harry Brundick, Chambersburg, Pa., 10:25:45.
27.t Carl Llewellyn, Hagerstown, Md., 10:25:45.
27.t Steve Blevins, Hagerstown, Md., 10:46:04.
30. Charles Brugh, Hagerstown, Md., 10:46:54.
31.t Kim Bryon, Frederick, Md., 10:51:08.
31.t John Dobbie, Hagerstown, Md., 10:51:08.
31.t Richard Masser, Taneyton, Md., 10:51:08.
34. Clayton Fuller, Hagerstown, Md., 10:51:35.
35. John Hunt, Walkersville, Md., 10:52:18.
36. Ronald Young, Frederick, Md., 10:54:01.
37. John Hyssong, Jr., Frederick, Md., 10:54:30.
38. Clater Smith, Frederick, Md., 11:03:58.
39. Calvin Mahaney, Fairplay, Md., 11:10:02.
40. Warren Neal, Jr., Walkersville, Md., 11:14:24.
41.t Martha Pryor, Thurmont, Md., 11:19:41.
41.t Karl Pryor, Thurmont, Md., 11:19:41.
41.t Galen Pryor, Thurmont, Md., 11:19:41.
41.t Richard Calimer, Lantz, Md., 11:19:41.
45. David Knode, Williamsport, Md., 11:20:15.
46. Richard Harne, Smithsburg, Md., 11:23:20.
47. Gale Whidden, Frederick, Md., 11:25:21.
48. Robert Kendle, Jr., Williamsport, Md., 11:28:18.
49. Francis Coble, Jr., Williamsport, Md., 11:28:19.
50.t Richard Busch, Washington, D.C., 11:31:32.
50.t Frank Pitzpatrick, Towson, Md., 11:31:32.

Entrant and hour, minute, second

52. Gary Naugle, 11:42:02.
53.t John Gray, 11:43:33.
53.t William Boteler, 11:48:33.
53.t Greg Snyder, 11:48:33
56. John Ulam, 11:49:28.
57. Andrew Friedel, 11:50:24.
58. M. A. Grossnickel, 11:50:40.
59. Daniel Snyder, 11:50:41.
60. Lloyd Snyder, 11:51:33.
61.t Duane Barnhart, 11:53:27.
61.t Jim Stine, 11:53:27.
61.t William Korrow, 11:53:27.
61.t Thomas Miles, 11:53:27.
65.t David Summerlin, 11:55:38.
65.t John Hinkle, Jr., 11:55:38.
67. Douglas Kefauver, 11:56:21.
68. Christopher Schweitzer 11:59:16.
69. Gilbert Martin, 12:05:38.
70.t Michael Elza, 12:08:52.
70.t Paul Bell, 12:08:52.
72.t Melanie Mikkelsen, 12:15:03.
72.t Eddie Glenn, 12:15:03.
74.t Mike Adams, 12:19:02.
74.t Joseph Palumbo, 12:19:02.
76. Justin Parker, 12:25:38.
77. Michael Appel, 12:27:14.
78. Michael Turner, 12:28:06.
79. Dan Webb, 12:32:10.
80. Mark Henry, 12:33:10.
81. Richard Heiks, 12:33:12.
82. John Routzahn, Jr., 12:33:50.
83. Joe Snyder, 12:35:48.
84. Kenny Renner, 12:46:57.
85. Steve Cardella, 12:48:18.
86.t James Ridge, 12:51:13.
86.t Jerry Ridge, 12:51:13.
86.t John Ridge, 12:51:13.
89. Howard Ridenour, 12:56:55.
90. James Patronik, 12:59:37.
91. Forden Jughes, 13:00:45.
92.t Richard Kurtz, 13:01:44.
92.t Roy Pfeiffer, 13:01:44.
94.t Jeffrey Toms, 13:02:33.
94.t James Criswell, 13:02:33.
96. David Frye, 13:06:13.
97.t John Mowen, 13:06:58.
97.t Donald Schwartz, 13:06:58.
99. Jack Griffin, Jr., 13:08:20.
100.t Lee Hargis, 13:08:22.
100.t Will Main, 13:08:22.
102. John Collmus, 13:09:52.
103. Hugh Williams, 13:10:45.
104.t Richard Goodrich, 13:13:31.
104.t Jack Spinnler, 13:13:31.
106.t James Stottlemyer, 13:17:17.
106.t Ling Louie, 13:17:17.
108.t Charles Robinson, 13:19:43.
108.t Michael Nelson, 13:19:43.
108.t Dwight Gaylor, 13:19:43.
108.t Gerard Zeller, 13:19:43.
112.t Steve Clever, 13:23:58.
112.t Bruce Burnside, 13:23:58.
114.t Richard Kendrick, 13:26:48.
114.t Bill Osburn, 13:26:48.
116.t Terry Draper, 13:29:15.
116.t Terry Baker, 13:29:15.
118. Lynn Keller, 13:33:52.
119. Gerald Doetzer, 13:36:12.
120.t Kenny Daniels, 13:52:40.
120.t Jan Waddell, 13:52:40.
122. Doug Himes, 13:58:16.
123. Brian O'Neill, 14:00:17.
124. Francis Dougherty, 14:06:00.
125. Bradley Vaughn, 14:10:51.
126. Raymond Rickett, Jr., 14:12:02.
127. T. E. Ressler III, 14:15:22.
128. Gary Myers, 14:16:04.
129. Mike Spinnler, 14:19:23.
130.t Dale Detrow, 14:20:43.
130.t Richard Marquis, 14:20:43.
132. Terry Socks, 14:20:56.
133. Ralph Fout, 14:25:05.
134. Timmy Broom, 14:26:32.
135.t Jeff Sprankle, 14:26:41.
135.t Nancy Link, 14:26:41.
137. George Fisher, 14:27:56.
138.t Robert Ackley, 14:29:32.
138.t John Lynch, 14:29:32.
140. Ralph A. Snyder, 14:30:25.
141. Donald Snyder, 14:30:26.
142.t Brock Jutton, 14:33:38.
142.t Howard Harne, 14:33:38.
144. Kenneth Huffer, 14:33:52.
145. Gary Edwards, 14:46:57.
146. Douglas Edwards, 14:47:38.
147. Paul Smith, 14:58:55.
148. Jiles Warner, 14:59:08.
149. John Snyder, Jr., 14:59:11.
150. Richard Snyder, Jr., 14:59:15.

HIGHER EDUCATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been drawn to a remarkable commentary on the American system of higher education. The Assembly on University Goals and Governance, founded by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences to stimulate educational reform, has presented a report setting forth nine broad themes and 85 "theses" calling for changes in virtually all areas of higher education. These documents deserve the most serious study by all who are interested in American higher education, its deficiencies, and its potential.

I insert the following from the Chronicle of Higher Education for January 18, 1971:

SCHOLARS CALL FOR "RETHINKING" ACADEMIC GOALS

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—The academic community must "rethink its fundamental orientations" if colleges and universities are to be revitalized and their weaknesses eliminated, the Assembly on University Goals and Governance has asserted in its first report since it was established in 1969.

The assembly, founded by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences to stimulate educational reform, presented 85 "theses" for changes in virtually all areas of higher education. The text of the theses begins on Page 5.

The report was written primarily by the assembly's chairman, Martin Meyerson, president of the University of Pennsylvania, and its director of studies, Stephen R. Graubard, professor of history at Brown University and editor of *Daedalus*.

TO STIMULATE THINKING ABOUT CHANGE

Mr. Meyerson said that the theses were not intended to be specific recommendations for change, but rather "goads" to stimulate thinking about change.

The theses ranged from financial problems to issues of governance to problems of broadening the make-up of both student bodies and faculties. Among them:

Opportunities for disadvantaged students of all sorts should be vastly increased, and coupled with programs designed to make up for "earlier neglect."

Colleges and universities should admit greater numbers of women to graduate and professional schools, and make special provisions for their needs. They should demonstrate their willingness to hire women "at every teaching, research, administrative, and staff level."

Higher education should not be reserved for young adults between the ages of 17 and 24, but should be open to people of all ages.

New paths to employment and status should be developed so that the "involuntariness" of attendance will be ended. "New kinds of institutions should be established to appeal to those who are not very much taken with an academic environment."

"A deferred-payment program covering tuition and other fees and room and board should be made available for any student capable of doing college or university work." The program was termed "Educaid" by the authors of the report.

"National and institutional examinations should be further developed to enable students who lack a bachelor's degree to go directly into advanced graduate or professional study."

Colleges and universities should seek to attract men and women from fields other than academia to teaching positions.

Tenure should be maintained as "a guarantor of academic freedom against political and other pressures," but means should be developed to facilitate the "early departure" of faculty members making little contribution.

"General education which is in retreat needs reformulation. . . . Faculty members ought to define alternative forms of what [general education] ought to be and how students are to be encouraged to explore them."

Colleges and universities must develop far greater knowledge about higher education itself.

"Difficult as it is politically to favor some institutions rather than others, selective support, public and private, is essential and ought to be fought for."

KNOWLEDGE AS BASIS FOR REFORM

Nine broad themes were "laced through and assumed within the entire set of theses," the authors said.

Among the themes listed by Mr. Meyerson and Mr. Graubard were the placing of learning at the center of the university, and the development of knowledge about higher education itself as the basis for educational reform.

In addition, the themes included a commitment to the preservation of private higher education as the best way to guarantee educational diversity. Mr. Meyerson and Mr. Graubard also stressed the development of cooperation among institutions to use expensive facilities and dwindling resources more efficiently.

In an introduction to the report, the authors state: "If these [85 theses] serve to stimulate trustees, faculties, presidents, students, staff, alumni groups, and those public officials concerned with higher education to look at colleges and universities more critically, and if these deliberations help to bring about improvements, they will have served their purpose."

Mr. Meyerson said in an interview that the report would be used next spring on 15 or 20 campuses as a tool for implementing changes.

What comes of the efforts to use the report on those campuses is more important than the document itself, Mr. Meyerson said. "The assembly should be judged less by its paper and more by the processes it initiates."

In writing the "first report," Mr. Meyerson and Mr. Graubard attempted to synthesize more than 1,000 pages of reports, recommendations, and position papers from five councils that were established to conduct much of the assembly's work during its first year. There were councils on learning, teaching, and evaluation; research and service; access, scale, and quality; relations with other institutions; and models of governance.

Mr. Meyerson said that during the year there were sharp divisions within the councils over specific issues and that the "first report" was not intended to represent a consensus of opinion from the councils.

Neither, he said, was it intended to repre-

sent a consensus from the advisory panel named by the American Academy of Arts and Sciences to advise the assembly.

NINE THEMES OF REPORT ON UNIVERSITY GOALS AND GOVERNANCE

LEARNING: THE CENTRAL MISSION

Like other complex institutions, colleges and universities have varied purposes. Foremost among them must be learning—learning that takes place between student and teacher, student and student, teacher and teacher, and between these and the staff, alumni, and citizens concerned with intellectual and professional pursuits. Research—important as it is—and public service are appropriate to colleges and universities when they contribute to learning and are consonant with those academic freedoms on which learning depends.

To say that the theses emphasize learning as the goal to which governance should be directed is not to be nostalgic or romantic about the past but to assert a purpose that has not been sufficiently central in the past or in the present.

KNOWLEDGE AS A BASIS FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

To improve and reform higher education—not to calm dissidents but to achieve the potentialities of colleges and universities—a kind of knowledge is required that does not now exist.

Many in institutions of higher learning are prepared to scrutinize almost everything—the natural environment, government and industry, all manner of other institutions foreign and domestic—but they are loathe to scrutinize themselves and the institutions they inhabit. If reform is not to be mindless, knowledge and data are needed on the character and effects of present educational and research programs.

It is essential to know more about how decisions are made and executed in colleges and universities, and how the successes and failures of innovations are communicated so that others may learn from the experiences of those who have experimented with new approaches.

Institutional self-study is desirable; it does not suffice for presidents and administrative staff to be interested in such matters.

The methods, content, and philosophy of education need to become a more vital interest of many professors, staff and students.

ADMISSIONS AND ATTENDANCE: EXTENDING CHOICE

College and universities ought to be open to those who are able and ready to benefit from association with them; this implies that those who attend choose to be there. Any arrangement that seems to enforce attendance, that causes some to claim that they are coerced into attending, violates the spirit that ought to prevail in these institutions.

Men and women of all ages—and not only late adolescents and young adults—need to think of the college or university as a place they can turn to if they can benefit from the kind of learning environment that it provides.

There are many matters that can be taught in modern society outside the university; there are some that can be taught only inside the university. An obligation of all institutions of higher education is to define more clearly what their particular educational strengths are, so that students will know which educational opportunities are available where. These institutions should help employers and others to see that there are other ways of certifying many employment capabilities than through college attendance alone.

Some young persons should be encouraged to defer higher education; some may prefer to avoid it altogether. Young persons should be confident that they will be welcome as mature adults.

The obligation in our society should be to encourage those of low income or of ethnic and racial groups previously denied higher educational opportunity to obtain admission if this serves their aspirations and talents; the education of women and adults generally should have higher priority.

When higher education ceases to be regarded as the unavoidable prescription for young persons and becomes instead the considered choice of men and women of all ages, voluntarism in relation to admission and attendance will grow.

EXPERIMENTATION, FLEXIBILITY IN UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE EDUCATION

In the last few years undergraduate requirements have been reduced, but few major curricular innovations have been instituted. Grading has been tempered or, in a few instances, virtually abolished. Course loads have been reduced; independent study has often been substituted for traditional courses. Distribution requirements designed to achieve some breadth in undergraduates education have been seen as so naive at various institution as to risk abolition.

With the failure of nerve of many faculties, few alternatives for a liberal education have been conceptualized, let alone implemented.

Undergraduate programs continue to provide degrees on the basis of credit hours completed and compiled. Graduate and professional programs, under the banner of high standards, have too often maintained barriers that are simply formal; they are not of a kind conducive to learning.

Studies for the doctorate are frequently pedantic, emphasizing a narrowness of focus that has little importance for the individual's intellectual and personal development, presumably the goal of all higher education. Similar charges can be leveled at far too many graduate professional schools.

Faculties ought to devise new options to achieve a liberal education; they need to infuse work and apprenticeship experiences with intellectual content. Certain students should be enabled to enter directly into advanced academic and professional education. New alternative paths to intellectual and professional development are in order.

Colleges and universities ought to develop curricula that will reflect the aspirations of contemporary 20th-century society; they should create a climate in which men and women mature, and where a larger number will understand and accept the responsibilities of service to their fellow citizens.

DIVERSIFICATION AND DIFFERENTIATION

The United States is noted for its presumed pattern of diversified higher educational institutions. In recent years, this diversity has been eroding.

Women's colleges seek men, religiously based schools are turning non-sectarian, technical schools add humanities, liberal arts colleges aspire to become graduate universities, and public state systems find political protection in copying each other.

Residual differences have not vanished; the tendency, however, has been unmistakable: toward greater uniformity. The same models are held to be desirable by too many institutions; there is too little questioning of the appropriateness of those models. Yet the nation is peculiarly fortunate in having several competing value systems in higher education, and much should be done to increase that competition.

It is an advantage that America has both public and private institutions of higher learning; it is good that some states have educational programs substantially different from those of others; it is desirable that some institutions should be linked to religious bodies and that some should be completely secular; it is important that some be exclusively for women and some exclusively for blacks if certain students flourish best in this kind of self-segregation; it is valuable that some should concentrate on the teaching of the young and that others should make their appeal to a more diversified student body

It is necessary that the variety and diversity of American higher education be preserved and extended; only through a clearly perceived understanding and acceptance of institutional differences can students and faculties make significant educational choices.

There is no one optimum educational experience, just as there is no optimum campus size or scale; students who are diverse in aptitudes and aspirations need many different paths to reason and self-fulfillment.

PRESERVING THE PRIVATE AND PUBLIC SYSTEMS

Educational diversity and differentiation can only be preserved and extended if private institutions continue to compete with those that are public. Since the second World War, the nation has shifted from a primary dependence on private institutions to a growing dependence on public institutions.

Today, almost all private institutions are in serious financial difficulties. The argument for their preservation and strengthening ought not to be a strictly economic one; the fact that private institutions with relatively modest public support would be able to perform tasks that public institutions would be required to do if the private institution did not exist, at greater costs, is not the plea that ought to carry the greatest weight.

Rather, the argument ought to be one of educational quality. If private colleges and universities ceased to exist, major goads to innovation and differentiation would disappear.

Private institutions should survive and flourish according to their merits; both public and private are more likely to strive after differentiation, recognizing its utility, if students are in a position to maximize their choices by being more free to select certain institutions and programs while rejecting others.

If financial assistance, whether through deferred payment plans ("Educaid"), or scholarships is made available to students, and if they in turn choose the institution most suited to their needs and competencies, there will be a greater tendency than is now the case for public and private institutions to complement one another.

ENHANCING THE PROFESSORIATE

The more than 500,000 teachers in American colleges and universities are recruited from a wide segment of the population and are highly diverse in qualities and interests. They are not professional in the same way that lawyers or medical doctors are.

Teachers belong to a large cohort whose calling is education; each has also a special field or fields of expertise, participating in professional life with others who may not be academics at all; finally, each, as an officer of a particular institution, has specific interests concerning immediate institutional issues.

It is not surprising that much of the professoriate has found it difficult to integrate all these roles effectively and simultaneously.

It is time to upgrade the art of teaching, to create an environment in which learning is as important for teachers as for students, to develop collective and self-enforcing codes of responsibility. Only then will new educational energies be generated.

Entrance to and exit from the professoriate should be made simpler. There are still too few women professors. This is particularly unjust when one considers the high proportion of women undergraduate students.

Trained individuals from creative, professional, and intellectual endeavors of the most

disparate kind ought to be welcomed to the colleges and universities on a part-time or other basis, to bring their unique experiences to the academic world.

THE PRESIDENCY: GOVERNANCE BY DELEGATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Since the second World War, faculty in American colleges and universities have participated more fully in policy-making. In the last few years, students at many institutions have also sought and achieved considerable participation in university affairs.

Many of the changes that have taken place—and these have been primarily in the area of rules and regulations, in grading and course requirements, in the introduction of such new fields as black studies or environmental studies—have generally been responsive to the demands and interests of students and faculty.

