

servation, and protection of endangered species of fish and wildlife; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLANTON (for himself and Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee):

H. Con. Res. 266. Concurrent resolution to direct the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and study certain anticompetitive practices in the Nation's energy industries, concerning the supply and price of coal, oil, gas, uranium and other energy resources, and to report the facts obtained by such investigation and study to the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, and Mr. CORMAN):

H. Con. Res. 267. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the House with respect to peace in the Middle East; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 268. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposed "proportionate repatriation" plan for obtaining the release of American prisoners held in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON:

H. Con. Res. 269. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the congressional intent in the enactment of the black lung benefit provisions of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON (for himself, Mr. ROE, and Mr. VANDER JAGT):

H. Con. Res. 270. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that our NATO allies should contribute more to the

cost of their own defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H. Con. Res. 271. Concurrent resolution to authorize the loan of the Freeman Thorpe portrait of Abraham Lincoln to the city of Brainerd, Minn.; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H. Res. 391. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to opportunities for people-to-people contact between the citizens of the United States of America and the citizens of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H. Res. 392. Resolution on dismissal of professional air traffic controllers by the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROE:

H. Res. 393. Resolution to provide free Federal telecommunications system service to patients in veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 7565. A bill authorizing the President to award the Medal of Honor to Harry S. Truman; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 7566. A bill for the relief of Brother

Michael Colavito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 7567. A bill for the relief of Sgt. William T. Richardson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRENZEL:

H.R. 7568. A bill for the relief of Duane M. Leisinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 7569. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor D. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7570. A bill for the relief of Jerald E. Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 7571. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sheila L. C. Tompkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7572. A bill for the relief of Blagoje Nikola Zlatkovic and his wife, Nevenka Zdenka Zlatkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROE:

H.R. 7573. A bill authorizing the President to award the Medal of Honor to Harry S. Truman; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7574. A bill for the relief of Ronald Gordon Bullen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 7575. A bill for the relief of Youngdahl Song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 7576. A bill authorizing the President to award the Medal of Honor to Harry S. Truman; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CLEARCUTTING IN NATIONAL FOREST LAND OF MAJOR CONCERN TO CITIZENS OF WEST VIRGINIA AND OTHER STATES—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS HOLDS HEARINGS ON FOREST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND CLEARCUTTING—EDITORIALS SUPPORT POSITION OF SENATOR RANDOLPH

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the issue of clearcutting in our national forest land is becoming increasingly an issue with more and more citizens throughout our Nation.

The Forest Service, which has done limited research into the detrimental effects of clearcutting apparently ignores the evidence which suggests that nutrient values and regeneration abilities may be adversely affected by the practice. We know how it looks—much like B-52 devastation, that on many sites which the Forest Service has supposedly intensely managed there has been irreversible soil erosion and that the Multiple Use, Sustained Yield Act passed in 1960 by Congress has been violated.

Multiple use cannot be achieved if even-aged management, or clearcutting, is the policy on the general forest zone. In discussing the issue, many persons

talk only of timber production to the total exclusion of multiple use.

The Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands held 3 days of hearings this month on forest management practices, including clearcutting. On the opening day of the hearings, I testified in opposition to clearcutting. I have been active in this effort for many months. I commend the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), and the other members of the subcommittee for this in-depth study.

West Virginians who testified included: Ralph O. Smoot, Camden-on-Gauley, a retired professional forester; Lawrence W. Deitz, Richwood, representing the West Virginia Forest Management Practices Commission; Howard Deitz, Richwood, representing West Virginia Division, Izaak Walton League of America; David H. McGinnis, Huntington, also representing the commission; George R. Shook, Athens; Nick Barb, Parsons; and George Langford, of Pittsburgh, representing West Virginia Highlands Conservancy.

While the practice may be permissible in some areas, it should not be the policy of timber management on the general forest zone, as has been the case on the Monongahela National Forest in West Virginia since 1964. In some areas clearcutting should never be practiced except to salvage burned, diseased, or otherwise damaged timber or to regenerate concentrations of over-age decadent trees.

Since the Forest Service has refused to

change its policy, at the insistence of many citizens, the West Virginia Legislature, and Members of Congress, I again urge the creation of a National Forest Management Commission. Such an independent commission is needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials on the subject, one from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 11, and one from the Washington Evening Star of April 16.

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

[From the Plain Dealer, Apr. 11, 1971]

PROTECTING THE NATIONAL FORESTS

The proposal of U.S. Sens. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va., and Gale McGee, D-Wyo., for creation of a blue-ribbon commission on timber management in the national forests is a sound one. Lengthy hearings in recent days before the Senate Interior Committee's public lands subcommittee point up the need.

Two years ago The Plain Dealer first endorsed such a suggestion, saying: "A national study by an independent commission seems in order." We are pleased to see our views being advanced in Congress now.

The national forests are not wilderness areas nor national parks, yet they are the property of all the people. The law as written is clear that national forests should be managed so that timber harvests are replaced with new growth and that all uses—timbering, watershed protection, fish and wildlife preservation, grazing and recreation—should be protected.

Instead, the dominant interest of the Agriculture Department's Forest Service

seems to be logging, virtually ignoring all the other mandated uses. Brock Evans of the Sierra Club says the Forest Service has become "a classic case of the regulatory agency being governed by the industry it should be regulating."

Clear-cutting is the practice of cutting down all trees in an area regardless of kind and age, to make space for regeneration of new trees, particularly those preferred for lumber. But so many vast areas have been clear-cut that national forest areas often are beginning to look as denuded as strip-mine areas in Ohio. If 1,500 to 1,800 trees in a compact area are felled each day, then several hundred acres are levelled in a brief time.

Conservationists heavily attacked clear-cutting in the Senate hearings. Ohio's neighbor, West Virginia, has been affected so much in its beautiful mixed hardwood stands in the Monongahela National Forest that the state has protested to the federal government. Thus the call for the national commission, a call which we support.

The Forest Service used to be proudly conservation-minded, dedicated, like its Smokey the Bear symbol, to guarding the nation's woodlands—not ravishing them.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 16, 1971]

DEFORESTATION

In 1950, this country's 154 national forests were set apart by law as "multiple purpose" areas, to be used for recreation, watershed protection, wildlife preservation, range development and timbering. Today, the U.S. Forest Service, with the firm backing of the Nixon administration, appears determined to scrap that policy. If the administration view prevails, the 187 million acres of national forest land will become a vast tree farm, operated for the welfare and the profit of the lumber industry.

There is nothing wrong, in principle, with private logging on public lands. It has been done, on a selective basis, since the forests were first set aside in 1905 "for the greatest good of the greatest number." But there is something very wrong with a rate of cutting that far exceeds the rate of forest growth. And that is what is happening today.

Since 1950, receipts from timber cutting in the national forest have increased 1,000 percent, from \$29 million to \$284 million. The administration proposes to increase the timber crop over the next few years by 60 percent.

This rate of cutting has led to the practice of "clear-cutting"—the harvesting of all trees in a given area instead of the selective cutting of mature, diseased or unwanted trees. It is an efficient method, employing machines of total destruction. It is economical; the denuded areas can be replanted with orderly rows of saleable trees. But there is one drawback: It is an environmental atrocity.

Clear-cutting destroys the forest. Replanting may restore the trees, but centuries of natural growth are required to replace a forest. The denuding of woodlands speeds soil erosion, increases the siltation of rivers, threatens wildlife and destroys recreational potential.

The administration and the timber cutters argue that the lumber is needed to meet the increasing demands of a growing population and the government's housing goal of 2.6 million new and rebuilt houses a year. The conservationists counter by suggesting that wood is not the ideal building material for the central cities, where much federal housing will be located. They argue that owners of private forests, who normally supply 75 percent of the country's lumber, should be encouraged to convert to tree farming. They believe that the additional cost of selective cutting should be passed on to the consumer as part payment for environmental improvement.

The conservationists have the better of the argument.

Certainly the practice of clear-cutting should be halted at least until the Forest Service catches up on the 5-million-acre reforestation gap that, by the service's own figuring, already exists. It should be reinstated only in those areas—if any such exist—that are of no potential recreational value, and where it can be shown that the ecological trauma produced by the mowing down of a forest will have no adverse impact on the wildlife, the soil or on any watershed.

It seems incredible that in this era of environmental enlightenment the administration should be pushing to abandon the concept of multiple use of the national forests. Somehow, the message must be conveyed that the first consideration of any use to which these public lands are put must be their preservation for the generations to come, when natural forest land will be a commodity beyond price. Congress will have the means to get that message across when the President's request for more money for Forest Service timber operations comes up.

First, Congress should declare a moratorium on clear-cutting. Second, it should pare the President's budget request. Third, the law establishing the multiple-use concept of the national forests should be re-examined with the aim of eliminating those loopholes through which the administration and the timber cutters are now trying to crawl.

MORE IMPORTS?

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation calling for the same kind of inspection for imported dairy and meat products as is required for our domestic dairy products and meat.

Most people do not realize that much of this food is shipped into this country with only minimum inspection, if any at all.

Margery Burns, one of my favorite weekly newspaper columnists in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, recently wrote on this matter in her weekly column.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert her column in the RECORD and commend its reading to my colleagues and all of those who read the RECORD:

MORE IMPORTS?

Do you ever wonder about all the stuff that's added to the food to preserve it and what it will do to you? We really don't know enough yet about some of the new chemicals, and it's worth checking on. The government always looks into the food contamination problem in our country and it is looking into these chemicals too. But how about all the contamination of the food which is imported?

Let me give you a quick run down on some queer sidelights on all this.

We have some of the best food in the world here, and yet over 10 million farmers have had to quit farming in the past 30 years because of low farm prices. But . . . our country imports tons of food materials from other countries which force down our own farm prices and force farmers off our farms.

Now, wait a minute. You believe in trade with other countries, and that means we have to take our chances with lower prices, right? (The textile industry is hurting now

too after losing only 400,000 workers because Japanese textile imports cut production, and you know how the government is working to preserve that industry.) But every year, the government lets in more farm products from other countries.

Even if you go along with more and more food imports in order to get more cheap meat and dairy products, you should take another look at the kind of products which are being imported.

The USDA has the job of inspecting all food imports coming into this country. But it's too big a job. For instance, some nations ship in meat without a single sample being tested. Last year only 1200 samples of imported meat were tested for chemical analysis, and more than 1.7 billion pounds of foreign meat come in each year. Yet . . . about 4 million pounds of meat came in before packages were set aside for residue analysis.

It's true that more than 1,100 plants in more than 40 countries are checked, but it takes more than visual searches to find chemical residues like DDT.

Almost 10% of all dairy products coming into this country are rejected because of contamination, and yet less than 10% of all these dairy products are inspected! For instance, one shipment of cheese from West Germany was found to contain contaminants of insect larva. Another shipment of cheese from France contained benzene hexachloride which is an unsafe chemical substance.

American farmers and manufacturers of dairy products have to meet certain standards, and we want them to. But why should we let in millions of pounds of foreign meat and cheese which are not safe to eat?

The question comes down to cheaper meat and dairy products or purer meat and dairy products. The Congressional Record has a list of cheese products which were seized in 1970, which country they were from and why they were seized . . . and it takes about 4 pages of fine print!

The meat imports which are seized and rejected have these unsafe additives plus just plain filth.

It seems so silly to demand cheaper food when you end up eating some dangerous dishes . . . besides wrecking the agriculture industry in our country.

So next time you take a bite of cheese which came from another country, you can wonder whether the price really is right.

PEACE ACTION COALITION NOT ONLY OPPOSED TO WAR; WANTS AMERICAN AND ALLIED DEFEAT

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the Evans and Novak column appearing in the Washington Post of April 19 cites some pertinent facts as to the sponsorship of next week's antiwar demonstrations of which all should be wary in determining whether to endorse the demonstrations.

Not noted for extremism on either end of the political spectrum, Evans and Novak point out that one leading contender for the Democrat nomination for President has already endorsed Saturday's—April 24—demonstrations, sponsored by the National Peace Action Coalition, "without even considering that its domination by Trotskyist Communists typifies the cloak of respectability inadvert-

ently provided for the far left by liberals." As to their goal, the column goes on—

The Trotskyists running Saturday's demonstrations want more than just peace in Vietnam. Their literature describes the Communist aggression in Vietnam as "The Vietnamese Revolution" and heaps praise on it.

In short, not only have the antiwar passions covered for the activities of groups such as the National Peace Action Coalition, but there should be little doubt that even legitimate emotions against the war are being exploited not only for a premature ending of American involvement in Vietnam, but for keeping alive the resistance of the enemy to a time when a takeover can be accomplished without the active intervention of American troops. The old proverb of "killing two birds with one stone" is nowhere more aptly illustrated than here with the United States and her allies being cast as the intended losers by the peace coalition.

The Evans and Novak column follows:

The fact that Sen. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine endorsed Saturday's antiwar demonstration here without even considering its domination by Trotskyist Communists typifies the cloak of respectability inadvertently provided for the far left by liberals.

In their rising antiwar sentiment, Muskie and other prominent Democrats are determined to back any nonviolent peace demonstration. Furthermore, in the lingering reaction to the Joe McCarthy era, liberals are reluctant to probe anybody's ideological beliefs.

The result puts Muskie in some decidedly strange company. Scarcely a radical himself, Muskie as president would continue—for a time, at least—aiding the Saigon regime. Yet, he has aligned himself with left revolutionary forces who do not merely oppose the U.S. participation in the war but openly advocate a Communist victory.

The situation derives from the fact that Muskie determined his attitude toward the spring antiwar demonstrations on one criterion only: non-violence. Saturday's march on Washington is peaceful in purpose and not likely to turn violent. Therefore, Muskie endorsed it. The series of sit-ins and other confrontations planned between May 3 and May 7, though avowedly non-violent, are likely to become violent. Therefore, Muskie did not endorse them.

At no time did Muskie check the background of the National Peace Action Coalition (NPAC), sponsors of the Saturday demonstration. "There is no way for us to inquire into the ideological beliefs of anybody in this organization," Muskie told us. Therefore, he had no idea whether Trotskyite Communists were or were not running NPAC nor did he show much interest in that question.

If he had, he would have found NPAC's staff dominated by the "Trots." An example: Don Gurewitz, a member of both the Trotskyist Socialist Workers Party and its youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance. Another example: Jerry Gordon, a Cleveland Trotskyist leader.

Their presence in NPAC is no accident. NPAC was formed in June last year during a meeting in Cleveland held by the Trotskyist-dominated Student Mobilization Committee. At that meeting, leaders of the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance were in dominant positions.

What makes all this significant is that the Trotskyists are not the few bedraggled malcontents of a generation ago but the most dynamic, most effective organization on the

American far left. Ever since the Socialist Workers Party fully took over the Young Socialist Alliance (then three years old) in 1960, the Trots have undergone an amazing renaissance. The Young Socialist Alliance has replaced the faction-torn SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) as the most important radical organization on college campuses and is now a prime mover in national antiwar demonstrations.

Behind this success has been undeviating Trotskyist insistence on two positions: non-violence and sticking to the war. While other left groups (including the Moscow-oriented Communist Party) go off on tangents concerning race and class struggle and may flirt with violence, the Trots have amassed support by concentrating on non-violent opposition to Vietnam.

But adopting this tactic does not mean they have abandoned their dream of a revolutionary takeover. Rather, the war opens a magnificent new avenue to an old goal. "The antiwar movement . . . can, through militant mass antiwar actions, contribute immeasurably—as it already has—to educating people about the true role and nature of the capitalist parties and the capitalist system," writes Nelson Blackstock of the Young Socialist Alliance.

Furthermore, unlike Muskie and other well-meaning liberals, the Trotskyists running Saturday's demonstration want more than just peace in Vietnam. Their literature describes the Communist aggression in Vietnam as "The Vietnamese Revolution" and heaps praise on it.

Growing antiwar passion has shielded these realities from the liberals. Well-organized and purposeful, the Trotskyists take the trouble to plan nationwide demonstrations, and liberals such as Muskie feel compelled to cooperate. The result is what would have been unimaginable a few short years ago: Hundreds of thousands of Americans marching in their capital under Trotskyist command.

THE LESSONS OF VIETNAM

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal of April 19 contains an excellent editorial on the lessons to be learned from the experience of the United States in Vietnam.

It points to the American support of the overthrow of the Diem government as a crucial decision in Vietnam, one which is rivaled in significance only by the decision in 1965 to send U.S. ground troops.

From the beginning, I have said that the involvement of American ground troops in Southeast Asia was a grave error of judgment. The editorial makes that point and also shows a number of other mistakes that led to our deep involvement in Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "On the Lessons of Vietnam," be printed in Extensions of Remarks.

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

ON THE LESSONS OF VIETNAM

The nation will be a long time sorting out the mistakes that led it to such grief in Vietnam, but it is none too soon to start any

reassessment that may help avoid similar mistakes in the future. Charles W. Yost has recently offered a list of eight errors, and we think it well worthwhile to discuss several of the major ones he lists as well as a very major one he omits.

Mr. Yost's account is refreshing because he was only on the remote fringes of Vietnam policymaking in a distinguished career that included a term as ambassador to the United Nations. One reason why the true lessons of Vietnam will emerge only slowly is the "reassessments" written by former officials intent on proving how their advice would have saved the day if it had been taken, or how their President would not have done it, or how they could have been so totally misled only by great villains. (One humorous exercise we witnessed was a bright young former foreign-policy intellectual tracing the problem back to Sen. Joseph McCarthy. How satisfying!

Anyway, in Mr. Yost's list two of the most important points are points of retrospect. One error, he believes, was thinking that Communist China was about to sponsor "wars of liberation" to conquer all Asia. Another was overestimating the potential for guerrilla war to topple developing governments, ignoring that Vietnam was more the exception than the rule because of deep Communist penetration during and after World War II.

Certainly Vietnam would have been a different proposition in the early 1960s if we had known that China was about to tear itself apart in the "great cultural revolution," or that guerrilla efforts even by such as Che Guevara would end in abject failure.

Still, we should not forget that in the early 1960s those things were not at all clear. Indeed, about the only serious opposition to Vietnam in those days came from men like Walter Lippmann and Hans Morgenthau, who proceeded from precisely the opposite premise—that Chinese control of this area was inevitable and irresistible.

Also, there is a real question whether today's retrospect is itself a product of the Vietnam war's buying time for other nations in the area. Would Indonesia really have gone the direction it did if Saigon had fallen and communism had seemed the wave of the future?

Two more of Mr. Yost's points seem to us highly salient. One fault was an exaggerated faith in "counter-insurgency." Another, he says, was supporting anti-Communist governments without insisting "effectively" that they reform themselves to broaden their popular base. We think him absolutely right on the first and absolutely wrong on the second, and between the two quite illuminating on the kind of thinking that led to the error he omits.

Mr. Yost sees that Americans cannot be effective with military tactics to subdue Asian guerrillas, but he clings to the belief they can be effective in designing political reforms to win the loyalty of Asian peasants.

Actually, one of the clearest lessons of Vietnam has been that the "hearts and minds of the people" will go to whichever side provides effective local military security. Asians long ago saw this simple lesson, but Americans long ignored it in looking for some magic political reform—don't worry whether the peasant is shot or starves, give him freedom of speech and a vote and he will fight the Communists.

This is precisely the kind of thinking that led President Kennedy's advisers to sanction the coup against Diem, which is the error Mr. Yost omits. In the long history of our involvement, this decision is rivaled in importance only by the 1965 decision to send American ground units; and of the two coup may have been the more decisive turning-point.

The coup decision remains crucial even if one lays aside the question of whether it

led to the military deterioration so marked during 1964. Perhaps the charges against Diem were all true and the country would have collapsed even without a coup, though we think that not so evident as popular history has it. The military question aside, the coup was highly decisive in terms of the American commitment.

When Washington gave the final go-ahead for the overthrow of the indigenous government, it assumed a responsibility for the eventual outcome many times greater than it held the morning before. If we were not to withdraw without doing that, how could we withdraw any time soon after doing it? What American President could in effect say to other nations. If you invite our support we may connive in the overthrow of your anti-Communist leaders, but when the Communists then threaten we will throw in the towel without a serious effort.

By now that serious effort has been made, and one of the purposes of the Vietnamization policy has been to insure that if Saigon does fall it will be only through its own fault, just as it would have been back in 1963. By now the error of the coup has been expiated at gruesome cost, but certainly no list of our mistakes should overlook it.

THIS IS A CHOICE LAND

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Daughters of the American Revolution magazine, I read an excellent article by Sara Roddis Jones entitled "This Is a Choice Land."

In her article, Mrs. Jones points out that national defense is more than planes, bombs, and guns. It is, in essence, the will and determination of every citizen to support their Nation, to uphold and strengthen its laws, and to encourage responsible government.

At this time, the national society Daughters of the American Revolution are holding their 80th Continental Congress in Washington. I certainly congratulate the DAR's for their long and honorable history of patriotism and devotion to our country.

I commend Mrs. Jones' fine article to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THIS IS A CHOICE LAND

(By Sara Roddis Jones)

America is a troubled Nation today. Our people are weary of war, inflation and turmoil. In this atmosphere, we are in danger of falling easy prey to the revolutionaries in our midst, forgetting that this is a choice land and that we, as a people, have been rarely blessed. The greatest disaster which could befall this land would be our failure to accept joint responsibility for defending and preserving all that is great and good in America.

Most of us think of "national defense" in terms of a strong military posture capable of defending the Nation against all enemies. However, "national defense" has a deeper

meaning. It is a thing of the spirit as well as of the military.

We could have all the planes and ships, bombs and guns that we need, but if we fail to understand the full measure of our responsibility as individual citizens, or if we grow weary of our responsibilities, then all that we hold dear may slip through our fingers through our own apathy and inertia. If we lack the will to be free, if we lack a willingness to defend our freedom at home and abroad, our military strength will avail us little. America can be destroyed from within as well as by A-bombs. The revolutionary forces at work within our borders are as much a threat to our survival as a free Nation as all the bombs the Soviet Union can muster. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union expects us to fall like an overripe fruit into its lap.

In a few short years America expects to have a momentous birthday, the 200th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The President's Bicentennial Commission is already drawing up grandiose plans to celebrate this great event from coast to coast. Each of the States has been invited to pick out a week of 1976 during which time that State would be the focus of national attention as it commemorates its own history in its own distinctive way.

All of this celebration will be but tinkling brass and cymbals if, in the meantime, we have failed to revive the ideals of the Republic. If we are also to celebrate 1976 as an anniversary of freedom, now is the time to rededicate ourselves to the moral and spiritual and constitutional values on which our freedoms are based. These are the enduring values which must be defended at all costs. The greatest gift we can pass on to succeeding generations will not be material goods or scientific advancement; it will be the gift of a cherished heritage of freedom, carefully nourished, preserved and protected.

At this moment in history, our Country is beset by war, inflation, crime, campus uprisings and a general decline of morals. Bombings grow more frequent and violence walks our streets.

What has happened to America? Can we permit a small band of revolutionaries to disrupt our colleges and universities, to bomb Government research centers, kill innocent people and ruin the careers of devoted scientists?

What kind of a Country do we live in when the flouting of law has become a national pastime, where a policeman is called a "pig" and becomes an object of derision and attack by an untutored, undisciplined and unprincipled rabble?

Are we now to sit idly by and allow the enemies within our gates to destroy constitutional government, make a mockery of justice, insure domestic anarchy, disregard the general welfare and repress the general liberty? Of course not! The answer should be a thousand times "No."

The violence that besets us has tended to obscure the fact that freedom is threatened on another front—by inflation. The lesson of history is that without financial solvency, freedom cannot long endure. Nevertheless, for 25 years we have scattered our substance in every corner of the world, and permitted unbalanced budgets at home. Our national debt is greater than the combined debts of every nation on earth but we continue our profligate spending without thought for the future. We are teetering on the edge of bankruptcy.

Not long ago, Congressman Otto Passman pointed out:

"Our gold holdings have been reduced from \$22.8 billion to \$10.3 billion. Short-term dollar claims against the United States have increased from \$8.6 billion to \$42 billion. If

we should be called on to meet these short-term demands, we could not meet the demand."

Moreover, the European central banks are growing impatient over United States failure to put its financial house in order. As long ago as 1962, a distinguished economist warned that these same European central banks, if they wanted to, could bring the dollar down to virtual worthlessness. Meanwhile, foreign aid and deficit spending at home go on, and on and on.

Our financial situation is reflected in the fact that our currency is no longer redeemable in either gold or silver. Even our coins have no intrinsic value. Throughout history, gold and silver have been the refuge of the people against the profligate spending of their government, but the American people have no such protection. Only foreigners can demand gold for the dollar. We are at the mercy of the European central banks and our own Government planners. Is this freedom?

The American people have not understood the significance of our irredeemable currency. Much less have they understood that a managed and irredeemable currency is a necessary weapon of socialism. This fact cannot be stated too often. The sequence of socialism in all history has been, 1) gifts to the people from taxes and printed money, 2) reduction of the purchasing power of money, and finally, 3) reduction in the freedom of the people. There is no surer way to destroy freedom than to debauch the currency.