Other educational and organizational improvements that have bogged down in committees or been lost entirely, having failed to secure wide support in either student or faculty governing bodies, have sometimes been among the most far-reaching reform proposals.

Since a university is not a parliamentary body, and even less a place where total participation is possible, the existence of a strong executive authority is essential. Only where such authority exists is there any possibility that proposed innovations will be debated, tested, and, when appropriate, implemented.

If the executive function is to be strong, but also accountable, and not only to trustees but to faulty and students as well, there must be an organizational structure that encourage the flow of communications and provides opportunities for initiative and review. Some institutions may find senate, committee, and other existing structures adequate for consultation and participation; others may find new mechanisms more functional.

In calling for the restoration of the authority and responsibility of the president, it is with the clear intention that leadership be exercised in a manner that gives weight to the opinions and values of the whole university community.

SELF-HELP

The theses which follow, formulated in 1970, are presented at a time when many of the nation's colleges and universities are in serious financial difficulties. Some are in need of immediate federal financial assistance; certain medical schools, for example, are not likely to survive without it.

But what ought colleges and universities to do beyond petitioning the federal government for help?

What can they do, individually and collectively, to help themselves?

They can, of course, take their place in the long line of petitioners already formed, that includes many of the cities and states of the country, and not a few of its major social and cultural institutions, who see in federal aid the only solution to their economic problems.

While it would be wrong to assert that this road should be disdained by colleges and universities, they ought to be prepared for the possibility that the federal purse will be slow to open. They must not so reduce their activities that they fail to educate in ways they should.

They must make now appeals for funds from all private and public sources; they must learn to husband the resources they already have; they must share together what they have.

There is not a perfect correspondence of interest between and among institutions of higher learning. It would be foolhardy to claim that there is. But there is more common interest than is sometimes realized.

What is so desperately needed is the invention of new procedures and new institutional forms that will make cooperation and self-help more of a reality.

ASSEMBLY LISTS 85 THESES TO STIMULATE ACADEMIC REFORMS

1

Education of the poor

Higher education is currently available to over 8-million Americans, but not to the very poor. A disproportionate number of the very poor are black, though many, of course, are white, American Indians, and Spanish-speaking Americans.

Financial aids in the past went largely to upwardly mobile young people who soon became indistinguishable from the majority.

In an America plagued by racial disorder and driven by conscience, there has been in the last half dozen years a serious effort to admit black students into colleges and universities. Despite the advances that blacks have made, black students today make up less than 6 per cent of the college population whereas blacks comprise over twice that proportion of the national population.

As for low-income whites in urban and rural slums, very few efforts are being made to secure higher educational opportunity for them. The situation of the American Indian and Spanish-speaking American is even more discouraging.

Without claiming that all young persons should be in college, a matter dealt with later, the failure to educate students of low-income families, whatever their race or ethnic origin, ought not to be countenanced. Such students should be sought out by colleges and universities. Public monies should be available to those institutions that share in this national higher educational obligation.

2

Because low-income students, black and white, are often inadequately prepared for higher education—their schools, family situations and neighborhoods having generally hindered them—there is a need to make up for earlier neglect.

There is no simple solution to the problem. Improvements in income and employment policy, in elementary and secondary schooling, and in the urban environment generally are obviously desirable.

However, the issue is to overcome promptly the results of past neglect. To this end, colleges and universities ought to establish pre-college and pre-professional school programs, racially integrated, and preferably under the aegis of groups of institutions, to prepare students for established curricula.

To encourage higher educational institutions to involve themselves in this work, state and federal grants should be provided to them.

3

Women in higher education

Undergraduate admissions are readily available for women who can pay the fees. Graduate and professional school entry is often more difficult for them, in part because of the belief that many women will marry and not persevere towards their degrees, or will not pursue the career they intended. Such arguments are used to deny financial aids even to those women admitted to advanced degree programs.

The transformation in higher education that began in the last third of the 19th century needs to be completed. Not only should women in greater number be accepted in graduate and professional schools, but special provisions should be made for them, including the right to study on a part-time basis, particularly during the years when they are obliged to care for their young children.

4

Undergraduate degrees earned by women rarely lead to the same employment opportunity as those earned by men. To a lesser extent, the same is true for lesser degrees.

Universities and colleges in their own employment policies ought to become model employers, demonstrating their readiness to engage women at every teaching, research, administrative and staff level. They ought to work through their placement and other offices to educate employers to pursue the same policy, thereby securing for women many more positions at salaries equal to those of men.

If the above are done, and if women have the same job opportunities in all professions, including that of university teaching, the situation by the end of this decade will be dramatically different from what it is today.

5

Education of older students

Having said something about those who are currently denied access to certain kinds of higher educational experience, it is important to speak also of those who are privileged in these matters but who are not at all content with their situation.

For students from certain favored family backgrounds, going to college on graduation from high school is automatic; many, though not all, proceed then to a graduate or professional school. Some insist that their choice is not a free one; the employment (and social) situation compels them to be students from the time they are six until they are in their twenties.

This "involuntary servitude"—it is seen as such by some—is wasteful and ought to be eliminated. It ought to be possible for more students to interrupt their studies, work for a time and return, with this regarded as a natural educational sequence.

Some colleges might experiment with reserving substantial numbers of places for students entering as undergraduates whose ages are 21 and over and who have spent three or more years away from formal schooling.

In addition, all institutions ought to be more venturesome in admitting older students into their graduate and professional schools.

In a very short time, and without help from outside agencies, colleges and universities could alter themselves so that undergraduate schools were no longer exclusively the enclaves of late adolescents and graduate and professional schools no longer exclusively the enclaves of young adults.

Those who choose to go through without a significant break should, of course, be free to do so.

6

The decision to postpone higher education, whether taken by an adolescent or a young adult, ought not to be regarded as irrevocable. What a young person may not wish to do at 18 or 22, he or she may be very interested in pursuing at 30 or 40.

American colleges and universities have generally been somewhat more hospitable to such "second chances" than their European counterparts, but few have made it a central tenet of their admissions policies to seek out and make places available for interested adult students. Even where "continuing education" and evening programs exist, these are rarely at the center of a university's concern.

A great number of institutions—including many of the more distinguished—ought to concern themselves with providing higher educational opportunity for adults and not simply of the old "continuing education" variety.

With such a major commitment, new kinds of students may be expected.

Some will come largely for vocational or professional reasons; their motivation will be to keep abreast in subjects that are rapidly changing.

Finding a new career—switching one's occupation in mid-life—may be the most compelling reason that others will have.

Still others will come for the kind of general education that was unavailable to them when they were young, or that they chose not to pursue at that tme, having little sense of its value.

No group stands to gain more from programs of expanded adult access than women. Their responsibilities as wives and mothers in a critical period of their lives effectively bars far too many from further education except in the most casual kinds of programs.

College and universities ought to recognize what is lost as a consequence of present academic practices.

7

Education for employment

Some students, after one or more years of college, will conclude that their experience of higher educational institutions does not have much interest for them; some teachers will reach the same conclusions about these and other students. It is unreasonable to believe that all who start will finish even with a lapse of time.

Institutions of higher learning ought to take the lead in helping such students to bypass the social and economic pressures for mandatory attendance.

The colleges and universities ought collectively to address themselves to the task of working with employers and trade and professional associations to free many jobs from routine requirements that make college obligatory. Such attendance is often unnecessary for many of the positions for which it is presently required, and ought not to be imposed as a condition for gainful employ.

In this, as in so much else, the colleges and universities themselves through their own employment policies should set the pattern for others.

8

If access to employment opportunity was less exclusively through college or university education, the pressure to secure admission to such institutions would diminish. New kinds of institutions should be established to appeal to those who are not very much taken with an academic environment; for example, many new kinds of apprenticeship are needed.

Every innovation that reduces the pressure on colleges and universities to accommodate all, including those who are not interested or able—and that reinforces an element of choice on the part of the individual—is desirable.

9

Deferred payment of costs

It is unrealistic to expect that increased access for neglected groups as described above, even with the caveat that all should not attend colleges and universities, can be achieved without new sources of financial support.

Therefore, in addition to existing scholarships, work-study and other financial aids, a supplementary self-help program to be called "Educaid" should be developed. Educaid refers to a deferred-payment program covering tuition and other fees and room and board that should be made available for any student capable of doing college or university work.

The deferred payments should be guaranteed by the federal government in much the way mortgage guarantees are provided. Repayment should be in proportion to the long-term income of the recipient.

The person who by choice or fortune later in life has a high income would repay somewhat more than received; the person who does not attain such an income, whether because his or her choice of profession or occupation precludes it, or because personal adversity—illness and the like—prevents it, would repay less.

Such methods for increasing student financial aid have been receiving greater attention in recent years; they provide that some will pay a fairly high premium for the funds they receive, while others will, in effect, receive a subsidy.

10

The certification function

American colleges and universities, responding to public demand, have collaborated in a system of degree certification that makes a mockery of some of their educational objectives. At times it almost appears that the degree-granting function is higher education's principal reason for being.

The role of colleges and universities as gatekeeper, granting "passports to employ" in professions and callings, is onerous.

Arguments have been made that the certifying responsibility ought more appropriately to reside with other bodies—employers, professional associations, governmental organizations, and the like.

Academic institutions ought to make more deliberate studies of what would be gained and lost by such a transfer (even if only partial) of many of their certifying obligations.

11

Until there are such studies, the present practice of having an individual college or university grant specific degrees as indicators of professional and career certification should be maintained.

This, however, need not preclude the development of new systems of certification.

State, national and international bodies, both public and private, either constituted for this specific purpose or serving other purposes as well, might be given degree-granting authority.

They should be prepared to recognize various kinds of accomplishments, evaluating studies performed at several institutions or undertaken at home, judging work and other like experiences.

12

Deferring or interrupting studies

Alternatives of this kind would contribute to the modification of present conventions that require individuals, generally in late adolescence, to pursue studies for a fixed period for a particular degree at a single institution.

The tradition that a bachelor's degree is awarded at the end of four years of formal study would be challenged. Certain students might obtain their first degree in one, two or three years; others might obtain it in five, six or seven years. The incentives to intersperse long work periods with periods of full-time or part-time study would be increased.

Such flexibility ought to become common for all degrees. Students should be able to defer or interrupt college, graduate or professional school, precisely because there is no rhythm or pattern of intellectual curiosity or social maturity that is common to all.

13

Intermingling study and work

Students ought to be permitted to intermingle study and work in ways that are now uncommon. This is not simply a plea for an extension of what now passes for cooperative, work-and-study programs, where the student spends one or more terms away from a college campus. Rather, it is an assertion that significant employment opportunities for students may be provided in term-time if the university recognizes the value of such experience and is prepared to admit its educational importance.

New counseling and instructional techniques will be needed for such educational combinations. Without close supervision, programs of this kind could easily become peripheral—a kind of extracurricular "make-work."

14

Credit by examination

National and institutional examinations should be further developed to enable students who lack a bachelor's degree to go directly into advanced graduate or professional study.

Where ability is demonstrated, there is no excuse for a person being barred from more advanced study by the lack of conventional degree credentials. Many veterans after the second World War were given options of this kind; there is no evidence that they abused the privilege or in any way suffered as a consequence.

15

Shorter graduate programs

Many students opt for advanced graduate and professional study not out of great interest but almost in a spirit of resignation. The universities would be well-advised to adopt a more critical stance in respect to their advanced degrees, recognizing that they are not necessary to all professional employ. They ought more regularly to initiate shorter graduate programs, which may or may not lead to degrees.

They ought systematically to encourage employers and professional associations to accept such preparation.

16

Access to academic profession

That colleges and universities would be substantially allerted by new policies of access and certification, no one would seriously question. They would be no less dramatically altered by substantial changes in the character of their faculties.

Present modes of access to the academic profession are too restrictive; training for the profession is frequently too narrow. The possibilities for withdrawal before compulsory retirement age are far too limited.

All these practices should be reviewed and modified.

17

The Ph. D. degree is today the required license for teaching in most American colleges and universities in arts and sciences faculties and in certain professional schools. This degree's nearmonopoly ought to be challenged.

The two distinguished English universities, Cambridge and Oxford, take it for granted that in many fields a well-educated person with an honors bachelor's degree is suited to an academic teaching career.

American colleges and universities ought to experiment with the same practice.

18

While advertising for candidates for university teaching posts is not regarded as undignified in many English-speaking countries, it is in the United States. In America, cronyism may easily substitute for a critical assessment of a wide range of available candidates.

Advertising is no panacea; however, it and other means of locating candidates and soliciting their interest about posts that are open ought to be more widely used.

Any device that serves to make a greater number of people aware of, the existence of an academic vacancy and that disseminates information about it may help obtain better applicants.

19

Colleges and universities should adopt recruitment policies that will attract for part-time or full-time teaching positions men and women whose original career commitments were not in the academic world. Clearly, not all disciplines can be served by such persons; many, however, can be.

In general, these persons ought not to be of

an age where they are near retirement in their own professions. Rather, the purpose ought to be to recruit for varied periods of time individuals at the height of their careers who would bring perspectives and concerns that are not common in the academy.

Some alumni would be attracted by such job opportunities.

The normal off-campus work place of such teachers might provide congenial learning sites for students, undergraduate and graduate.

20

Preparation of college teachers

Although every effort should be made to recruit from outside as well as inside the academic profession, the greatest number of professors will come from the ranks of those who have especially prepared themselves for a university post. Despite the possible changes noted previously, this will often mean persons holding the Ph.D. or an equivalent degree.

It behooves universities, and particularly the 50 that provide most of the arts and sciences and engineering doctorates in the country, to examine their graduate degree programs critically.

Many institutions offer a graduate education that is excessively specialized and unreasonably time-consuming. Every effort ought to be made to introduce greater flexibility into these graduate programs, with all unnecessary hurdles being eliminated.

The large universities of the country bear a heavy responsibility for the morale of doctoral candidates, and therefore for the morale of the academic profession. Too many academics presently enter the profession in a disgruntled state, angry over what they conceive to be the inadequacies of their graduate education.

21

Apprenticeship programs for college and university teachers, with guidance and supervision provided by experienced teachers, ought to be available for graduate students who intend to become professors. Those who are just starting in these careers would be particularly helped by such programs.

Young scholars and teachers are now being given such learning opportunities in several institutions; this practice needs to be widely copied.

22

If some of the aridity of primary-school education derives from the sex-typing of teachers who are overwhelmingly women, a comparable problem arises in university education where the professoriate is overwhelmingly male. Major efforts to recruit a greater number of women professors ought to be initiated. The academic profession would be substantially transformed by an infusion of such new talent.

23

Evaluating research

The most stimulating university teaching generally occurs where the individual is actively engaged in significant scholarly research or in other creative exploration. The college or university has an interest in encouraging individuals in these efforts and in rewarding them. Too few institutions are at all adept in doing so. Too many gauge scholarly performance by the crudest of measures; they count bibliographical citations.

Just as students need to be persuaded to work for something other than the accumulation of course credits, professors ought to be discouraged from that kind of writing designed to fill dossiers with lists of publication titles. The production ethic that emphasizes quantity is inimical to scholarship; the more prestigious universities generally recognize this.

Though many good scholars and teachers are prolific, creative endeavor is frequently sporadic and time-consuming, and not at all susceptible to gross production standards.

Reliable evaluation of quality is probably as often accomplished through external review by scholars who understand the nature of the scholarly contribution as by any other means.

24

Evaluating teaching

Teaching is still too little valued in too many colleges and universities. More systematic appraisal methods need to be introduced to identify and reward successful teachers.

Student opinion in these matters is crucial, even though decisions on appointment ought to continue to rest with faculty and administration. Those who secure the benefits of good teaching—the students—ought to be included among the principal guardians of the teaching function.

The hazard that such guardianship will encourage and favor showmanship and a quest for popularity can be overcome by policies that balance student preferences with the judgments of others, including colleagues. These judgments should include an estimate of the individual's capacity to attract able students, however few, and the importance of preserving specific fields whether or not they attract many students.

25

Appointment to permanent tenure is often regarded as the most important stage in an academic career. Colleges and universities are derelict when they make the most searching inquiry to determine whether an individual merits a permanent post and do nothing to encourage creativity once the person is installed in that post.

The intellectual growth of its faculty ought to be a prime responsibility of any institution concerned with the intellectual growth of its students. Colleagueship will have a determining influence in this matter. So, also, will the administrative decisions that grant time to individual faculty members, not as sabbaticals and not tied to specific projects financed from outside, but as an opportunity to explore new areas relevant to their teaching and research.

To make these decisions wisely, deans and presidents will need to inform themselves more thoroughly about the teaching and scholarly contributions of professors.

26

Tenure and self-regulation

In many institutions, an initial appointment carries the presumption of the right of re-appointment. Tenure is generally automatic in such instances on re-appointment after a number of years of service. The growth of unionization and collective bargaining reinforce this practice and also reinforce the practice of having uniform salary scales.

The principle of differential rewards for merit in teaching and scholarship, which exists for very good reasons, should not be tampered with where it still prevails.

27

There is little self-regulation by faculty in most institutions. Only the most flagrant evidence of gross misbehavior will involve an individual in disciplinary actions initiated by colleagues.

Desirably, the faculty member who, for example, interferes with the academic freedoms of colleagues or students ought to be subject to faculty-imposed sanctions under a self-generated code of faculty conduct and responsibility.

The alternative to such self-regulation may be a form of additional outside control that carries hazards for intellectual freedom in the colleges and universities of the country.

28

Despite the abuses common to permanent positions, professional tenure needs to be retained as a guarantor of academic freedom against political and other pressures. Yet, means ought to be developed to encourage and facilitate the early departure of those who are making small contributions to their institution and their students.

To this end, pensions should be reorganized so that professors may retire (and in some cases be encouraged to retire) at substantial partial pay after 20 years of tenured service at one or more universities. This arrangement is similar to others that prevail in the foreign service, the military and various civil service systems where indemnity offers a viable reconciliation between competence and security.

29

Curricular experiments

Alterations in the character of the academic profession, together with changes in respect to access and certification, cannot fail to have profound effects on the curriculum.

For great numbers of American undergraduates, instruction is still largely in readily marketable skills, principally business administration, elementary and high school teaching, engineering and the like. In the case of the two-year colleges, the occupational focus is even sharper.

It is in selected large universities, public and private, and at certain four-year colleges that substantial numbers of undergraduates devote themselves to what is traditionally defined as an arts and sciences curriculum.

Curricular experiments should be made in all these institutions; it is very desirable that these experiments be as varied as possible.

30

What is required is the development of new attitudes towards learning. General education which is in retreat needs reformulation. The difficulties of doing this ought not to be underestimated.

To point out that a curriculum should make place for the affective no less than for the cognitive and the objective is only to open the argument.

To recommend that facts be respected, but that general theory not be scanted, that a concern with Western culture be tempered by a concern with Eastern and other cultures as well, that contemporaneity be stressed, but that the past and the uncertain future also be studied, and that literacy be achieved not simply by studying one's own language but by knowing others, including that represented by the symbolic languages of the sciences, is to give a measure of the complexity of the problem.

The difficulties are so great that it is easy to fall back on one of two curricular options—to have all students study some one subject to the complete exclusion of others, or to have them take any combination of disparate courses so long as they add up to the total number of semester credits specified for a degree. Both these courses of action are evasions of curricular responsibility.

If faculty members believe in something in addition to specialized education, they ought to define alternative forms of what that education should be and how students are to be encouraged to explore them.

31

The problems of instruction today are different from what they were a decade ago; they are likely to become even more different if the theses with respect to access and certification, suggested above, are realized. Thus, for example, the struggle to familiarize students with their past, to locate them in time and place, is not likely to be achieved by demonstrating a link with a European past, or even with an African or Asian past.

One of the many experimental approaches to undergraduate education might be to dwell on those elements common to modern societies, at the same time indicating what makes them distinct and separate.

Modernity may best be studied on two

levels: what unites the planet and what divides it. It must not be assumed that the latter are mere residues—political, religious, and philosophical ideas of an earlier time—destined soon to be placed on the ash-heap of history. These are integral to modernity, no less so than the technology too often seen as its only distinctive hallmark.

An approach that concentrated on man's 20th-century experience should not mean that only the 20th century is studied. The spiritual and material fantasies of our time cannot be disassociated from their roots.

The concern must be with interpreting and understanding modern man's political and social predicament, seeing these in a context that takes account of his psychic and spiritual needs.

32

Science for non-scientists

Colleges are not very successful in communicating the nature of scientific endeavor or inquiry to those—the great majority—who do not concentrate in the natural sciences.

As between the sciences and the humanities broadly defined, there are large methodological and epistemological differences. So long as the majority of American students situate themselves in non-scientific disciplines, there is an obligation to instruct them in the activity that dominates contemporary culture and yet remains so alien.

One problem is to determine what kinds of concrete scientific information various groups of educated men and women need to have. Another problem is to develop means for instructing undergraduates in certain of the methods and symbolic languages of the natural sciences.

Too many colleges and universities have accepted for too long the reality of their students' scientific illiteracy.

33

Study of languages

Today, another kind of illiteracy and cultural parochialism also threatens. The interest in foreign languages has declined sharply. Traditional language requirements were clearly insufficient for giving most students any meaningful proficiency in a foreign tongue.

This failing contributed to the demand to do away with the requirements altogether, a demand that was sometimes acceded to. Whether or not it was, new experiments are called for that will enable the student to use a foreign language in his or her other studies, particularly in the examination of other cultures.

34

Instruction of undergraduates

An undergraduate's decision to concentrate in a given field ought not to be taken to mean that a new recruit has been won for graduate study in that field; the undergraduate's major ought not to be viewed simply as a preparation for graduate study.

If members of departments will concern themselves as much with the logic of their discipline as they do with its content, new kinds of instruction will become available for the undergraduate.

This ought not to be interpreted as simply a plea for a study of methodology; it is an argument for a greater concern with instructing the undergraduate in the nature of evidence, the forms of proof, the basic premises and axiologies of a discipline.

The members of a department ought to define what a student may be expected to derive from a period of study in a particular discipline.

35

Early specialization

Certain large institutions might experiment with creating programs that permit early specialization. For some beginning undergraduates, a university option with immediate entry into advanced professional or academic study should be made available. This option would be most appropriate for those few who have acquired a superior general education in their secondary schools, have made an early and firm selection of career or field, and are ready, emotionally as well as intellectually, to forego many of the experiences of college life; also, it would be particularly appropriate for those who return to college after years of absence.

36

Revision of graduate study

Just as it would be wrong to prescribe a single curriculum for all undergraduates, so it would be wrong to do this for all graduate students, or even for those in arts and sciences faculties alone. Still, certain broad assertions can be made.

The graduate student who expects to be a college teacher ought to be treated as a prospective colleague by professors. This means that students will be encouraged to prepare courses and will be given teaching opportunities; also, that there will be a large involvement by senior professors in these instructional assignments.

Where students are intending to choose a professorial career, they ought to learn as much as they can about the profession that they intend to enter, and about universities generally. Too many who emerge with Ph.D.'s have little sense of either.

The dissertation requirement remains a confusing obligation in too many disciplines; every effort should be made to clarify what is required, and modesty ought to be the general rule.

Many disciplines would be well advised to consider what has become commonplace in the natural sciences where students frequently obtain their advanced degrees in a relatively short time, having demonstrated their capacity for independent research.

In too many fields, the use of stilted 19th-century scholarly formulae result in the production of huge pretentious documents that mock the presumed intentions of dissertation requirements. Neither student nor professor is enhanced by the rules of the dissertation game as it is too frequently played at present.

Many graduate students, of course, are enrolled in advanced degree programs that are directed to professional rather than to professorial careers. They, no less than future academics, would profit from a change in the ethos of graduate instruction.

Studies that are too impersonal and prolonged, with requirements that are obscure or unintentionally punitive, should be drastically revamped.

37

Professional education

With the American penchant for "professions," each decade sees more occupations so labeled. Professional schools in colleges and universities often work hand in hand with professional organizations to set up qualifications—and restrictions—for entry into their fields.

An early preoccupation with a narrow vocational competence is gradually giving way, at least in some universities (in certain professional schools more than others) to a greater concern with research and theory. This tendency carries desirable possibilities, particularly if it can be linked to the concern for "social relevance" that is so much a preoccupation in our time.

New kinds of education in medicine, law, management, architecture and other professions are now called for.

This is a propitious time for innovation in professional curricula. Among the reforms worth considering is the opening of professional courses, now reserved for post-baccalaureate students, to undergraduate students, to give them an early acquaintance with the profession so that they may judge whether they are suited to it. If they conclude they are, they ought to be encouraged to integrate their professional study with study in the arts and sciences.

Courses in the professional faculties should be regularly open to arts and sciences graduate students; the reverse privilege should also be generally available.

Faculty from professional schools ought to be encouraged to offer instruction in related arts and sciences disciplines and in professional schools other than those in which they hold their appointment. The same encouragement should be extended to professors in the arts and sciences.

The greatest flexibility should exist in all these matters. Too many universities continue to harbor too many academic and professional ghettoes, separating colleagues whose intellectual interests should be bringing them together.

38

Innovations in instruction

Colleges and universities are experimenting with variations on the instructional system that they have traditionally relied on. Clearly, independent study and small group tutorials offer large teaching possibilities. They are immensely demanding, and often—though not always—entail extra expense. Also, there has been over many years talk of the increased use of audio-visual and other technical devices, some of which reduce staff costs.

Certain of these procedures are now being tried, and professors and administrators should inform themselves on their utility. The sharing of technical devices ought to be considered by neighboring institutions.

Significant learning experience gained outside the college or university should be welcomed. Whether the instruction be formal or informal, in a ghetto or in a foreign university, evidence of accomplishment should be quickly recognized. The university has no interest in keeping back students who have had equivalent educational experience elsewhere and who can demonstrate this.

Where it is possible to involve students in the research efforts of professors, there is every reason to do so for the benefit of both.

39

Reform of academic calendar

Many faculties ought to reconsider existing college and university calendars. More flexible class schedules need to be devised, permitting many professors to concentrate their teaching over a shorter period in which they give the whole of their attention to teaching obligations, while reserving another part of the calendar year principally for research and similar creative activity.

A variety of calendar reforms would give students opportunities to work by themselves or to work off campus in ways that are not now possible.

The classroom need not be the only setting for teaching; residence halls, museums, hospitals, courthouses, factories, schoolhouses, and other public and private facilities offer appropriate sites for education. Where they can be useful, the college or university has an interest in gaining access to them.

40

Extra-curricular activities

Examination of prevailing extra-curricular activities suggests that many were created in the 19th century to assist adolescent boys to enjoy collegial living. Faculty and other adult supervision was provided as a way of showing the institution's concern for its charges.

Colleges and universities would be well-advised to reconsider their commitment to support such extra-curricular pursuits. If students, increasingly adult, are to be independent, they must choose those activities they wish to maintain and must consider how to support them. There may be a sound edu-

cational reason for the extra-curriculum being placed wholly in the hands of students at certain institutions, making possible experiments of a kind that cannot be expected to originate in the votes of faculties or governing boards.

At certain other institutions, where the extra-curriculum is seen as an integral part of the educational experience, almost indistinguishable from the curriculum, faculties may choose to exercise greater leadership.

41

The role of research

The argument has been frequently made that research interests divert professors from their teaching obligations, thereby leading to a neglect of students. This may indeed happen. It is particularly unfortunate when it happens for research or writing that is trivial, motivated largely by pressures for promotion. The challenge, clearly, is to remedy such abuses.

To adopt policies that will destroy the vital links between research exploration and imaginative teaching is no remedy. Any attempt to develop a teaching ethic in higher education that would banish research would risk making teaching sterile.

Those professors who are inclined to do research should be encouraged to do so.

This, however, need not mean that the university will welcome every kind of research effort.

42

Certain types of a large-scale sponsored research are more suited to outside research institutes than to universities, though some of these institutes may be loosely affiliated with universities.

Research that improves the learning process, is linked to teaching and the intellectual concerns of faculty members, is most appropriate for universities.

There is no reason for universities to serve as holding companies for large laboratories or research projects that are not linked to their educational programs. The attraction of large expansions of staff and facilities needs to be resisted.

43

Research in universities, whatever its source of support, ought not to be secret. The results of research under any kind of university sponsorship ought to be made freely available, except where conditions of privacy relating to individuals require confidentiality.

44

Decisions to accept or reject particular large-scale sponsored research programs have a major effect on the character of an institution. Faculty and administrators who decide on these matters ought to consider: the contribution such research will make to faculty members and to the educational programs of the institutions; the effects that there may be on the traditional academic freedoms of the university community; the positive and negative impacts on other institutional programs that can be foreseen; the future costs of maintaining such research activity and its probable social value.

45

Some of the current adverse criticisms about university policies with respect to research and service assume a far greater institutional involvement than is in fact the case. The amount of industry-sponsored research at colleges and universities is relatively small. Large-scale federal sponsorship of research projects is important at perhaps 50 universities and only for a minority of their professors.

Most research by college and university professors has no outside support, and might be best described as individual, publication-oriented inquiry without elaborate or expensive trappings. Such research can be immensely significant for the quality of teaching within a college or university and for the intellectual growth of the teachers. For these reasons, the institution ought to foster it from its own resources. Where these are insufficient, as they will generally be, strong efforts should be made to secure additional funds, and not only from the federal government.

46

Involvement in public service

Universities have never been extensively involved in directly providing public service except in agriculture and medicine and to some extent in primary and secondary schools, and, of course, in their role of providing education and training to their own students.

However, many thousands of professors, on an individual basis, working as consultants or volunteers, independently of their institutions, have served community, state, federal and private organizations.

Today, colleges and universities are urged to devote major resources to public service. The suggestion is made that they solve the difficult problems of modern society; poverty, racism, urban blight, and a deteriorating natural environment are a few of the matters that they are asked to deal with.

Higher educational institutions, in fact, have neither the resources nor the political capacity to engage in such activities except on a modest scale.

What they can do and should do, if invited, and if their professors and staff have the professional competencies and are in fact interested, is to contribute knowledge that may be relevant to these problems.

Their major contribution ought to be an intellectual one; individuals and groups are in a position to outline courses of action worth considering by those with the responsibility for solving public problems.

A larger direct institutional involvement is possible only in a limited number of circumstances.

47

Study of higher education

One would expect universities to have a complete agenda, with very many suggestions, on at least one subject—the study of higher education. This is rarely the case. Universities are too little involved in a subtle and complex analysis of education at any level; it is still uncommon for the talented members of a variety of disciplines to focus on the problems of education. This area of research and service ought to be developed.

It is unreasonable for the university to pride itself on its expertise in numerous other areas and be ready to accept its continued ignorance on many aspects of its own prime concern—education.

48

Modes of governance

A college or university—even when it is small—is an intricate organization. Trustees, administrators, students, professors, staff, alumni, and legislators and public officials are all assumed to have an interest in the institution. It is easy to underestimate (or exaggerate) the influence of any one of these.

Good governance depends on a reasonable allocation of responsibilities, that makes the structure of authority credible for all these groups.

It is impossible that all should decide everything or be consulted on every issue. No parliamentary or bureaucratic procedures can be developed that will guarantee such participation and consultation in most institutions.

University governance exists to make education possible. This objective is most likely to be achieved, and not in a superficial sense, where there is a division of responsibility, a sharing of information, and a readiness to subject authority to the requirements of a well-defined system of accountability.

Too few institutions have developed these characteristics in their mode of governance. Many more ought to do so.

49

A system of college or university governance should itself be educative for all who take part in it. A style of institutional arrangements appropriate to higher education should be borrowed from the academic ideal of reasoned scholarship, in which findings and proposals are submitted to critical review.

For too long, colleges and universities have borrowed their governance models from business and public administration. Neither is appropriate for most functions of academic institutions.

50

The governing board

The ultimate legal authority in most contemporary American colleges and universities resides in a lay governing board. The idea that higher education is too important to be left to educators and students alone, and that it requires surveillance by the larger society, is implied by this arrangement.

Because of the importance of trustees, they ought to be chosen on the basis of their capacity for deliberation, judgment, and vision. These attributes do not run counter to fund-raising ability and devotion to the institution.

51

The principal functions of the governing board ought to include: to join with the president in planning the long-range future of the institution (the faculty can rarely transcend itself in this matter, and students generally have too short a time-perspective); to select a president with the cooperation of those that have reason to be interested in the appointment; to preserve and improve the financial position of the institution; to link the institution with public and other outside agencies in such a way that will advance the interests of faculty and students.

52

Though governing boards should not be selected on a Noah's Ark principle, certain groups (blacks, for example) are rarely included; women are least represented, considering the proportion of women students. Both ought to be significantly represented; if represented, they would enhance the general influence of the board, bring new perspectives, and, in some instances, might possibly improve their fund-raising capacity.

At most institutions, board members ought to have renewable term rather than life appointments.

53

Faculty and students serving on the governing boards of their own institutions might lead boards into day-to-day academic decisions that ought in fact to be delegated. However, governing boards should often include professors and administrators from other institutions.

Recent alumni are often closer to the perceptions of students than others, and should be considered for board positions.

Faculty and students ought to have the opportunity to nominate outside trustees, though not necessarily to select them. The opportunity to nominate by a petition signed by a designated number of faculty or students—alumni frequently have such a privilege—ought to be experimented with.

Faculty senates, student governments, employee organizations ought all to have means available for communicating with the governing board.

54

Boards of trustees have often been effective buffers against political and other pres-

sures directed at colleges and universities. Today, however, boards are sometimes the conduits of these pressures, serving only to exacerbate already difficult situations.

The buffer role ought to be reinforced, particularly in those state institutions where political pressures are especially strong.

55

The academic administrator

The college or university presidency is uniquely important in American higher education. The office needs to be strengthened so that it can more effectively fulfill its principal responsibilities. These are: to represent the general interest of the university as a whole; to be its spokesman; to be sensitive to the educational and intellectual needs and missions of the academic community to be both a member of the faculty and its leader; to initiate major academic study and reform; to allocate resources to achieve specific educational goals and priorities.

Together with the governing board, the president should plan for the development of the university (the planning process should involve all the constituencies to the fullest extent possible).

Through the appointments the president makes to the administrative staff and those he or she influences in the professoriate, standards are set for integrity, educational achievement, vision and humanity.

The president should perform his or her duties with as much grace, efficiency, and absence of bureaucratic control as possible.

56

Many large institutions should have two or possibly three or four leaders with such titles as president, chancellor, provost, executive vice-president; in addition, there may sometimes be a need for a full-time chairman or executive vice-chairman of the board of trustees.

The complexity of many academic institutions requires a greater division of labor than now exists. With every such division of labor, there is, of course, the hazard of divided responsibility. This needs to be guarded against. The best way to do so is to have all major executive task delegated to others by a single chief executive officer in whom authority is vested.

57

Part of the ambiguity about presidential and other academic authority arises because there are two major organizational systems: the associational system and the executive system. In the first (for example, in a faculty senate) all members are presumably equal so long as they accept the basic premises of the association and act collegially. In the second (for example, in an administrative hierarchy) a central set of incentives and sanctions is established by executives.

These conflicting organizational systems should be combined into a system of delegated, responsive governance, in which authority and responsibility are exercised by executives who themselves are accountable and thus can be checked by faculties and others when there is extreme dissatisfaction with their decisions or actions.

58

Academic administrators come principally from faculty careers, and desirably so. Normally, they ought not to serve for more than a dozen years. In the course of that period there ought to be at least one review, which should include an assessment by both faculty and students.

In large institutions, a corps of middle-level administrative staff ought to be developed to relieve the routine for academic department heads, deans, and other officials. Training and career-advancement programs for such staff ought to be offered by single institutions and groups of institutions.

59

In the American pattern of academic organization, either strong academic deans or strong department chairmen are required. If neither is strong the institution will suffer, if both are, conflict is likely. In most cases, it is desirable to strengthen the deans as against the department chairmen, lest excessive compartmentalization takes place.

60

Faculty/student representation

Arguments for representative faculty senates or for town-meeting faculty senates are legion. The small college can function well with the latter type. The larger institution should think seriously of having both—the representative body for most issues, the town-meeting senate when a sizable proportion of the faculty wishes an opportunity for further deliberation.

Small groups of faculty generally dominate faculty senates and similar organizations. At many colleges and universities, a large number of faculty either choose to avoid senate assignments or are not invited to take part in them. The same names appear repeatedly in the membership of key committees.

If faculty self-governance is in fact to flourish, many who are devoted to teaching and scholarship, who would often rather stay aloof from administrative responsibilities, need to become involved.