Thus, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that inflation must be reversed if we are to survive as a free people. Pressure groups of our people at home—and foreigners around the world—must stop irresponsible raids on the treasury of the central Government in Washington. This is not too much to ask for the preservation of a great Nation and the free world. It is really asking for responsible citizenship, good government and fiscal soundness. And I might add here that a guaranteed annual income will contribute to neither responsible citizenship nor fiscal soundness.

These are elements which are required if freedom is to be preserved. Unfortunately, freedom cannot be passed on from generation to generation like some fine work of art or rare piece of silver. Each generation must earn freedom, if it is to deserve it.

Here we must ask ourselves whether we have the faith, the courage, the necessary self-discipline, and the will to make the effort to preserve our God-given liberty. Can we match the zeal of the revolutionaries and the communists who are bent on our destruction? These questions are not asked idly for "a society that does not defend itself is bound to destroy itself." To yield to mob rule or to permit inflation to flourish can only bring the downfall of government of the people.

How do we reverse this trend? Where do we begin? With ourselves, of course. Every American must accept some responsibility for the fact that we have allowed the moral, the financial and the military strength of this Nation to be sapped. Moreover, we have failed to enlist the help of idealistic youth in our task of preserving freedom.

If we are to succeed in our task, we must now look to our young people for help in shoring up the foundations of the Republic, since the future of this or any other nation must lie in the hands of its young people. We can never survive unless our young people understand and appreciate the American system which has given more freedom and more of the good things in life than any other system in the world. We cannot survive as a free nation unless our young people have a

dedication that exceeds the dedication of the enemy. Character must become important in this Country again. The essentials of honesty, self-respect, loyalty, support for law and order, MUST be taught the younger generation—and here is where we have failed them most dismally.

Our sons and daughters come home from college challenging the moral and spiritual and constitutional values which brought this Nation to the pinnacle of greatness. Parents have reason to wonder whether their children are coming home from hotbeds of anarchy rather than groves of learning. Meanwhile, an extremely vocal minority among the young people is already alienated from what they choose to call the "establishment." And is it any wonder when such well publicized speakers as Jerry Rubin, Abbie Hoffman and David Dellinger are permitted and paid to give campus audiences profane assurances that the United States must and will be completely destroyed? These men have nothing to offer the youth of America but the destruction of the edifice of constitutional liberty, but their speeches are all too often accorded a standing ovation by campus audiences.

The communists have understood—if we have not—that if the thinking of a single generation can be changed, America can ultimately be taken over without firing a shot. For more than 20 years our children have been their prime target and the wonder is that so many have come through unscathed by the continuing attack upon our institutions and way of life.

It is, therefore, urgent that these still unaffected young people be enlisted now. And this is why.

Former special assistant to President Nixon, Roger A. Freeman, has reported that during a trip to the Soviet Union early in 1970 he personally heard Soviet officials boast openly and boldly of our impending destruction. His report stated:

"Soviet officials were quite frank in saying that they expect American foreign policy to be influenced and largely governed by domestic events, including mob violence on our campuses. The Soviets expect that they can sit back and wait until we give in. They are, 'I believe, mistaken,' said Mr. Freeman, 'but I am not surprised that they feel this way.'

It is this Nation's tragedy that we have continuously underestimated communism. We have refused to equate it with the creeping socialism which is gnawing at the vitals of our Country. For 15 years the Attorney General's office has failed to provide a list of subversive organizations. Technically, there have been no new communist fronts in the past 15 years. Meanwhile, the communists have flourished and grown bolder.

During this same period, the so-called liberals have pooh-pooed the threat of communism and have been quick to raise the spectre of McCarthyism and witch hunts. The result is that our free society finds it difficult to defend itself against the inflammatory and anarchistic nihilism abroad in the land.

On the international scale, we have been no less blind. We have failed to understand that communism seeks by every means to prevent peace between nations and to foment new causes of conflict, the watchword being to transform every new war into a civil war.

We look at communism, but we do not see it clearly as a continuing threat to all that we hold dear. Perhaps our most tragic blunder has been our surrender of our once overwhelming strategic superiority. At the close of World War II, we had a 100-1 lead over the Soviet Union. In the years that have followed, our strategic forces and military

strength acted as the greatest single deterrent to a full-scale confrontation with the Soviet Union. Can we still say that today?

In our quest for an illusory peace we have allowed the Soviet Union to achieve nuclear parity with the United States and have simultaneously pursued a policy of unilateral disarmament. Hear the recent words of Senator Henry M. Jackson: "The total megatonnage the Soviets can deliver against United States targets is several times our own." During the height of the debate on ABM—as the antiballistic missile system is called—he also stated that it would be "dangerously foolish" for the Senate to kill further expansion of the Safeguard ABM system.

To be sure, the United States is bending every effort to slow down the arms race. However, we have no assurance that this can be done—with or without a treaty with the ever-perfidious Soviet Union. Without such a slowdown, America's strategic position could suffer dramatically in the next three years. The August 17, 1970 issue of *U.S. News & World Report* warned that at the present rate of building, the Russians will move far ahead in land-based missiles, pull at least equal in sea-based missiles, and the United States bomber force will decline. In short, warning was given that the strategic lead could shift sharply to the side of the Soviets. Should this occur, our great Nation would find itself subject to nuclear blackmail.

Unfortunately, this is not our only danger. In July 1970, Frank J. Johnson wrote a somber epitaph to the declining greatness of this Country. Mr. Johnson is the foreign editor of the American Security Council's *Washington Report*. These were his words: "The tide of history has begun to run against us, and the day of our world pre-eminence is over."

Here let it be said that America never sought world pre-eminence. It was thrust upon us. But we gloried in our freedom and triumphantly overcame every adversity until, in 1945, we emerged from the scourge of war as incomparably the world's greatest power.

"But today," wrote Mr. Johnson, "the strength of character and will which once maintained our legions in their awesome strength and fueled them with purpose flowing from conviction is fast ebbing. . . . America is now a Nation in deep crisis and tragically divided.

"The internal convulsions which beset Rome in the first century B.C. did so with her external frontiers at least secure so that she could afford the luxury of domestic strife and still survive. We are not so fortunate. Our Time of Troubles has come upon us in the midst of, and in part because of, a titanic world conflict for the political destiny of all mankind. A large segment of our population seems entirely to have lost sight of what is at stake. We are turning inward and contending against each other, either unmindful of or uncaring about the holocaust which our withdrawal from power and responsibility will unleash upon the world and upon ourselves.

"It is a matter of will, and we no longer have it," he concluded.

Shall we meekly accept this judgment? Shall we bow before the twin threats of Soviet military might and internal subversion? Are we approaching the point in history where we are prepared to accept the slogan: Better Red than dead? Almighty God, forbid it!

Perhaps we would do well to remember that Gulliver wasn't felled by the Lilliputians all at once. He was tied down bit by bit, and so it is with us as insidious communist propaganda divides and weakens us. Isn't it time that we woke up to our peril? Isn't it time that we recognize communism for what it is and understand that it pollutes the atmo-

sphere of freedom with its venomous attacks upon all that we hold dear—our Flag, our Country, our churches, our homes, our institutions and our traditions?

We should have understood this long ago. In 1947, J. Edgar Hoover warned that the communist goal is unchanged. It is the destruction of the power of religion and the establishment of a godless, atheistic society. He added, "Only their propaganda line has undergone alteration. Now they, the most reactionary advocates of tyranny the world has ever known, and best described as 'Red Fascists,' advertise themselves as champions of liberty. They claim to stand for equal rights, for better working conditions, for the abatement of poverty, for the equitable division of the products of industry and for the rights of racial groups and political minorities. But these are idealistic objectives for which all God-fearing people stand. The communists use them as a cover to conceal their real aims of undermining democracy."

In 1955, Mr. Hoover was already mourning the inroads that communist propaganda had made in influencing law-abiding American citizens. Now we are in the seventies. A recent editorial reminds us: "Here we stand, the strongest, freest, most compassionate and humane Nation on earth; yet from all sides we daily hear intemperate assaults on our way of life, our cherished values, our inspired traditions, and our national character. And millions of us in the 'silent majority' tolerate these assaults.

"For more than 10 years a hodgepodge of downgraders of America has tried to persuade us that everything we believe in, everything we have done in the past, and everything we plan to do in the future is wrong. Their violent actions on college campuses, their desecration of public buildings, their despoliations in our cities—most unhindered and unchecked—are paraded before us in newspapers and magazines and on TV as though these people were the harbingers of some glorious future instead of destroyers of both necessary public institutions and private property. . . .

"We are told we should feel guilty for helping our allies in Korea and Vietnam maintain their independence from communism. We may have made mistakes in the way we have conducted these wars; but assuredly we should not feel guilty for honoring our promises, for helping others to resist aggression, and for fighting—with no hope of material reward and at great sacrifice—for the right of these people to live in peace and freedom."

So, what is the matter with us? What is the matter with the United States of America? Nothing is the matter with us that a renewed faith in Almighty God and in this great Nation of ours could not undo. Nothing is the matter with us that cannot be cured and corrected if the "silent majority" will throw off its apathy, speak out, stand up and be counted in defense of all that is great and good in America. We need not one, but thousands of Paul Reveres to "proclaim liberty throughout the land" and to remind the people that the perpetuation of freedom is our responsibility—Now.

Today, we are engaged in a war that is no less fateful than the Revolution of 1776. I do not speak of the war in Vietnam but rather of the battle for the minds of men. It is a battle against the dialectical materialism of atheistic communism. It is a battle for our God-given liberty. History will not hold us guiltless if we lose this war. America has always been the bastion of freedom. If the lights of freedom ever go out in this Country, they will go out all over the world. There will be no one to help us. If we do not act now to preserve the American heritage of

freedom, tomorrow's children will have neither the freedom nor the opportunity to protect it.

Our generation is charged with the most awesome responsibility in history—the trusteeship of freedom. While we stand strong and firm all the world can hope for ultimate delivery from tyranny. So let us take action—in politics, in our schools, in our newspapers—yes, even in our churches, or wherever the need is felt. Let us also put on the armor of faith. Let us, as our forebears have done before us, put our trust in Divine Providence and resolve to win the battle for freedom. It is a continuing fight and one in which we cannot afford to grow weary. And as we gird for action, it may help us to remember the promise and warning contained in the Book of Mormon:

"Behold, this is a choice land. And whatsoever people shall possess it shall be free from bondage and from captivity and from every nation under Heaven, if they will but serve the God of the Land."

TWO SEABEES ADD NEW SKILL

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the attention of my colleagues to the fine contributions our service personnel make to their adopted communities. We, in Rhode Island, are especially proud of the work of the Seabees, both collectively and as individuals. Many of these men go out of their way to participate in community activities such as Boy Scouts and Big Brothers. The newspaper article that follows is a pertinent example of this social commitment. I am proud to draw it to your attention:

TEACH GRADE SCHOOL ON LUNCH HOUR: TWO SEABEES ADD NEW SKILL

Two days a week, two Seabees travel to East Greenwich schools on their lunch hours. Waiting for them are grade-school pupils who are having trouble with certain school subjects.

Under a special arrangement with Volunteers in Action in the town, Seabees volunteer their time to work with pupils on a one-to-one basis.

They don't have to have any prior training. But even by flashing arithmetic cards, or pointing out difficult words, the volunteers help to make school a little more rewarding and interesting for the youngsters.

At the Eldredge School, John S. Sullivan, who is a constructional electrician second class at Davisville, meets with two boys for a half-hour each.

"I noticed a bulletin," he said, and volunteered to help. "The idea appealed to me."

Yeoman Second Class Robert M. Mock goes to Our Lady of Mercy School twice a week to assist pupils with reading or arithmetic difficulties.

On one particular afternoon, Sullivan worked with David Wild, a seven-year-old son of a Navy family. His problem was reading. A half hour later he met with Robert DeRensis, 7, of East Greenwich, who is having trouble with arithmetic.

"You can do it if you want to," Sullivan said to Robert, as he kept flashing addition cards. "I want to," the youngster replied.

CVXVII—695—Part 9

THE PROPOSED ALASKA PIPELINE

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, among the important problems facing us and demanding solution is that of the North Slope oil strike in Alaska and the question of the proposed Alaska pipeline.

I claim no expertise on this matter but as a conservationist I am seriously concerned that whatever is done be done with preservation of the values of the largely unspoiled Alaskan wilderness very much in mind, and with every strict precaution taken to that end. At the same time I am convinced that, ultimately, we must and will have the oil. This has to be true, as a matter of economic and world political reality; and, in addition, the romance, the risk, and the adventure of private enterprise will force the continuation of this vast exploration upon the minds of men—no less than will the prospect of great financial profit. The question, then, it seems to me is probably not whether the pipeline will be built, but rather, when, how, and under what careful and intelligent safeguards it will be done.

In this connection I am impressed with the following thoughtful excerpt from the book "Wilderness and Plenty" by Dr. Frank Fraser Darling, vice president of the Conservation Foundation, which was recently reprinted in the Chicago Tribune:

THAT ALASKA PIPELINE
(By Frank Fraser Darling)

(NOTE.—With the permission of Houghton Mifflin Company, we print below an excerpt from "Wilderness and Plenty," by Frank Fraser Darling. The text of this short book was originally written for a series of lectures for the British Broadcasting Company. Dr. Darling is now vice president of the Conservation Foundation in Washington, D.C.)

I was recently in Alaska, attending the public hearings on the projected building of an 800-mile pipeline from the Arctic Ocean to Valdez on the Pacific Ocean. Nearly 20 years ago I traveled Arctic Alaska pretty thoroughly when the Office of Naval Research was exploring for oil west of this new great strike at Prudhoe Bay. The passage of caterpillar trains across the tundra, the dumps of oil drums, the filth of camps on permafrost were not very pretty. . . . Now the activity is terrific.

Hundreds and thousands of acres of Arctic tundra will no longer rear phalaropes, sandpipers, lemmings and snowy owls, but are being reinforced to take drilling rigs, make permanent campsites and so on. Many more cat trains are going on what will be a permanent road one day, and there are about a thousand flights a day to the north slope of the sublime Brooks Range.

OIL DEVELOPMENT CERTAIN

Here is going to be impact in a big way. Whether we like it or not, we live in our era and that oil is going to come out. The world does not need that oil right now, but the world political factor which is also so potent an ecological factor makes it expedient that the rigs get going, the pipeline be built, and the 1,000-foot tankers get moving thru the Northwest Passage, even tho Canada is both

ered about possible accidents in those narrow seas. Oil of the Middle East is subject to the political vagaries of impulsive, compulsive peoples who can upset the world situation at any moment they choose. Diplomacy and duplicity are not far apart where oil is in debate. The Alaskan strike gives the chance of more stability, so it must be developed. It could indeed be a factor in world peace. But what is going to happen to a large and biologically important area of Arctic wilderness?

It is no good looking back over our shoulder. We simply cannot stop oil development, but we can do our utmost to canalize it and prune wasteful movement and development over the fragile habitat of the tundra.

Till recently the state of Alaska was poor. Now it is potentially rich and is desperately eager to get its fingers onto the contracts and subcontracts, the land speculation and all the rest. The state wants to get the land for itself from the federal government for the whole 800-mile length of the pipeline. There are lots of eager quick-buck men in Alaska. But there is also a surprisingly large number of people dedicated to the conservation of the Alaskan environment. There are 586,000 square miles and only a quarter of a million people, over 20 per cent of them natives. The far-seeing minority, extremely well informed and enjoying a high scientific prestige, have forced the federal government to hold these public hearings.

It is certain that the pipeline will come, but the group calling for postponement and much better survey and research than has been applied so far point out that the route passes thru a series of changes in permafrost conditions and it crosses an active earthquake region.

EXPERIENCE TEACHES CAUTION

Each mile of pipeline will contain half a million gallons of hot oil. What is the risk of fractures? Breakdown could make the *Torrey Canyon* a drop in the ocean by comparison. The oil in the pipeline will be hot. How far will it affect the immediate ground climate of the pipeline? How good will the insulation be? Melting of permafrost could cause a good deal of erosion and landsliding, as well as fracture. . . .

The United States has had the salutary lesson of the Santa Barbara oil disaster to make us be more careful in Alaska. The geological formations in the Santa Barbara Channel are unstable and the Department of Interior was advised against allowing drilling in those waters. But the prize was so great that the advisers were overruled. Now the problem is to seal the disturbed strata against further seepage. The costs of this mistake in policy and failure in technology are going to be immense. One good thing to have come from this disaster is the extra caution the present administration is taking.

MHD—A BUILDING BLOCK FOR AIR AND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Nation is dangerously close to becoming a second-class power in the crucial field of electric energy. Government and industry have been, for much too long, playing a waiting game, each inviting the other to step out first into the programs that will

eventually provide more power with less pollution, or programs which will, in the interim, modify power use by supply and environmental considerations.

I refer here to the neglect of development of new techniques of power generation from fossil fuels and particularly MHD—magnetohydrodynamics. Some of us have tried for several years to encourage both industry and Government to invest more in MHD research.

I recently urged the Department of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee to increase study funds for the Office of Coal Research in this regard, because the suggested 1972 budget seemingly does not indicate the comprehension of international implications, security implications, and environmental implications of failure to move ahead speedily with the energy technology which can produce power from fossil fuels much more efficiently and with much less pollution than at present.

A thoughtful and informative article on MHD power generation, entitled "A Building Block for Air and Water Pollution Control Programs," written by Elvin Quiring and William E. Trommershausen, appeared in the recent first issue of the Charles Street Journal, an undergraduate magazine at Johns Hopkins University. I compliment the editors of the Charles Street Journal on their excellent first issue. I look forward to reading subsequent issues of this fine publication.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article on MHD be printed in the RECORD.

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

MHD POWER GENERATION: A BUILDING BLOCK FOR AIR AND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PROGRAMS

(By Elvin Quiring and William E. Trommershausen)

I. INTRODUCTION

In the early 1960's our nation accepted a goal of putting a man on the moon by 1970. That goal was accomplished one year ahead of schedule and "Mission Apollo" will henceforth stand as a monument to dedicated and cooperative human effort. In this same period man learned, to the surprise of many, that he also is on the "endangered species" list along with the whooping crane, the peregrin falcon, the cheetah and the golden eagle. The present world population of 3.6 billion is committing an irrational act of depleting its natural resources at a very high rate and world population must be stabilized if even present living standards are to be maintained. Furthermore, many of our rivers have become "ecological slums" and the polluted air over our centers of population is a discredit to our recognized technology.

Everywhere people insist on an improvement in their standard of living. This means greatly enlarged energy requirements. Based upon our present methods of developing energy, it is inevitable that there be an increase in the total amount of air and thermal pollution with increasing energy production. There is, however, on the horizon, an energy conversion process called Magnetohydrodynamics or "MHD," that promises to increase the efficiency of energy production thereby decreasing both air and thermal

pollution. The failure of government and industry to boldly support this new technology as we continue to decry the rape of our world ecosystem is discussed in this paper. Perhaps some ways and means can be found to establish a national goal of effective pollution control, a goal such as was set for the "mission to the moon" of the 1960's. Certainly MHD, if made operational, would provide one positive step toward pollution abatement.

II. THE NATURE OF MHD

The origins of the concept in MHD generation are found in the 19th Century studies of the great British experimenter Michael Faraday, who predicted that the armature of an electric power generator could be an electrically conductive fluid or high-pressure gas. Figure 1 shows the principle of MHD generation. Thomas Edison is generally credited with promoting the use of conventional rotating armature type power generators and patents have been issued for this type of generation since about 1910. The substitution of a gaseous fluid for a rotating armature on an experimental basis did not start until 1940 and it was not until the 1950's that measurable progress was made in MHD generation. Several experimental MHD cycles now being investigated by Avco Everett Research Laboratory at Everett, Massachusetts are shown in Figure 2. Avco is one of the few United States firms that is currently continuing active research in this field.

Very simply, the term "magnetohydrodynamic" describes the behavior of electrically charged fluids in electric or magnetic fields. Ionized gases (plasmas), for example, can generate considerable electric power density when passed rapidly through a magnetic field.

Most MHD generators presently being studied work along these lines:

Fuel and air are first compressed, and then introduced continuously to a combustion chamber, where they are burned. The resulting hot gas expands through a nozzle into a generator channel under the influence of a transverse magnetic field. The generator channel contains electrodes which extract electrical energy from the plasma as a direct current voltage. The efficiency of the process can be improved by "seeding" the plasma with sodium or potassium to increase its electrical conductivity.

III. MHD AND ITS RELATION TO THE ENVIRONMENT

The efficiency of a combined MHD-conventional thermal generation is expected to be about 60% as compared to 40% for presently used fossil-fired thermal generation and 30 to 35% for present-day nuclear generation. This means that a conventional thermal generating plant wastes 50% more heat per unit of electric power generation than is expected from MHD generation. About 85% of the waste heat from the present conventional thermal generation is absorbed by cooling water. The effects on our environment of adding heated cooling water to our rivers and lakes are currently under critical review as some experts predict that if the present trend of power supply expansion continues, by the year 2000 fully one-third of the fresh water runoff in the United States will be required as cooling water for both conventional thermal and nuclear generating plants, with possible adverse effects on aquatic life. The remaining 15% of waste heat is lost directly to the atmosphere through plant losses and the tall smokestacks that are seen at all modern thermal generating plants. Along with waste heat are large quantities of CO₂, the effect of which is now under critical review by our leading

scientists.¹ Also discharged to the atmosphere are quantities of sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxides and fly ash and other products of combustion. Efforts are being made to reduce fly ash discharges through the use of electric precipitators and wet scrubbing processes. Chemical means are being used to remove, to the maximum extent possible, sulphur dioxide while at the same time many regulatory agencies do not permit the burning of fuel, either oil or coal, having in excess of 1% sulphur by weight. At the present time there is no concerted effort to attempt to remove nitrogen gases from the gaseous discharges of thermal plants.

In nuclear plants the waste heat that is lost to the environment is about 15% greater than for conventional thermal plants. However, nearly 100% of nuclear waste heat is lost to the cooling water supply as there is no waste heat discharged from the nuclear reactor to the atmosphere. There is a small amount of radioactive gases that are discharged to the air from the reactor and control measures are being worked out to reduce or contain this source of contamination. In some instances there are traces of radioactive pollution in the cooling water and minimum standards are under constant review by regulatory agencies.

In contrast it is anticipated that an MHD generator can operate with a "clean stack". The high combustion temperatures in the range of 3,000° to 5,000° F. will make it commercially possible to remove all sulphur and nitrogen from stack gases. The seed material used to increase the conductivity of the hot gases in the MHD process will also be recovered so that only heat, water vapor and carbon dioxide are discharged into the earth's atmosphere. As heretofore discussed, the effect of adding large quantities of heat and CO₂ to the atmosphere and a possible "green house" effect is currently under active investigation by many scientific organizations.

It is estimated that fuel savings alone from the improved efficiency of MHD generation could be to the order of \$11 billion in the period 1985-2000.²

It is important that the foregoing matters receive consideration as positive steps are taken to improve our ecosystem. While it is true that our large modern fossil-fired thermal-electric generating plants are more efficient than smaller plants built in earlier years, the ever-increasing energy market will require the construction of additional large blocks of conventional fossil-fired generation. Both government and industry predict that electric power requirements nationwide will double every decade to the end of this century. It must also be recognized that a generating unit, once installed, will be operated over about a 30- to 35-year period in order to recover the capital investment made in such plants. Accordingly, control of air and water pollution from the large generating plants that will be installed in the future will become more and more important. Looking back, it now seems clear that our MHD development program over the last 20 years should have had more attention. Having finally accepted this situation, we are still much too lethargic in the matter of bringing into commercial production large-scale MHD generation. In our opinion, a government that can budget and spend more than \$2 billion to develop a commercial nuclear power industry in the last 15 years can give greater attention to the potential of MHD generation. Furthermore, the electric industry itself has not budgeted sufficient funds

¹ See *Scientific American*, September 1970.

² Report from U.S. Office of Science and Technology, June 1969 entitled, "MHD for Central Station Power Generation—A Plan for Action."

for research and development over the last two decades, and today our nation faces a widespread shortage of electric power. It seems clear that ways and means must be found to stimulate greater interest and participation by both government and industry.

About a decade ago, three U.S. industrial firms started serious research on the development of a commercially operable MHD unit, namely General Electric Company, Westinghouse, and Avco Everett Corporation. The problems apparently were greater than originally anticipated, and General Electric and Westinghouse, who are heavily committed to conventional steam-turbine generators, reduced their research programs materially; only Avco continued active interest in MHD research. Through support of a utility group and the Defense Department a pilot plant known as Mark V was developed by Avco which provided basic answers to the problems of high-temperature gas dynamics. Records show that about \$10 million was expended in this effort and the Avco Mark V unit produced up to 32 mw for very short periods of time. Avco then developed a modified Mark V unit (referred to as the LORHD unit) for the Air Force's supersonic wind testing tunnel at Tullahoma, Tennessee, but reductions in Federal spending for basic research have not permitted a continuation of this research project. An effort in 1966 to finance a joint \$26 million project between electric utilities and the Federal Government failed when Federal funds were not made available. Avco is presently doing research and development work on a peaking type MHD generator with limited support from the electric utility industry.