Membership in the executive bodies of large senates or in representative senates or major faculty committees ought to rotate.

61

Faculty or faculty-student committees have grown more important in the governance of colleges and universities. These are sometimes chosen by administrators, who have some sort of "representative" principle in mind. In other cases, they are chosen by senates, university councils, and similar groups. Departmental, divisional, school, and other committees have also proliferated.

Committees in such profusion create confusion. Their number ought to be reduced and a time limit should often be set for them.

To save the energies of both faculty and students, and to make committees more effective, the more important ones ought to have administrative staff members assigned to them. This, of course, raises the hazard of committees becoming the servants of the staff, but that problem can be guarded against, whereas the inefficiency that frequently develops when there is no staff cannot.

62

The tendency to create unicameral legislative or advisory bodies for colleges and universities raises the possibility that important issues specific to either faculty or students will be obfuscated. Where such councils or campus-wide senates are established, separate faculty, student and other deliberative bodies should also be maintained.

63

Use of faculty expertise

Many colleges and universities possess in their faculties great expertise in management, design, law, operations research, and other fields important to the running of a complex institution. These internal talents should be called on to help in the governance of the institution. Although difficulties may arise when recommendations from faculty are turned down, the benefits of using such talents generally exceed the costs.

64

Students in governance

Student government is a misnomer in almost all institutions. It rarely governs, though it often provides a forum where student views on the governing of colleges and universities are heard.

The centralization of student politics, a result of having a student government, may reduce the involvement of students in the decentralized schools and departments of the institution. When this happens it is unfortunate, because the greatest possibility of students influencing educational policy can occur on a decentralized basis. This is the kind of student involvement that should be fostered.

65

Many activities in addition to the extracurricular ones now handled by students might desirably be delegated to them. For example, on some campuses the responsibility for residence halls and other living arrangements ought to rest with students, as is the case in several European countries.

These, and similar experiments, should be monitored; it is possible that some functions can be better performed by students than by others.

66

The "non-professoriate"

In the functioning of colleges and universities, particularly large ones, those who carry professorial titles are only part of the larger company of professionals who have responsibilities for teaching and research. These other professionals, at some compuses, may be at least as numerous as the professoriate. They are beginning to seek an influence from which they have been previously excluded.

There are no traditions for guiding faculties or administrations in dealing with these important colleagues. The concept "staff" is far too ambiguous and all-inclusive.

If any internal governance problem, not already high on college and university reform agendas, requires study, it is this one.

67

Use of the initiative

Though the *initiative* has not had large influence in public affairs, where it once seemed to hold such promise, it may have greater applicability in academic institutions. Various colleges and universities ought to experiment with the *initiative* so that when large numbers of faculty, staff or students seek a new policy or wish to abolish or revise an old one, the issue can be acted on with reasonable promptness by administrators, senates and others who have authority to do so.

68

The ombudsman

There is much experience at certain colleges and universities in the use of ombudsmen, which is intended to enable any member of the institution to seek redress of grievances. Not suprisingly, those ombudsmen function best who appear to have the respect and ear of all constituencies. Additional institutions ought to experiment with ombudsmen or boards of ombudsmen, informing themselves of, and evaluating the experiences of others.

69

Winning alumni support

Traditional methods for winning alumni support—athletic programs, class reunions, regional alumni gatherings—though successful with some, are clearly no longer adequate for others. Younger alumni seem indifferent to many of these approaches.

Just as the colleges and universities must recognize the diversity of their students, so they should acknowledge and benefit from the diversity of their alumni.

If higher educational institutions pursue the objective of making the education of diverse adults a more central concern, lifetime educational opportunities ought to be made available to alumni. This might in-

clude the right to return for special courses, summer programs, and other educational offerings still to be devised.

70

Since colleges and universities are dependent for their well-being on public confidence and support, they should inform their alumni regularly about those problems and issues that affect higher education.

To contribute to the creation of an informed public opinion on higher educational matters is an obligation about which colleges and universities should be outspoken.

71

Institutional publications

If the internal and external constituencies of a college or university are to be kept properly informed, effective, use of the written word is required.

The many publications issued by departments, faculties and schools, including college catalogues, faculty handbooks, student guides, financial aid bulletins, weekly calendars, alumni magazines, and fund-raising literature together represent a considerable financial investment. Their purpose—to expound the institution's activities and goals—is insufficiently achieved.

As a result, those who are not actually in the institution (and many who are) have only the most rudimentary notion of what in fact is happening.

All such publications should more deliberately seek to reflect the institution's character and specific programs.

72

Colleges and universities ought to have a "Hansard" or regular publication reporting on all specific actions, executive, adjudicative and legislative, taken by trustee, faculty, student, staff and administrative groups.

Similarly, such a publication should make available information about major contemplated policies or decisions on the part of any or all of the above groups.

When possible, there should be sufficient time for comments and criticisms to be prepared and included in this publication.

73

Future of private institutions

The American ideal of equality of opportunity through education has in the last quarter of a century been achieved largely through state universities and colleges, public junior colleges, and municipal institutions. Without public higher education, the present level of access would never have been secured.

Now, however, many private institutions are in great trouble. If private institutions fail financially, the public exchequer will be required to assume the burden they previously carried; the costs would be very high.

The more important argument for a dual system, private and public, however, is one of educational quality.

Private institutions ought to continue to exist as sources of experimentation. The major private institutions are important precisely because they guarantee that higher education is not pushed toward uniformity and political hypersensitivity.

Foundations, private firms, and other potential donors should recognize the fragility of these institutions and reflect on how they can help them.

74

Selective support of excellence

With the growing dependence of higher education on public funding, the risk of leveling increases. Examples of excellence, so important in setting the standards of aspiration for all institutions, become all the more necessary.

Difficult as it is politically to favor some institutions rather than others, selective support, public and private, is essential and ought to be fought for. No one ought to underestimate the resistances to this principle; uniform support for all institutions will have ardent defenders.

75

Minimizing size disadvantages

There is no optimum size for colleges and universities. For some students and teachers the small school will provide the most gratifying experiences. At larger colleges and universities, there are more choices. This is not to say that the increase in choice is at all commensurate with the increase in size.

Large institutions should create programs and facilities that provide the option of a more intimate scale; this can be accomplished at some places through creating a variety of small colleges within the larger campus, or through other, more modest ventures.

76

Producing greater differentiation

Higher educational institutions in America, to their detriment, are imitative. The "front-runners" are constantly aped by those with more limited resources. As a result, though there are over 2,500 institutions, they converge on a few models.

Policies designed to produce greater differentiation, though difficult to fashion, are essential.

Colleges and universities should become more discriminating in relating their resources to particular needs, less worried about their standing (often a mythical one) *vis-à-vis* other institutions, and more determined to develop experiments in every aspect of institutional life.

If these things were done, the claim of American higher education to being pluralistic would begin to approach reality.

77

Women's colleges

Women's colleges, despite their financial and other problems, ought not lightly to abandon their identity. This is particularly so when many coeducational institutions continue to be male-oriented. Few have managed to protect or further the position of women.

The present tendency, which is to eliminate women's colleges, may be unfortunate. Schemes for coeducation at women's and men's colleges are rapidly gaining favor; many of these proposals may be ill-conceived.

The concern on the part of some institutions to be in fashion risks the loss of a purpose that may not be easily recovered.

78

Predominantly Negro colleges

The predominantly Negro colleges are in desperate financial straits. They continue to enroll a very substantial proportion of black college students. Without these institutions, many thousands of black students in the South would be denied higher educational opportunity.

Public and private resources should be directed to these colleges, while programs to develop other options for black students are devised, tested, and made more widely available.

79

Long-range planning

Long-range planning is uncommon in many colleges and universities. Few can boast organizations and procedures adequate for the advanced planning of their needs and resources. Many self-studies scarcely mention long-range planning mechanisms.

The key to such planning is the development of institutional research which provides data and knowledge of a specificity and range not now available. Only then can a planning committee and staff function.

80

Budgeting

College and university budgeting should be directed to the reallocation of the total resources of the institution rather than to annual increments. Changes in colleges and universities will have to depend on a kind of budgetary review not now taking place.

In a period of financial stringency, substantial substitution of programs rather than addition to them must be the principle that guides those responsible for decision-making. It can no longer be assumed that new programs will be supported by extensive new funds.

Unpopular decisions will have to be made and explained.

81

Filling faculty vacancies

When a professor retires, resigns, or dies it is generally assumed that the vacancy in the field will be automatically filled. This is an unwise policy, since it prevents response to new priorities unless the institution grows in size.

Every vacancy ought to revert to a campus-wide pool where the requirements for a particular specialism can be weighed by administrators and faculty against requirements for other fields.

82

Non-educational services

Private industry or non-profit corporations ought to be encouraged to supply services now offered by colleges and univerities to their students. Considerable savings might be realized by such policies. Also, a more sensitive response to changing student needs might be registered.

Housing, dining facilities, career counseling, health and medical services might be supplied more reasonably by outside agencies.

Institutions ought to experiment with many different systems. At large institutions, what is suited to one faculty or school might not be appropriate for another.

83

Sharing resources

Resource-sharing for expensive or unique facilities will become a financial necessity for all colleges and universities. More important however, are the educational improvements that would be realized through imaginative cooperative efforts of a kind that are not now taking place.

Colleges and universities ought to share scarce human talents through joint appointments, permitting either students or gifted teachers to move among campuses.

The use of modern technology by several institutions involved in collaborative enterprises is also called for.

Most difficult, however, is cooperation based on the willingness of one institution to abandon an established field of study entirely, recognizing that opportunities for such study exist elsewhere in the region and can be made readily available to their own students.

84

Cooperation in experimentation

Educational experiments often take place on a single campus. They are rarely studied or evaluated by other colleges or universities that stand to profit from knowing about them.

Interinstitutional cooperation in educational experimentation ought to become more common. It is possible for a group of institutions to plan specific educational reforms jointly, to try out variants of these on individual campuses, to monitor these experiments, and to learn from them.

These experiments would then be the common concern of all the institutions involved. Each would have invested funds and manpower resources. Each would have an inter-

est in incorporating into its own programs the results achieved.

85

Primary, secondary education

The primary and secondary schools of the country, responsible for the education of the young during what is incontestably the most formative periods of their lives, bear a heavy instructional and social burden. Many colleges and universities have been generally unimaginative in considering how they might cooperate with these schools, to the advantage both of students and institutions.

It is time that more universities accepted a responsibility in this matter, and did not locate it solely in their professional schools of education.

This is an important need which cannot be satisfied by traditional methods.

The colleges and universities stand to gain immensely from new kinds of cooperation with schools, and they ought to arrange for them. The task will be difficult, often frustrating. It will call for political, organizational, as well as intellectual skills.

Any tendency towards paternalism by institutions of higher education with regard to schools needs to be strenuously resisted.

RUSSIA NEARS DOMINATION OF MIDDLE EAST

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, as I have repeatedly stressed, there is a need for the United States to maintain a balance of power in the Middle East. We may be the only nation that Israel can depend upon in her struggle to remain free.

In the November 1970, issue of Navy magazine there appeared an article by Dr. Alvin J. Cottrell, director of research for the Georgetown University Center of Strategic and International Studies. Dr. Cottrell affirms that the gradual deterioration of U.S. naval power is the prime reason for Russian domination in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this article for the perusal of my colleagues at this point:

RUSSIA NEARS DOMINATION OF MIDDLE EAST—FROM MOROCCO TO INDIAN SUBCONTINENT

(By Alvin Cottrell)

Although the Middle East has occupied the headlines in past months, indeed years, it is only recently that the broad picture of Russian aims there has become quite clear. The fact that these aims—and actions—sharply conflict with American policies, that the current U.S. world difficulties are directly tied to our deteriorating naval power—while Russia's power has grown vastly—is either misunderstood or ignored by many of our people and leaders.

Years of neglect in replacing the largely World War II-built U.S. Fleet and today's extensive mothballing of warships, coupled with long American emphasis on a land-based military strategy, have left us in a very serious situation. Russia is on the verge of true domination of the entire Mideast, possibly the whole Mediterranean and beyond that the entire vast and vital area East of Suez.

We should view this prospect with great alarm for several reasons. The immediate Mideast is the crossroads of three continents, Europe, Asia and Africa. Its center is the Suez Canal, of which much more later, and its oil riches, without which Western Europe would almost grind to a halt, are now being threatened by the Russian bear.

The Soviets still are denied their greatest objective, the opening of the Suez Canal, by the Israeli occupation of its east bank. It is the key to most of their immediate and long time objectives in the wider stretches of what is called the Mideast, plus the broad Indian Ocean and the countries washed by its waters.

While the broad spectrum of Soviet aims and action will be developed below, here are some recent, significant developments.

SOVIETS OCCUPY SOCOTRA

Russian Marines have taken possession of Socotra, key island and potential base near the southern end of the Red Sea, an event of major importance.

Turkey reportedly has been ignoring Soviet violations of the Montreux Treaty governing the use of its strategic straits.

Old Western allies, not only Turkey but also Iran and others, are now "hedging their bets" because the United States no longer seems to them an entirely creditable protector.

It all adds up to an impending shift in the world balance of power, and possible new confrontation of the two super-nations, in which the United States may hold the losing cards.

Soviet Naval activity in the Middle East and Indian Ocean is proceeding at a vigorous pace at a time when the Nixon Administration is seeking to lower its military silhouette abroad by reducing U.S. commitments. It may be that the Soviets are simply testing American resolve and that we are seeing the kind of policy that they believe can be safely implemented under the umbrella of strategic nuclear parity with the United States—or the superiority towards which they seem clearly to be aiming. However, testing aside, the Soviets do have very real—imperialistic is the only word—interests in the Middle East which they are striving constantly to achieve.

Practically everyone with any recollection of Russian history has heard of Russia's longing for warm water access to the world's open seas. Such ambitions long antedate Soviet Russia. In fact, Russia has always had access to the open seas, but did not have the military and naval power and hence the political leverage to gain control of the Turkish Straits and take advantage of it. This is now being altered by the Western retreat and Soviet pragmatism—as well as an active Russian shipbuilding program that has created a large, perhaps soon the world's largest, and certainly today the most modern navy.

IMPORTANCE OF SUEZ CANAL

To be fully understood, it is necessary to view the Mediterranean-Middle Eastern involvement of the Russians as only a part of a global policy which also includes the vast Indian Ocean. This is especially true in order to grasp why Russia has poured so much into Egypt. It is she who would control a reopened Suez Canal, a matter of vast importance.

Although the canal is of decreasing importance to the West just the converse is true for the Soviets. With the canal reopened the long voyage around the Cape of Good Hope or from Vladivostok would be eliminated. With this strategic short-cut it would be much easier to maintain, with their Black Sea—Mediterranean Fleet, a naval presence in support of their interest in the Indian subcontinent and to further their goals in the oil-rich Persian Gulf which is one of the two arms of the Indian Ocean; the Red Sea is the other. The Soviet's plan in the area is maintenance of a level of forces at least equal to those of the West from Morocco to the Indian Ocean—to eventually replace the West. At the same time they are moving against the West (for this is a double edged policy), they would prevent the Chinese Communists from effectively asserting their influence in the riparian states of Africa, the Arabian Peninsula and South Asia, as well as completing the encirclement of Communist China by linking the Soviet's Pacific and Atlantic naval forces.

It is not widely known but the term Middle East was invented by the distinguished American naval historian, Alfred Thayer Mahan. Mahan, writing in 1902 in a London journal, was endeavoring to define the area between the Arabian Peninsula and the sub-continent of India and as seen by a naval strategist such as Mahan the Persian Gulf was located at approximately the center. In order to differentiate this area from what had always been known as the Near East, i.e., the eastern Mediterranean area which included the corner of Turkey, the Levant, and the Egyptian-Red Sea area, he referred to this region as the Middle East. The term Middle East was adopted by The Times of London and it soon gained wide acceptance and passed into official usage by the British Government and much of the world.

WIDER MIDEAST

It is worth discussing this little historical event, because if one considers Soviet objectives in the area today, it must be borne in mind that Soviet objectives encompass much more than the boundaries of Mahan's original Middle East. The Middle East today, in its very widest context, can be said to extend from Morocco on the Atlantic Ocean to Pakistan on the Indian sub-continent and as far north as the Moslem areas of Russia and as far south into Africa as the Sudan.

In attempting to achieve its objectives in the Indian Ocean, Russia has adopted a policy much like that which is proving so successful in changing the balance in the Mediterranean-Middle East area. Namely, moving in at any point the Western nations seem disinclined to defend.

The USSR, long tied to a land power concept of military policy, now sees what Britain and other Western powers recognized long ago, but apparently no longer believe or feel they can maintain, that the most politically acceptable strategy at home and abroad is a maritime doctrine. Although little publicized, the Soviet military intervention (actually getting troops and technicians involved on land) in support of the Arab cause, like the U.S. effort in Viet Nam, is unpopular at home. Their large-scale military occupation in Eastern Europe has required two massive interventions which have produced political repercussions at home and abroad.

President Nixon has stressed both before and during his recent trip to Europe and the Mediterranean the fact that the United States is a sea power—and also that Russia is a land power. This statement, once true, can be changing as Russia outbuilds us on the seas. It is the United States which is bogged down militarily on land overseas and the Soviet Union which, despite its presence in Eastern Europe and Egypt, is rapidly moving toward being the leading maritime power in the world if we do not act swiftly.

More than words and the theoretical acceptance of such a strategy is necessary if the United States really desires to implement a dominant naval presence. For in the important areas of ships and hardware required to promote a naval-diplomatic strategy, the United States is rapidly falling behind. It is well and good to speak as the President did of reinforcing the Sixth Fleet, but increasingly this is becoming more and more difficult—if not impossible—and only temporarily so far. The reserve forces necessary for meeting sustained operations, as opposed to a marginal contingency, are

rapidly declining. It is not only the Soviets, as often suggested, who in the future will necessarily prevent the United States from doing what was executed—even then with some strain—so beautifully in the Lebanon crisis in 1958. Rather it will be the reality of the inadequacy of the U.S. naval capabilities to meet the need.

Many observers have missed the point due largely to Russia's high profile military and political commitment in Egypt, and their own preoccupation with the Arab-Israeli conflict, that Soviet objectives obviously extend far beyond the eastern basin of the Mediterranean. Indeed, it can be said that to a very large extent the Soviets are in Egypt and are committed so heavily in the Suez Canal area largely *because* of their wider interests. Their *prime* interest, namely reopening the Suez Canal, can only be achieved through control of Egypt—hence the UAR venture.