IV. PRESENT STATUS OF MHD PROGRAM

One of the leading trade magazines³ had the following progress report to make on MHD generation:

"A first-generation 1,000-mw open-cycle magnetohydrodynamic power plant burning natural gas or coal could be in operation by 1980 at a capital cost of \$100 to \$120 per kw. Half the power would come directly from MHD and half from a conventional steam cycle. It would show a 20% fuel saving compared with a conventional plant this size, would use less than half the cooling water, and cause practically no air pollution."

If this objective can be realized, MHD generation will result in savings ranging from \$20 to \$40 per kilowatt of installed capacity. We have grave reservations on the ability of the United States electric utility industry to achieve the aforementioned goal by 1980 unless substantially greater budgets are made available for research and development of MHD generation.

At the present time both the U.S. Congress and the Executive Department are showing an interest in the MHD program. In the Executive Department, the U.S. Office of Science and Technology appears to be taking the lead, and in a 1968 report, the following recommendation is made concerning the future of MHD generation:

"(a) That the U.S. Government encourage work on the difficult problems of coal-burning open-cycle gas MHD systems through annual funding of research and development effort of about \$2 million. This would include but not be limited to the problem areas identified in Conclusion (f) and should be done in such a fashion, perhaps through the Electric Research Council, that realistic financial support from the utility industry and suppliers might also be obtained in approximately an equal amount. (Italics supplied.)

"(b) That aside from system studies, work on a complete coal-fired MHD demonstration system should await meaningful success on

the work funded in item (a). This would be expected to take 3 years or more."

The aforementioned report and recommendations did not inspire the public that MHD generation held promise of solving some of the environmental problems associated with the electric utility industry, while at the same time making substantial savings in capital costs.

Senators Mansfield and Metcalf, from the coal state of Montana, having an expressed interest in environmental effects of the utility industry, continued a program that was designed to speed up the research program for MHD. In one bold step the entire Montana Congressional Delegation sponsored a Coal Symposium on November 6 and 7, 1969 which was attended by some 400 representatives of the utility industry, manufacturers, and coal suppliers. There was considerable discussion concerning a \$50 million research and development program that could produce a 75,000-kilowatt pilot MHD generating plant by the mid-1970's, and several excellent technical papers on the subject were presented by Richard J. Rosa and Dr. William D. Jackson of Avco and Kenneth A. Roe of Burns & Roe.

Following that meeting, Congressional Hearings were held before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The record of that hearing indicated clearly that Japan, Russia, and Poland, all being large coal using nations, were aggressively moving ahead with the development of MHD generation. The Russians have under construction and nearing completion near Moscow a 75,000-kilowatt pilot plant that is expected to be the forerunner of large commercial MHD generating plants in the Russian coal fields by the late 1970's. It is of interest to note that in Russia the MHD program is under the Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers directly under Mr. Kosygin, an indication of the importance placed on this potential energy conversion process by that nation.

Notwithstanding the excellent record made at the 1969 Senate Hearings, the interest of the U.S. Congress and the Executive Department has not been sufficiently activated for appropriations for research and development. The aforementioned Hearings on MHD indicate that the Office of Coal Research of the Department of the Interior estimated that a 5-year, \$50 million research program would see MHD through the pilot plant stage. It is our understanding that the 1971 Fiscal Year Budget of the Office of Coal Research contains \$2½ million to start on this program. Based upon the testimony of experts in this field this amount is insufficient and should be increased substantially in the next few years. Unless more funds from the U.S. Government, the electric utilities, and industry are made available for basic research and the construction of one or more pilot plants, it is likely that Russia, Poland, or Japan will develop and sell a commercially operational MHD generating unit well ahead of us—perhaps by as much as a decade.

SUMMARY

In 1960 the United States had about 200,000 megawatts of generating capacity. The Federal Power Commission predicts that this capacity may double in every decade up to the year 2000. If this prediction is realized the utility industry will be making investments in new generating capacity in the next three decades in excess of \$300 billion. The electric utility industry has accepted the responsibility for meeting its predicted load growth while at the same time giving due recognition to the need to avoid degradation of the environment. With due regard for these objectives, we believe that the utility industry and the Federal Government are not dedicating sufficient funds

and manpower to research and development in the field of power generation. The basic question that remains is how can the Federal Government, the electric utility industry and equipment manufacturers be motivated to proceed in a much more aggressive manner on a program for development of a commercial MHD generating unit? Hopefully, the youth of our nation whose lives will span the next four or five decades and who will be greatly affected by decisions to be made in the decade of the 1970's, can bring this problem into better focus than we have been able to do. We heartily applaud such efforts as may be forthcoming from our colleges and universities through the medium of intellectual inquiry.

TECHNOLOGICAL SURPRISE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 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:

Starting about 1971 we could reasonably expect several technological surprises from the Soviet Union.

This statement may not mean a great deal to those 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, Hon. 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 the implications for our future, I would highly recommend that my colleagues peruse 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-

³ "Electrical World," page 5 of August 25, 1969 issue.

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 spectacles. 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 im-

port 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 strategic 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 which employed several forms of conflict, including intelligence operations, propaganda and psychological warfare, political and diplomatic maneuvering, 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 Erfurth² has shown that there are two parties to the operation, the surprier 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 surprise 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.

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 attacker hits the defender where and when he does not expect to be hit. Or, conversely, the defender reacts by hitting with weapons or with performances the attacker did not anticipate and against which he cannot protect himself properly; the defender counterattacks when and where he is not expected.

The number of operational variations is truly infinite, and the details of such operations usually can be planned and prepared with a high degree of secrecy. These variations are possible because of the multiplicity of weapons, the great spectrum of their performance, and the vast number of operational options.

Opportunities to use operational techniques to achieve surprise arise from various combinations of the performance of the carriers of destructive agents and the effects of those destructive agents when they are transported to the target—from the possibilities of multiple routes and methods of attack—from the variety of environments—and from countless other factors and their combinations. In addition, there are the skills of tactics, the principal one of which is to use a military force in a surprising manner. The use of expedients, saturation, and other techniques that cause uncertainty create further possibilities for tactical surprise.

TECHNOLOGY AND SURPRISE

We repeat, surprise is not confined to active combat. Even though hostilities are not occurring now, the battle for tactical advantage and the effort to achieve surprise goes on incessantly. Laboratory is pitted against laboratory to find new advances such as radar techniques for looking over the horizon and for distinguishing between warheads and decoys. The laboratories struggle to compress data so that information, particularly details on attack, can be instantaneously transmitted and presented to decision makers. They search for new concepts that can find expression in hardware and tactics.

In addition, there is the broad area of strategic deception in matters of science. This includes deception about the general state of excellence, the level of progress in a given aspect of science, and the application of science to specific weapon and component development. It seems that behind the Iron Curtain there is a second curtain that conceals the nature of Soviet science.

To conduct this deception, the Soviets release scientific articles and withhold others, thus creating a false impression of their suc-

¹ As this was written the news was announced that the U.S.S.R. has demonstrated a space-borne "satellite destroyer."

² General Waldemar Erfurth, *Surprise*, S. T. Possony and Daniel Vilfroy, trans. (Harrisburg: Military Service Publishing Company, 1943).

cesses, 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 technological 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 Soviet 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 EXAMPLES

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 sequiturs usually abound because emotions become involved in the arguments.

Another frequent source of error is that the versatility of the weapon system is underestimated. 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 surprise has its advantages as far as modernization of the force in being 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 warfare 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 denial 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 deception³ 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

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.

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. Certainly 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

⁴ The Six-Day War in the Middle East has made the concept better known.

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 able 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 percent 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.

ABILITY COUNTS

HON. QUENTIN N. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Miss Janelle Knutson, a young high school student from Williston, was North Dakota's first-place winner in the 1971 "Ability Counts" contest sponsored by the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

I believe Miss Knutson's theme not only calls attention to the outstanding capabilities of handicapped individuals, but also makes a contribution to the national effort to promote jobs for America's thousands of handicapped citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Knutson's theme entitled "Employment of the Handicapped: Community Attitudes" be printed in the RECORD.

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

EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED: COMMUNITY ATTITUDES

Handicapped? Oh, you mean those 24,000,000 men, women and children who cannot carry out their lives to full capacity. Those 8,000,000 adults in the current labor force and 5,200,000 earners who have to be restricted in amount and kind of work they do.

Well, I'm not just thinking statistics. I am thinking about handicapped people everywhere. They live on farms, in towns and cities. Yes, even in your city there are physically handicapped. Some of these handicaps can be seen and others are not visible. I am one such resident in your community. I can be put in that category, handicapped, because of my limited vision. The United States Public Health Service uncovered by a recent survey that one out of seven or eight Americans are limited by a disability to some extent.

Dr. Gudmand Harlem, 8th World Congress of the International Society for Rehabilitation of the Disabled said, "There is no such thing as a normal individual. We are all different in all the thousands of human abilities and activities. We will find large differences among people and really what a dreadful world it would be if we did not!"

If I am handicapped, what am I handicapped for? Maybe I am not able to drive a car or read the print in the daily newspaper, but is that really enough to label me handicapped?

When Mr. David Reyerson, a Williston High School Counselor, was asked about a handicapped person he answered, "What really is considered handicapped? I can't call a person who can paint a picture using his mouth, handicapped. I could never do that with my hands in four years!" Each of us has felt a feeling of inadequacy and has envied the talents and abilities of others. These feelings are more than a passing mood for millions of disabled Americans. Feelings of inadequacy by the handicapped must be replaced by a purpose, a meaning to life. A good job is a way of filling the inadequacy in the life of a handicapped individual. In your community, as an employer, would you hire me?

I don't, Mr. Employer, want you to judge me by my disability, but search deep and see the things I am capable of doing. Try me, you might find me very capable in the right job and valuable in our community.

Two local employers stated, "With proper training in a field, a disabled person can do a good job" and "A handicapped person can do a good job if he is suited and placed in the right kind of work." "The job for which a person is trained must be carefully selected." In other words, a man or lady with only one arm or leg is limited in the kind of job, if the job demands running, carrying or lifting. A person who is deaf or blind must not be barred from a job because he might not be limited in intelligence, aptitudes or a good personality.

So you see, Mr. Employer, if I were placed in work I could do, I would do a good job!

Problems with hiring the handicapped? Mr. Ralph Nelson, a local employer of the handicapped, said, "When a handicapped person is trained for a job it is quite hard for him to accept change. Other employees must realize this. Also, other employees must realize that a handicapped person has certain limitations. There is just a certain area this person can work capably in."

"A handicapped person should not be discriminated against but should be treated equally."

If it weren't for you, Mr. Employer, in my community it could be difficult to find a good job, but with such statements as "In a certain way a handicapped worker is more valuable in that once he is trained he is very devoted and won't miss a day of work," I can. I thank you for investing in me.

My single effort in my community to find

a job would be hopeless. Employment offices placed 300,000 handicapped workers in 1966. There are 3,700,000 handicapped and who are eligible for such services. These can benefit from Vocational Rehabilitation. In 1967, Vocational Rehabilitation rehabilitated 173,000 handicapped people.

Through determination, Vocational Rehabilitation services and cooperative employers, residents of your community, like myself, are earning good incomes, paying taxes and supporting their families with dignity and respect.

AEROSPACE INDUSTRY CAN MEET OUR TRANSPORTATION NEEDS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that our aerospace industry is undergoing a tremendous economic depression. The causes of this depression are, first, the cutback in military and space research and development and, second, a reordering of our priorities.

I favor cutting the waste out of military spending and concentrating our resources in those areas which demand our immediate attention, such as pollution control, mass transportation, housing, and education. However, in reordering our priorities, I feel that there are areas of great demand that can be met by the talents and resources of the aerospace industry.

Mr. Speaker, the talents of the aerospace industry are directly and almost immediately transferable to areas requiring technical and scientific expertise. The North American Rockwell Corp. is currently working with the Department of Transportation to relieve the congestion on our highways by developing a high-speed urban tracked system. The Rohr Corp. is involved in the construction of cars for the Bay Area Rapid Transit in San Francisco. Garrett Corp. is committed to develop a linear induction motor which will reduce automobile pollution in future models.

We must step up our spending in these areas and we must encourage aerospace firms to expand in other related fields. Aircraft noise and air pollution can be reduced significantly by steering our aerospace talents in this direction. We need greater research in airport and air corridor safety. Our air terminals can be improved to reduce time lost on the ground and in airport congestion.

While most people do not travel across the country, there is a great need for improved transportation systems from city to city. Short takeoff and landing—STOL—and vertical takeoff and landing—VTOL—aircraft will be in great future demand for short flights in our urban corridors to save major airports from overwhelming traffic.

Finally, high-speed ground transportation systems are needed to relieve our cities from traffic congestion, air pollution, noise pollution, and great inconvenience.

I believe that the aerospace industry

can meet these needs effectively and economically. Thus, I am introducing a bill to channel the talents, experience, and resources of the aerospace industry into these fields.

This legislation authorizes \$134 million to be spent on aviation safety, urban mass transportation systems, and aviation systems serving urban areas.

Priority in awarding contracts would go to aerospace firms which have had Federal contracts canceled within 12 months of their application, which are located in areas of high unemployment, or which have reduced their labor force by 10 percent since January 1, 1969.

Mr. Speaker, the aerospace industry is ready to meet our needs, we must be ready to include them in our effort to reorder our priorities.

ADDRESS BY DR. ISAAC LEWIN BEFORE THE UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION FOR SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last month, Dr. Isaac Lewin, a distinguished historian representing the Agudas Israel World Organization, addressed the Commission for Social Development of the United Nations. He asserted that the economic aspects of development had been given precedence over the social aspects over the past 25 years and indicated that this has led to the gap between the rich and poor. He called for the drafting of a set of moral guidelines which should apply to economic development.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Lewin's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY DR. ISAAC LEWIN

In considering the World Social Situation at the present time we must necessarily use the historical perspective as well.

We are undoubtedly witnessing now a transformation of the fundamental concepts under which the post-war world was organized. In San Francisco, when the United Nations came into being, peace was envisaged not only in terms of political ideas but also in terms of the inseparability of peace from the whole complex of economic and social development.

Twenty-five years ago, however, economic growth was given priority at the expense of social development. Great emphasis was put upon the economic aspect of the development of nations. The international community expanded through the proliferation of new sovereign states whose political problems closely paralleled their need to attain a minimal national economy.

Now after twenty-five years—one might well say: twenty-five years of trial and error—we must take inventory of the fruits of the emphasis on the economic rather than the social half of the equation.

In making such inventory we find that along with the sweet fruits of national development has come as well as bitter fruit of a gross and overwhelming materialism—a

materialism that threatens to erode the human spirit.

In developed countries the drive for material goods threatens to eclipse the moral and spiritual values of man. Societies, once destroyed by war, have been rebuilt on foundations of worship of material abundance. Economic development, conceived for needy states, has become the over-riding goal of rich nations. Obviously, the underdeveloped nations suffer. A paradoxical situation, therefore, has arisen—the economic and material needs of poorer countries have been neglected at the expense of larger nations' growth.

A similar discrepancy has also been created on the social level between the rich and under-privileged within each affluent nation with the result that we now are witnesses to uprisings in many countries in response to social injustice. Moreover, it is abundantly clear that only when social justice is combined with a stable economy can a nation contribute to peace in the world at large.

The General Assembly of the United Nations has launched the second Development Decade with new emphasis upon the social institutions which must go hand-in-hand with a viable national economy. It is a great tribute to the family of nations that it has accepted increased social responsibility.

I represent here a non-governmental organization, the Agudas Israel World Organization, which was founded in 1912 and embraces religious Jewry all over the world. I represent a creed which has promulgated the concepts of social ethics, morality and justice for centuries. Our pre-occupation with the very core of human existence is therefore understandable. So far we placed emphasis upon the rights of the individual. But our approach to human rights must now meet the modern-day challenge to social rights of man—a challenge that involved not only the poor in the underdeveloped nations but the poor everywhere, for none are so unfortunate as those who live their lives of poverty next door to an unconscionable indulgence in luxury and riches.

In the final analysis the issue is a moral one. First of all, because it is inherently immoral to adopt a creed of materialism at the expense of those who do not have even the basic necessities of life. Secondly, because over-emphasis on the material blinds us to the basic humanism without which an economic structure becomes a Sodom and Gomorrah. Thirdly, because the concept of economics as the basis for peace is an illusion unless social rights go hand-in-hand with economic progress.

The drive for materialism has already gone too far. A dramatic gesture of reversal is necessary. I submit respectfully that the Commission for Social Development consider the drafting of a Declaration of Social Ethics urging the nations of the world to restore the balance between the economic and the social in a set of moral principles related to the concept of world peace.

The peoples of the world should be united and not divided by antagonistic goals which are undermining all efforts for peace and bring about only violence and new revolutions, the rumblings of which are already in our ears.

UPPER DUCK RIVER PROJECTS IN TENNESSEE RECEIVE STRONG BACKING AND ENDORSEMENT

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Congress last year appropriated \$4.6 mil-

lion for land acquisition and the start of construction of the Normandy and Columbia Dams on the Upper Duck River in middle Tennessee.

The Bureau of the Budget, contrary to the mandate of the Congress, has withheld and impounded \$4.3 million of these funds.

Many local governmental and civic organizations have recently reaffirmed their support and interest in moving forward with this project and, in this connection, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in water resource development, I place in the RECORD herewith copies of resolutions enacted by county courts, Rotary Clubs, chambers of commerce, conservation boards, Kiwanis Clubs, Lions Clubs, public authorities, and others.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Duck River Project (Normandy and Columbia Dams) was officially started and publicly announced by TVA in July of 1970.

Whereas, the funds for the Duck River Project were frozen by the Bureau of the Budget in December of 1970.

Whereas, TVA and the Bureau of the Budget have conjured up a requirement of repayment of the water supply portion of this project.

Whereas, the TVA Act gives TVA control of all of the streams in the Tennessee Valley and responsibility for its resource development.

Whereas, heretofore, TVA has maintained a uniform policy without charge for water to municipalities or industries in the valley until the freeze of the funds in December of 1970.

Whereas, it is considered unjust to require the Upper Duck River Area (four-counties of 201 counties in the Tennessee Valley) to pay for water supply.

Therefore, we, the County Court of Bedford County, respectfully urge our Senators, Honorable Howard Baker, Jr. and Honorable William Brock, to prevail upon President Nixon to release immediately the Duck River Project funds.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman Joe L. Evins, Congressman William Anderson, and Chairman A. J. Wagner.

OTTS K. RENEGAS,
County Court Clerk.

RESOLUTION

TULLAHOMA ROTARY CLUB,
Tullahoma, Tenn.

Whereas, Tennessee Valley Authority has planned and is ready to start work on its Duck River Project, calling for construction of dams on Duck River at Normandy and Columbia; and

Whereas, construction of these dams is an essential part in an overall resource program of the Upper Duck River Development Association and the Tennessee Upper Duck River Development Agency; and

Whereas, this resource program is necessary for a future of balanced growth and preservation of our region's human and natural resources; and

Whereas, this effort includes such goals as development of the upper Duck River to provide for domestic, industrial and municipal water needs, while providing a habitat for fish and wildlife; minimizing of flood damage; ensuring that clean water is both used and returned to the river and its tributaries; and conserving the land as much as possible while providing for physical growth; and

Whereas, the communities and their utility systems in Bedford, Coffee, Marshall and Maury counties, on the basis of plans for the

dams and reservoirs, already have spent several million dollars to begin an interconnecting water pipeline system that would provide potable water to more than 100,000 people in both cities and rural areas; and

Whereas, this needed effort has been stymied by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, which has impounded \$4.3 million in funds for this project appropriated by Congress; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Rotary Club of Tullahoma, Tennessee, reaffirms its wholehearted support of the TVA's Duck River Project and the total resource development and preservation program for the upper Duck River region and urges that appropriated funds for these dams be made available by the Office of Management and Budget so that overdue work can begin on this vitally needed project. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our senators and congressmen, to Governor Winfield Dunn, to the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, and to the directors of TVA.

By JAMES R. GRAY,
President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Duck River Project (Normandy and Columbia Dams) was officially started and publicly announced by TVA in July of 1970.

Whereas, the funds for the Duck River Project were frozen by the Bureau of the Budget in December of 1970.

Whereas, we are indeed grateful to Congressman Evins for his untiring efforts to get the Project funds released.

Whereas, there is a small group of people who are opposing the Normandy Dam.

Whereas, the Normandy Dam is vital to Tullahoma's industrial expansion and economic growth.

Therefore, we, the Tullahoma Chamber of Commerce of Tullahoma, Tennessee, reiterate our whole-hearted support of the Duck River Project. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to Congressman Joe L. Evins.

DOYLE E. RICHARDSON,
President.

RESOLUTION

CONSERVATION BOARD OF
COFFEE COUNTY,
Manchester, Tenn.

Whereas, Tennessee Valley Authority has planned and is ready to start work on its Duck River Project, calling for construction of dams on Duck River at Normandy and Columbia; and

Whereas, construction of these dams is an essential part in an overall resource program of the Upper Duck River Development Association and the Tennessee Upper Duck River Development Agency; and

Whereas, this resource program is necessary for a future of balanced growth and preservation of our region's human and natural resources; and

Whereas, this effort includes such goals as development of the Upper Duck River to provide for domestic, industrial and municipal water needs, while providing a habitat for fish and wildlife; minimizing of flood damage; ensuring that clean water is both used and returned to the river and its tributaries; and conserving the land as much as possible while providing for physical growth; and

Whereas, the communities and their utility systems in Bedford, Coffee, Marshall and Maury counties, on the basis of plans for the dams and reservoirs, already have spent several million dollars to begin an interconnecting water pipeline system that would provide potable water to more than 100,000 people in both cities and rural areas; and

Whereas, this needed effort has been stymied by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, which has impounded \$4.3 mil-

lion in funds for this project appropriated by Congress; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Conservation Board of Coffee County, reaffirms its wholehearted support of the TVA's Duck River Project and the total resource development and preservation program for the Upper Duck River region and urges that appropriated funds for these dams be made available by the Office of Management and Budget so that overdue work can begin on this vitally need project. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to Congressman Joe L. Evins, Congressman William Anderson, Senator Howard Baker, Jr., Senator William Brock, Governor Winfield Dunn, and Chairman A. J. Wagner, TVA.

By WILLARD TEMPLETON,
President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Duck River Project (Normandy and Columbia Dams) was officially started and publicly announced by TVA in July of 1970.

Whereas, the funds for the Duck River Project were frozen by the Bureau of the Budget in December of 1970.

Whereas, we are indeed grateful to Congressman Evins and Congressman Anderson for their untiring efforts to get the Project funds released.

Whereas, there is a small group of conservationists who are opposing the Normandy Dam.

Whereas, this opposition is predicated on their resistance to change and progress in the Upper Duck River Valley.

Whereas, the Normandy Dam is vital to Shelbyville's industrial expansion and economic growth.

Therefore, we, The Shelbyville Kiwanis Club of Shelbyville, Tennessee, reiterate our whole-hearted support of the Duck River Project. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to Congressman Joe L. Evins and Congressman William Anderson.

WADE ARNOLD.

RESOLUTION

UPPER DUCK RIVER
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,
Shelbyville, Tenn.

Whereas, the Duck River Project (Normandy and Columbia Dams) was officially started and publicly announced by TVA in July of 1970.

Whereas, the funds for the Duck River Project were frozen by the Bureau of the Budget in December of 1970.

Whereas, we are indeed grateful to Congressman Evins and Congressman Anderson for their untiring efforts to get the Project funds released.

Whereas, there is a small group of conservationists who are opposing the Normandy Dam.

Whereas, this opposition is predicated on their resistance to change and progress in the Upper Duck River Valley.

Whereas, the Normandy Dam is vital to Shelbyville's industrial expansion and economic growth.

Therefore, we, the Shelbyville Rotary Club of Shelbyville, Tennessee, reiterate our whole-hearted support of the Duck River Project. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to Congressman Joe L. Evins and Congressman William Anderson.

JOHN SHOFNER,
Vice President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Duck River Project (Normandy and Columbia Dams) was officially started and publicly announced by TVA in July of 1970.

Whereas, the funds for the Duck River

Project were frozen by the Bureau of the Budget in December of 1970.

Whereas, we are indeed grateful to Congressman Evins for his untiring efforts to get the Project funds released.

Whereas, there is a small group of conservationists who are opposing the Normandy Dam.

Whereas, this opposition is predicated on their resistance to change and progress in the Upper Duck River Valley.

Whereas, the Normandy Dam is vital to Manchester's industrial expansion and economic growth.

Therefore, we, the Manchester Chamber of Commerce of Manchester, Tennessee, reiterate our whole-hearted support of the Duck River Project. Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to Congressman Joe L. Evins.

RICHARD BELL,
President.
H. THOMAS PARSONS,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION

SHELBYVILLE LIONS CLUB,
SHELBYVILLE, TENN.