It should be made clear that the greatest loss suffered by the Soviets when their Arab clients were defeated in 1967 was the closure of the Canal. Had it stayed open and with the former large British naval base at Aden at their disposal, the Soviet Navy could easily have established their supremacy in the Red Sea and exerted political pressure designed to bring about a reorientation or replacement of regimes on both sides. The British evacuated Aden in 1967. Russia then could have, just as Britain did before, exert influence on eastern Arabia and in the Persian Gulf area. This is much more difficult with the Canal closed. Soviet support for the U.S. initiated ceasefire along the Canal was undoubtedly largely due to their belief that they will be able to have it reopened as part of the negotiation. It is significant that the opening of the Suez Canal has always been a key point in all Soviet proposals for a Middle East settlement. Evidence that this was indeed a high priority objective is clear from the fact that the Soviets, while still endeavoring to get the Canal open, have already established an Indian Ocean presence largely around the island of Socotra—500 miles east of Aden.

SOVIETS IN INDIAN OCEAN

The Soviets have also acquired facilities, for the use of their trawlers, on the former British territory of Mauritius which received its independence in 1968. Its strategic value comes from its location astride the main shipping lanes around the Cape of Good Hope in the ocean 500 miles east of Madagascar. Soviet supply ships already call there frequently for fuel and supplies for their naval vessels in the Indian Ocean. They also have established anchorages near the British Seychelles Islands, where they stop for replenishment, just as they do in the Mediterranean of Malta and the Greek islands. The Seychelles are located about 400 miles off the coast of Kenya and also along the main shipping lanes coming around the Cape and on the route to South Asia.

Soviet marines have been landed on barren former British Crown Colony of Socotra which now belongs to Aden. They have taken over the island and the landing forces there is a departure from long standing policy—in contrast to the United States—of not "garrisoning" forces overseas.

The island is an excellent command post and base for the Soviets' increasing focus on the Indian Ocean. It is 70 miles long and 20 miles wide, and has three airstrips, each of which can be extended to accommodate the most modern jet aircraft. Although there is no natural harbor, the waters around the island are deep enough for the development of an artificial port. The island is also being used as a training base for acclimatizing Soviet forces for tropical areas such as the Persian Gulf. As the London Economist (Sept. 5) observes: "The Russian admirals, cautious, conservative men that they are, have been steadily testing the capacity of their ships and crews to operate for weeks and sometimes months in tropical conditions."

These ambitions in the Persian Gulf-Indian Ocean should come as no surprise to any informed reader of modern European history, since the Soviet interests in the area were established in secret protocols between Germany and Russia in 1940. One of the secret protocols which grew out of the Ribbentrop-Molotov discussion in November 1940 reads, "the Soviet Union declares that its territorial aspirations center south of the national territory of the Soviet Union in the direction of the Indian Ocean." Captured documents from the Nazi German Foreign Office state that following this agreement, Molotov informed the German Ambassador to Russia that "the area south of Batum and Baku in the general direction of the Persian Gulf is recognized as the center of aspirations of the Soviet Union."

Egypt was selected by the Soviets to play the principal role in broad Soviet strategy, Canal considerations aside, primarily because of its geographic location and also because it is the largest and, until Nasser's death, certainly the leading Arab state. Nasser's death will in no way diminish Egypt's importance to Russia in a geo-strategic sense.

In the Middle East, as in their past history, the Soviets have opted quantity over quality in allies. That is, Israel although the most technologically advanced country in the area was also one of the smallest, hence, not a desirable ally. In the Soviet eyes, all other questions aside, the many Arab states, despite their own intra-Arab conflicts still comprised the largest area, with the greatest population and thus were the best choice to back.

SOVIET'S HISTORIC DREAM

When their Arab clients, Egypt and Syria, were defeated in the June 1967 war it appeared that the Soviets' decision to support "the biggest battalions" i.e., the Arabs over the Israelis, had failed. However, if one assesses the situation today it is clear that depending on the outcome of their position in Egypt following Nasser's death they are just a short step—the opening of the Suez Canal—away from their historic dream of complete and uninhibited access to the open seas.

One other point often overlooked or underestimated is the Russian willingness to support countries or movements whose philosophy of government may differ from their own. The operative point is whether they can further Russian goals; not whether they are good Soviet-style Communists. This is even extended to cover regimes at odds with one another. While placing primary reliance on the more revolutionary regimes such as Egypt, Syria, Iraq and Algeria, they have also been quite willing to cooperate with Kings and Shaikhs, whenever it was expedient for policy reasons to do so; examples are the Shah of Iran, who has been the arch antagonist of their Egyptian client, and the Shaikh of Kuwait, whose territory is claimed by the Soviet's Iraqi ally.

Clearly, both Turkey and Iran are behaving with their erstwhile arch antagonist in a way which indicates their belief that the Soviets may eventually come to dominate the entire area. The Turks apparently have already been winking at the provisions in the Montreux Convention on the Turkish Straits, i.e., the Bosphorus, the Sea of Marmora and the Dardanelles.

The Montreux Convention requires that submarines transiting the Straits must surface and pass through in daylight. The Convention also states that submarines may only pass through the Straits if they have been built outside the Black Sea and return for purposes of repair if adequate notification is given the Turkish Government. It is implausible that the number of submarines passing through the Straits have required repairs at foreign ports. Reportedly they now are coming through at night.

If Soviet influence becomes dominant in the Mideast, Moscow can be expected to demand—and perhaps get—dual control of the Turkish Straits, as it demanded in 1946 but was thwarted by President Truman and his famed doctrine.

In the event of an acute crisis, it is quite possible the Soviets could overturn the military balance which now favors Iran over Iraq as they appear to be doing in the Israel-Egypt face-off. As in Egypt, supplying Iraq with a highly sophisticated air defense, including Soviet pilots, would, in part, neutralize the now superior Iranian Air Force. They could also cancel the effectiveness of the Iranian Navy with land-based air power from Iraq. In any case, it is certain that the Soviet commitment to Egypt has heightened Iran's fears in regard to Iraq.

The Iranians meanwhile have concluded commercial and military assistance deals with the Soviets as much for political as economic reasons. The Iranian-Soviet military assistance agreement includes over $100 million worth of less sophisticated Soviet military hardware such as small arms, trucks and half-tracks. No advisors are included in this or any agreement, as yet.

Both Turkey and Iran have, in effect, been taking out insurance against the possibility that their powerful historical enemy to the north, who now is in a position to put pressure on both nations from north *and* south, may do so.

Certainly the reorientation of the foreign policy of these two formerly solid Western Allies has been one of the primary aims of Soviet policy. Both nations have developed closer relations with the Soviet Union.

United States policy, due to conflicting treaty obligations, has had an opposite effect on Turkey and Iran. Just a few examples: in 1964, during the Cyprus crisis President Johnson intervened in a way favorable to Greece over Turkey. United States policy in the war between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, produced negative effects when the United States cut off aid to the Shah's friend and ally, Ayub Khan, then President of Pakistan, and at the same time prevented the Iranian government from using military equipment provided under the CENTO treaty to aid Pakistan.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S COMMENT

Feeding this mounting Soviet influence is the growing Soviet presence to the south of them; primarily in terms of naval power, but also in the form of a large military "advisory" presence in Iraq and Egypt. The Soviets now have as many "advisors" in Egypt alone as the United States had in Viet Nam when President Kennedy was assassinated, and the Iranians are watching with much concern the large and growing Soviet advisory group in Iraq. The rationale for Turkish and Iranian policy is simply that given the growing Soviet military strength in the area and no obvious intention on the part of the United States to firmly commit itself to a military policy in that part of the world, they cannot count on the United States in a showdown with either the USSR or their Arab allies.

Mr. Nixon's recent visit to the Mediterranean in which he reaffirmed U.S. interests in the area and made statements to the effect that the United States Sixth Fleet would be strengthened will not necessarily alter their attitudes. These countries are aware of the declining quality and quantity of the United States Navy—particularly in the form of such surface vessels as destroyers and cruisers—and it will require more than a Presidential pronouncement and visit to the Sixth Fleet, however useful, to convince them that the United States is determined to formulate and implement a policy for countering the Soviets in the area.

There have been unflattering remarks with regard to the inferiority of U.S. naval capabilities in the area from both Iran and Turkey. In this regard, the recent debate

over the bases in Spain, particularly the Rota Naval Base, was not helpful. All nations in the area have been watching for any sign that the United States might evacuate Rota, which is, beyond its great importance as a base for Polaris submarines and surface ships, the symbol of U.S. naval power in the whole Mediterranean area even though the base is on the Atlantic side of Gibraltar. This could prove the final blow to American credibility in the area.

From this same psychological point-of-view the recent suggestion, by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, that the military benefit of the U.S. Fleets making stops in Turkey is of questionable value, is disturbing. There are considerations greater than economy. Not to "show the flag" in these critical times in this "low profile" way would be a grave error.

As Hanson Baldwin correctly points out in his new book, Strategy for Tomorrow. "The Southern shores of the Mediterranean, which once protected NATO's southern flank, have bene largely neutralized or lost. And the Northern shores, from Turkey to Spain, are threatened."'

SOVIET PORT VISITS

Soviet naval visits to Mediterranean parts, particularly in the eastern Mediterranean have increased while the ability of the United States to usefully visit these ports in the area has declined. The Soviets in the Mediterranean visit ports in Yugoslavia, Syria, Egypt, Algeria and Morocco. The United States can expect only relative enthusiasm for naval visits at Italian and Greek ports. The last visit of the Sixth Fleet to the Turkish port of Izmir was marred by a left-wing demonstration and plot which apparently had as one of its objectives the killing of at least one U.S. seaman. All ports of the area have been increasingly denied, or made more difficult, to the U.S. Navy.

This itself is an important indication of the changed political environment in the area. Any abandonment of the Rota base would increase the Soviet ability to use ports or even acquire bases if it so desired, i.e., their ability to visit ports or bases is likely to increase in direct proportion to the decline of our presence.

With the British decision to withdraw East of Suez by the end of 1971 the Soviets will have a golden opportunity to fill the vacuum from Aden to Singapore.

CALLEY TRIAL

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, with some reluctance, I would like to comment on the trial and conviction of Lt. William Calley for the murder of Vietnamese civilians at Mylai 3 years ago.

I comment with reluctance, for I do not believe that any public official has the right, legally or morally, to attempt to influence the outcome of a judicial matter that is still in progress. Lieutenant Calley has been found guilty, and his attorneys are utilizing the normal appellate rights to which every American is entitled. I have no right, and no desire, to interfere with these processes, nor to judge Lieutenant Calley's guilt or innocence.

I am speaking out, however, since the President of the United States, the highest elected official of our Nation, has seen fit to violate these very basic judicial precepts.

Commenting on the Mylai incident in December 1969, the President described it as "what appears to be a massacre" and declared that "under no circumstances was it justified." He also pledged that he would "do everything that I possibly can to see that all the facts in this incident are brought to light and that those who are charged, if they are found guilty, are punished."

These were noble words, and obviously in accord with the thinking of most Americans at the time, who had been shocked and horrified at the unfolding picture of the Mylai tragedy.

But then came the conviction of Lieutenant Calley and his sentence to life imprisonment. Predictably, the fickle wind of public opinion changed. All the built-up frustration and horror was poured into an overwhelming feeling of sorrow and pity for the Lieutenant. A flood of mail and telegrams to the White House and to Congressional offices defended Calley and called for his release.

The President apparently changed his position. He ordered Calley released from confinement, made him a prisoner at large, promised a personal review of the case, and there were even hints of an eventual pardon.

What changed his mind? Does he have access to evidence and facts that were withheld from the jury and from the public? Or was he merely "playing politics," and shifting with the wind of public opinion?

Mr. Speaker, I emphasize again that I do not intend to make any comment on Calley's guilt or innocence, or on what the ultimate disposition of his case may be. As an attorney, a former member of the Air Force Judge Advocate's Corps, and a Member of the U.S. Congress, I am perfectly willing to let the matter be handled through the usual processes of law.

Lieutenant Calley has been found guilty by a jury of his peers, six combat veterans who agonized for 13 days over a case that has brought shame upon their country and their Army. Theirs was not an easy task, and they deserve the praise of their fellow Americans for carrying it out with dignity and fairness. Their decision and the sentence will be reviewed, will be considered by the Military Court of Appeals, and could even come before the U.S. Supreme Court.

No elected official, and indeed no one in the world, has any right to intervene in this orderly progression through the due process of law.

Since the President, however, has chosen to interfere, where does he propose to draw the line? What about the more than 60 other American servicemen who have been convicted of murdering South Vietnamese civilians? Should they too be released from confinement and allowed to live in barracks while their cases are reviewed and appealed? What about those convicted and sentenced for lesser crimes of rape, robbery, or assault?

And what about the 1,600 or more Americans who are being held prisoner in Vietnam? What is their situation and their future if responsible Americans take the position that our soldiers should not be punished for murdering their prisoners—even women and children?

I certainly share with all Americans the feelings of confusion, of sorrow, and even of guilt that the tragedy of Mylai has created. With other Americans, I am even more convinced of this Nation's great error in becoming involved in the internal affairs of Vietnam, and of the need for ending our involvement there with all possible speed.

But we cannot rewrite history. What has been done has been done. Let us hope that we as Americans and as human beings can profit from the bitter lessons that have been thrust upon us.

Mr. Speaker, let us here in the Congress avoid the temptation to play politics with the tragic story of Mylai and Lieutenant Calley. Let us instead bend our energies to the task of bringing all our boys home, and making certain that there are no more Mylais and Lieutenant Calleys in our future.

A NEW APPROACH TO JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, Americans should be appalled by the latest statistics on juvenile crime. The upward trend in delinquency rates which began in 1962 continues. Between 1968 and 1969 the number of juvenile cases handled by U.S. courts rose 10 percent. During the same period, the population of young people increased by only 2 percent.

Youths are also becoming increasingly involved in serious crimes, and they have a disproportionate share of all arrests. Even though individuals under the age of 18 comprise less than 20 percent of the population, they account for nearly 32 percent of criminal offenses solved. The sad fact is that juveniles account for one-third of the entire crime problem.

Such facts are particularly distressing because for most of these young people their criminal act represents only the beginning of a career of lawlessness—a life at odds with society. Within 5 years, over 72 precent will be arrested again.

Something is clearly wrong, and it is obvious that all of our present efforts have not reversed present trends.

The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training identified two major causes of the ineffectiveness of our attempts to deal with criminal activity.

First, the Commission found that correction today is characterized by an overlapping of jurisdictions, a diversity of philosophies, and a hodge-podge of organizational structures which have little contact with one another.

Second, lacking consistent guidelines and the means to test program effectiveness, legislators continue to pass laws, executives mandate policies, and both cause large sums of money to be spent on ineffective correctional methods.

In short, we are doing many of the wrong or ineffective things to combat

juvenile crime at tremendous costs to the taxpayer.

President Nixon recently exhorted the States and local jurisdictions to undertake innovative programs to deal with those who have run afoul of the laws.

During the 91st Congress a number of Congressmen and Senators introduced legislation to establish an Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. Hearings were held by a subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, but final action was not completed before adjournment. Therefore, identical bills have again been introduced in both bodies of Congress, and I am hopeful the legislation will be enacted as quickly as possible.

Briefly stated, the bill I am today cosponsoring designates an Institute to serve as a coordinating center for all information about juvenile delinquency. Patterned after the FBI Academy, the institute also will train persons connected with the control and treatment of juvenile offenders.

The two-pronged approach embodied in the Institute for Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice could make a difference, and I am proud to join in this effort. If such an effort is not soon made to reverse the skyrocketing rate of juvenile delinquency, we will accept for many of our children the immense burden of destructive and wasted lives.

ACCREDITATION GIVEN TO BETHEL COLLEGE IN INDIANA

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, Bethel College, located in Mishawaka, Ind., was granted full membership in the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Thus Bethel joins nearly 600 fully accredited institutions of higher learning in the 19-State area covered by NCA.

I wish to offer my congratulations to the entire Bethel College community, and in particular to President Ray P. Pannabecker who has worked long and hard to bring the college where it is today. It is truly a fine institution.

Last Thursday, a convocation was held at Bethel to celebrate the college's new status. I include two news clippings, the first from the South Bend Tribune of April 3, 1971, and the second from the Goshen News of the same date, highlighting the events of last week.

STAMP OF APPROVAL

There is jubilation on the campus of Bethel College, and for very good reason, indeed.

The college has been granted full membership in the North Central Assn. of Colleges and Secondary Schools, which means that the school is now fully accredited as an institution of higher learning.

It has passed all tests with distinction.

Dr. Ray Pannabecker, president of the liberal arts college, summed up the importance of the accreditation succinctly:

"No longer will questions be raised about the value of credits for transfer. Certain job opportunities in high school teaching and social work will now be open without reservation."

Characteristically, Dr. Pannabecker pledged the college to a continuing effort to supply the "highest quality of education in a Christian atmosphere."

Bethel was founded in 1947 and has experienced steady growth. Current enrollment is about 500. It is operating in the black. The accreditation marks the attainment of another significant goal. It is, as Dr. Pannabecker said, the "stamp of approval" which has been actively sought since Bethel was granted candidate status in the association in 1966.

Congratulations are in order.

BETHEL COLLEGE CELEBRATES ACCREDITATION BY NORTH CENTRAL

A convocation was conducted Thursday at Bethel College to celebrate the Mishawaka school's accreditation by the North Central Association.

The NCA accreditation, announced Wednesday in Chicago, for the college now in its 24th year, came some five years after application had been made. The school was granted candidate status with the association in 1966, indicating that it was in a position to make serious efforts toward meeting the standards of the accrediting group.

President Ray P. Pannabecker and Dean Wayne J. Gerber met with NCA officials in Chicago a final time on Sunday prior to the Wednesday decision. They along with Ancel Whittle of Goshen, a member of the board of directors, and others participated in the Thursday convocation.

In noting that Bethel had now taken its place alongside other accredited colleges in the country, Pannabecker said, "no longer will questions be raised about the value of credits for transfer. Certain job opportunities in high school teaching and social work will now be open without reservation.