Whereas, Tennessee Valley Authority has planned and is ready to start work on its Duck River Project, calling for construction of dams on Duck River at Normandy and Columbia; and

Whereas, construction of these dams is an essential part in an overall resource program of the Upper Duck River Development Association and the Tennessee Upper Duck River Development Agency; and

Whereas, this resource program is necessary for a future of balanced growth and preservation of our region's human and natural resources; and

Whereas, this effort includes such goals as development of the Upper Duck River to provide for domestic, industrial and municipal water needs, while providing a habitat for fish and wildlife; minimizing of flood damage; ensuring that clean water is both used and returned to the river and its tributaries; and conserving the land as much as possible while providing for physical growth; and

Whereas, the communities and their utility systems in Bedford, Coffee, Marshall and Maury Counties, on the basis of plans for the dams and reservoirs, already have spent several million dollars to begin an interconnecting water pipeline system that would provide potable water to more than 100,000 people in both cities and rural areas; and

Whereas, this needed effort has been stymied by the U.S. Office of Management and Budget, which has impounded \$4.3 million in funds for this project appropriated by Congress; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Lions Club of Shelbyville, Tennessee, reaffirms its wholehearted support of the TVA's Duck River Project and the total resource development and preservation program for the Upper Duck River region and urges that appropriated funds for these dams be made available by the Office of Management and Budget so that overdue work can begin on this vitally needed project. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to Congressman Joe L. Evins, Congressman William Anderson, Senator Howard Baker, Jr., Senator William Brock, Governor Winfield Dunn, and Chairman A. J. Wagner, TVA.

By Alfred L. English, R. M. Megois, Jim Landeys, W. B. Kyle, A. C. Mitchum, J. C. Edgar, Tom Sigrones, William Parker, Ben A. Green, Benton M. Wheeler, W. D. Copeland.

W. L. Payne, James K. Gore, Archie L. Winnett, Bailey Little, Hobart H. Durbin, E. B. Jenkins, D. W. Rappleye, W. T. Gentry, Sam Pearce, Gerald Priest, Sam Keller.

James W. Kesner, John C. Sheel, Jr., Edw. C. Huffman, H. V. Griffin, N. C. Langley, Adrean G. Fox, Fred Hunt, Jr.
 Dan W. Bobo, Louis S. Smith, D. J. Rice, Roger W. Wilkerson, Jr., Glenn Morrison, Joseph E. Borer, J. D. Norris, Joe Pitner, Theron A. Bracey.
 W. B. Seigneur, Ray Bell, Carl E. Brandon, Berry J. Allen, Ted Hurt, Gust E. Johnson, T. Stacy Welch, John Brutbill, Roy Moon.
 James V. Simmons, Bill Magruder, J. D. Harris, Alfred L. English, Everett Smith, Jr.
 R. A. Roberts, Otis Woodruff, Norman Gibson, Herman Duncan, G. Herman Fogg, Robert R. Newton.

CASTRO—RAILROADING THROUGH THE OLD 92D—CHAPTER 2

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
 Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, last Thursday I placed in the Extensions of Remarks the detailed plan of several conglomerate corporations—which incidentally and reluctantly engage in the railroad business—to lobby a multibillion dollar subsidy for themselves through the Congress. This CASTRO—Conglomerate America's Slick Transportation Rip-Off—proposal includes saturation advertising, designed to curry the favor of media owners and to paint this attempted tax grab as a tax saving.

The Southern Railway has already begun a series of ads to be run in virtually all daily and weekly newspapers in its territory. CASTRO ads have been scheduled on two of the major networks. CBS has refused to carry the CASTRO spots, stating that they are too political. In view of the fact that CASTRO portrays the Federal Government as a robber, perhaps the network fears that Uncle Sam would ask for equal time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles relating to the CASTRO advertising campaign. One appeared in the March 21 issue of Advertising Age; the other in the March-April issue of Ties, house organ of the Southern Railway.

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

RAIL GROUP ASKS CUTBACK IN FEDERAL REGULATION

(By Thomas E. Kelly)

CHICAGO.—The Assn. of American Railroads early next month will begin a \$2,500,000 six-month campaign in support of legislation favoring less government regulation of the railroad industry.

Advertising is scheduled on ABC-TV and NBC-TV, spot radio and in newspapers, including the home town newspaper of each member of Congress. CBS-TV refused to carry the spots, believing they are "too political," Donald T. Martin, assistant vp for advertising and pr, Seaboard Coast Line Railroad, said here today.

Mr. Martin, who is national coordinator of the association's America's Sound Transportation Review Organization (Astro), said the initial tv spots will emphasize de-regulation of the railroad industry. One commercial, called "The Great Train Robbery," will attempt to show how government regulations

are, in the opinion of the association, "robbing" the industry. McCann-Erickson is the agency.

The purpose of the campaign—freight-oriented and not connected with Railpax—is to push legislation through Congress to help implement the Astro program, Mr. Martin said. He spoke at a meeting of representatives of such major railroad suppliers as Pullman-Standard, General Electric, the Electro-Motive division of General Motors and Amsted Industries, and asked their support, both through internal and external pr efforts and media advertising.

Suppliers were sympathetic, but none promised—or refused—to run ads in support of the Astro program. "We have no objection at all (to Mr. Martin's proposals), except budget," said Warren Logelin, vp, Amsted. #

SOUTHERN LAUNCHES "ASTRO" NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

Southern Railway will be talking about ASTRO in advertising placed in virtually all daily and weekly newspapers on-line this year. Five of these advertisements will run at regular intervals throughout the year. The first ad, "Tax Payer Today. Tax Burden Tomorrow?" appeared March 9 in daily papers. The weeklies carried this ad the same week.

At the end of the copy in each advertisement, "The ASTRO Answer" to government takeover of the railroads is given, as follows:

"We think a better alternative is the plan offered by ASTRO (America's Sound Transportation Review Organization), a railroad-sponsored group. In essence, this plan calls for equal treatment of all forms of transportation. And it would encourage investment in rail equipment sorely needed to catch up with today's needs and be ready for tomorrow's.

"Find out more from this free booklet, which outlines the ASTRO plan in easy-to-read questions and answers. Write: ASTRO Booklet, Southern Railway System, P.O. Box 1808, Washington, D.C. 20013. (See questions and answers on page 15.)

"We want to stay a tax payer. Not become a tax burden."

CITIZENSHIP—A PRIVILEGE OR A RESPONSIBILITY?

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
 Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to direct to the attention of my colleagues a very thoughtful essay, written by Miss Janice Floyd of Glen Rose, Ark. Miss Floyd was recently awarded a George Washington Honor Medal by Freedoms Foundation for her essay entitled "Freedom—A Privilege or a Responsibility?"

This same essay also won first place in 1970 in the Good Citizenship Essay Contest of the Ozark District of Civitan International. A 1970 graduate of Glen Rose High School and valedictorian of her class. Miss Floyd is a freshman this year at Henderson State College in Arkadelphia, Ark.

Under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include the essay at this point in the RECORD:

CITIZENSHIP—A PRIVILEGE OR A RESPONSIBILITY?

The day is November 14, 1972. The people of America are at the polls electing a President.

That is, some of the people are there. The others are just too busy to take the time to vote. What they do not realize is that voting and being able to have a part in their government is not an ordinary privilege. It is just one of the many important rights that we have as American citizens. If we do not use these rights, then our country and all that it stands for is being hurt tremendously. As the famous American author Mark Twain once said: "What keeps a republic on its legs is good citizenship."

But what is this citizenship of ours? "It's our right as Americans—our privilege," the people exclaim. If citizenship is such a great privilege, then why do we treat it so lightly?

To explain what is meant by "privilege" in this statement, the Communist type of government presents a good example. When a new leader takes over in a totalitarian country, it is not by will of the people. It is done by a few who are devoted to the party, and the party only. The people of that country are not asked whom they want to lead them. They are given no choice. In this case, they are not given the opportunity of taking part in their government. They have no privileges and only one major responsibility—to do exactly what the government tells them to do.

The citizens of America cannot imagine what it would be like to live under this kind of ruling. Therefore, to be able to appreciate our life as Americans, we must first realize what is happening to us. Because we are taking our citizenship for granted, the idea has been formed that freedom inherited is freedom everlasting.

The second thing that must be realized is what could happen if we continue believing this way and treating our citizenship with such indifference.

Even if we cannot see what is happening, the Communists can, and this could be the destruction of our way of life. Many people want to know how such a thing could happen in our country today. This is my explanation:

Citizenship is linked with freedom, and freedom with morality in America's chain of democracy. Morality, in turn, derives from religious faith, and the source of all goodness is God. Destroy faith in God and moral standards crumble. Destroy your citizenship and faith in yourself and freedom crumbles. The Communists, having no belief in God, know that if they succeed in destroying religion and Americans' faith in their country, that our democracy will not long survive. This is what they are waiting for. If one link grows weak, then the entire chain is in danger. I feel that it is definitely our responsibility, as well as our privilege, to keep this chain strong.

The following example will prove this explanation true in theory, if not in fact.

When General William F. Dean was released from a Korean Communist prison camp, George Schuyler quotes the Chinese psychologists who had been trying to break him, as saying, "General, don't feel bad about leaving us. You know, we will soon be with you. We are going to destroy the moral character of the generation of your young Americans, and when we have finished, you will have nothing with which to really defend yourselves against us."

Usually when a person does not take advantage of what he has, then he is deprived of the right, or privilege, to use it. If the citizens of the United States do not take advantage of the rights that are ours and strive to maintain them, then there is a strong possibility that our freedom could be lost.

The fate of America lies in its youth. The young people of our nation need to be taught the values of life—faith in God, faith in their country, and faith in themselves.

Most important of all, we need to be taught the value of citizenship. Americans should realize that it is a privilege in itself to have the responsibility of being a citizen of the United States, and that it is a responsibility to have and maintain the privilege of our

citizenship, if we intend for our descendants to live in a free country.

In every free nation, such as the United States and Canada, the citizens themselves are the real rulers. Their governments can do only those things which the people authorize. Thus the government may be strong or weak, just or unjust, fair or unfair, depending upon the interest and desires of its citizens.

So the next time you dislike election returns, but do not vote; or you disagree with the actions of Congress, but will not write your Congressman; or you do not understand the issues, yet you change channels when the President gives his State of the Union Address on television, remember this:

As Americans, we are privileged.

To stay Americans, we must be responsible.

ART INSTITUTE OF PITTSBURGH
ESTABLISHES JOHN DENT SCHOLARSHIP

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, we all know the great work that JOHN DENT has performed on behalf of the workingman. Currently his committee is seeking legislation that will protect the pensions of workers and a second bill to raise the minimum wage and put 7 million more workers under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

With a track record like this, it is not difficult to see why homage is paid to JOHN DENT for his efforts.

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania is renowned for his work with another important group, America's students, the greatest hope our Nation has.

Most recently, the Art Institute of Pittsburgh, a school with whose good work I am very familiar and an institution which happens to be in my district, established a John Dent Scholarship to be presented every 2 years to a deserving high school senior.

I believe that this is an excellent tribute to one of this body's more energetic Members.

In establishing the John Dent Scholarship, John Johns, president of the Art Institute, said:

We consider it a great privilege to set up a scholarship in honor of Congressman DENT, as only a small token of the tremendous work he has been doing to help the cause of education. Every student owes a debt to Mr. DENT's diligence and enthusiasm. I am just happy to be able to say "thank you" in a way that will help even more students.

Helping people seems to be a habit with JOHN DENT and a habit with the Art Institute of Pittsburgh which has provided my city of Pittsburgh with hundreds of competent art and design specialists.

A John Dent Scholarship at the Art Institute of Pittsburgh, I could not think of a better union of interests and concerns.

I just want to congratulate both JOHN DENT and the Art Institute and bring to the attention of the House this great honor for the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

LEST WE FORGET

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there have been few problems as perplexing or as frustrating as the prisoner of war/missing in action issue. Over the past 24 months, the plight of our captured and missing countrymen and their families has been brought increasingly before the public, and as a result, we have witnessed an overwhelming groundswell of public sentiment.

During this period, as our attention has been focused on detained and missing servicemen in Southeast Asia, I have concluded that Hanoi does, in fact, value world status—especially as construed by the Communist bloc nations. The Communists of Southeast Asia do not want to be eyed as callous barbarians. Hanoi's leadership continually monitors the waves of world opinion and the release of a debatable complete prisoner list, periodic propaganda films, and an increase in the flow of mail validate our contention that Hanoi hears the American people loud and clear.

Our outrage on this issue must not subside until the missing are accounted for and all men are allowed to return home. Hanoi has consistently indicated that the Communists will not respond to any initiative which will not be to their advantage. The key feature of mounting world public pressure, I believe, is to show the North Vietnamese that continued unresponsiveness to pleas for compliance with the Geneva Convention will work only to Hanoi's disadvantage.

It is our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to let those who prolong the separation of American families know that our anger will not diminish with time.

To be honest, it is easy to sit quietly by. It is also easy to assume an "out-of-sight, out-of-mind" attitude about the issue. It would be simple to pass along the responsibility for these men to someone else, and wash our hands of any involvement in the matter. It does not take much courage to ignore 1,550 American men lost, missing, or interned deep in the jungles or Indochina.

This would be all too easy, and maybe all too true except for the fact that Americans are competitors. Americans are thinkers and Americans are doers, and for our countrymen to remain unlawfully detained for years, thousands of miles from home, is an injustice and should be promptly resolved.

Though these men are, in fact, out of sight, they are not out of mind. All too often, information relating to the prisoners and missing is in cold statistical terms. In a report or filing cabinet portfolio, they may be only figures on a printed page. But as individuals, the figures give way to faces, to personalities, to likes and dislikes, and backgrounds not greatly different from ours. These statistics have names. These names belong to men who have hometowns. Most are married and many have children. They enjoy concerts, art, fish-

ing, a good book, football, summer, fall, winter, and spring. They are just like you and I, then, with the one significant exception that while we live the good life the prisoners and missing only dream of it half a world away.

They cannot be forgotten.

Today I am initiating a POW/MIA project to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Under the heading "Lest We Forget" this daily entry of the name and pertinent background information of an American serviceman who is presently detained or missing in Southeast Asia will serve to remind us that we have a pressing obligation in the fate and future of our prisoners and missing.

With the concurrence of the Department of Defense and the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia, and with the permission of the families of the servicemen whose names will appear in this project, I submit the first entry:

LEST WE FORGET

In a land of progress and prosperity, it is often easy to assume an "out of sight, out of mind" attitude about matters which are not consistently brought to our attention. The fact exists that today more than 1,550 American servicemen are listed as prisoners or missing in Southeast Asia. The wives, children and parents of these men haven't forgotten, and I would hope that my colleagues in Congress and our countrymen across America will not neglect the fact that all men are not free for as long as one of our number is enslaved.

Sgt. Thomas Angelo Mangino, U.S. Army, ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Alliance, Ohio. Married with no children. The son of Mr. and Mrs. Angelo Mangino, Alliance, Ohio. Attended Kent State University. Reported missing in action on April 21, 1967. As of today, Sgt. Mangino has been missing in Southeast Asia for 1,459 days.

INSIDE "THE SELLING"

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1971, there was an interesting article in the Army Times entitled, "Commentary: Inside 'The Selling.'"

It was written by Maj. Raymond E. Funderburk, community relations division, Department of the Army. His comments are most revealing since he was directly involved in the CBS production, "The Selling of the Pentagon," as the Department of the Army project officer for the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference—JCOC—as well as the JCOC Army escort officer on the trip which CBS criticized.

I want everyone to have the opportunity to read what he has to say, and for that reason I insert his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Army Times, Apr. 7, 1971]

INSIDE "THE SELLING"

(By Maj. Raymond E. Funderburk)

As a participant in "The Selling of the Pentagon," I find it impossible to remain silent while the American public ponders the CBS documentary.

I was the Department of the Army project officer for the Joint Civilian Orientation Conference (JCOC) as well as the JCOC Army escort officer on the trip. Interviews with JCOC conferees played a major role in the CBS attempt to portray the military in the worst possible light.

My involvement in this farce was even deeper for I coordinate the appearances of Maj. James N. Rowe, the former POW who was shown being interviewed by Congressman F. Edward Hébert. I knew of the interview with Major Rowe, its intended use, who produced the film clip and the remarks to be made.

Finally, my personal involvement encompasses the entire documentary and its purpose, for I am a journalist and take pride in my professional ethics. It didn't take an MA in journalism to teach me the difference in objective and subjective reporting.

Let's examine what "The Selling of the Pentagon" actually portrays.

First, let's discuss the dialog of Roger Mudd. His narrative was filled with inaccuracies. "We (CBS) were not permitted to film the JCOC activities at Fort Hood—but we later learned what happened..." he reported to the public, with the obvious intent of showing the viewer that CBS had uncovered some secret and elusive activities that took place at the huge armored base.

To my knowledge, CBS made no real attempt to film the JCOC conferees as they were shown the various Army weapon systems and permitted to fire many of them. "They (conferees) pulled the triggers..." related Mudd without telling why. I encouraged the Fort Hood project officer to include time in the schedule for the conferees to touch and feel our equipment and weapons.

My rationale for wanting the civilians to touch and handle our Army equipment was justified by their reactions. "We now better understand the complexity of the equipment and can better appreciate the degree of expertise necessary to control them," said the conferees. We had no intent to amuse the conferees. We wanted them to appreciate the level of training, the degree of professionalism displayed by our young soldiers. They were impressed.

CBS stated quite candidly that JCOC cost the taxpayer huge sums of money. They failed to relate that most of the demonstration shown the civilians during the tour were normal training exercises. Nor, for example, did CBS tell the awed viewers that each JCOC conferee paid \$325 at registration to defray the cost of food, lodging and other personal services.

CBS tried to take the very positive remarks of JCOC conferees interviewed on the show and refute them with the mumbblings of a former Air Force public affairs officer. Why did CBS not interview several present or former public affairs officers rather than stick to the negativens of one man? Obviously, the intent was to show this individual's negative attitude. This is an excellent example of editorializing through the words of others.

At present, Congressman Hébert and his staff are justifiably angry over the less-than-reputable tactics employed by CBS in gaining a film staff member who released the film to CBS under the assumption it was to be used for a POW documentary. He told me that CBS later said they probably wouldn't use it at all for any purpose.

"I have nothing in writing," the staffer related, "so I must suffer under the false allegations." Why should Congressman Hébert or his staff be abused because they were honestly offering the film in hopes it would assist in the POW campaign to bring our prisoners home?

Furthermore, CBS showed the Hébert film as an example of what the Department of Defense produces for the public. Such a statement is too ludicrous and obviously

false to mention. Does the average citizen believe the military would produce films to further the political careers of Members of Congress?

Certainly not! They are commercially produced and shown by local stations in the congressman's home state.

I talked with Major Rowe about the show. He was quite upset that his efforts on behalf of our POWs would be affiliated with such an unprofessional attempt to damn the military. He has reason for being angry, for he takes his own spare time and money to travel throughout the U.S. to speak to groups on the POW issue. The film with Congressman Hébert was one of many made to reach the people with the true story of the plight of our prisoners.

It would take many pages to completely reveal the inaccuracies and falsehoods related by Roger Mudd. What I have revealed is but a small portion of the truth. I do not wholly blame Mudd for the documentary and its script, for there are many writers and producers involved. However, Mudd and the CBS staff cannot look upon their efforts as true professionalism, for the story was one-sided, biased and generally subjective in nature.

The public has a right to know about the workings of its military, for they support its efforts. We in the military use tours, exhibits, speaking engagements and other tools to inform the people. They request these tools—we don't solicit. They beg for speakers—we don't offer. They flock to see demonstrations—we don't herd them. With the interest of our public so evident, should we close our gates, withdraw and continue in seclusion? No. We can ill afford to spend the taxpayers' money without showing them how their dollars are being put to use.

We welcome constructive criticism, for it is helpful in determining problems that can be corrected. However, I find it impossible to apply this label to "The Selling of the Pentagon." It is a shame that CBS would expend thousands of dollars to show the public their views—not the truth.

TELLING IT LIKE IT IS IN VIETNAM

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, this week we have been promised the dubious treat of seeing yet another "peace" demonstration, as if those who are insisting on a U.S.-guaranteed Communist victory in Indochina were the only people in the country who want peace.

Unfortunately, the national influence media are, by and large, overly sympathetic with this far-left movement. Thus, we see a highly distorted picture of what is really happening in Vietnam.

The media are not exactly lying about the war; they are just not telling the whole truth. While concentrating on the failures, they ignore the tremendous successes of American and South Vietnamese military forces and soft-pedal the effectiveness of President Nixon's policies—both in reducing American involvement and in giving South Vietnam a fair, fighting chance for survival.

A very good friend of mine, a career Army officer who is presently on a tour of duty in Vietnam, recently sent me an excellent piece that he wrote himself, listing the media's sins of omission. While

not denying the truth of the media's stories of Allied problems, he points out very well the many successes ignored by the media. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

On the positive side of the coin, there are some elements of the media who march to a different drummer. One such element is the excellent Washington news weekly, Human Events. In the issue of April 17, Human Events points out what an honest reporter should have already pointed out with greater emphasis—namely, the success of the President's Indochina policy and the need for public support of that policy, support that is very much deserved.

Mr. Speaker, I include the message from the Army officer and the article from Human Events at this point in the RECORD:

WHAT THE — GOING ON IN LAOS?

Someone mailed a card to my boss the other day and asked that question. He and I discussed same and with zero extensive research I ran off a few thoughts that may be of interest to friends. It is not clean writing but thoughts as they occurred to me.

Cambodia happened and received the exact same criticism that Laos is now receiving. That action resulted in a total choking of the enemy ability to supply by ship through Cambodia—This has never been highlighted or hardly mentioned in the media.

Laos has been an attempt to cut the other half of the supply routes—the overland routes. The media has condemned it almost totally with no effort to say what its purpose was or how successful it has been.

It seems to me that the viciousness of the media and the super doves is directly proportional to the degree of damage being inflicted on the enemy. Many of the things the media has said about Laos cannot be refuted. However in most cases they are only half truths with no attempt to portray the overall picture.

Report: The beleaguered troops half dead from exhaustion are straggling back to Vn by all means available. Comment: That is not too unnatural in the heat of battle but why not point out that before they straggled back they had an almost ten to one kill ratio which is higher than most of the engagements the Americans were involved in.

Report: Our tank, helicopter and weapon loss has been very high. Comment: Yes, but why did they not also report the massive numbers of enemy trucks destroyed and why no emphasis on the large quantities of enemy caches destroyed which have probably set the enemy back for at least a year. Further, a national media cameraman was aboard one of the attack planes and witnessed great destruction of enemy trucks.—Did you see any pictures of this or hear of it on the news?

Report: The Vietnamese are not ready for such operations yet and are too inexperienced to conduct this type of activity. Comment: Partially true, but the same media and super doves who are politically forcing the Vietnamization to be moved at such a rapid pace may be the ones who should be considered responsible... However look again at the casualties and equipments destroyed by these inexperienced Vietnamese and against the most seasoned troops the North has available.

Report: The war has been widened. Comment: Compare the US casualties now with those of a year ago and consider the fact that we are accelerating the rate at which we leave the country.

No Report: The Delta and other large sections of Vn have been cleared of most or all enemy action and the clearing is continuing at a rapid pace.

No Report: The sea routes of supply for the enemy were closed with Cambodia and now the overland routes have been badly mauled by the Vietnamese and the VC have no real sanctuaries or open routes upon which they can depend to continue their war in South Vietnam or Cambodia.

No Report: Construction throughout many parts of South Vietnam is booming, inflation is at least being slowed and political assassinations are on the decline. Whereas North Vietnam has rationed practically everything but sex—and maybe that.

We don't know the degree of success in Laos but as Alsop said a few days ago we went for the jugular vein and perhaps only chopped off a couple of legs. There were friendly setbacks, but what about those two missing legs, why were they not reported?

COUNTRY SHOULD RALLY BEHIND NIXON WAR STAND

Defying the rising chorus of demands for an immediate and total U.S. troop pullout, President Nixon took a boldly courageous stand in his Viet Nam posture statement last week. He told the country that he would withdraw 100,000 more American troops from Viet Nam between May 1 and Dec. 1, 1971, but he flatly rejected advice to set a terminal date for a complete withdrawal of all American forces there.

Going into 1972, there will still be 184,000 American military personnel in South Viet Nam and, if the public rallies around the President, he may even be able to keep a good-sized residual force in that country for some time to come. Indeed, it is imperative that such a force be retained.

To the consternation of the doves, the President refused to restrict the bombing missions of our Air Force or even rule out ground combat operations for American soldiers. In brief, the President appeared determined that the sacrifices made in Viet Nam will not have been made in vain.

In face of insidious liberal and radical attacks against the Vietnamization formula, the President rightly pointed out that when he left Washington in January 1961, after having served as the Vice President under Dwight Eisenhower, there were no American combat forces in Viet Nam. When he returned there were some 540,000 American troops in that Asian country, with 300 Americans dying every week and with no plans to end U.S. involvement.

By equipping and training the South Vietnamese to take over the war, the President has not only been able to see South Viet Nam survive, but he has cut American casualties to about one-fifth of what they were when the Democrats held office and when Muskie, Humphrey, et al., were hailing their party's war policies.

The President has already withdrawn close to 265,000 troops from South Viet Nam, and he will have removed 365,000 by year's end; yet he will have accomplished this remarkable feat without having jerked the rug out from under South Viet Nam and leaving it easy prey for Hanoi's Soviet-fed military machine. South Viet Nam, in truth, is far stronger today than when he took office, largely because of his successful Vietnamization plan.

Hitting the seductive argument for setting a withdrawal date head on, the President said:

"If the United States should announce that we will quit regardless of what the enemy does, we would have thrown away our principal bargaining counter to win the release of American prisoners of war; we would remove the enemy's strongest incentives to end the war sooner by negotiation, and we will have given enemy commanders the exact information they need to marshal their attacks against our remaining forces at their most vulnerable time."

The issue, as the President forcefully

stated, is this: "Shall we leave Viet Nam in a way that, by our own actions, consciously turns that country over to the Communist? Or shall we leave it in a way that gives the South Vietnamese a reasonable chance to survive as a free people?"

Appealing to those long-forgotten commodities—courage and character—the President stressed that "We have it in our power to leave Viet Nam in a way that offers a brave people a realistic hope of freedom. We have it in our power to prove to our friends in the world that America's sense of responsibility remains the world's greatest single hope for peace."

What else would the ferocious critics of the President have him do other than withdraw in an orderly fashion? They would, sad to say, have him surrender South Viet Nam to Hanoi. They would have him yank out all our troops by year's end—in fact, by yesterday, were that possible. They would deny the South Vietnamese government—a freely elected government, we might add—the vital air and sea power it needs to protect itself. And they would impose a Communist-style coalition government on South Viet Nam.

This formula, or a variation thereof, is favored by every leading Democratic presidential contender save for Henry Jackson. Each of these men has also embraced Hanoi's favorite American resolution—the McGovern-Hatfield proposal—which would expel every American sailor, soldier and marine from South Viet Nam by December 31.

Sen. Edmund Muskie, the Democratic party's most likely presidential nominee at the moment, has even gone an outrageous step further in prostrating himself before Hanoi. He has endorsed, with no apparent qualms, the Communist conceived April 24 "peace" demonstration, which is led by domestic subversives and orchestrated by North Viet Nam (see page 3). He has, literally, called upon the enemies of our country to sandbag the President's Vietnamization policy.

The President has bravely resisted these assaults from the Democrats, as well as the milder attacks from those timid, dovish souls in the Republican party who would rather have the President sell out Viet Nam than risk a possible defeat at the polls.

But he cannot successfully withstand the rising dovish pressures all by himself. He needs support.

Aside from dispatching a note of approval to the White House, those who back the President's stand should write letters to congressmen, senators and the media in support of Vietnamization. Conservatives should mount their own "spring offensive" on behalf of the President's so far highly successful policy.

The facts of the matter are that for the President's formula to succeed, he must sell the country not only on Vietnamization but on the necessity of keeping a "residual" force in Viet Nam—Sen. Hugh Scott to the contrary. As military strategists like Herman Kahn, head of the prestigious Hudson Institute, point out, the U.S. must be prepared to leave a residual support force of at least 100,000 men if we are to discourage further Communist aggression into South Viet Nam, Laos and Cambodia.

There is, of course, ample precedent for such a position. Eighteen years after the Korean War, the United States still has 50,000 troops in South Korea. Though the Russians haven't taken over any new countries in Europe since the late 1940s, the U.S. has a "residual" force in Germany of 220,000 troops in order to block further Communist advancement.

The President, we believe, would very much like to leave a healthy American presence in South Viet Nam—not to fight wars, but to prevent them. He is not going to be able to do so, however, unless the American people rally behind his efforts. The time to show your support is now.

RURAL AMERICA: TRANSPORTATION DESERT

HON. ARTHUR A. LINK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, few things are of greater importance to rural America than adequate basic transportation. Without it, how can we diversify our economy, attract industry and stop the exodus of our young people? How are we going to be capable of absorbing our share of the increasing national population? The Board of City Commissioners of Fargo, N. Dak., has recognized the importance of maintaining adequate rail passenger service in a resolution they recently adopted:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED REGARDING THE RAILPAX PROPOSAL

President Lashkowitz relinquished the Chair to offer the following Resolution and move its adoption: (Vice President Markey presiding)

Whereas, The City of Fargo has noted with considerable interest the introduction of Resolutions by the Honorable Milton R. Young, Senior United States Senator from North Dakota; the Honorable Arthur Link, Member of Congress from the Western District of the State of North Dakota; and our distinguished United States Senator from our own home City of Fargo, the Honorable Senator Quentin N. Burdick; expressing their displeasure with various aspects of the program known as Railpax; and

Whereas, The Fargo City Commission shares the concern of these three distinguished gentlemen and wishes to express its displeasure and unhappiness with Railpax in many respects—its adverse impact on many communities across America with passenger service summarily cut off, the most conspicuous and notable being that of Cleveland, Ohio and also many other cities equally adversely affected; and

Whereas, The so-called southern swing of the State of North Dakota, embracing the communities of Valley City, Jamestown, Bismarck, Mandan and Dickinson are to be also summarily cut off from passenger service which will have a profound physical and economic impact upon our State, its people and its economy, which the Fargo City Commission views with deep concern; and

Whereas, The railroad industry has had a covenant with the American people for many generations whereby the United States of America conferred huge grants and patents of vast tracts of land comprising millions and millions of acres of land across America in consideration of the railroads rendering certain passenger services; and

Whereas, Over the past 15 years there has been a gradual erosion, attrition and evaporation of passenger rail service, always with assurances that the current bite would be the last one, with the result that today we are faced with an emasculated rail transportation service presented to us by the Department of Transportation; and

Whereas, The Fargo City Commission believes that it must now turn to the Congress of the United States and appeal to it to take such action as is necessary to halt Railpax, or to at least delay Railpax, or to modify and alter Railpax—but to do something and do it promptly.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That this Resolution expressing the deep concern of the Fargo City Commission over this latest emasculation of rail passenger service, not only in North Dakota but nationally, should be made a part of the permanent record of

the proceedings of the Fargo City Commission and certified copies shall be forwarded herewith to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable Spiro T. Agnew, Vice President of the United States; the Honorable John Volpe, Secretary of the Department of Transportation; and to the four distinguished Members of the North Dakota Congressional Delegation in the hope and expectation that this Resolution will be incorporated in the Congressional Record and called to the attention of the American people.

Second by Schuster. On the vote being taken on the question of the adoption of the Resolution Commissioners Schuster, See, Lashkowitz and Markey voted aye.

Commissioner Bromenschenkel passed his vote.

The Vice President declared the Resolution to have been duly passed and adopted and returned the Chair. (President Lashkowitz presiding)

THE RIGHT TO LEARN

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Edwin W. Martin, associate commissioner for the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, recently addressed the eighth Annual International Conference of the Association for Children with Learning Disabilities. This is an area of our education programs which is receiving more and more attention, and rightly so, and I include a copy of Dr. Martin's remarks in the RECORD so that my colleagues might be apprised of what is being attempted to help those unfortunate young people who have learning disabilities and who unfortunately have not been given the attention they deserved in the past.

THE RIGHT TO LEARN

(By Dr. Edwin W. Martin)

I want to begin by congratulating you on your existence. That is, something of an existential comment related to the concept that "being" is the ultimate reality. I see your existence as being tremendously important for a number of reasons. First, because as a parents organization, you are dedicated to providing your children with "the right to learn". Second, because from the earliest days you have made your allegiances with professionals who also were dedicated to your goal and so, today, you have an organization which combines into useful effort, these two important segments of our population. Third, and perhaps this is most important, because your existence and your successes exemplify a characteristic of our American system which is vital to our survival as people.

You are a minority group. You have identified a need, that is, equal educational opportunity for your children, and you are now in the process of rearranging national, State, and local priorities toward the end of meeting that need. I think your progress has been exceptional. The Congress of the United States has recognized this need and has created a special section under the Education of the Handicapped Act for stimulating increased educational opportunity for your children. The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children stimulated by such men as Sam Kirk, Chuck Strothers, Jack Irwin, and others who served on the Committee at that time, has attempted to pro-

vide a definition, or description perhaps, of children with learning disabilities which made easier the development of Federal statutes and of Federal programming. The results in many States and localities have been even more impressive in terms of numbers of children served and in the establishment of new priorities at those levels of government.

Finally, with the assistance of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped programs, numbers of colleges and universities are developing new programs or modifying older programs so the teachers will be able to offer assistance to children with learning disabilities.

It is an impressive accomplishment attested to by the thousands of people who attend this convention and by the tens of thousands of children who are now in educational programming. The forces which have caused the system to change and to modify in the past are the forces which must be multiplied and expanded in the future if the "right to learn" is to be reality rather than rhetoric.

Children with learning disabilities now find themselves included in a group which numbers approximately 8 million school-age children and perhaps another million preschool-age children who are identified as educationally handicapped. They will require a special response on the part of the schools if they are to succeed. Our estimate is that about 40 percent of these children are now receiving some special education services, although we know that in some cases these services may not be of the highest quality. For example, of the 120,000 teachers now employed in the States, only about 50 percent have certification. An estimated one-half of the non-certified teachers are no longer even operating on valid temporary certificates. This does not automatically mean that the services to those children are less adequate than the services offered by certified teachers. In fact, each of us knows examples to the contrary, but it does suggest the magnitude of the problem that we have in relation to some minimal assurance that handicapped children will be reasonably educated.

Each day I receive letters from across the country. In addition to those that I receive and that the Bureau staff receives, we have received 25,000 letters to CLOSER LOOK, our computerized service for providing a list of schools which offer special education classes. The letters that I receive are important and I want to share a few excerpts of them with you, not only because each of us does not know about such letters, but because I believe that we should continue to keep them visible, that we should continue to try and open ourselves to the feelings of the parents who write them so that our level of motivation toward responding to them is maximally high.

A mother wrote that she had a young child with a physical handicap and deafness. She had been able to get some services for the youngster in the first years of her life, at the University Hospital School in that State, during short visits. But now the child needed daily instruction and the Hospital School had no teacher of the deaf. The State School for the Deaf, in another city, did not accept physically handicapped, deaf children and so there was no place for her to turn. Kurt Vonnegut, in *Slaughterhouse Five*, present a powerful statement on the destructiveness of mankind, particularly relating it to the fire bombing of Dresden. In an ironic refrain, each-time death is mentioned in the book he adds the phrase, "... so it goes", and I guess that's society's response to the lady in question, ... so it goes.

I received another letter this week:

"I am hoping you can direct my efforts in seeking education for my handicapped son,

age 16. He is brain-damaged with some emotional problems stemming from the brain damage. First, he is excluded from public school education. Our State allows a parent \$2,000 payable toward tuition in a private school. We purchased a privately published directory and wrote to every school in the U.S.A. which is listed as accepting this type child. There is not one residential facility with a tuition of \$2,000. Most cost at least \$6,200 and one as much as \$22,000 per year. If my son is to have a chance to live in society and not be institutionalized the rest of his life (can you imagine being doomed at 16 years of age?) then he must be in a proper educational setting. I have written or gone to see many sources here in my State, but none have any constructive advice."

So it goes....

While each of the letters I mentioned comes from a parent of a multiply handicapped child, and they probably represent our most critical need in terms of nonavailability of services, it is no less a fundamental violation for a child with a mild handicapping condition to be deprived of full educational opportunity.

As I have tried to understand the many reasons for our present failure to provide special education for handicapped children, a number of possibilities come to mind. The most commonly phrased problem is that there is not enough money. An analysis of school budgeting suggests that this is probably not true. There are many items in the school budget which support desirable parts of the program, but parts which may not be critical. For example, my son receives instruction in music, in art, physical education, etc. I'm happy that these courses of study are provided in our schools and that my children have a chance to partake in them. At the same time it does not seem to me that extras for the normal child have a higher priority than reading, writing, and other basic education for the handicapped child. A similar case may be made in many areas with regard to transportation, where we find it available to non-handicapped children, but not to the handicapped child. The problem of not enough money is really a problem of insufficient priority. And that problem is probably not based on the fact that school officials, or school board members, are heartless and cruel. There must be other reasons.

The first possible reason is that most people in this Nation do not understand that education for handicapped children really works, and that the overwhelming majority of handicapped children can be educated. And with appropriate vocational education and training, can fit into the job stream as well as into society in general. Our patterns of isolating handicapped children from the majority of our citizenry have resulted, I think, in stereotypes as to what handicapped people are. The picture in the mind is only the most severely retarded, the most severely emotionally ill, the most severely physically involved child, and with this picture the average man probably sees education for the handicapped as being a "kind" thing to do, a kind of charitable babysitting, but not truly cost-beneficial to society. He also imagines that there are very few handicapped children. I have had instances reported to me where school officials honestly felt that there were no handicapped children in their areas, and that all the handicapped children were being well served because there was a State school for the blind, deaf, and retarded.

It is also possible to speculate that there are deeper psychological barriers to the provision of services to handicapped children; and this includes not only education, but the problems that the handicapped person faces in being denied job opportunity, in being denied access to public buildings, in being denied access to transportation, and so forth.

The fact that a person has a handicap may suggest to us the fact that injury, crippling conditions, and ultimately death, are part of human life, a part of our own experience and the desire to repress and not focus on that aspect of our finite human existence, causes us psychologically, to hide our heads in the sand. Where these feelings are strong enough, they may make us wish to deny the presence of handicapped children, to deny the reality of their circumstances, and to focus, instead, on things which are more reassuring, more comforting. Robert Lewis Shayon of the *Saturday Review*, in discussing these issues with us has called them funds, fatalism, and fear, and helped us to focus our attention upon them. I am sure that many of you can offer additional hypotheses concerning societal attitudes, or additional parameters of the problem—and we should strive to do just that so that we understand the nature of our opposition—and how best to develop constructive answers to these problems.

I think this becomes particularly relevant in this area we call learning disabilities. A number of years ago, Wendell Johnson, the great speech pathologist and semanticist at the University of Iowa, wrote a little piece called, "The Indians Have No Word For It." Johnson's premise developed in that and in other articles was that the problem of stuttering was caused, in good part, by the actual labelling and identification of the disorder, itself. He proposed that for many children, at least, normal hesitations and disfluencies in speech were overly responded to in the environment of the child, either by the parents, or the teachers. And that this reaction set up a circular process in which the child, himself, began to become fearful of hesitations, began to attempt to avoid them, began to struggle; and so the pattern of stuttering began. Whether one agrees fully with Johnson on the etiology of stuttering, or not, it seems clear to me that he understood at least part of the process, and we recognize a phenomenon that is part of our everyday human experience as we struggle with self-consciousness with fears of various kinds, etc. There is a self-fulfilling prophecy dimension to much of human experience. In a conversely analogous way, Rosenthal's studies published in recent years, suggested that the positive prophecies of teachers with regard to the ability of children very much influenced not only their perceptions of those children, but the children's actual achievements in school. Again, additional research is necessary to substantiate this theory, but for the sake of argument, today, let's accept the premise that behavior can be shaped, at least in part, by the label we give to it and by the assumptions we have about it.

I think we need to keep these principles in mind as we think about the future development of programming for children with learning disabilities, and by extension, for children with all kinds of handicapping conditions. Identifying and laboring the learning problems of children by their individual handicaps, has been useful to us in a variety of ways, in that it helps focus attention on the problems, it helped us communicate the seriousness of the educational needs of our children, and it allowed for specific programs to be developed as attempts to meet those needs. We are a great society for categorizing and for labelling, and to a certain point, such methods of classification are useful.

A basic premise in the development of programming for children with learning disabilities, however, has been an attempt to avoid strict etiological labels. For example, brain injury, dyslexia, etc. Instead, you have attempted to focus on the specific learning tasks which are necessary for the child to succeed in school. Extending this reasoning a little, I think all of us, you as an association interested in these children, and those of us in the Federal government in-

terested in developing programming, should consider carefully, our future strategy in approaching the general education system on behalf of these children. In what may be seen by some as a kind of Swiftian "Modest Proposal," I think we should consider an amicable divorce of learning disability children from the ranks of the handicapped. Instead, I think we should expand the ranks of the normal learner to include many children with the kind of variations and learning style that are displayed by the majority of children who are called learning disabled. I think this approach is worth considering for two broad reasons. First, the question of the self-fulfilling prophecy of the label "handicapped" that I mentioned to you a moment ago, and second, a careful analysis of the distribution of education resources which suggests that nowhere in the United States are handicapped children receiving full educational opportunity. While this pattern is changing, and it is improving, and I am dedicating myself to try and bring about a full commitment across the nation, to equal educational opportunity for every handicapped child by the end of this decade, it is nevertheless true that in many instances special education is a separate and segregated school system, and that it suffers from the inequality that segregated systems are recognized to have.

Instead, I think we should face the general educator with his own responsibility for increasing the flexibility within every school, within every classroom, so that a broader segment of the normal population of children may be served. This is the direction of innovation in education. This is the direction of flexibility of programming and scheduling. This is the direction of individualization. It should not be necessary to separate the child, to identify him as handicapped, and to provide him with separate programming, in order to meet his individual learning needs.

I hope that you will not misunderstand my meaning. A number of years ago I made a similar suggestion to the people who were then interested in the development of this association. And I think some of them interpreted my remarks as an attempt to close them out of the handicapped camp. That is not what I'm saying, we have a substantial commitment to learning disabled children in the special education field and in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, and we will be expanding that commitment as rapidly as we are able. In fact, essentially I see the development of programming for children with learning disability moving down two possible paths. The first is increased programming under special education laws, special education assumptions. Here, the ultimate success of services for children depends on the development of new national attitudes. A national commitment to each child which will afford him with an appropriate educational opportunity. In many States we are well along the way in that direction and that may be the best route and the fastest route to travel. In other States and in localities we are just beginning. And here, I think we ought to consider, carefully, whether our children's needs can be met through reform of the general education system.

As most of you know, we now support, under our training authority, programs for training teachers of children with learning disabilities. As this program develops we will be encouraging, through our own authorities and through the authorities of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, the training of specialists who can fit in either model. That is, teachers who are better able to help children with learning disabilities participate in regular education programs and specialists who will work intensively with children for whom regular education cannot be the answer. Similarly,

in our research program, we will continue to emphasize research in a variety of approaches to solving this educational problem. This morning, in our panel, we will detail to you some of the ways we propose to implement the learning disabilities portion of the Education of the Handicapped Act. One part of that will be to bring together over an extended period of time, a special institute of national leaders in the area of learning disabilities to develop a careful plan for future research and training activities. With such a plan in hand we will, then, systematically go about funding the kind of projects which will bring us the critically needed information in this area. At the same time we will make grants to a number of States in conjunction with local school systems, colleges and universities, and private agencies for the expansion of the best of current practice in treatment of learning disabled youngsters. Our efforts in this program will be to have a maximum catalytic or multiplier effect on the use of Federal funds by providing support to the agencies, now constituted in the several States, which can do the most to bring about the expansion of educational opportunity for children with learning disabilities.

In summary, then, it seems to me that your program chairman, Jerry Minskoff, and the other of your officers who have selected the theme for this convention as "The Right to Learn", are exactly on target in identifying the critical issue in education of children with learning disabilities, and in education for all handicapped children. We must move out of the charity era. We must move out of the era of just enough programming to ease the conscience of the citizenry without offering full opportunity. We must establish that the right to an education is an intrinsic right. It is not something to be given by the haves to the have nots in the spirit of generosity. We are in an era in the United States where there is a new sensitivity to the concept of equality, and we know that equality does not mean sameness. Instead, it means appropriateness, so that equality of opportunity for one child may be quite different from equality of opportunity for another.

In recent weeks I have said on many occasions that this is an important work that we do, not just for the handicapped children we serve and their parents, and not just for the teachers who will participate in it. But, it is important work for all of the United States because at least, in part, it helps promote this understanding of equality. Because it helps all American citizens to understand the intrinsic nature of man and that his worth is not dependent on whether his arms and legs work the same as a non-handicapped person's arms and legs work. Or whether he's as able to quickly grasp arithmetic or reading, or whether his skin is black or white. What is important is that he is a human being and that under our system his humanity must be responded to. Your efforts to bring to the right to learn to your children are the efforts which will strengthen the character of our nation. And so, do not hesitate to claim that right. Do not feel your purposes are selfish. They serve every man. I pledge to you my support in your endeavors.

NORMAN Y. MINETA: FROM CONCENTRATION CAMP TO SAN JOSE MAYOR

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the newly elected mayor of San Jose, Calif., Norman Y. Mineta, is remarkable in many respects.

First, because he was elected by an unprecedented margin of almost 5 to 1.

Second, because he is the first American of Japanese ancestry ever elected to the office of mayor in a city as large as San Jose, which has nearly one-half million inhabitants.

By far the most remarkable aspect of Mr. Mineta's victory, however, is the fact that he and his family were among some 110,000 Americans of Japanese ancestry and their parents who were forced to leave their homes and businesses and who were imprisoned in American concentration camps following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941—and Mayor Mineta is not bitter about the experience. The new mayor said in an Associated Press interview following his election:

This is a kind of history from which we must learn so that nothing like it can happen again. My victory shows that political success is not just a possibility for Japanese-Americans in Hawaii but on the mainland as well.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Norman Y. Mineta, who went from a concentration camp to become mayor of one of our finest cities, will doubtless inspire members of other minority groups in our society. I therefore submit the Associated Press account of Mr. Mineta's victory in San Jose for inclusion in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 14, 1971]

ONCE-INTERNEED NISEI WINS SAN JOSE MAYORAL ELECTION

SAN JOSE, CALIF.—Norman Y. Mineta, who spent two boyhood years interned with other Japanese-Americans in a U.S. relocation camp, has been elected mayor of San Jose by a huge margin.

San Jose is a city of nearly half a million persons.

The 39-year-old mayor-elect, hailed the victory as a "breakthrough" for Japanese-Americans.

"It shows that political success is not just a possibility for Japanese-Americans in Hawaii but on the mainland as well," he said early today.

Of 49,777 votes cast yesterday in all 147 precincts, Mineta polled 30,496. City Councilman David J. Goglio, his closest challenger, had 6,902.

Mineta, a partner in an insurance firm founded by his father, was elected to the San Jose City Council in 1966 and became vice mayor in 1969.

During World War II, Mineta and his family were interned at the Heart Mountain relocation camp near Cody, Wyo. "I personally picked a lot of potatoes that fall," he recalled.

Declaring he was not bitter about the experience, Mineta explained: "This is a kind of history from which we must learn, so that nothing like it can happen again."

After the attack on Pearl Harbor, more than 100,000 Japanese-Americans—who call themselves Nisei—were rounded up in the United States and interned in fenced camps. Many Nisei ultimately served in the armed forces and the roundup has remained a controversial action.

Beaming at his victory, Mineta said, "It feels good."

Unemployment, environmental questions and transportation were among the issues in the election. San Jose is the county seat of Santa Clara County, one of the fastest growing in the nation, with 1 million residents.

A center of the electronics industry and manufacturing, it has been hit hard by defense cutbacks.

ADDRESS BY ROBERT D. TIMM, MEMBER, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, Robert D. Timm, a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, recently gave a very interesting speech before the Aero Club of Washington. Because this is of great general interest, I am including in the RECORD for all who have an interest in aviation to see.

I am particularly pleased that President Nixon appointed Mr. Timm to the CAB, because of his long experience as chairman of the Public Service Commission of the State of Washington. Also, Mr. Timm has made a great contribution to the two-party system by his distinguished service as a member of the Republican National Committee. His speech to the Aero Club is his first public statement since he assumed his new post and I believe the Members will find it most interesting:

ADDRESS BY ROBERT D. TIMM

It is a great pleasure and a distinct honor to be invited to visit, western style, with my brandnew fellow members of the Aero Club. The Aero Club has long been the leader in moving the outer limits of man in flight to the distant reaches. I note that you are an organization that has both the wisdom to look back in the interest of preserving the heritage of aviation and the willingness to strike forth relying on the proposition that man, in his constant and inherent desire to improve will always move to higher and more challenging technology for the aviation industry you represent so aggressively.

I have been properly warned that you are a tough group of extremely knowledgeable people in the most viable industry of them all, aviation.

And that if I wanted to escape unscathed I had best retreat to the position that I'm a new boy in town and really shouldn't be expected to spout words of new found wisdom. And that you might, however, be interested in my impressions of your industry, your city, and the governmental agency so concerned with your past, present, and future.

I plan to take the easy way out and do just that, and in so doing I want to draw on my experiences in an adult lifetime association with government on many levels. There is a certain fascination about the governmental process that grabs you and holds you, and I recall that after the first election I won as the most junior member of the Washington State House of Representatives, I knew I could never walk away from it. And I knew too that government has to be very much concerned with its internal improvement, or it will fall in its charge to serve the constant yet changing needs of the people.

I am most grateful to the President of the United States who gave me a chance to continue my regulatory career as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The regulatory field is a world unto itself, it has a history all its own. Any industry that falls under the scope of a regulatory agency must at times be overjoyed at its good fortune or more often despondent at its bad. Such an industry is the aviation industry.

Having worked my way up through the governmental minor leagues, as a legislator, and as the chairman of my State's Regulatory Agency, and through so many committees with titles more imposing than their ac-

complishments, I think I can now offer some impressions which will lead me to some inevitable conclusions about the new area of responsibility and activity assigned to me.