"Armed with this encouragement, Bethel College promises to continue its program of furnishing the highest quality of education in a Christian atmosphere," Pannabecker concluded.

SUPPORT BETHEL

Among the denominational churches that support Bethel College are the Bethel Missionary Church, Route 3, Goshen, pastored by the Rev. Ronald Phipps; the Brenneman Memorial Missionary Church, 423 East Jefferson Street, pastored by the Rev. G. G. Waun; and the Sunnyfield Missionary Church, 2004 Bashor Road, pastored by the Rev. Arnold Dietz; and the Ligonier Missionary Church, pastored by the Rev. Devon Stump.

Goshen residents attending the school include Beverly Blosser, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Blosser, Route 5; Roland Bowen, son of Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Bowen, 505 North Sixth Street; Richard Gates, son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Gates, Route 5; Arthur Heemer, son of Mr. and Mrs. Basel Heemer, 515 South Main Street; Daniel Hess, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Hess, 712 North Fifth Street; Elizabeth Hochstetler, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Hochstetler, Route 4; James Hoogenboom, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Hoogenboom, 113 West Madison Street; Linda Hostetler, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Dan Hostetler, 4101 South Main Street; Carolyn Maurer, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Devon Maurer, 1500 Lincolnway East; Marlen Miller, Route 4.

Linda Nettrouer, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Nettrouer, Route 1; Tim Riley, son of Mr. and Mrs. William Riley, Route 1; Karen Smith, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Smith, 902 North Fifth Street; Brenda Stump, Route 5; Donna Vannoster, 101 Greenway Drive; Alison Waun, 411 East Jefferson Street; and Gregory Widner, 201 North Indiana Avenue.

TWO TALES OF RED CHINA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations this fall will again consider the issue of admitting Red China to the halls of the largest international body. With the recognition of the Red Chinese by several nations recently, chances are now more favorable that the world's "peace" organization will accept one of the most brutal and blood-stained regimes in recorded history. Since 1949 when mainland China fell under the heel of the Chinese Reds, volumes of testimony from victims and eyewitnesses of Red Chinese brutality have amply recorded the unbelievable savagery visited upon the Chinese and Tibetan people, not to mention American POW's during the Korean war. In the 1950's missionaries of various religious faiths told their tales of abuse at the hands of their Red captors.

Today, unfortunately, although this same Red regime continues in power, far too little information is made public concerning this slave state in a so-called civilized world. Teenagers and young adults whose beginning awareness postdated the early 1950's, for the most part, cannot be faulted for viewing Red China in a more favorable light than would older, more knowledgeable sources.

The violent and revolutionary Black Panther Party, for instance, supports the present Red Chinese regime and has been guided by "Chairman Mao's Quotations." The March 16, 1969, issue of the Black Panther, the Panther publication, advertises the "Writings of Mao Tse-tung" and directs its readers to China books and periodicals in San Francisco where this item can be obtained. The March 16, 1968, issue of the Panther publication quotes Mao as saying:

War is the highest form of struggle for resolving contradictions, when they have developed to a certain stage, between classes, nations, states, or political groups, and it has existed ever since the emergence of private property and of classes.

The case of the Black Panther Party is a timely and extremely important example of how American youth are propagandized with a view to recruitment by a revolutionary group using the brutal Red Chinese leaders as a model.

Another statement, this time by Black Panther leader Huey Newton, further illustrates the influence that Mao Tse-tung has had on the Panther philosophy. In the "Message from Huey" to the Panther benefit rally on February 16, 1969, the Panther leader made the following statement which he attributed to Mao:

In the near future a colossal event will occur where the masses of the people will rise up like a mighty storm and a hurricane, sweeping all evil gentry and corrupt officials into their graves.

Regarding this statement, Newton commented:

Brother Mao put that quite well. We will follow the pattern and follow the thoughts of Chairman Mao.

Another example of pro-Mao propaganda appeared in the New York Times of February 20, 1971, in the form of an article by Robert F. Williams. The Times identified Williams in this manner:

Robert F. Williams, indicted in North Carolina on charges of insurrection, fled the country and spent some years in Peking. He is now at the Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan.

Here are pertinent facts on Williams which the New York Times neglected to bring out.

Williams became involved in a violent racial demonstration in his hometown of Monroe, N.C., in August 1961. He, along with others, seized a couple and held them as hostages. When the police attempted to free the hostages, as Williams called them, Williams and his family fled the country and later turned up in Cuba. He was charged with kidnaping and the FBI issued a "Wanted" poster reading:

Williams allegedly has possessed a large quantity of firearms including a .45 caliber pistol which he carries in his car. He has previously been diagnosed as schizophrenic and has advocated and threatened violence. Williams should be considered armed and extremely dangerous.

From Cuba and later Red China Williams published a monthly newsletter, the Crusader, in which he advanced a completely new concept of guerrilla warfare. He applied traditional guerrilla warfare tactics to urban areas, particularly those which are densely populated. Here are excerpts from the February 1964, issue of the Crusader:

The old method of guerrilla warfare, as carried out from the hills and countryside, would be ineffective in a powerful country like the USA. Any such force would be wiped out in an hour. The new concept is to huddle as close to the enemy as possible so as to neutralize his modern and fierce weapons . . . It sustains a state of confusion and destruction of property. It dislocates the organs of harmony and order and reduces central power to the level of a helpless, sprawling, octopus. During the hours of day sporadic rioting takes place and massive sniping. Night brings all out warfare, organized fighting and unlimited terror against the oppressor and his forces.

Williams is more specific in the May–June 1964, issue of the Crusader:

The weapons of defense employed by Afro-american freedom fighters must consist of a poor man's arsenal. Gasoline fire bombs (Molotov cocktails, lye or acid bombs . . . can be used extensively. During the night hours such weapons, thrown from roof tops, will make the streets impossible (sic) for racist cops to patrol. Hand grenades, bazookas, lights (sic mortars, rocket launchers, machine guns and ammunition can be bought clandestinely from servicemen, anxious to make a fast dollar. Freedom fighters in military camps can be contacted to give instructions on usage.

Also in 1964 Williams openly admitted his role in the formation and continuation of the Revolutionary Action Movement—RAM. Two members of a RAM "front," the Black Liberation Front, were apprehended while plotting to blow up the Statue of Liberty and the Washington Monument.

Other cases in which RAM members figured prominently included a charge of conspiring to murder Roy Wilkins, the executive director of the NAACP and Whitney Young, the late executive director of the National Urban League.

In September 1967, Philadelphia law authorities charged certain members of RAM with solicitation to murder and to commit arson, conspiracy, carrying bombs and explosives, felonious possession of explosives, attempted murder, and conspiracy to commit riotous destruction of property.

It would belabor the point to further list groups or personalities in this country who actively work to recruit unsuspecting prospects to further their revolutionary ends while extolling Mao Tse-tung and Red China as a model to be emulated. Suffice it to say, that there exist in this Nation certain elements who are a real danger to our internal security and who paint Red China as the coming paradise. The article mentioned above by Robert Williams and carried by the New York Times on February 20, 1971, is a prime example of their work.

To counter such efforts to delude and defraud American citizens into working for a Communist paradise by means of insurrection and anarchy here at home the House Committee on Internal Security began hearings last year on the theory and practice of communism, which hearings are being continued this year.

Among those who have testified before the committee as defectors from various Communist countries was Prof. Ma Szu-Tsung—Sitson—who fled from China in 1967, where he held, among other officers, the directorship of the Central Conservatory of Music in Peking. His comments about various aspects of life in Red China give the lie to Robert Williams' attempt in his New York Times article to paint a rosy picture about life in Red China. The professor's account of unbelievable oppression in that unfortunate land should engender second thoughts in those who might look toward extremist groups in the United States to correct social ills, real or imagined. Conditions in Red China concerning basic rights enjoyed here in the United States in the areas of free speech, religion, education, labor, voting, and so forth, are such that the term "slave state" is a pitifully inadequate description.

I insert at this point the above-mentioned New York Times article of February 20, 1971, by Robert F. Williams, now fighting extradition to North Carolina on the charge of kidnapping, and the prepared statement of Prof. Ma Szu-Tsung, nationally known in Red China as a concert violinist and a native of that country, who testified before the House Committee on Internal Security on March 25 of this year:

ON THE PLATFORM WITH MAO TSE-TUNG

(By Robert F. Williams)

ANN ARBOR, MICH.—As an N.A.A.C.P. official forced to flee the South in 1961, I had not the slightest concept of the magnitude of the forces that would hew my destiny.

As a "fugitive" my travels included Cuba, China, Vietnam, Tanzania and a number of other countries. Of all these, the People's Republic of China left the greatest imprint upon my life. China impressed me as a variety of worlds with a variety of people bound by profound human qualities, some of which the Western world must cultivate if it is to survive. I think that the greatest human qualities being manifested in China today are those of morality and selflessness.

The collective Chinese spirit is a powerful productive force. It is incredible how it is transforming the face of China. In Inner Mongolia friendly herdsmen and their families assembled in the villages to welcome my wife and me. They gave us a camel ride, told us how their life had improved and asked about the people and traditions in America. In the Korean Autonomous Chou we visited the homes of peasants, dined with them and talked of the state of the world. Local performers staged a special production called "A Night With Robert Williams."

When we visited the mountainous commune of Da jai we saw what could be considered one of the great wonders of the world. It was a stunning example of the Chinese people's spirit in their war against nature and poverty. At Da jai, barren gray mountains had been turned into fertile land, green with bumper crops. Similar feats were being accomplished throughout the regions we visited. Self-sufficiency is the watchword of China.

People, even in the most remote areas, were keen on international affairs. They wanted to know about conditions and attitudes in the United States. They asked when the American people could be counted on to force U.S. leaders to adopt a more peaceful and sane foreign policy. Shortly before I departed from China I received a letter from a student in far-away Sining. It contained fifty yuan. These were the student's savings and he wanted me to use the money to buy literature about China to send to the U.S. so that people here would have a greater understanding of their socialist achievements and aspirations.

Chinese children are reluctant to have foreigners photograph them. After convincing three small boys to hold still for a photo, one asked why I wanted their picture. I said it was to show to children in America who want to know more about them. One replied: "Send us some of their pictures, we don't know what they look like either."

I was invited to speak to a National Day gathering of two and a half million, as a representative of the American people. No form of censorship was invoked though Mao Tse-tung was to stand at my side.

On May Day of 1969 Mao Tse-tung stopped to ask me where I had been because he had not seen me in quite a while. I explained that I had been in Africa. Though he had previously autographed, a copy of his little red book, I asked that now he and Lin Piao were together, both autograph a copy for me. He smiled, signed and turned to Lin Piao urging him to "sign Williams' book."

The night before our departure from China Premier Chou En-lai had a two and one half hour farewell session with us in the Great Hall of the People. Premier Chou wanted to know if I had enough trust in the U.S. to return home without fear of being killed, imprisoned or isolated from my people. I explained that it was not trust in the Government, but in the fact of changed conditions. I felt that logically the Government would be more interested in what I had to say than in killing or imprisoning me on a racist frame-up. It is now obvious that he had a better understanding of Washington's attitude than I did. He said, at any rate, at home I could work for better understanding between the Chinese and American peoples. He walked us to the car, we warmly embraced and we left him standing on the steps of the Great Hall waving as we disappeared.

I left China with a new life quality and style, believing in the necessity of a selfless man if humanity is to survive. China is not a fearful dragon of plunder requiring isolation and quarantine. She is a plodding dragon making her way toward the top of humanity and she warrants understanding and recognition.

STATEMENT OF PROF. MA SZU-TSUNG (SITSON)

I was born on March 21, 1912 (Chinese lunar calendar. Actually it is May 7) in Canton, China and presently reside in Philadelphia, Pa. I now use the surname Sitson, which is the anglicized version of my name. I held the following offices in communist China: Director of the Central Conservatory of Music in Peking; Vice Chairman of the All-China Union of Art and Literature; Vice Chairman of the All-China Union of Musical Workers; Member of the Sino-Soviet Friendship Association; Member of Chinese-Indonesian Friendship Association; Member of China-Latin American Friendship Association; Vice President of the Chinese-East Germany Friendship Association. I was also a Deputy at the National People's Congress. I graduated from the Music Conservatory in Paris, France, in 1930.

My wife, my son, my daughter and I escaped from Red China in January, 1967 and came to the United States. The main reason for leaving mainland Ch'na was to survive the so-called "Cultural Revolution", the aim of which is to destroy anything in opposition to the new slavery regime that the Mao-Lin clique is going to build up in modern China. During those months of the "Cultural Revolution" before our escape, the reign of terror was complete. But even before that, people under Mao's regime lived in a world of fear, especially during each "movement". There were so many "movements" during the 17 years I lived in mainland China. There were: The Land Reform, 1949; The Repression of Counter Revolutionaries, 1950; The Rectification of Thinking of the Intellectuals, 1951; The Three-Anti and the Five-Anti, 1952; The Liquidation of Hu Feng's Anti-Parti Bloc, 1955; The Hundred Flowers and the Anti-Rightist Struggle, 1957; The Leap Forward and the Three Red Banners, 1958; then after three years of famine (1960–1963) the 4 purges. These finally were culminated in 1966 by the "Cultural Revolution". People are kept busy with all these "movements". They took about ½ to ⅔ of their working time, even the evenings are filled with those endless "Cheu-Chee" (Learning) meetings, when criticizing, self-criticizing, struggling, confession and sentencing took place. These sessions would end very late at night. The 8 working hours become 10, 12, 14 or even more hours. You feel exhausted and have no more time to think about anything else but sleep. I think it's a good way to keep people quiet.

With each movement, one is more and more aware of the danger of speech, of behavior, and learns to be careful, extremely careful. Each person voluntarily isolates himself from the others for fear of articulating some "bad" thoughts. One lives like a bee in a honeycomb, confined to his own cell by the fear of being denounced by someone for something.

With the advent of the Red Guards all the intellectual groups in China came under sharp attack; actors, musicians; artists; dancers; all of the cultural groups for which China had been noted came under attack as non-productive elements of society. The treatment of all of these persons at the hands of the Red Guards, many of whom had been former students, was too horrible to think about. Actors were disfigured, dancers were crippled, musicians had their hands damaged.

China under Mao Tse-tung has had many programs which were difficult to understand. The "Great Leap Forward" which was a national disaster. "The Hundred Flower Movement" was a trick and ended with the anti-rightist movement which sent many innocent people to their death in labor camps, and the "Cultural Revolution" was the most devastating. The constant change and threat to any free expression of ideas was more than one could stand. Because of the many official positions which I occupied as a musician and well known composer in China I perhaps was spared much of the suffering that was visited upon the average Chinese citizen. Even so, the part that I experienced left me a physical wreck and only now, four years after I left China do I feel sufficiently recovered to recapture the quietness of mind which I have long lost. The hatred and suspicion which has become a way of life in China is a terrible thing. China today, is a cult of one person, Mao Tse-tung. He is supposed to be God to all Chinese. Every time you go out of doors you must wear a button with a picture of Chairman Mao on it. On your bicycle you have a small placard on which you must write a quotation of Chairman Mao or some form of praise for Chairman Mao. The only freedom that people have in China today is the freedom to praise Chairman Mao, (as it is emphatically put in the new Constitution). I have been to Russia six times. I was there in 1949, in 1951, 1955, 1957, 1958 and 1962 as delegate or as member of the jury to the music competition in the Soviet Union, Poland and Czechoslovakia. I can tell you this, conditions in Russia, Poland and Czechoslovakia are much, much better than they are today in Red China. I have traveled all over China. I gave concerts until my last one in 1962. I was privileged to be able to tour nearly all of the furthest provinces.

The factory worker, for example, could also travel if he had the money and the time, however, he has neither. The farmers on the other hand are tied to their commune. They are treated like cattle, and probably live and die without ever having left their commune, except for a party display or two during their lives. The Chinese have lived under so much cruelty and sorrow for so many years that they have become adaptable to much of this. Life in China has varied considerably since the end of World War II. However, until 1957 most of the people had enough to eat and a place to live. After 1958 it began to change. After Mao's "Great Leap Forward" it became very difficult. By the end of 1958 we had to line up a whole night to buy meat. From 1960 to 1963 there were three years of famine. During that period the state control over people relaxed a little and we had more freedom. I can say that we were even more happy with our empty stomach. In the communes thousands and thousands of people starved to death. Each village and each commune, was supposed to pledge a certain percentage of their production to the state. Many commune leaders became carried away with trying to outdo one another and pledged more food than they could provide. This left the people with nothing at all, and they died. From 1963 on, the control of the state became more and more severe. They used personnel from the Army as models. The slogan was: First we don't fear hardships. Secondly, we don't fear death!! Everyone was encouraged to follow their example. Those who died trying to work for the state were hailed as heroes. Because of my position at this time, I perhaps did not suffer as did most of the citizens. I recall one time in 1960, my family and I went out to a restaurant. The bill for our family came to $80.00 which for most people was more than one month's pay. Because of the shortage of food the black market grew up whereby farmers and others who had small plots of land would grow some items for sale. Eggs sold on the black market for $2.00 each. I recall I once bought a pound of peanuts for $6.00. If the eggs could have been bought in the store they would only have cost $.10 each. During this period of time cabbage was plentiful however, it cost about $2.00 to $3.00 for a hundred pounds. People dried it and stored it away for future use. Most of the food was locally produced in China. The only import that we saw during this time was wheat from Canada. Food continues to be in short supply in China.

The problem of education in China has been one of long duration. Today, children in China go to school through the first six grades. If you must work, however, because of your family situation, I think that you can be excused. A person who is free to attend school can complete up through high school or twelve grades and also go on to the University provided he has a good political background. By good political background I mean that you must be from the family of workers, military or poor farmers. The children from the family of a former land owner or one deemed to be an enemy of the state can never go to the University. The only charges for the children attending school are their food and clothing. All the rest of the expenses are paid by the state. In the Conservatory of Music where I was director, most of the students were the children of intellectuals. These students were hand-picked from all over China to attend the Conservatory to study music. We looked for those individuals with the most musical talent. At one time the Conservatory was criticized because they only had students from a bourgeois background and had shut the doors to children of soldiers, workers, and farmers. A musician in China today has no problem finding a job. There are not too many musicians in China and the Government will, of course, assign the job. When a student graduates from the Conservatory usually the school assigns him to work somewhere. The job may not be of his own choosing, however, he will have a place to work as a teacher or he may play in an orchestra somewhere, or he may even go into the Army and work in a band. Usually the Ministries of Education or Culture decide the future of a graduate student. A student can write down his choice of an assignment but he is sent where he is needed. This is true of any occupation. If you decide not to go to that assignment then you are in great trouble. You are jobless and become a "Society Youth". It means "society parasite". Those who show outstanding talent are frequently sent to the Soviet Union to compete in music competition. Frequently they went to Russia several years ahead of time in order to study with better teachers.

Communist China has a constitution, it stresses the rights of the citizens such as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom to assemble, freedom to express your thoughts, and so forth. It's all a lie. I can say that the only right a person in China has is to work and to praise Mao Tse-tung. Of course you could say, "The weather is good", or "The sky is blue", but you could not say for example, "I would like to go to America". A statement such as this would cause you a great deal of difficulty. You would then be called in to examine the root of your thinking. Questions would arise about where your education broke down and allowed such a bad thought. Perhaps they may think the individual might be a spy or perhaps he has contact with spies. The individual should have been taught all of his life that America is the number one enemy of China, and of the people of China. The individual would be called upon to confess to what prompted him to make such a statement. This confession would lead to more confessions. You must confess for the good of your soul and the good of your thought. You must completely understand why you made these statements.

The more detailed your confession, the better you would understand why you were wrong. After you have confessed sufficiently you may be set free. It would be the best of luck, or you may be sent off to a labor camp for re-education. Most trials in China today do not take place in a courtroom. They are held in the schools, in the factories, or in any group to which you belong. You may be interested to know that China does not have capital punishment. People are not executed. They are sent to labor camps where they are worked to death. This way the state has the good reputation of

being merciful and in the meantime derives some benefit from their work.

In China today, the most casual comment to a friend, to a relative, or even to members of your own family can often bring you before such a tribunal. Everyone lives in a state of fear. Fear is everywhere. Everyone is isolated from everyone else by this fear. Allegations made by anyone can bring you before a peoples tribunal and there is no defense. Any of these groups that I have mentioned can send you away to a labor camp. In America I have found that everyone has so many rights that it seems to me at times that one cannot be punished for anything. Here one cannot walk the streets after dark in safety. In China we do not seem to have this problem, but I cannot be sure of this, however, because one never looks around to see what is happening to others. In China you live your own life, you do not question what happens to anyone else and you evidence no interest in what they are doing. The newspapers in China are only a media for carrying the praises of Chairman Mao with his thoughts. A person in my position in China could have a radio. I, for example, was permitted to purchase a large radio and could listen to radio stations outside of China; BBC, Voice of America, Japanese radio, etc. To listen to these programs, of course, was illegal, but we still did it nevertheless.

Elections in China are another example of this system which has enslaved a very old and very honorable people. Elections are only a play. Every 4 years we have what are called local level elections. They put, for example, ten names on a ballot. Everybody must vote for these names. You may never have heard of these people before and probably never will again. There are ten positions, there are ten names, they are elected, and that is it. It is possible to put down another name—to write it in below the others—but this means nothing. The elections are decided long before the ballots are counted. For example, I was appointed to the Peoples Congress. I was a representative in the Cultural group. The representatives in the Peoples Congress represent all of the occupations of the population, Economics, the Army, etc. We numbered in the thousands and we elected the Chairman of the state and the Congressional positions. They only put down the number of names that there were positions open. One man for Chairman, Chairman Mao, and so on. Such balloting as you have in the United States is not even heard of in China today. What it amounts to is each individual must show up and approve what the state has done by approving the people it has selected. There is no alternative. You do not vote against anyone.

I should like to mention religion in China. There is none. According to the constitution freedom of religion is permitted but this is not true. A person who goes to church is always in trouble. All the churches must adapt to Maoism. It makes no difference which religion you are referring to, if you are a Buddhist you are accused of being supersititous. If you are Christian you have ties with imperialist countries. Members of the communist party cannot belong to any religion. Mao Tse-tung is God. His word, his teachings, are to the modern Chinese what the Bible is to a Westerner.

China has a number of political parties unlike many communist countries. However, these parties are all controlled by the communist party. Their sole purpose is to say yes to Chairman Mao and all of them must follow the wishes of Chairman Mao. I know for a fact that the communist party sends personnel into each of the other parties to control them. There is never any question about which is *the* party in China.

In China under Chairman Mao there are so many changes that a person who is in favor today may be in a labor camp tomorrow. Personnel who are friends of Mao today may be his enemies tomorrow. No one knows from day to day whether he will be doing what is considered right or whether he will be accused of doing something that is wrong. You must not think. You must not plan. You must do nothing but live from day to day only to do what is right each day in conformance with the thoughts of Chairman Mao.

I notice that in this country there are many people who are very proud of the fact that China now has the atomic bomb and is thus one of the major powers of the world. They apparently never think of the price that was paid by the Chinese people so that this was possible. I think that those in this country who are so proud of China should be sent to live there for a few years. They would then know the truth and in all probability would have a decided change of thought.

All my life I have lived for China and for my music. Because of my prominence in music I was appointed to many positions involving contacts with foreigners such as the Sino-Soviet Friendship Society, the Chinese-Indonesian Friendship Society and others. I was never a party member. My music was known all over China. One of my compositions "Longing For Home" prefaced each Radio Peking propaganda broadcast to Taiwan. I had concert tours all over mainland China up to 1963. While the "Great Leap Forward" program in China in 1958 was a national disaster and reduced the people of China to starvation, my family and I managed to keep our hope that some day things would work out and China would recover.

In the Fall of 1966 the full impact of the latest program "The Cultural Revolution" hit us. This was as close to anarchy as I ever wish to come. All intellectuals, artists, actors, dancers, musicians and members of any cultural group were singled out as useless members of the privileged class. I was among 500 who were rounded up and sent to a sort of concentration camp at the Socialist Institute to undergo thought reform. We were there 50 days while I was accused of following a capitalist line in my music. After this I was suddenly returned together with 18 others to the Central Academy of Music where I had been Chairman and immediately felt the wrath of the student nucleus of what later became the Red Guard.

They greeted me by pouring a bucket of paste over my head and stuck abusive slogans to the paste. I was called a devil, a demon and an authority on the reactionary capitalist class. I was confined to a small room where I was forced to write confessions to all sorts of crimes aganist the state. Crimes which I had never committed nor even thought of. Each morning I was forced to do hard labor with the result that my health began to fail. The tragic part of it all is that the Red Guards were mostly students who themselves had been somewhat of a privileged class but were now given free rein to do whatever they wished. The excesses they carried out against those who fell into their disfavor were difficult to imagine. I was beaten with belt buckles many times, other artists, musicians, and dancers were beaten so badly that their careers were finished.

By the time I left China my right arm had been so badly injured that I could not raise it. I remained at the Central Academy of Music for 103 days as a prisoner before my release. At this time in China no one could be sure that he would not be the next to be accused. Those who initiated many of the purges found that they themselves eventually became the victims. As time went on the excesses of violence and confusion among the groups began to tell upon the way we were treated.

By September 1966 I was permitted to spend my evenings at home. My home in the meantime had become a sleeping place for Red Guards. Sixty of them were sleeping in our former sitting room. My family was gone and all of my records, and books were smashed or confiscated. My daughter Celia returned one evening and we spoke of leaving China. At last one bitter cold night in November we boarded a train and left Peking for good. I cannot discuss the details of my reunion with my family and our escape from China for fear of endangering others who are still in China and who took great risks on our behalf. To these will go our eternal thanks.

It is interesting to note that the Chinese communists used to play my music in their propaganda broadcasts beamed at Taiwan. After my escape this stopped and now the Nationalists play my music in their programs beamed to the mainland. All China now knows of my decisions to leave and my escape from what has become the worst, most inhuman slave camp on earth.

CALLEY CASE

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker I am inserting into the RECORD a letter sent to the President by Capt. Aubrey Daniel, prosecutor in the court-martial of Lt. William Calley, and a New York Times editorial of April 4, 1971, entitled "The President and My Lai."

The incident at My Lai has deeply troubled all of us and has raised several great moral questions which this Nation must face. Yet regardless of our personal reaction to the incident we must not forget that Lieutenant Calley was found guilty by a jury of his peers. The law has always been the cornerstone of this Nation. We have stood by our laws throughout our history because we knew that without law there is no justice and without justice there is no nation worth defending.

The President's announcement that he will personally intervene in the review of the Calley case cannot help but prejudice the atmosphere of the appellate process. The case must still undergo several intermediate levels of appeal and review. It is highly doubtful that any appellate authority can act with detached objectivity knowing that the President is in effect looking over his shoulder. Additionally, there are at least three more courts-martial pending in connection with the My Lai incident. The juries and the review authorities in each of these will no doubt feel they are acting under Presidential scrutiny and may, consciously or unconsciously, tailor their decisions accordingly. The judicial process cannot serve its intended purpose when it must operate under such constraint. Independence of verdict and of appellate disposition are seriously affected when the Commander in Chief makes known in advance his overriding interest in the outcome of the case.

The type of society that we will have in America and the example we set for the rest of the world will be largely determined by the means we use to achieve our ends. If we allow ourselves to be corrupted by war or by a momentary outburst of public opinion we weaken that

law and tradition which we seek to defend. No soldier has the rights to wage his own war and no President should intervene prematurely in the judicial process. It is not the President's legal rights that are in question, but his legal judgment.

Two further points need to be made:

Lieutenant Calley has not been singled out as a scapegoat, as many have suggested. Two Army enlisted men have been prosecuted for assault with intent to commit murder for alleged acts at My Lai. Both were acquitted by court-martial. At least three other officers are being prosecuted by court-martial for offenses arising from My Lai. Both the Army and the Marine Corps have prosecuted a number of men for murder of Vietnamese civilians in the past few years. Therefore, while Lieutenant Calley's trial has been the most prominent, it has by no means been the only prosecution for atrocities committed by American combat troops in Vietnam.

At the same time, fairness to Lieutenant Calley requires that all senior military officers who may be guilty of legal offenses in connection with the My Lai incident be tried by court-martial. Administrative punishment, such as has been recommended for Maj. Gen. Samuel Koster and Brig. Gen. George Young, Jr. is woefully inappropriate under the circumstances. If there is evidence of their guilt, they should be court-martialed as have been Lieutenant Calley and the other My Lai defendants; if there is insufficient evidence of their guilt, they ought not be punished administratively or otherwise.

In the hope that voices of reason will ultimately prevail in this entire episode, I commend the following two items to the attention of my colleagues:

TEXT OF CALLEY PROSECUTOR'S LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

WASHINGTON, April 6—Following is the text of the letter sent to the President by Capt. Aubrey M. Daniels 3d, the prosecutor in the Calley case:

Sir:

It is very difficult for me to know where to begin this letter as I am not accustomed to writing letters of protest. My only hope is that I can find the words to convey to you my feelings as a United States citizen, and as an attorney, who believes that respect for law is one of the fundamental bases upon which this nation is founded.

On Nov. 26, 1969, you issued the following statement through your press secretary, Mr. Ronald Ziegler, in referring to the Mylai incident:

"An incident such as that alleged in this case is in direct violation not only of United States military policy, but is also abhorrent to the conscience of all the American people:

"The Secretary of the Army is continuing his investigation. Appropriate action is and will be taken to assure that illegal and immoral conduct as alleged be dealt with in accordance with the strict rules of military justice.

"This incident should not be allowed to reflect on the some million and a quarter young Americans who have now returned to the United States after having served in Vietnam with great courage and distinction."

At the time you issued this statement, a general court-martial had been directed for a resolution of the charges which have been brought against Lieut. William L. Calley Jr. for his involvement at Mylai.

'MY OWN BELIEF'

On Dec. 8, 1970, you were personally asked to comment on the Mylai incident at a press conference. At that time you made the following statement:

"What appears was certainly a masacre, and under no circumstances was it justified.

"One of the goals we are fighting for in Vietnam is to keep the people from South Vietnam from having imposed upon them a government which has atrocity against civilians as one of its policies.

"We cannot ever condone or use atrocities against civilians in order to accomplish that goal."

These expressions of what I believed to be your sentiment were truly reflective of my own feelings when I was given the assignment of prosecuting the charges which had been preferred against Lieutenant Calley. My feelings were generated not by emotionalism or self-indignation but by my knowledge of the evidence in the case, the laws of this nation in which I strongly believe, and my own conscience. I knew that I had been given a great responsibility and I only hoped that I would be able to discharge my duties and represent the United States in a manner which would be a credit to the legal profession and our system of justice.

IN THE FINEST TRADITION

I undertook the prosecution of the case without any ulterior motives for personal gain, either financial or political. My only desire was to fulfill my duty as a prosecutor and see that justice was done in accordance with the laws of this nation. I dedicated myself totally to this end from November of 1969 until the trial was concluded. Throughout the proceedings there was criticism of the prosecution but I lived with the abiding conviction that once the facts and the law had been presented there would be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable person about the necessity for the prosecution of this case and the ultimate verdict. I was mistaken.

The trial of Lieutenant Calley was conducted in the finest tradition of our legal system. It was in every respect a fair trial in which every legal right of Lieutenant Calley was fully protected. It clearly demonstrated that the military justice system which has previously been the subject of much criticism was a fair system. Throughout the trial, the entire system was under the constant scrutiny of the mass media and the public, and the trial of Lieutenant Calley was also in a very real sense the trial of the military judicial system. However there was never an attack lodged by any member of the media concerning the fairness of the trial. There could be no such allegation justifiably made.

I do not believe that there has ever been a trial in which the accused's rights were more fully protected, the conduct of the defense given greater latitude, and the prosecution held to stricter standards. The burden of proof which the Government had to meet in this case was not beyond a reasonable doubt, but beyond possibility. The very fact that Lieutenant Calley was an American officer being tried for the deaths of Vietnamese during a combat operation by fellow officers compels this conclusion.

JURY CAREFULLY CHOSEN

The jury selection in which customary procedure was altered by providing both the defense and the prosecution with three peremptory challenges instead of the usual one, was carefully conducted to insure the impartiality of those men who were selected. Six officers, all combat veterans, five having served in Vietnam, were selected. These six men who had served their country well, were called upon again to serve their nation as jurors and to sit in judgment of Lieutenant Calley as prescribed by law.

From the time they took their oaths until they rendered their decision, they performed their duties in the very finest tradition of the American legal system. If ever a jury followed the letter of the law in applying it to the evidence presented, they did. They are indeed a credit to our system of justice and to the officer corps of th United States Army.

'SHOCKED AND DISMAYED'

When the verdict was rendered, I was totally shocked and dismayed at the reaction of many people across the nation. Much of the adverse public reaction I can attribute to people who have acted emotionally and without being aware of the evidence that was presented and perhaps even the laws of this nation regulating the conduct of war.

These people have undoubtedly viewed Lieutenant Calley's conviction of an American officer for killing the enemy. Others, no doubt out of a sense of frustration, have seized upon the conviction as a means of protesting the war in Vietnam.

'I would prefer to believe that most of the public criticism has come from people who are not aware of the evidence, either because they have not followed the evidence as it was presented, or having followed it they have chosen not to believe it.

Certainly, no one wanted to believe what occurred at Mylai, including the officers who sat in judgment of Lieutenant Calley. To believe, however, that any large percentage of the population could believe the evidence which was presented an approve of the conduct of Lieutenant Calley would be as shocking to my conscience as the conduct itself, since I believe that we are still a civilized nation.

If such be the case, then the war in Vietnam has brutalized us more than I care to believe, and it must cease. How shocking it is if so many people across this nation have failed to see the moral issue which was involved in the trial of Lieutenant Calley—that it is unlawful for an American soldier to summarily execute unarmed and unresisting men, women, children and babies.

APPALLED BY LEADERS

But how much more appalling it is to see so many of the political leaders of the nation who have failed to see the moral issue or, having seen it, to compromise it for political motive in the face of apparent public displeasure with the verdict.

I would have hoped that all leaders of this nation, which is supposed to be the leader within the international community for the protection of the weak and the oppressed regardless of nationality, would have either accepted and supported the enforcement of the laws of this country as reflected by the verdict of the court or not make any statement concerning the verdict until they had had the same opportunity to evaluate the evidence that the members of the jury had.

In view of your previous statement concerning this matter, I have been particularly shocked and dismayed at your decision to intervene in these proceedings in the midst of the public clamor. Your decision can only have been prompted by the response of a vocal segment of our population, who while no doubt acting in good faith, cannot be aware of the evidence which resulted in Lieutenant Calley's conviction.

Your intervention has, in my opinion, damaged the military judicial system and lessened any respect it may have gained as a result of the proceedings.

You have subjected a judicial system of this country to the criticism that it is subject to political influence, when it is a fundamental precept of our judicial system that the legal processes of this country must be kept free from any outside influences. What will be the impact of your decision upon the future trials, particularly those within the military?

RESPECT WEAKENED

Not only has respect for the legal process been weakened and the critics of the military judicial system been given support for their claims of command influence, the image of Lieutenant Calley, a man convicted of the premeditated murder of at least 21 unarmed and unresisting people, as a national hero has been enhanced, while at the same time support has been given to those persons who have so unjustly criticized the six loyal and honorable officers who have done this country a great service by fulfilling their duties as jurors so admirably.

Have you considered those men in making your decisions? The men who since rendering their verdict have found themselves and their families the subject of vicious attacks upon their honor, integrity and loyalty to this nation.

It would seem to me to be more appropriate for you as the President to have said something in their behalf and to remind the nation of the purpose of our legal system and the respect it should command.

I would expect that the President of the United States, a man whom I believe should and would provide the moral leadership for this nation, would stand fully behind the law of this land on a moral issue which is so clear and about which there can be no compromise.

ABHORRENT TO CONSCIENCE

For this nation to condone the acts of Lieutenant Calley is to make us no better than our enemies and make any pleas by this nation for the humane treatment of our own prisoners meaningless.

I truly regret having to have written this letter and wish that no innocent person had died at Mylai on March 16, 1968. But innocent people were killed under circumstances that will always remain abhorrent to my conscience.

While in some respects what took place at Mylai has to be considered to be a tragic day in the history of our nation, how much more tragic would it have been for this country to have taken no action against those who were responsible.