I have always been one proud citizen where the aviation transport industry is concerned. What a remarkable record of accomplishment has been chucked up by the managers of this vital new mode! Following many of my learned predecessors at this podium, I too say that no other nation in the world can point with such national pride to an air transportation system that has bound its people closer together; lowering the mountains, removing the bumps from the terrain, skybridging the rivers, and in so doing, widening our national horizons and making us the most mobile people on earth.

Because these successes have come to pass in a unique economic atmosphere, a blend of regulation and competition, I cannot help but comment in this initial conversation with you, that it is a system that has worked demonstrably well for the common good. But I do not believe that the virtues of cascading competition always endure during all economic cycles. There is a time for determined withdrawal from catastrophic competition, beyond what is now being individually done by management. This is the time for reflective reexamination of managerial and marketing techniques. This is the time to redesign the hull of the industry to withstand the next inevitable economic onslaught be it 10, 20, or 30 years away.

Sound proposals for fortifying the basic structure of the industry have been readily forthcoming. However, Congress has yet to act on an administration approach in the unique area of transportation labor problems. Nor has Congress issued one word on the highly constructive alternative offered by chairman Browne in his proposal urging a select committee to take on this perplexing and complex issue. In my opinion, not arrived at in 2 quick months on the board, but as an interested observer for a long time, the sheer weight of the technique of selective sandbagging in airline labor negotiations could well bring the house down.

Of even greater concern to me is the snowballing debit financing in the industry. While it is perfectly true that the "techni-econ" cycles that have staggered the industry from time to time have always brought about problems of financing, a growth and profit pattern has always come along to ease the fiscal pain—but each time the swing occurs the simple dollar magnitude grows larger and less manageable.

The industry debt is like icing on the wing of a plane. There is a maximum allowable icing build up which the plane can carry while functioning on all engines. This same mass of ice will crash the plane if engine malfunctioning develops. The question must be answered therefore: What is the debt icing limit of the airplane industry assuming a recurring economic engine malfunction?

The game of progress of the air transport industry should not be played with two adversary teams: Government domination versus management independence. Many nations have gone that way and have cut the competitive heart out of the industry. Even some members of Congress balefully view nationalization as an inevitable progression for this industry. I view even the discussion of that prospect as counter productive and would pledge my talents to strengthening a great system and a great concept of constructive enterprise.

I am willing to listen to new versions of old ideas, and to any new ones which might strengthen the structure of this part of our economy. The life of the airline industry must not be sacrificed on the altar of pompous precedent. We are in an innovative period for advancing ideas for the future, and as a member of the board I believe the ideas and the plans should rise on their individual merits.

The present and future problems of the industry will tax the ingenuity and the talents of the Congress, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the industry—not working alone, but working together—communicating more and criticizing less—and taking advantage of time to move toward solutions.

I have not been aboard at the Civil Aeronautics Board very long, and I am aware that I have a long learning process ahead—but in my years of regulating both competition and monopoly at the State level, I have formed certain opinions as to how regulatory agencies should work. The Civil Aeronautics Board has an obvious reservoir of unique and dedicated talent. It is a compact, unitized agency. It needs only to resist mightily the natural regulatory enemy, that of reacting and not acting and leading, to serve the public well.

I am convinced that there has been no finer staff assembled on a governmental team, and I believe the goals of the presently constituted board will be realized and recognized as a regulatory model. The goals I speak to are those of quick response to needs and ideas—the goal of constant re-evaluation of management techniques, the goal of polishing technical procedures, the goal of maintaining sufficient "in house" data processing equipment to keep up with the industry we regulate—the goal of keeping an expert team intact in a highly technical agency. All of these and others I recognize as being responsible approaches for a regulatory agency.

I do pose these questions here—should the Congress look into making procedural improvements for regulatory agencies? Could there not be a less burdensome administrative procedure and still preserve the legal positions of all parties concerned?

Because we are always under the congressional microscope and swim in their fishbowl, I am suggesting that innovative techniques approved by Congress might make sense in the dynamism of this age. I hope to use my bush league experience to see that this comes true, so that administrative and legal corrections and procedures will give the most valuable tool of all to the decision makers—the tool of time—time to think, to plan, to progress.

You will note I have skipped early impressions on your city. I like it here. Although I am still not geographically oriented and the sun comes up in the west, and sets in the south, and from my office the Potomac runs uphill, I must say everything is absolutely wonderful, especially the people, except for that one person who said to me in the reception line after I had been sworn in—"welcome to sinus city." I'd love to get my hands on him because, until today, and this meeting with you fine people, I've had a headache ever since.

In summary I would like to state that the greatest responsibility anyone can have in government is the exercise of good judgment. I hope that my judgment will be good for your industry and the nation!

PERIL AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from a newspaper in my home town brings sharply into focus a number of challenges to the Bill of Rights.

It is timely interesting and significant and I am most pleased to include it in the RECORD for the benefit of all.

The article follows:

[From the Newport News (Va.) Daily Press, Dec. 5, 1970]

PERIL AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS

Not since the days of its formulation has the Bill of Rights been challenged as it is today. That may seem like a bold statement, since the attacks upon this noble and inspiring guarantee of individual rights have been many and varied through the years and have involved men both in and out of government. Indeed, at the time of adoption, there were many who felt that such rights were not meant for all people.

Today's assaults are far more dangerous than any that have gone before. The Bill of Rights has proved it can withstand the dangers of frontal assault because such open and direct attack is obvious to all and arouses a public which knows that these rights are the basis of all freedom. But the attacks upon the Bill of Rights today are insidious and often attractively packaged in the tinsel of humanistic aims—sort of rose-colored glasses to keep the public looking through a glass darkly.

In such a situation it is even more important to keep in mind that the Bill of Rights deals with the rights of individuals. There is a tendency today to subvert these rights for the benefit of groups—of the poor, the minorities, the ethnic groups—but this is merely false gold. Only the protection of individual rights can guarantee the rights of these groups and it is impossible for one person to secure his rights by taking away the rights of another.

The federal Bill of Rights takes the form of the first ten amendments to the Constitution and a reading of these show how clearly they concern the individual: Congress shall not abridge freedom of press or speech, establish religion or prevent petition or lawful assembly; the right to keep and bear arms may not be infringed; citizens do not have to submit to quartering of troops in their homes, to unreasonable searches and seizures or arbitrary seizure of their property; they are protected against double jeopardy, excessive bail and fines and cruel and unusual punishment, guaranteed speedy and public trial by jury and the right to hear the accusation against them; and finally, all powers not allocated or prohibited by the Constitution were reserved to the people.

It is not surprising that, throughout history, those amendments guaranteeing freedom of speech and press and those limiting governmental powers have been most under seige. These, of course, are the foundation stones of the whole structure.

This has been true also in our own day, and the insidious nature of the attack makes it doubly dangerous. Vice President Spiro Agnew's comments about the press have been labeled a threat to freedom of the press, but the press has never been and cannot be immune to legitimate criticism. Of far greater threat to freedom of the press is the holier-than-thou attitude within the media for personal or philosophical ends. Subtle governmental pressures also are a threat, and we have seen these in recent years, but fellow-traveling journalists fall into this same category.

One threat to freedom of the press comes in the form of a supposed defense of it. This is the claim that this freedom protects the purveyor of pornography. Even our courts have incorrectly taken this view on occasion. Nobody is guaranteed by the Bill of Rights or any of its precedents the right to corrupt.

The strongest frontal assault which has been made on the Bill of Rights has affected the right to keep and bear arms. There have been several attempts in recent years not only to abridge this freedom, but to destroy it entirely. Modern technology may have limited the effectiveness of this provision, which was supposed to guarantee

citizens the right to defend themselves against unreasonable demands of government, but it still guarantees the citizen protection against the oppression of other individuals or outlaw bands, and consequently has not lost its efficacy.

Court decisions have nearly destroyed the reservation amendments, but this does not mean that their meaning cannot be restored. In a very real sense, then, this anniversary of the Bill of Rights requires a renewal of our allegiance to one of mankind's greatest documents.

JOB DESTROYERS

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, inflation, unfortunately, is still very much with us. There are many reasons for this, including, very definitely, excessive deficit Federal spending by the vote of the Congress, and no one segment of our society can rightly be held solely to blame. Among the culprits, however, must be listed wage increases which are not matched by increased production; and such increases, moreover—including particularly the economically and morally indefensible practice of paying for unnecessary jobs or for work not actually performed—in many cases operate to the detriment of laboring men and women, by operating, in the end, to abolish jobs which would otherwise be available.

In this connection I call attention to the following very intelligent editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune for Sunday, April 18, 1971:

JOB DESTROYERS

Several railroads are bankrupt or close to bankruptcy. Thousands of railroad men are about to lose their jobs as a result of the cancellation of passenger trains. Under these conditions one might expect railroad unions to seek ways to help industry avoid further economic disasters that would destroy more jobs.

Don't count on it. In the latest wage dispute the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen turned down a Presidential emergency board's recommendations for pay increases totaling about 42 per cent when compounded over 42 months. The board's proposals would raise the pay of the union's 10,000 members an average of \$1.61 to about \$5.42 an hour. A union official promptly denounced the proposals as "unacceptable."

It must be admitted that the Signalmen's union is no more stubborn or unreasonable than the other rail brotherhoods. Rejecting the recommendations of emergency boards is standard practice among unions. All of them have resisted changes in work rules which might have saved many of the passenger trains that will be eliminated on May 1. They continue to resist work rule changes that would help put bankrupt railroads back on their feet.

Federal Judge John P. Fullam, who is in charge of the Penn Central reorganization proceedings, commented on this subject at a recent hearing on agreements granting wage increases.

"I don't think that the public, as the price for continuing rail operations, has the right to expect railroad employees to work for less than they should be earning," he said. "But the converse of that is equally true and extremely important in this situation, and that is that the railroad obviously cannot

pay employees for work that they don't do. . . . This business of people earning three or four days' pay or having to be paid three or four days' pay for less than a day of work is a concept which is going to have to be changed radically.

"The concept that the railroad must maintain perhaps as many as 10,000 employees that it doesn't need for efficient operations, and not only that it must retain these employees but that they must be replaced as they retire or die, is simply ludicrous, and I think that it should be made clear that this court is highly unlikely to authorize any payments of further wage increases beyond September unless and until some of these matters are resolved or at least a solution seems very likely in the immediate future."

Railroad unions are not the only ones that disregard financial conditions in their industry or the nation's economic welfare. They reflect a shortsightedness common to many unions. The building trades have long been prime examples of greed and irresponsibility—and they have thus helped to depress housing construction and contributed to unemployment in their own ranks. The United Steelworkers seem determined to stage a costly strike in spite of warnings by the President's Council of Economic Advisers that a big pay increase would compound the industry's troubles and lead to higher unemployment.

The vital interest of all workers is to keep their jobs. This means accepting a pay level and work rules consistent with competitive conditions in their industry. It means helping to check the inflationary spiral that already has destroyed many jobs by pricing American goods out of the world market.

Isn't it the purpose of unions to preserve jobs?

DAIRY FARMER COSTS

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, despite recent milk price increases, average income to dairy farmers remain extremely low and dairy producers are faced with a continuing cost-price squeeze.

The reasons for the sustained downturn in production are not hard to find. As in any industry, dairy farmers must have sufficient income incentive if they are to remain on the farm. They must have reasonable prospect that they can produce and market milk at prices that will yield reasonable returns for their work and investment.

These fundamental conditions do not exist today for many dairy farmers. The statistics tell the story in vivid terms:

	Index of prices paid by farmers for production items interest, taxes and wage rates (1957-59—100)	Price of all milk wholesale ¹	Real per capita disposable income ²
1952	100	\$4.85	\$1,641
1953	95	4.32	1,697
1954	95	3.97	1,693
1955	94	4.01	1,786
1956	94	4.14	1,841
1957	97	4.21	1,838

See footnotes at end of table.

	Index of prices paid by farmers for production items interest, taxes and wage rates (1957-59—100)	Price of all milk wholesale ¹	Real per capita disposable income ²
1958	100	\$4.13	\$1,818
1959	102	4.16	1,877
1960	103	4.21	1,879
1961	104	4.22	1,903
1962	106	4.09	1,958
1963	108	4.10	2,002
1964	108	4.15	2,109
1965	111	4.23	2,213
1966	116	4.81	2,298
1967	119	5.02	2,360
1968	123	5.24	2,425
1969	131	5.49	2,434
1970 (preliminary)	136	5.69	2,470
Percent change 1952-70	36	17.3	50.5

¹ Dairy Situation, November 1970, p. 10 and other issues of Dairy Situation.

² Dairy Situation, November 1970, p. 13.

From 1952 to 1970, the wholesale price of milk increased by only 17.3 percent.

Prices paid by farmers for production items increased by 36 percent. Currently, production cost increases are outstripping price increases. Under present conditions, further production cost increases appear to be inevitable.

During these years, real per capita disposable income for all U.S. wage earners rose by 50.5 percent. There is little wonder that dairy farmers have sought better opportunities.

As a percentage of parity, average prices paid for all milk sold to plants are now lower than a year ago. In January 1971 the average price of all milk amounted to only 81 percent of the parity equivalent as compared to 82 percent in January 1970.

Farm wage rates in 1970 were nearly seven percent above 1969.

Farm machinery and equipment costs were six percent higher in 1970 than in 1969, but will likely be greater in 1971.

1970 interest cost on real estate debt rose seven percent above 1969, while interest cost on non-real estate debt was up 18 percent.

State and local taxes on farm real estate in 1969 increased by 11 percent over 1968.

Insurance related to farm production is expected to increase in cost by about 10 percent in 1971.

The single most important expense item for dairy farms is the concentrate ration fed to milk cows. The key indicator of the relationship of feed prices to returns to dairy farmers is the milk-feed price ratio. This ratio indicates the number of pounds of concentrate ration which can be purchased with the value received from one pound of milk sold to plants and dealers.

As feed prices increase without a corresponding increase in milk prices—such as we have witnessed the past 6 months—the milk-feed ratio is lowered. This is a prime example of the recent and continuing cost-price squeeze on dairy farmers.

Corn is a major component of the dairy ration. The cost of concentrate rations has increased rather dramatically since July of 1970. The corn blight crisis, and the resulting increase in feed grain prices

has definitely affected this cost increase.

Accordingly, as this ration value has increased, the milk-feed price ratio has been diluted to its lowest January level since 1968. With further indications that the corn blight may have further impact in 1971 which would further increase the cost of dairy rations, an upward adjustment of at least 30 cents per hundred-weight in the milk price is needed to offset just this one cost increase.

DALLAS—DYNAMIC FUTURE

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. COLLINS of Texas, Mr. Speaker, last week when I was back in the Third District of Texas, I spoke to the Salesmanship Club. This fine group is made up of a cross section of our business leaders. I do not know why the name Salesmanship except everyone in Dallas is selling something.

In the past 2 years our community has had some discouragement. The tax law cutting oil depletion has sent rotary oil drilling to its slowest production in history. Our biggest industries are in Aerospace and they have had tremendous cutbacks in volume. But in Dallas the outlook is to the future and the optimism and enthusiasm is high. Adversity builds strength, and I would like to extend for the RECORD my remarks in Dallas.

Everytime we face adversity Dallas gains strength and comes up stronger. Dallas got started with a log cabin near a place to ford the river. But we needed a railroad for a town of 1,200, so we went after it. And they put their money where their faith was. It cost the new town \$200,000 in bonds, \$5,000 in cash and 142 acres of land to get that first rail line, but they got it, and Dallas grew. Next came a North South Train for a Crossroads—so that is when Dallas began to roll.

The first trade was built on Buffalo Hides. Buffalo traders sent their hides to Dallas and we became the Buffalo Hide Center of the world.

When hunters killed off all the buffalo on the plains, Dallas paused but cattle were being branded in the West now. So Dallas made the transition to cow hide, and made saddles, and harness—becoming a national center for horse and mule leather. When Henry Ford's automobile and mechanized agriculture swept the Country, Dallas went through another transition: finance and cotton trading. Cotton was bought and sold for the world market, and the city became the cotton trading center of the world. Then came 1932, when Washington established fixed minimum prices on cotton which eliminated a large amount of the trading.

Again Dallas moved with the changing times and actively entered the oil business by inducing oil producers in Arkansas, Oklahoma, Louisiana and East Texas to come to Dallas to make their deals, arrange their financing, and centralize their offices here.

In recent years oil production left the USA for world production, which necessitated changes within the hometown industry. Dallas has expanded to other fields and moved further into electronics, finance and insurance.

It is said that Dallas is the heart of the Bible Belt. Churches are strong and folks go to Church. The largest churches in Amer-

ica in several faiths are in Dallas. Many of you helped them grow so that Dallas has the largest Baptist, Disciples of Christ, Presbyterian, and Methodist Churches in the country.

Dallas has been criticized for its so-called "oligarchy", but this is Dallas' greatest strength—instead of one leader, we have hundreds. Leadership and management is any organization's greatest asset. As one business leader said: "There is no good business, just good management."

The other day I heard a stock broker evaluate stocks. He analyzed the location of the plants, growth tendencies in the industry, price earnings ratio. But, he said the important factor about a company is that it has good management, that it has good leadership. This is true of a church, of a school, or of a business. Good leadership is your greatest asset.

Dallas is on the move. We are the eighth largest metropolitan city in the United States—doubled our population in the past 20 years.

This leadership set goals for Dallas—and with full city participation, we just received the National Award as the USA's large All American City.

Aggressive Dallas, where we stress jobs, not relief because our city is built by folks who like to work. In the past 10 years we have created tens of thousands of new jobs. In 1960 we had 465,000 jobs and as we enter the Seventies, we have a local economy capable of 700,000 jobs.

Let us look at the personality of Dallas. It is a friendly city that offers much and receives even more from its citizens. Friendliness is Dallas' natural manner. A survey of newcomers revealed that what they liked most was the interest of neighbors and the welcome everyone received in becoming a part of the city. We do not have as many millionaires as New York, Boston, Philadelphia and Houston; but the difference is that we call them by their first names.

Ours is a new city with 4.5 billion dollars worth of construction in the Sixties in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. That represents 120 million square feet of new commercial construction. We had the second highest ratio of new dwelling units to population of any city in the USA. Dallas is building—and building more for the future.

Ours is a business city. Bank deposits have grown 128% to 6.5 billion dollars since 1960. Another yardstick as a business city shows we are 5th nationally in First Class mail.

Today, Dallas ranks fourth among American cities in the number of companies with a net worth of a million dollars or more headquarters within its city limits. Only New York, Chicago and Los Angeles have more home office headquarters. When business wants to grow and develop faster they come to Dallas—a competitive city, where a dollar goes further and buys more than any city in America.

New business is delighted at the eager enthusiasm of the employees to move to Dallas. It is not only our delightful weather but a man with a family of four finds more spending money in his pocket. The Bureau of Labor Statistics surveyed all Urban areas and found a cost of living index of 112 high in New York City down to a low of 91—and Dallas had a 92 index where the Dollar goes a long way.

Dallasites are on the move. In our cars we drive smoothly over ten super highways. Freight moves fast with nine mainline railroads. There are 41 truck lines serving Dallas, and many give overnight service to their destination.

We have nine different airlines so you can fly the skies on 350 scheduled daily flights. Yet, with all this, Dallas entered the Seventies with still another transportation crisis.

Since 1960, air passenger traffic had grown by 266 percent, and our airport facilities were inadequate for the future. The Dallas airport handles more air traffic than all other commercial airports in Texas combined. The new Dallas/Fort Worth Regional Airport being built on 18,000 acres of ground will be the most modern in the world. Compare this to America's busiest airport—Chicago's O'Hare, which is now being expanded to 7200 acres—or the largest present acreage in the U.S. which is Dulles Airport in Washington with 9800 acres. 18,000 acres will not only solve the passenger crisis but will also handle the mountains of mail and air freight generated by our industrial growth.

While there are many economic factors involved in that destiny, the growth and success of Dallas is based mainly on manpower and a philosophy of self-reliance.

Our people enjoy working. That's why Texas has a Right to Work Law, and that is why unemployment in Dallas is only 3.4% while the rest of the Nation struggles with 6%. Dallas workers have a record in all industries combined of an output per worker in Dallas being 5% above national average. And we are training to beat this in the Seventies. That is also why the business climate is so much more dependable in Dallas. Our metropolitan area lost only 1.5 man-days per employed worker due to work stoppages over a recent 10 year period when the national average was 6.1 man-days lost.

This willingness to work has attracted company after company to Dallas, resulting in more jobs and increased living standards. In 1960 the personal income of Dallas residents was about \$3 billion. Currently, it is more than twice that, at \$6.1 billion. And it is expected to rise to \$14.3 billion by 1980.

Education sees new breakthroughs. This year we open the Skyline Center for Career Development. This new concept in American High School education provides career oriented youngsters an opportunity to learn a vocation through use of all facilities and equipment.

Dallas goes after trade and one of our most dynamic successes has been in Conventions. This is growing and with the Dallas Convention Center scheduled in 1972 the outlook is up. Right now we have 810 future date scheduled conventions—which puts us in fourth place in the nation. Conventions bring more customers, more visitors, and more spending which probably tops 150 million dollars a year.

The best in recreation—and action being taken now will insure that Dallasites will have it. The development of State Fair Park is moving ahead. All states have a State Fair, but Texas tops them all with 3 million visitors in our two week fair. When completed, Fair Park will provide year around enjoyment in its museums, picnic areas, landscaped waterways and lagoons, modernized amusement areas, ice skating and many other activities.

I consider a 5-Star important goal for the Seventies—the development of the 10,000 acre green belt through the center of Dallas in the Trinity River floodplain. This will provide solid green with horseback trails, bicycle paths, baseball, tennis and all types of park recreation. This Trinity Park when completed, will be a unique "first" in civic development and will serve as a model for every major city in the nation.

Talk of Ecology means fresh air, open space, more greenery—all of this in the middle of Dallas. We have all heard of what the Central Park system means to New York. Our Trinity Park will provide 3 times this size in green acres.

This year, 1971, is a centennial of sorts in Dallas. It was just one hundred years ago that the papers were signed that changed our community from a town to an incorporated

city. Our first century has been one of dynamic growth and opportunity on the economic front.

As we enter our second century as a city, that economic growth will grow and accelerate.

While working for a better place in which to raise our families, we are moving now to perfect the quality of our life.

We have come a long way in this past century. But think what an exciting challenge we have in the Seventies. Dallas is a city built by men and women of vision—who do not look for the easiest way but the best way—who do not think of how much we can get out of Dallas but enjoy seeing how much we can put into it. Dallas was a great city yesterday—but thanks to all that you are doing today, it will be a better city tomorrow.

This is Dallas—our Hometown—where our greatest asset is people. People full of love for others; who believe in God, their families, their neighbors and themselves. Neighbors who are proud of Dallas today but are even prouder to stand together to build a greater future for our children for tomorrow.

EARTH WEEK II IN SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Earth Week, awakening in us each year a renewed commitment to clean up an environment fouled by two centuries of mindless exploitation, is now a part of our national life. Indeed, it is something akin to an American institution—honored by young and old alike, by rich and poor, by Americans ranging all the way across the political spectrum. It is a heartening sign, Mr. Speaker. For years some of us in the Congress have warned—often fruitlessly, I regret to say—about the growing threat to our natural environment. Now, backed by the force of an aroused public opinion, we are at last beginning to fight that threat. Earth Week has played a major role in mustering the kind of widespread public support needed to maintain the effort.

An ad hoc citizens' group in my home city of Springfield, Mass., is sponsoring Earth Week activities as promising and as ambitious as any in cities of comparable size. Among its projects—projects that will not end abruptly after Earth Week is over, but that will continue as long as the need exists—are solid waste recycling and river, stream and litter cleanup jobs. More than 40 Earth Week displays are set up throughout the city, attracting public attention to the most pressing ecological problems now before us. Other projects are special school programs, adult community seminars, a film festival and guided bus tours designed to emphasize pollution in the Springfield area.

Coordinating the Earth Week activities are:

James A. Madden, Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce.

Peter Lappin, office of Mayor Frank Freedman.

James Saart, Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association.

Edward Piela, Springfield Museum of Science.

Stanley J. Mulak, Springfield Public Schools.

Philip Demetrian, R. A. Usifer Association, Inc.

Springfield owes special thanks to three people who have sacrificed large amounts of time to helping direct the Earth Week activities.

They are H. Bradford Riga, Dr. Charles Gadaire, and Mrs. Carol Anderson.

Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD a Springfield Museum of Science bulletin outlining the community's Earth Week projects:

EARTH WEEK II

GENTLEMEN: Springfield and the surrounding communities have inaugurated eight days of activities with programs on ecology and environment. Earth Week II has been designated as April 14, 1971, through April 21, 1971. The idea is to expose the public to a wide coverage of the importance of the proper relationship between man and his environment. A few of the activities are as follows:

1. A forty unit display at Earth Fair to be held in the Science Museum and banks.
2. School programs, at all levels.
3. Adult community seminars.
4. Continuous film festival.
5. Environmental guided bus tours.

In progress at the present time are:

1. Recycling projects on metal, glass, aluminum, paper and leaves.
2. River, stream, and litter cleanup.

We hope you can activate rapidly and join us in this very important activity.

H. BRADFORD RIGA.

DR. CHARLES GADAIRE.

MRS. CAROL ANDERSON.

COORDINATORS

Peter Lappin, Adm. Aid, Mayor's Office, Springfield.

James A. Madden, Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce.

James Saart, TB-RD Association.

Edward Piela, Museum of Science.

Stanley J. Mulak, Springfield Public Schools.

Philip Demetrian, R. A. Usifer Advertising.

Other cooperating groups include all ecology and outdoor organizations, conservation commissions, school ecology groups and civil organizations.

PROFITS IN WASTE RECYCLING

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing concern and concentration of energies over the problem of waste disposal and recycling of waste materials. We are presently seeking legislative solutions in Congress, and a variety of study groups, universities, and private citizens are investigating ways to reduce the volume of waste materials and to find economical and efficient means for putting these materials back into productive use.

Perhaps we in this body are at times

presumptuous when we think in terms of grand strategies and complex programs which seek to solve every aspect of a difficult and wide-ranging problem. We sometimes forget that a small group of interested individuals can have an effect beyond their numbers when they act quietly and independently to create their own small solution.

It has been brought to my attention that such a group, the Mark Twain Cadet Drum and Bugle Corps of Elmira Heights, N.Y., in cooperation with the Thatcher Glass Manufacturing Co., has found a mutually profitable way to collect and recycle used glass containers and old newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a report on the reclamation and recycling activities of the Mark Twain Cadet Drum and Bugle Corps for the information of my colleagues:

The Mark Twain Cadet Drum and Bugle Corps is sponsored by the American Legion Clarence Oliver Post Number 154 in Elmira Heights, New York. The Corps membership is open to all youths between the ages of 12 and 21 years who are residents of Chemung County.

There are two units within the Corps which consist of a "mini-corps" approximately 85 strong and the junior corps which again is 85 strong. The "mini-corps" is considered as a feeder corps. When the youths have gained sufficient experience and reach the required age limit, they are then promoted into the junior or cadet corps.

Last summer the group traveled 5,000 miles reaching out to such points as Marion, Ohio, and Lynn, Massachusetts. This summer they anticipate a journey to Guelph, Ontario.

The unit has a tentative operating budget for 1970-71 of \$15,000-\$18,000. Last year the 1969-70 budget topped \$25,000 due to the purchase of two coach buses in addition to normal expenses.

The corps receives financial support from Legion Post 154, but must rely almost entirely on their own resources. Such projects as candy sales, bake sales, and competition prize winnings help finance their operations.

Another means of support is the County's residents' donation of used glass containers for redemption at Thatcher Glass Manufacturing Company and old newspapers which are redeemed at I. Shulman and Sons' scrap yard in Elmira.

Collections are made throughout the Country by volunteers who are not necessarily Legion members or corps affiliates. At the present time about 1/2 of the corps members and families participate in the glass and paper collections. Pick-ups at private residences are arranged mostly by private automobiles on weekends and evenings. There is also a collection point behind a service station in Elmira Heights where a covered truck owned by the corps is located.

The glass collections were initiated by an employee of Thatcher Glass, Ed Mansfield, and has continued to grow throughout the years. Barrels are distributed to bars and hotels in the Elmira area with pick-ups arranged each Sunday morning. This is probably the major source of glass supply. Residents will telephone in requests for the corps to pick glass at homes, and residents will drop off their glass at the collection point outside the Thatcher plant entrance.

The glass is then cleaned of metal closures, labels when possible, and contents, and taken to Thatcher Glass. It is weighed at the plant, and a check is then sent to the corps at the end of each month. Since the start of the

glass collections in September 1969 approximately 350 tons of glass have been collected, which equals \$6,500.

The newspaper collections are conducted in the same manner as the glass collections. The paper drive has netted 200 tons at \$2,800 since mid-1969.

Until recently the newspapers were brought to Thatcher where they were unloaded and baled by using Thatcher equipment. A baled ton of newspapers is worth \$20. However, due to increasing needs for warehouse space, the corps now delivers the newspapers to the scrap yard loose, and this brings \$12 per ton.

The money received from the glass and paper collections amount to a significant portion of the corp's total income. A breakdown since September 1970 to the present for both glass and the paper is as follows:

	Paper	Glass
September.....	\$334.80	\$275.00
October.....	330.70	334.80
November.....	222.40	
December.....	175.24	290.60
January.....		395.50
February.....	351.55	

The money that is received is placed toward the purchase of new uniforms, instruments, equipment, and travel expenses. Horns and bugles range in cost from \$135 to \$250 each. The instruments available improve from year to year, and must be purchased regularly so that the corps can stay in competition. The only expenses not incurred by the corps is the instruction costs which approach \$5,000 per year. The Legion pays for this. The only cost for membership in the corps is a \$1.00 fee for insurance.

The result of conversations with various volunteers of the Mark Twain Cadets is that they are "only scratching the surface" as far as glass and paper collections are concerned. If the corps had more volunteer workers, they would be able to gather far greater amounts of discarded newspapers and especially glass.

RODINO ASSAILS BOMBING OF JEWISH CENTER

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, repeated bombings of public buildings have become an increasingly common occurrence in this country. On April 18, 1971, another bomb exploded—this time the blast occurred at the West Orange, N.J., Jewish Center.

These shocking acts of violence, especially against religious institutions, cannot be tolerated. I am appalled at this incident which caused massive damage to this house of worship and education center and I urge law enforcement authorities to do everything possible to determine the cause and to apprehend the offenders of this heinous action. It is time that we crack down on those who perpetrate such criminal acts.

Following is the text of the news article concerning this incident as reported in the Newark, N.J., Evening News of April 19, 1971:

PROBE TEMPLE BLAST

(By Diane Ouding)

Members of the West Orange Jewish Center, which was rocked by a mysterious explosion, early yesterday, have made emergency repairs and plan to continue most of their program elsewhere.

Police and FBI agents pressed their investigation of the explosion, which caused \$250,000 damage to the building. The synagogue was unoccupied at the time, and there were no injuries, although the blast was heard for miles.

Officials and members of the congregation pitched in yesterday to make emergency repairs, as curiosity-seekers streamed past the damaged building.

A number of other institutions offered their facilities to the congregation, and officials said scheduled activities would continue in other locations.

The explosion at about 12:30 a.m. yesterday, blew off the roof and tore out walls in the main lobby of the center, which is at 300 Pleasant Valley Way. It also shattered the synagogue's windows and destroyed offices, a gymnasium and furnishings. The blast also shattered windows in neighboring homes and was heard for miles around.

The bombing occurred the night before, Rabbi Meir Kahane, Jewish Defense League leader, was scheduled to speak. Kahane, however, had canceled the engagement more than a week ago. Police said no bomb threats had been called in.

"We aren't going to make our decision subject to this kind of hooliganism," Rabbi Harold Mozeson, leader of the center, said. "We decided that Rabbi Kahane's new invitation for May 2 still stands."

Murray Gottlieb, Jewish Center president, said he was called to the scene immediately by West Orange firemen from the firehouse across Woodland Avenue from the center. He accompanied them as they rushed in to rescue the Torah and sacred scrolls soon after the blast. Police, firemen and members of the Ft. Monmouth bomb squad, who were called to the scene, then picked through the rubble for most of the night looking for clues.

Fire Inspector Capt. James Cohrs said the bomb contained "a goodly amount, an excessive amount of explosives." Cohrs said, "If anybody had been in the building, he'd be dead." He said the department had determined the bomb to be one of two types but could not release the information. Final lab tests, he said, would be completed today.

The FBI released a statement last night saying it was "maintaining a liaison with the West Orange police to determine if there was any indication of the breaking of federal laws." But, there was "no indication of the breaking of federal statutes so far," the FBI said.

"It was definitely a professional job," said Mayor Louis Falcone. "This was not the work of a kid who doesn't like Sunday school. The whole community, gentile and Jewish, is upset by this."

RALLY PLANNED

Meanwhile, public officials and leaders of the West Orange Jewish community met yesterday down the street in the Goldman Hotel to determine a course of action. A rally on the grounds of the bombed-out synagogue is tentatively scheduled for 8 p.m. Wednesday.

A man present at the meeting, who declined to give his name, said the rally was set to "show support of the Jewish community and reaffirm the ideals of the right to worship, in fact, the existence of the democratic process here."

Also present at the meeting were Mayor Falcone, and members of the Board of Education as well as representatives from the police and fire departments.

Gottlieb reported that Hebrew classes

would continue in West Orange's Redwood School, and, due to the many offers of help, the center would not have to curtail its activities. He said seven area communities had offered facilities to the center.

"But," Gottlieb added, "it will be many months before the center is totally repaired, and we are recovered from the effects of the blast."

The center, a one-story building, was completed in 1955, and is set back in a large open tract 200 feet from the roadway. Rabbi Mozeson has been spiritual leader of the center since 1945.

WBEN—TV WORKS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, a TV studio in my district recently learned firsthand that pollution abatement can start at home when potentially dangerous chemical byproducts of the station's film-processing unit were discovered and corrected. Station officials found themselves in the position of pointing their fingers at others in the coverage of pollution problems and then found they had one right in their own studio.

The 10,000 feet of news and documentary film the station develops weekly were producing an effluent of 500 gallons of spent liquid containing ferrocyanide, one of the top 10 chemical pollutants, and silver nitrate. The ferrocyanide, when exposed in water to sunlight, converts to hydrogen cyanide, a toxic poison requiring large amounts of water to be diluted to the point where it is rendered harmless. Silver nitrate attacks bacteria used in city filtration plants to decompose waste from residential areas and destroy them.

WBEN installed a \$15,000, tailor-made treatment plant that both removes silver and eliminates the toxicity of spent liquids used to develop the film. It is estimated that the plant may recover between \$2,000 and \$3,000 worth of silver a year—metal that is 98 per cent pure and sells at \$1.80 a troy ounce.

Howard McEwan, the station's executive producer, pointed out:

We learned that the silver is a factor in destroying helpful bacteria in the treatment plant that digest sewage, and the other toxic chemicals are harmful to the waterways we have a stake in preserving.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the fact that this station is out in the forefront here—WBEN-TV is the first station in Buffalo to install such a unit and is the only station among the 750 or more stations in the Nation to treat these chemicals before dumping them.

We ignored for too long our pollution problems and now it will take the combined efforts of government, business, industry and the individual to restore the quality of our environment. It is to everyone's advantage to stop pollution, and I feel WBEN's accomplishment is one excellent example of private initiative.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Public Works after extensive hearings during the period March 15-19, reported favorably H.R. 5376 on March 24. Tomorrow, the bill will be considered on the floor of the House.

This bill includes three titles. Title I will reactivate the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962; title II will extend to June 30, 1973, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; and title III will extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The purpose of title I of H.R. 5376 is to extend and to modify the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 to meet the economic conditions confronting the Nation in 1971. This program was created in September 1962 to stimulate the construction of Federal and local public works for the dual purpose of increasing employment in areas of greatest need and helping communities to provide the basic facilities such as water and sewer works, hospitals, road improvements, public buildings, and the like required to meet the needs of their citizens and at the time pave the way for the further expansion of employment. The 1962 act authorized the appropriation of \$900 million to undertake Federal projects authorized by the Congress and to make 50-percent grants—or up to 75 percent in special hardship cases—for needed State and local public works.

Title I of H.R. 5376 would authorize the immediate appropriation of an additional \$2 billion for these grants, broaden the criteria for designating eligible areas, and liberalize the conditions under which assistance can be extended—all to the end that this act may more effectively assist in attaining increased employment opportunities in those areas, both urban and rural, suffering persistent or substantial unemployment or underemployment. Areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce include "redevelopment areas and economic development centers," and those areas which the Secretary of Labor designated each month as having been areas of substantial unemployment for at least 6 of the preceding 12 months.

Unlike the Economic Development Act, title I is intended to provide for the construction of projects that can be built quickly and therefore do not require extensive long term planning as do the projects constructed under the Economic Development Act of 1965.

It is intended to put people to work quickly and to utilize resources now used for unemployment compensation and public assistance payments for gainful employment in constructing badly needed public facilities at all levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

Also under title I the Federal Govern-

ment would be able to contribute up to 80 percent of the cost of the project; also if the State or local government unit does not have effective taxing and borrowing capability to assume a share of the financial obligations required, the grant may be increased up to 100 percent of the cost of the project.

A list of areas which would presently qualify for assistance under the Accelerated Public Works Act follow:

AREAS DESIGNATED BY THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AS "REDEVELOPMENT AREAS" FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

ALABAMA

Barbour County.
Bayou La Batre-Coden Area, Bayou La Batre Census, County Division of Mobile County.
Bibb County.
Bullock County.
Butler County, Greenville Area.
Conecuh County.
Crenshaw County.
Fayette County.
Franklin County.
Geneva County.
Greene County, Eutaw Area.
Hale County and part of Tuscaloosa County.
Henry County.
Jackson County, Scottsboro Area.
Lawrence County, Decatur Area (part).
Lowndes County.
Macon County.
Marengo County.
Marion County.
Marshall County, Albertville Area.
Monroe County.
Perry County, Marion Area.
Pickens County.
Pike County.
Randolph County.
Saint Clair County, Pell City Area.
Sumter County.
Walker County, Jasper Area.
Wilcox County.
Winston County, Haleyville Area.

ALASKA

Election District No. 1 (Formerly Nos. 1+2), Ketchikan, Prince of Wales.
Election District No. 2, Formerly No. 3, Wrangell Petersburg.
Election District No. 5 (Formerly No. 6), Lynn Canal-Icy Straits.
Election District No. 6 (Formerly Nos. 7+8), Cardova-McCarthy Valdez.
Election District No. 7 (Formerly No. 9), Palmer-Wasilla-Talkeet.
Election District No. 8 (Formerly No. 10), Anchorage.
Election District No. 9 (Formerly No. 11), Seward.
Election District No. 10 (Formerly No. 12), Kenai-Cook Inlet.
Election District No. 11 (Formerly No. 13), Kodiak.
Election District No. 12 (Formerly No. 14), Aleutian Islands.
Election District No. 13 (Formerly No. 15), Bristol Bay.
Election District No. 14 (Formerly No. 16), Bethel.
Election District No. 15 (Formerly Nos. 17+18), Kuskokwim, Yukon.
Election District No. 16 (Formerly Nos. 19+20), Fairbanks, Upper Yukon.
Election District No. 17 (Formerly Nos. 21+22), Barrow, Kobuk.
Election District No. 18 (Formerly No. 23), Nome.
Election District No. 19 (Formerly No. 24), Wade Hampton.
Southeast reservation (PT) Annette Island (Metlakatla res.); Election District No. 1 (Part) (Formerly Part of District No. 2).
Cities of: Craig (covered by U.S. surveys Nos.

1430, 2327, 2612 and 3857); Hoonah (U.S. surveys Nos. 736, 751, 1735, 1929, 2124, 2414, 2577, 3716, 3717 and 4539); Hydaburg (U.S. survey No. 1570); Klawock (U.S. survey, 1569); and Kake (U.S. surveys Nos. 1871, 3851, and 3852).

ARIZONA

Ak-Chin Reservation, part of Pinal County.
Apache County (see also Ft. Apache and Navajo Ir), McNary area.
Bisbee, city of.
Camp Verde Reservation (part of Yavapai County).
Cocopah I Reservation, Yuma County (part).
Colorado River I Res., parts of Yuma County, Arizona, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, California.
Fort Apache I Res., parts of Apache, Gila, and Navajo Counties.
Fort McDowell Resv., part of Maricopa County.
Fort Mohave Reservation, parts of Mohave County, Ariz., and San Bernardino, Cal., and Clark County, Nevada.
Fort Yuma Reservation, parts of Yuma County, Ariz., and Imperial Cty., California.
Gila Bend Indian Res., part of Maricopa County.
Gila River I Res., parts of Maricopa and Pinal Counties.
Graham County, Safford area.
Havasupai Reservation, part of Coconino County.
Hopi Reservation, parts of Coconino and Navajo Counties.
Huslapal Reservation, parts of Coconino and Navajo Counties.
Kalbab I Reservation, parts of Coconino and Mohave Counties.
Mohave County (see also, Hualapai and Fort Mohave Reservations).
Navajo County (see also Ft. Apache, Hopi, and Navajo Reservations), Winslow area.
Navajo Reservation, parts of Apache, Coconino and Navajo Counties, Arizona, and San Juan County, Utah, San Juan and McKinley Counties, New Mexico.
Papago Reservation, parts of Maricopa, Pima and Pinal Ctys.
Salt River Reservation, part of Maricopa County.
San Carlos Reservation, parts of Gila, Graham and Pinal Counties.
San Xavier Reservation, part of Pima County.
Santa Cruz County, Nogales area.
Yavapai-Prescott Reservation, Yavapai County (part).

ARKANSAS

Bradley County, Warren area.
Calhoun County, Camden area (part).
Carroll County, Berryville area.
Chicot County.
Clay County.
Cleburne County.
Cleveland County, Rison area.
Conway County, Morrilton area.
Crawford County, Van Buren area.
Crittenden County.
Cross County.
Dallas County.
Desha County.
Drew County.
Franklin County, Ozark area.
Fulton County.
Greene County, Paragould area.
Hempstead County.
Hot Spring County, Malvern area.
Independence County, Batesville area.
Izard County, Melbourne area.
Johnson County, Clarksville area.
Lafayette County, Stamps area.
Lawrence County, Walnut Ridge area.
Lee County.
Lincoln County.
Little River County.
Logan County, Paris area.
Lonoke County.
Madison County.
Marion County.

Mississippi County.
Monroe County.
Montgomery County.
Nevada County, Prescott area.
Newton County.
Ouachita County, Camden area (part).
Perry County, Morrilton area.
Phillips County.
Pike County.
Poinsett County.
Randolph County, Pochontas area.
Scott County, Waldron area.
Searcy County.
Sharp County.
St. Francis County.
Stone County.
White County, Searcy area.
Woodruff County.

CALIFORNIA

Big Pine Indian Res., part of Inyo County.
Bishop Indian Reservation, part of Inyo County.
Butte County, Chico-Oroville area.
Del Norte County, Crescent City area.
Eldorado County, Placerville area.
Fresno County.
Hoopa Valley Indian Res., Humboldt County (part).
Humboldt County, Eureka area.
Imperial County, El Centro area.
Lake County, Lakeport area.
Lassen County, Susanville area.
Lone Pine Indian Res., part of Inyo County.
Los Angeles City (part), South Central Los Angeles.
Madera County.
Mariposa County (requalified).
Mendocino County, Ukiah area.
Merced County, Merced area.
Modoc County, Alturas area.
Monterey County, Salinas-Monterey area.
Nevada County, Grass Valley area.
Oakland, city of.
Placer County.
Plumas County, Quincy area.
San Benito County, Hollister area.
San Joaquin County, Stockton area.
Santa Cruz County.
Shasta County, Redding area.
Siskiyou County, Yreka area.
Sonoma County, Santa Rosa area.
Stanislaus County, Modesto area.
Sutter County, Yuba City area.
Tehama County, Red Bluff area.
Trinity County, Weaverville area.
Tulare County, Visalia area.
Tuolumne County, Visalia area, Sonora area.
Yuba County, Yuba City area.

COLORADO

Conejos County, Antonito area.
Costilla County, Blanca area.
Huerfano County.
Saguache County, Center area.
Southern Ute I Res., parts of Archuleta and LaPlata Counties.
Ute Mountain Resv., LaPlata City, Colo. (part), Montezuma City, Colo. (pt), San Juan City, Utah (pt), San Juan City, N.M. (pt).

CONNECTICUT

Norwich area, New London County (part), towns of Bozrah, Colchester, Franklin, Griswold, Lisbon, Norwich, Preston, Sprague and Voluntown.
Torrington, City of.
Waterbury area, Litchfield County (part).
Towns of Bethlehem, Thomaston, Water-town, Woodbury, Newhaven County (part).
Towns of Beacon Falls, Cheshire, Middle-bury, Naugatuck, Prospect, Southbury, Waterbury and Wolcott.

DELAWARE

Sussex county.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Washington, D.C., City of.

FLORIDA

Big Cypress I. Res., Hendry County (part).
 Brevard County.
 Brighton I Reservation, Glades County (Part).
 Franklin County, Apalachicola area.
 Gilchrist County.
 Hamilton County.
 Hollywood I. Res., Broward County (part).
 Holmes County, Bonifay area.
 Polk County, Lakeland Area.
 Sumter County, Wildwood area.
 Walton County.

GEORGIA

Atkinson County.
 Bacon County, Alma Area.
 Baker County.
 Ben Hill County, Fitzgerald Area.
 Berrien County, Nashville Area.
 Brantley County, Nahunta Area.
 Brooks County.
 Bryan County, Pembroke Area.
 Burke County.
 Calhoun County.
 Camden County.
 Candler County, Metter Area.
 Clay County, Fort Gaines Area.
 Coffee County.
 Dodge County, Eastman Area.
 Dooley County.
 Early County.
 Echols County.
 Fannin County, McCaysville Area.
 Forsyth County, Cummings Area.
 Glascock County, Gibson Area.
 Greene County.
 Hancock County.
 Heard County.
 Irwin County.
 Jasper County, Monticello Area.
 Jefferson County.
 Jenkins County, Millen Area.
 Jones County, Gray Area.
 Lanier County, Lakeland Area.
 Lee County.
 Lincoln County, Lincolnton Area.
 Long County, Ludowick Area.
 Macon County.
 Marion County, Buena Vista Area.
 Meriwether County, Manchester Area.
 Miller County, Colquitt Area.
 Mitchell County, Camilla Area.
 Montgomery County.
 Morgan County.
 Murray County, Chatsworth Area.
 Oglethorpe County.
 Paulding County, Dallas Area.
 Pierce County, Blackshear Area.
 Pike County, Zebulon Area.
 Quitman County.
 Rarun County, Clayton Area.
 Randolph County.
 Schley County.
 Schreven County.
 Seminole County.
 Stewart County.
 Tallaferrro County.
 Taylor County.
 Telfair County, McRae Area.
 Terrell County.
 Towns County, Young Harris Area.
 Treutlen County, Soperton Area.
 Turner County, Ashburn Area.
 Union County, Blairsville Area.
 Walton County.
 Warren County, Warrenton Area.
 Washington County.
 Webster County.
 Wheeler County, Alamo Area.
 White County, Cleveland Area.
 Wilcox County, Rochelle Area.
 Worth County.

HAWAII

Hawaii County.

IDAHO

Benewah County, SS Marles area.
 Boise County, Horseshoe Bend area.
 Bonner County, Sandpoint area.

Clearwater County, Orofino area (also part of Nez Perce Res).
 Fort Hall Reservation, parts of Bannock, Bingham, Caribou and Power Counties.
 Idaho County, Grangeville area (see also Nez Perce Indian Reservation).
 Nez Perce Reservation, parts of Clearwater, Idaho, Lewis, and Nez Perce Counties.
 Shoshone County (Avery-Clark CCD only) St Marles area.
 Teton County, Driggs area.
 Valley County, McCall area.

ILLINOIS

Alexander County, Cairo Area.
 Calhoun County, Hardin Area.
 City of Chicago (Part).
 City of Chicago (Part), Du Quoin Area.
 Franklin County Harrisburg-W. Frankfort-Herrin Area.
 Gallatin County, Shawneetown Area.
 Hamilton County, McLeansboro Area.
 Hardin County, Rosiclare Area.
 Jersey County, Jerseyville Area.
 Johnson County, Harrisburg-West Frankfort-Herrin Area.
 Perry County.
 Pope County, Golconda Area.
 Pulaski County, Carlo Area (Part).
 Saline County, Harrisburg-West Frankfort-Herrin Area.
 St. Clair County.
 Union County, Anna Area.
 Williamson County, Harrisburg-West Frankfort-Herrin Area.

INDIANA

Clay County, Terre Haute area (part).
 Crawford County, Marengo area.
 Dearborn County, Lawrenceburg area (part).
 Greene County, Linton area.
 Lawrence County, Bedford area.
 Ohio County, Lawrenceburg area.
 Scott County, Scottsburg area.
 Marshall County, South Bend area (part).
 St. Joseph County, South Bend area (part).
 Starke County, Knox area.
 Vermillion County.

IOWA

Jackson County, Maquoketa area.
 Monroe County.

KANSAS

Butler County, Wichita area (part).
 Cherokee County, Pittsburg area.
 Crawford County, Pittsburg area.
 Sedgwick County, Wichita area (part).

KENTUCKY

Adair County.
 Allen County.
 Bath County, Morehead area.
 Bell County, Middlesboro area.
 Breathitt County, Jackson area.
 Breckinridge County, Hardinsburg area.
 Butler County, Morgantown area.
 Caldwell County.
 Calloway County, Murray area.
 Carlisle County, Bardwell area.
 Carter County, Grayson area (part).
 Casey County, Liberty area.
 Clay County, Manchester area.
 Clinton County, Albany area.
 Crittenden County, Marion area.
 Cumberland County, Burkesville area.
 Edmonson County, Brownsville area.
 Elliott County, Grayson area (part).
 Estill County, Richmond area (part).
 Floyd County, Prestonburg Area.
 Graves County, Mayfield area.
 Grayson County, Leitchfield area.
 Greenup County, Flatwoods area.
 Harlan County.
 Jackson County, Richmond area (part).
 Jessamine County, Nicholasville area.
 Johnson County Paintsville area.
 Knott County, Hazard area (part).
 Knox County, Barbourville area.
 Lawrence County, Louisa area.