That action was taken, but the greatest tragedy of all will be if political expediency dictates the compromise of such a fundamental moral principle as the inherent unlawfulness of the murder of innocent persons, making the action and the courage of six honorable men who served their country so well meaningless.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 4, 1971]

THE PRESIDENT AND MYLAI

No development in the whole tragic history of the Vietnam war has produced a more spontaneous outcry than the conviction of First Lieut. William L. Calley Jr. The protests have brought into unaccustomed unity such divergent national figures as Gov. George C. Wallace of Alabama and Dr. Benjamin Spock, to say nothing of millions of Americans not normally given to public expressions of outrage.

But the mass clamor in no way alters the correctness of the judgment reached by the court-martial after agonizing deliberation. Exoneration of Lieutenant Calley would have dishonored both the American military tradition and the solemn commitments this country has subscribed to under the Geneva and Hague Conventions on the rules of war.

On that basis, President Nixon's decision to intervene in the Calley case, first to order the officer's release from the stockade and yesterday to announce his intention to review the case and to make a final determination on the sentence, represents an unfortunate interference with the processes of military justice.

It would have been perfectly appropriate, if unusual, under established Army practices for the commanding general at Fort Benning to have ordered Lieutenant Calley released from the stockade and confined to quarters pending review of his conviction on charges of murdering Vietnamese civilians.

Similarly, it would have been quite proper for Mr. Nixon to have reviewed the case and its outcome at the end of all judicial proceedings. This could even have been considered his duty. But the precipitous manner in which Mr. Nixon publicly intervened over the heads of military authorities to make an exception that is not ordinarily granted to prisoners convicted of capital crimes and more especially his public announcement at this stage that he will himself make the final decision create a prejudicial atmosphere affecting all intermediate steps in the appeals process. He has now in his capacity as Commander in Chief identified himself with the intemperate public outcry against the initial court-martial.

With the White House admission that Mr. Nixon has acted in response to "widespread public interest" to provide a "different quality of review," it is all too clear that he bowed to intense public pressure, something he has repeatedly declared no responsible leader could ever do when it came to decisions involving the Vietnam conflict.

The President's moves at a time of high political fever undermine confidence in the impartiality of the outcome he will ultimately decree. This appearance of Executive partisanship has been reinforced by the ill-considered remarks of Vice President Agnew in an interview just hours before Lieutenant Calley's court-martial sentencing to life imprisonment was announced.

In an indirect but unmistakable reference to the Calley trial, Mr. Agnew said: "The point comes out to this: many of the people in America—particularly those of us who served in the service—understand that the rather abnormal fears and the conditions in a military operation are not subject to Monday-morning quarterback judgment by someone sitting comfortably in an office in Washington."

The men who passed judgment on Lieutenant Calley were not such Monday-morning quarterbacks. Six combat infantry officers, five of them veterans of Vietnam, unanimously found him guilty of murdering at least 22 unarmed civilians at Mylai. They acted after hearing months of testimony and deliberating for thirteen days. "To even consider that any American soldier would ever do such a thing is beyond my own comprehension," one of the jurors declared after the verdict. "I wanted to believe it didn't happen, that it was a hoax."

But Mylai did happen. A House Armed Services subcommittee long ago concluded that: "What obviously happened at Mylai was wrong. It was contrary to the Geneva Conventions, the Rules of Engagement, and the MACV directives."

The task of the President and other political leaders is not to sit as judge and jury in courts-martial but rather to address themselves forthrightly to the broader issues that the Calley trial has brought into agonizing public focus—the question of responsibility at higher levels for the acts committed at Mylai and elsewhere in Vietnam and the problem of ending a war that continues to inflict misery and death on the peoples of Indochina.

EULOGY OF THOMAS E. DEWEY

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme sorrow that I mourn the recent passing of Thomas E. Dewey—a great man of unequaled abilities, a dynamic prosecutor of organized crime, a Governor with tremendous foresight and unexcelled administrative skills, a generous and loving family man, and a personal friend.

To my knowledge, I am the only incumbent Member of this body ever to have worked under the able direction and leadership of Tom Dewey during his several outstanding terms as the Governor of New York State. I was a member of the State Senate during that entire period, and I marveled at his tremendous talent for working with legislative matters. Never before or since has the Empire State seen such a pillar of strength with the unequalled ability to get his legislative programs sold to the people and their representatives.

And these abilities merely reflected the man, who understood the people because he was of them and for them. From his humble beginnings, Thomas E. Dewey rose like a meteor into the hearts of his countrymen. With Horatio Alger-like inevitability, he became a lawyer of consummate ability and dazzled the Nation as the brave and relentless prosecutor who took to task the most untouchable gangsters of the interbellum era. His star continued to rise until he reached the near-pinnacle of public office by being twice chosen as standard bearer for the Republican Party in bids for the Presidency in 1944 and 1948.

I well remember Tom Dewey as the crusading chief assistant to the U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York. His first case was the prosecution of Waxey Gordon, a notorious racketeer considered unconvictable by most who described the young prosecutor as a Don Quixote tilting at windmills. But Tom Dewey was no Quixote, and to everyone's amazement he successfully prosecuted Gordon.

As a result of this remarkable performance, he was appointed U.S. attorney, and 2 years later special prosecutor for the State of New York, to continue his investigation and prosecution of the rackets. In this latter capacity he was again proved his mettle, securing the conviction of the famed "Lucky" Luciano, and breaking up a vast array of illegal operations in the New York City area.

When he sought the position of district attorney in 1937, running as a Republican, he was opposed by the seemingly invincible Tammany Hall machine. No Republican had held the office of district attorney for New York County in two generations. Yet Tom Dewey's record swept him to victory with a majority of more than 100,000 votes.

Under Dewey's direction, the district attorney's office was responsible for the conviction and punishment of Louis "Lepke" Buchalter, a well-known Manhattan gangster, Fritz Kuehn, of the disloyal German-American Bund, and Richard Whitney, the defalcating head of the New York Stock Exchange. Others set upon by the vigorous policies of the "Fighting DA"—as he came to be known—were ambulance-chasing lawyers, landlords whose tenants burned to death in unsafe buildings, and a ring of subway employees responsible for the

theft of a fortune in nickels. He also established without any fanfare the Volunteer Defenders, a panel of the best legal talent in the city which has handled a large number of indigents' cases each year without fee.

During the first year of his term as district attorney, Tom Dewey was nominated for Governor on the Republican ticket and did much better than most pundits predicted. A switch of 35,000 votes would have meant his election. Thoroughly impressed, New York supporters urged his nomination for President at the 1940 Republican National Convention. Unsuccessful in this attempt, Dewey returned to State politics and in 1942 was once again nominated for Governor. Although the Democrats had controlled the State House for 20 years without interruption, Dewey carried the election with a handsome majority. The era of the gangbusting prosecutor was over and thus began a new era: Tom Dewey, statesman.

During his first term as Governor he was responsible for a long-overdue reapportionment of congressional and legislative districts in New York State. He put the State on a pay-as-you-go policy for capital construction, increased State aid to education, and passed the first State laws aimed against religious and racial discrimination in matters of employment. He also was responsible for liberalizing the unemployment-insurance law, and he launched a concerted drive to wipe out tuberculosis in the State within a period of 20 years. Clearly, Tom Dewey was ahead of his time and he led New York State into a position of being the legislative trailblazer for the Nation.

Governor Dewey can properly be credited with increasing the wartime industrial contributions of New York State and with piling up surpluses in the State treasury to the tune of $435 million. These were earmarked, at the insistence of the Governor, for reconstruction and rehabilitation of State institutions and highways neglected during the war years. He also holds a record of sorts for presiding over the State during its longest period of astonishing calm between management and labor. This was in large part the result of his tremendous personal ability to negotiate with both sides and to set a compromise position acceptable to all.

With the full backing of the legislature, Governor Dewey reorganized many departments of the State government, revised the laws to an unprecedented extent, and reorganized the State Police Department from top to bottom. Public works, including new housing, hospital, and highway projects, were planned under his authority; the workman's compensation law was overhauled; the mental hospital administration was revised, and veterans' aid legislation was enacted. His record as Governor was unsurpassed by any in the Nation.

Nominated for President at the 1944 Republican National Convention, Governor Dewey was faced by insurmountable odds. Waged against the background of World War II, the presidential campaign seemed geared to a widely held belief that the victory of Dewey and the repudiation of the incumbent, Franklin D. Roosevelt, would be tantamount to rejecting the national war effort, of which Mr. Roosevelt had become symbolic, as Commander in Chief of American Armed Forces. The Governor was compelled to temper his criticism of the administration's conduct of the war in the interest of the Nation's morale. Against these obstacles the Republican campaign foundered and Dewey was defeated.

The people of New York recognized the value of the man and in 1946 he was reelected Governor by 687,000 votes—the largest majority ever obtained by a candidate for Governor in New York State.

Thus encouraged, he sought and secured the presidential nomination once again in 1948. The Republican 80th Congress was elected in 1946 and the presidential campaign of 1948 hinged largely upon the record of the 80th Congress. The 80th was the first Republican Congress in almost two decades, and its leadership was faced by gargantuan problems arising from the staggering betrayal of America by her wartime ally, the Soviet Union, and the unprecedented complexities of the postwar economic situation. Any Congress would have had great difficulties in coping with such crisis situations, and the 80th had its full share. The 1948 election boiled down to a vote on the record of a Congress with which Governor Dewey had had nothing whatever to do. Seizing on the situation, the opposition blazed away at Congress, and the Governor was caught in the effect of that attack.

On top of all this was the colossal misjudgment of the several national opinion polls, all of which predicted victory for the Governor and in so doing transformed his opponent to a colorful "underdog." Although opposing the incumbent President on many issues, the Governor regarded him as a decent leader who had done his best. With victory assured, according to the polls, the opposition was raking his own record with a withering verbal barrage. When it was all over, the Governor again was defeated in his bid for the Presidency—ths time by a hairbreadth.

That was Governor Dewey's last battle for national office, but not his last connection with politics as such. He took his defeats with great dignity and became the "Senior Statesman" of the Republican Party. In 1952, it was he who urged upon the Republican Party the nomination of Richard M. Nixon for Vice President. And when the opposition saw fit to bring slanderous charges against Mr. Nixon during the campaign, concerning the acceptance of certain campaign contributions, it was Governor Dewey who stood by Mr. Nixon all the way and urged him to tell the whole story in clear detail and let the public decide. Mr. Nixon followed the Governor's advice explained the matter on nationwide television, and the people gave him their endorsement.

A true leader, a solid citizen with broad outlook and unexcelled political, legal, and administrative skills, Thomas E. Dewey won the admiration of millions and the respect of all.

His death removes from the national political scene a man of extraordinary ability and high principle, and one of the finest men I have ever had the experience of knowing in life and mourning in death.

HELLENIC PHILATELIC SOCIETY PROTESTS TO POSTMASTER GENERAL BLOUNT

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1971

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to express my disappointment that the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee failed to recommend that the United States issue a stamp commemorating the 150th anniversary of Greek independence.

My disappointment is shared by thousands of other Americans of Hellenic background as well as, I am sure, many other Members of Congress who are interested in Greece and its great contributions to democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the Hellenic Philatelic Society of America spearheaded efforts to win a commemorative stamp for this historic occasion for Greece. Their disappointment is evident in an open letter from Dr. H. N. Petrakos, president of the Chicago Chapter No. 1 of the Hellenic organization to Postmaster General Blount.

I insert the excerpts of the letter to be printed in the RECORD.

The text of the letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO POSTMASTER GENERAL BLOUNT—A PROTEST

Dear MR. BLOUNT: It is with deep regret and disappointment that we received the news that the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee did not see fit to recommend that the United States issue a stamp commemorating the 150th Anniversity of the Greek struggle for independence being celebrated starting March 25th of this year.

For a country that is deeply indebted to Greece for its many, many contributions to Western civilization and culture this seems incongruous! This country over the years has issued 52 commemorative stamps honoring other countries and almost as many foreigners. Finland, Poland, Sweden have been honored several times. Greece was included in the omnibus issue of 1943–44 honoring the 13 captive nations of World War II. How is it that we then remembered Greece and now we forget this heroic nation? Were Premier Venizelos' words and deeds of less importance than Mannerheim's, Reuter's, Paderewski's? Did not Greek soldiers fight along with our doughboys in World War I? Did not the Greek people resist the Axis powers to the utmost? Do we forget Metaxas' resounding 1940 "OXI" (NO!) when Mussolini asked to walk into Greece? Did not the Greeks spill their blood fighting side by side with the Allies? Did not the Greek regiments fight in North Africa, Sicily, Korea and elsewhere along with our boys? Did not Greece fight successfully for the very same reason our boys are dying in Southeast Asia?

Is it that Dante's poems are more inspiring than the works of Homer, Plato, Aristotle, Euripedes, Xenophon? Were Erickson's deeds of more importance than the contributions of Socrates, Archimedes, Pythagoras, Euclid, Phideas?

How does the Stamp Advisory Committee

explain its refusal to recommend a stamp to the hundreds of American philhellenes who supported the Greek struggle for independence 150 years ago with moral, financial and physical contributions including their very lives? What would George Jarvis and Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe have thought? What would be the reactions of James Monroe, John Quincy Adams, Henry Clay, Daniel Webster and many others? Their feelings for Greece are well documented before the eyes of the world.

What would the poet Byron write? What would Delacroix paint? How do you explain this refusal to Ypsilanti, Michigan? Perhaps we better should revoke our Olympic participation and tear down the graceful neoclassical Grecian architecture of our Capitol and drape the municipal buildings of all our Corinths, Athens, Atticas, Ithacas, Cretes, Marathons, Spartas and Smyrnas in black! Are we so ashamed?

How do you explain this failure to issue a stamp to Senator Percy of Ill., Reps. Pucinski, Brademas, Kyros, Galifianakis, Yatron, Sarbanes who have all enthusiastically advocated such a stamp? To Reps. Carney of Ohio and Young of Florida who have made speeches before the House and have bills pending in support of the stamp?

How, Mr. Postmaster General, do you explain this failure to the thousands of Greek-Americans who help make up this country? To Dr. George Pappanicolaou, to D. Mitropoulos, to the Admirals Colvocoresis, to Archbishop Iakovos, to George Dilboy, to the AHEPA, to the Vice President's father and the rest of our fathers, to the "Greek" waiter behind the counter of the local snack shop?

For many years this country has seen fit to issue dozens of commemorative stamps for such groups as the chicken growers, children's toys, wool gatherers, etc. On several occasions we have issued not one stamp but groups of four and some of them monstrosities! And yet we do not see fit to issue one stamp honoring this brave little nation, a truly loyal ally, that has contributed and will continue to contribute so much to our civilization . . .

Adamantios Koraes, that grand old "teacher of the Greek race," said in writing to ex-President Jefferson asking for moral support from America in 1823 . . . "Help us, fortunate Americans; it is not charity we ask. Rather an opportunity to augment your happiness!"

And in closing we quote Daniel Webster's words in the House in January, 1824:

"With suffering Greece now is the crisis of her fate—her great, it may be her last struggle. Sir, while we sit here deliberating, her destiny may be decided. The Greeks contending with ruthless oppressors, turn their eyes to us, and invoke us by their ancestors, slaughtered water, by the hecoatombs of dead they have heaped up, as it were to heaven, they invoke, they implore us for some cheering sound, some look of sympathy, some token of compassionate regard. They look to us the great Republic of the earth—and they ask us by our common faith, whether we can forget that they are struggling, as we once struggled, for what we now so happily enjoy? I cannot say, sir, that they will succeed; that rests with heaven. But for myself, sir, if I should to-morrow hear that they have failed—that their last phalanx had sunk beneath the Turkish scimitar, that the flames of their last city had sunk in its ashes, and that nought remained but the wide melancholy waste where Greece once was, *I should still reflect, with the most heartfelt satisfaction, that I have asked you, in the name of seven millions of freemen, that you would give them at least the cheering of one friendly voice.*"

Sincerely,

H. N. PETRAKOS, M.D.,
Hellenic Philatelic Society of America
Chicago Chapter No. 1.

SENATE—*Wednesday, April 14, 1971*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for this world resplendent in the resurrection of springtime. For buds and blossoms, for lush meadows and verdant hills, for bounding streams and gentle breezes, for bright sun and starlit skies, for the lyric notes of birds and the music of all nature, we give Thee thanks.

We thank Thee for the resurrection of the human spirit, for the gospel of redemption and new life, which speaks of men made new, arising above cold indifference and callous unconcern to a new life of kindness, warm friendship, and sacrificial service.

We pray for our Nation, mighty in power and deep in need, that there may come a resurrection of idealism, of patriotism, of selfless service, of peaceful purpose, and commitment to the keeping of Thy law and the doing of Thy will. Guide by Thy higher wisdom Thy servants here and in all positions of trust, that they with all the people of this land may become "one nation under God," for the good of all mankind.

In the name of Him who is the Resurrection and the Life. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOLLINGS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 5, 1971, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 7, 1971, received messages in writing from the President of the United States.

REPORT ON MARINE RESOURCES AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT (H. DOC. NO. 92-85)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 5, 1971, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 7, 1971, received the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

Creation last year of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has given us the capacity to manage our Federal oceanic, atmospheric and environmental responsibilities with substantially greater effectiveness and efficiency.

The United States' marine science program was marked in 1970 by a number of sound accomplishments and new departures.

Internationally, we worked successfully with other nations to produce a seabed arms control treaty. We proposed development of a treaty governing the exploration and exploitation of seabed resources and submitted a working draft of such a treaty to the United Nations. And we are also joining forces with others in earnest efforts to preserve the quality of the marine environment.

A major step toward more rational use of the oceans was taken in December, 1970, when the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization resolved to achieve by 1975, if possible, and by the end of the decade at the latest the elimination of intentional discharges of oil and oily wastes into the oceans. We are earnestly pursuing this worthy objective. It is my hope that the Senate, as part of this effort, will soon give its advice and consent to the international oil spills conventions and amendments which were transmitted last May.

I have also asked the Congress to enact the Ports and Waterways Safety Act, which would increase the Coast Guard's authority to protect against oil spills, and the Wholesome Fish and Fishery Products Act, which would provide for the inspection of fish and fishery products during their harvesting, processing and transport.

These accomplishments are reported in detail in the annual report of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, "Marine Science Affairs," which I am today transmitting to the Congress. During 1970, the Council, which is chaired by the Vice President, has continued to assist me in the development of marine science policy, the co-