Lee County, Beattyville area.
 Leslie County, Hyden area.
 Letcher County, Jenkins area.
 Livingston County, Smithland area.
 Lyon County, Eddyville area.
 Madison County, Richmond area (part).
 Magoffin County, Salyersville area.
 Marion County, Lebanon area.
 Marshall County, Benton area.
 Martin County, Inez area.
 McCreary County, Whitley City area.
 McLean County.
 Menifee County, Morehead area (part).
 Metcalf County, Edmonton area.
 Monroe County.
 Morgan County, West Liberty area.
 Nelson County, Bardstown area.
 Ohio County, Hartford area.
 Perry County, Hazard area.
 Pike County, Pikeville area.
 Powell County, Stanton area.
 Robertson County.
 Rockcastle County, Richmond area (part).
 Rowan County, Morehead area (part).
 Russell County, Russell Springs area.
 Todd County, Elkton area.
 Trigg County, Cadiz area.
 Washington County, Springfield area.
 Wayne County, Monticello area.
 Webster County, Dixon area.
 Whitley County, Corbin area.
 Wolfe County, Campton area.

LOUISIANA

Allen Parish, Oakdale area.
 Arcadia Area, See Bienville Parish, Donaldsonville area.
 Ascension Parish, Donaldsonville area.
 Avoyelles Parish, Alexandria area (part).
 Bienville Parish, Arcadia area.
 Calcasieu Parish.
 Caldwell Parish, Columbia area.
 Catahoula Parish, Ferriday area (part).
 Concordia Parish, Ferriday area (part).
 De Soto Parish, Mansfield area.
 East Carroll Parish.
 Evangeline Parish, Ville Platte area.
 Franklin Parish, Winnsboro area.
 Grant Parish, Alexandria area.
 Livingston Parish, Denham Sprigs area.
 Madison Parish.
 Natchitoches Parish.
 Pointe Coupee Parish, New Roads area.
 Rapides Parish, Alexandria area (part).
 Red River Parish.
 Richland Parish.
 Sabine Parish, Many area.
 St. Helena Parish, Greensburg area.
 St. Landry Parish, Opelousas area.
 St. Martin Parish, (except ward 6-south part) St. Martinville area.
 Tangipahoa Parish, Hammond area.
 Tensas Parish.
 Vermillion Parish, Abbeville area.
 Vernon Parish, Leesville area.
 West Carroll Parish, Oak Grove area.

MICHIGAN

Alger County.
 Alpena County.
 Antrim County, Mancelona area.
 Arenac County, Standish area.
 Baraga County, L'Anse area.
 Bay County, Bay City area.
 Benzie County, Elberta area.
 Charlevoix County, Boyne City area.
 Cheboygan County.
 Chippewa County, Saulte Ste Marie area.
 Clare County.
 Crawford County, Grayling area.
 Delta County, Escanaba area.
 Dickinson County, Iron Mountain area.
 Emmet County (requalified), Petoskey area.
 Gogebic County, Ironwood area.
 Grand Traverse County, Traverse City area (part).
 Gratiot County, Alma area.
 Hillsdale County.
 Houghton County, Hancock area (part).

Huron County, Bad Axe area.
 Iron County, Iron River area.
 Kalkaska County, Traverse City area (part).
 Keweenaw County, Hancock area (part).
 Lake County, Baldwin area.
 Leelanau County, Traverse City area (part).
 Luce County, Newberry area.
 Mackinac County, Saint Ignace area.
 Manistee County.
 Marquette County.
 Mason County, Ludington area.
 Missaukee County, Cadillac area (part).
 Montmorency County, Hillman area.
 Muskegon County, Muskegon-Muskegon Heights area.
 Newaygo County, Fremont area.
 Oceana County, Hart area.
 Ogemaw County, West Branch area.
 Oscoda County, Mio area.
 Otsego County, Gaylord area.
 Presque Isle County, Rogers City area.
 St. Clair County, Port Huron area.
 Schoolcraft County, Manistique area.
 Wexford County, Cadillac area (part).

MINNESOTA

Aitkin County, see also Mille Lac Reservation.
 Becker County, Detroit Lakes area.
 Beltrami County, Bemidol area.
 Clearwater County, Bagley area.
 Cook County, Grand Marais area.
 Crow Wing County, Brainerd area.
 Fond Du Lac Reservation, Carlton-St. Louis Counties.
 Grand Portage Indian Res., Cook County (part).
 Hubbard County, Park Rapids area.
 Itasca County, Grand Rapids area.
 Kanabec County (requalified), Mora area.
 Kittson County, Hallock area.
 Lake of the Woods Cty., Baudette area.
 Leech Lake Reservation, parts of Beltrami, Cass, Crow Wing, Hubbard, and Itasca Counties.
 Mahnomon County.
 Marshall County, Warren area.
 Mille Lac Reservation, Aitkin, Mille Lacs, and Pine Counties (parts of each county).
 Nett Lake Reservation, parts of Koochiching and St. Louis Counties.
 Norman County, Ada area.
 Pine County, Pine City area, see also Mille Lacs Reservation.
 Red Lake County, Red Lake Falls area.
 Red Lake Reservation, parts of Beltrami, Clearwater, Koochiching, Lake of the Woods, Marshall, Pennington, Red Lake, and Roseau Counties.
 Roseau County, see also Red Lake Reservation.
 South Saint Paul, city of.
 St. Louis County (except city of Duluth).
 Hibbing-Virginia area.
 Wadena County.
 White Earth Reservation, parts of Becker, Clearwater, and Mahnomon Counties.

MISSISSIPPI

Amite County.
 Attala County, Kosciusko area.
 Benton County.
 Bolivar County.
 Calhoun County.
 Carroll County.
 Chickasaw County.
 Choctaw County.
 Choctaw Reservation, parts of Attala, Jones, Kemper, Leake, Newton, Neshoba, and Scott counties.
 Claiborne County.
 Clarke County.
 Coahoma County.
 Copiah County, Hazlehurst area.
 Covington County.
 DeSoto County.
 Franklin County, Meadville area.
 George County, Lucedale area.
 Greene County, Leaksville area.
 Hancock County, Bay St. Louis area.
 Harrison County, Biloxi Gulfport area.

Holmes County.
 Humphreys County.
 Issaquena County.
 Jasper County.
 Jefferson County.
 Jefferson Davis County.
 Jones County, Laurel area (see also Choctaw reservation).
 Kemper County.
 Lamar County, Lumberton area.
 Lawrence County.
 Leake County, (see also Choctaw reservation).
 Leflor County.
 Madison County, Canton area.
 Marion County, Columbus area.
 Marshall County.
 Montgomery County.
 Neshoba County (see also Choctaw reservation).
 Newton County, see also Choctaw reservation.
 Noxubee County.
 Panola County.
 Pearl River County.
 Perry County, Richton area.
 Pontotoc County.
 Quitman County.
 Sharkey County.
 Smith County.
 Stone County.
 Sunflower County.
 Tallahatchie County.
 Tate County.
 Tippah County.
 Tunica County.
 Walthall County.
 Washington County, (requalified), Greenville area.
 Wayne County, Waynesboro area.
 Webster County.
 Wilkinson County.
 Winston County.
 Yazoo County.

MAINE

Biddeford Sanford area: York County (part) cities of Biddeford, and Saco and towns of Acton, Alfred, Arundel, Buxton, Cornish, Dayton, Hollis, Kennebunk, Kennebunkport, Lebanon, Limerick, Limington, Lyman, Newfield, North Berwick, Old Orchard Beach, Parsonfield, Sanford, Shapleigh and Waterboro.
 Calais-Eastport area: Washington County.
 Corinna-Newport-Dexter area: Penobscot County (part), towns of Corinna, Dexter, Dixmont, Etna, Exeter, Garland, Newport, Plymouth, Stetson; Somerset County (part), towns of Cambridge, Detroit, Palmyra, Ripley, St. Albans; Waldo County (part) towns of Burnham, Troy.
 Fort Kent area: Aroostook County (part) towns of Eagle Lake, Fort Kent, Frenchville, St. Agatha, St. Clair, Allagash, New Canada, St. John, St. Francis, and Wallagrass Plantations.
 Greenville area: Piscataquis County (pt) organized towns of Elliottsville, Greenville, Lily Bay, Shirley, unorganized towns of Big Squaw, Frenchtown, Little Squaw, and T.A.-2, R-13 and R-14, Wels in Piscataquis County, Maine.
 Indian Township: Indian reservation Washington County (part).
 Lincoln area: Penobscot County (part) towns of Burlington, Chester, Enfield, Howland, Lee, Lincoln, Lowell, Mattamiscontis, Mattawamkeag, Maxfield, Passadumkeag, Springfield, Winn, Woodville, townships of Kingman, Whitney, 1 N.D., 2R-8, 2R-9, 3R-1 and 3R-9, plantations of Carroll, Drew, Grand Falls, Lakeville, Prentiss, Sebocis, and Webster.
 Penobscot Indian Reservation, Penobscot County (part).
 Pleasant Point Indian Reservation, Washington County (part).
 Rockland area: Knox County and Town of Waldoboro in Lincoln Co.

Stonington-Deer Isle area: Hancock County (part) towns of Blue Hill, Brooklin, Brooksville, Deer Isle, Sedgewick, Stonington, Penobscot.

MARYLAND

Calvert County, Prince Frederick area.
 Dorchester County, Cambridge area.
 Garrett County, Oakland area.
 Somerset County, Crisfield area.

MASSACHUSETTS

Bourne-Wareham-Rochester area: Barnstable County (Pt) towns of Bourne; Plymouth County (Part) town of Wareham and town of Rochester.
 Dukes County, Tisbury area.
 Gloucester area: Essex County (Part) city of Gloucester; towns of Essex and Rockport.
 Lowell area: Middlesex County (Part) city of Lowell; towns of Billerica, Chelmsford, Dracut, Tewksbury, Tyngsborough, and Westford.
 New Bedford area: Bristol County (Part) city of New Bedford; towns of Acushnet, Dartmouth and Fairhaven; Plymouth County (Part) towns of Marion and Mattapoisett.
 Newburyport area: Essex County (Part) city of Newburyport; towns of Amesbury, Ipswich, Newbury, Rowley and Salisbury.
 Palmer: Town of Hampden County (Part).
 Plymouth area: Plymouth County (Part) towns of Carver, Kingston, Plymouth and Plympton.
 Provincetown area: Barnstable County (Part) towns of Provincetown and Truro.
 Southbridge-Western area: Worcester County (Part) towns of Charlton, Douglas, Southbridge, Dudley, Sturbridge and Webster.
 North Adams area.

MISSOURI

Carter County.
 Dallas County, Buffalo area.
 Douglas County.
 Dunklin County, Kennett area.
 Iron County, Ironton area.
 Miller County, Eldon area.
 Mississippi County, Charleston (area).
 New Madrid County.
 Ozark County.
 Pemiscot County, Caruthersville area.
 Phelps County, Rolla area.
 Putnam County.
 Ripley County, Doniphan area.
 Shannon County, Eminence area.
 St. Francois County, Flat River area.
 Stone County, Galena area.
 Washington County, Potosi area.
 Wayne County, Greenville area.
 Worth County.
 Wright County, Hartville area.

MONTANA

Blackfeet Reservation, parts of Glacier and Pondera Counties.
 Crow Reservation, parts of Big Horn and Yellowstone Counties.
 Deer Lodge County, Anaconda area.
 Flathead Reservation, parts of Flathead Lake, Missoula and Sanders Counties.
 Fort Belknap Reservation, Phillips County.
 Fort Peck Reservation, parts of Daniels, Roosevelt, Sheridan, and Valley Counties.
 Granite County (requalified), (requalified).
 Madison County, Sheridan area.
 Meagher County, White Sulphur Springs.
 Musselshell County, Roundup area.
 Northern Cheyenne Reservation, parts of Big Horn and Rosebud Counties.
 Rocky Boys Reservation, parts of Chouteau and Hill Counties.
 Silver Bow County, Butte area.
 Valley County, Glasgow area.

NEBRASKA

City of Omaha (part).
 Greeley County.
 Omaha-Winnebago Reservation, parts of Burt Cuming, Dixon, and Thurston Counties.
 Pawnee County.

Santee-Sioux Reservation, part of Knox County.

NEVADA

Duck Valley Reservation, Elko County, Nev. (Part) and Owyhee County, Ida. (Part). Fallon Indian Reservation, and Colony, Churchill County (Part).

Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation, Humboldt County (Part).

Goshute Indian Reservation, White Pine County (Part).

Lincoln County, Caliente area.

Moapa River Indian Reservation, Clark County (Part).

Pyramid Lake Reservation, part of Washoe County.

Reno-Sparks Indian Reservation, Washoe County (Part).

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Carroll County.

Coos County.

Grafton County.

NEW JERSEY

Camden, city of.

Cape May County, Ocean City-Wildwood-Cape May area.

Cumberland County, Bridgeton area.

Newark, city of.

NEW MEXICO

Acoma Pueblo Res., Valencia County (part).

Albuquerque Indian Land area, 11.6 acre tract, former Albuquerque Federal Indian School Land.

Colfax County, Raton area.

Eddy County, Carlsbad area.

Guadalupe County, Santa Rosa area.

Isleta Pueblo Res., parts of Bernalillo and Valencia Counties.

Jemez Pueblo Res., part of Sandoval County.

Jicarillo Reservation, parts of Rio Arriba and Sandoval Counties.

Laguna Pueblo Res., parts of Bernalillo, Sandoval and Valencia Counties.

McKinley County, Gallup area, also see Ramp and Zuni Reservations and the Navajo Reservation, Ariz.

Mescalero Reservation, part of Otero County.

Mora County, Wagon Mound area.

Nambe Pueblo Indian Res., part of Santa Fe County.

Picuris Pueblo Indian Res., part of Taos County.

Pojoaque Pueblo Indian Reservation, part of Santa Fe County.

Ramah Reservation, parts of McKinley and Valencia Counties.

Rio Arriba County, Espanola area, see also Jicarilla and Santo Domingo Indian Reservations.

San Ildefonso Pueblo Indian Reservation, part of Santa Fe County.

San Juan Pueblo Indian Reservation, part of Rio Arriba County.

San Miguel County, Las Vegas area.

Sandoval County, Bernalillo area, see also Jemez, Laguna Pueblo, Jicarilla, and Santo Domingo Indian Reservations.

Santa Clara Reservation, Sandoval, Santa Fe and Rio Arriba Counties.

Santo Domingo Res., parts of Rio Arriba, Sandoval and Santa Fe Counties.

Socorro County.

Taos County.

Taos Pueblo Indian Res., part of Taos County.

Tesuque Pueblo Indian Res., part of Santa Fe County.

Torrance County, Mountainair area, see also Isleta Pueblo and Laguna Pueblo Indian Reservations.

Zuni Reservation, parts of McKinley and Valencia Counties.

NEW YORK

Allegheny Reservation, part of Cattaraugus County.

Cattaraugus Reservation, part of Cattaraugus, Chautauquy, and Erie Counties.

Cayuga County, Auburn area.

Clinton County, Plattsburg area.

Essex County, Ticonderoga area.

Franklin County, Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone area (part).

Fulton County, Gloversville area.

Greene County, Catskill area.

Hamilton County, Speculator area.

Jefferson County, Watertown area.

Lewis County, Lowville area.

New York City (part), Lower East Side.

Orleans County, Rochester area (part).

Oswego County, Syracuse area (part).

Schoharie County, Cobleshill area.

St. Lawrence County, Ogdensburg-Massena-Malone area (part).

Warren County, Glens Falls-Hudson Falls area (part).

New York City (part), Brooklyn Navy Yard.

NORTH CAROLINA

Avery County, Spruce Pine area (part).

Bertie County, Windsor area.

Bladen County, Elizabethtown area.

Brunswick County, Wilmington area (part).

Camden County, Elizabeth City area (part).

Carteret County, Morehead City area.

Clay County, Hayesville area.

Columbus County, Whiteville area.

Currituck County, Moyock area.

Dare County, Manteo area.

Duplin County

Eastern Cherokee Reservation, parts of Graham, Jackson and Swain Counties.

Franklin County, Louisburg area.

Gates County

Graham County, Robbinsville area, see also Eastern Cherokee Reservation.

Greene County, Snow Hill area.

Halifax County, Roanoke Rapids area.

Hertford County, Ahoskie area.

Hyde County, Swanquarter area.

Jones County.

Madison County, Marshall area.

Northampton County

Pamlico County

Pitt County, Greenville area.

Robeson County, Lumberton area.

Swain County, Bryson City area.

Tyrrell County, Columbia area.

Warren County

Wilson County, Wilson area.

Yancey County, Spruce Pine area.

NORTH DAKOTA

Fort Berthold Res., parts of Dunn, McKenzie, McLean, Mercer and Mountrail Counties.

Fort Totten or Devils Lake Reservation, parts of Benson, Eddy, Nelson and Ramsey Counties.

Oliver County.

Rolette County, Rolla area. See also Turtle Mt. Res.

Standing Rock Sioux Res., parts of Sioux County, and Vorson and Walworth Counties, South Dakota.

Turtle Mountain Res., part of Rolette County.

OHIO

Adams County, Manchester area.

Carroll County, Carrollton area.

Clermont County, in Cincinnati area (pt.).

Cleveland City of (requalified).

Gallia County, Gallipolis area.

Jackson County.

Lawrence County, Huntington-Ashland, West Virginia area (pt.).

Meigs County, Pomeroy area.

Perry County, New Lexington area.

Pike County, Waverly area.

Warren County, Cincinnati area (part).

OKLAHOMA

Adair County, Stilwell area.

Atoka County.

Cherokee County, Tahlequah area.

Choctaw County, Hugo area.

Coal County, Coalgate area.

Delaware County, Jay area.

Haskell County, Stigler area.

Hughes County, Holdenville area.

Jefferson County, Waurika area.

Johnston County, Tishomingo area.

Latimer County, Wilburton area.

Le Flore County, (part of Ft. Smith, Arkansas area).

Mayes County, Pryor Creek area.

McCain County, Purcell area.

McCurtain County, Idabel area.

McIntosh County.

Muskogee County.

Okfuskee County, Okemah area.

Okmulgee County, Okmulgee-Henryetta area.

Ottawa County, Miami area.

Pawnee County.

Pittsburg County, McAlester area.

Pushmataha County.

Sequoyah County, (part of Fort Smith, Ark. area).

Wagoner County.

Washita County, Cordell area.

OREGON

Coos County, North Bend-Coos Bay area.

Douglas County, Roseburg area.

Fort McDermitt Indian reservation, Malheur County (part) see also Humboldt County, Nevada.

Gilliam County, Condon area.

Hood River County, Hood River area.

Jackson County, Medford area.

Josephine County, Grants Pass area.

Lake County, Lakeview area.

Lincoln County, Toledo area.

Umatilla County, Pendleton area.

Umatilla Reservation, part of Umatilla City.

Warm Springs reservation, parts of Clackamas, Jefferson, Linn, Marion, and Wasco counties.

Wasco County, (requalified), The Dalles area (part) also see Warm Springs Indian reservation.

Yamhill County, McMinnville area.

Curry County (requalified), Gold Beach area.

Tillamook County, Tillamook area.

PENNSYLVANIA

Armstrong County, Kittanning-Ford City area.

Bedford County.

Centre County (part), Clearfield-Dubois area (part).

Clearfield County, Clearfield-Dubois area (part); Clearfield County; Centre County (part), Boroughs of Philipsburg and South Philipsburg and Township of Rush.

Fayette County, Uniontown-Connelville.

Somerset County, Johnstown area.

RHODE ISLAND

Providence-Pawtucket area:

Bristol County.

Kent County.

Newport County (part), town of Jamestown, town of New Shoreham.

Providence County.

Washington County (part), town of Exeter, town of Narragansett, town of North Kingstown, town of Richmond, town of South Kingstown.

Bristol County, Massachusetts (part), city of Attleboro, town of North Attleboro, town of Rehoboth, town of Seekonk.

Norfolk County, Massachusetts (part), town of Bellingham, town of Franklin, town of Plainville, town of Wrentham.

Worcester County, Massachusetts (part), town of Blackstone, town of Millville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Allendale County.

Bamberg County.

Barnwell County.

Berkeley County, Charleston area.

Calhoun County.

Clarendon County (and part of Florence).

Darlington County, Darlington area.

Dillon County.

Edgefield County.

Fairfield County.
Georgetown County, Georgetown area.
Lee County.
Marion County.
Marlboro County.
McCormick County.
Orangeburg County.
Saluda County, Saluda area.
Union County.
Williamsburg County.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Cheyenne River Res., parts of Dewey, Haakon, Meade, Perkins, Stanley, and Ziebach Counties.

Crow Creek and Lower Brule Reservation, parts of Brule, Hughes, Buffalo, Hyde, Lyman, and Stanley Counties.

Pine Ridge Reservation, Bennett, Shannon and Washabaugh Counties.

Rosebud Reservation, parts of Gregory, Mellette, Todd and Tripp Counties.

Sisseton Reservation, parts of Codington, Day, Grant, Marshall and Roberts Counties. S.D., and Richland and Sargent Counties, N.D.

Yankton Reservation, parts of Bon Homme, and Charles Mix Counties.

TENNESSEE

Bledsoe County.
Campbell County, Lafollette-Jeblico area.
Claborn County.
Clay County.
Cocke County, Newport area.
Fayette County.
Fentress County.
Grainger County, Rutledge area.
Greene County, Greeneville area.
Grundy County, Tracy City area.
Hancock County, Sneedville area.
Hardeman County.
Hardin County, Savannah area (pt).
Haywood County.
Houston County, Erin area.
Humphreys County, Waverly area.
Jackson County.
Johnson County, Mountain City area.
Lake County, Tiptonville area.
Lauderdale County.
Lawrence County, Lawrenceburg area.
Macon County.
McNairy County, Savannah area (part).
Meigs County, Decatur area.
Monroe County, Sweetwater area.
Morgan County, Harriman Rockwood area (part).
Overton County.
Perry County.
Pickett County.
Rhea County, Dayton area.
Rutherford County.
Scott County, Oneda area.
Sequatchie County, Dunlap area.
Sevier County, Sevierville area.
Stewart County.
Union County, Maynardville area.
Van Buren County.
Waverly area, see Humphreys County.
Wayne County, Waynesboro area.
White County (requalified), Sparta area.

TEXAS

Cameron County, Brownsville-Harlingen-San Benito area (part).
Delta County.
Dimmit County.
Falls County, Marlin area.
Fannin County.
Freestone County.
Frio County, Pearsall area.
Goliad County.
Gonzales County.
Grimes County.
Hill County.
Houston County.
Jim Hogg County, Hebbronville area.
Karnes County.
Kinney County, Brackettville area.
La Salle County, Cotulla area.
Leon County.

Limestone County, Mexia area.
Madison County.
Marion County.
Maverick County, Eagle Pass area.
Medina County, Hondo area.
Polk County.
Rains County.
Real County.
Red River County.
Robertson County.
Sabine County.
San Augustine County, San Augustine area.
San Jacinto County.
Starr County, McAllen area.
Trinity County.
Uvalde County, Uvalde area.
Val Verde County, Del Rio area.
Webb County, Laredo area.
Willacy County, Raymondville area.
Wilson County, Floresville area.
Zapata County.
Zavala County, Crystal City area.

UTAH

Beaver County (requalified) Beaver area.
Carbon County, Price area (part).
Duchesne County, Roosevelt area, see also Uintah and Ouray Reservation.
Emery County, Price area (part).
Garfield County, Panguitch area.
Goshute Indian Reservation, Juab County (part).
Grand County, Moab area.
Juab County, Nephi area.
Kane County, Kanab area.
Sanpete County, Manti area.
Sevier County, Richfield area.
Summit County, Park City area.
Uintah and Ouray Reservations, parts of Duchesne, Grand Uintah, and Wasatch Counties.
Utah County, Provo-Orem area.
Wasatch County, Heber City area, also see Uintah and Ouray.

VERMONT

Franklin County, St. Albans area.

VIRGINIA

Accomack County, Chincoteague area (part).
Brunswick County, Lawrenceville area.
Buchanan County (requalified), Grundy area.
Cumberland County.
Dickenson County, Lebanon area (part).
Highland County, Independent City of Norton, Norton-Big Stone Gap area.
Lancaster County (requalified), Colonial Beach area (part).
Lee County.
Northampton County, Chincoteague area.
Northumberland County (requalified), Colonial Beach area (part).
Richmond County (requalified), Colonial Beach area (part).
Russell County, Lebanon area (part).
Smyth County (requalified), Marlon area.
Tazewell County (requalified), Richlands area.
Westmoreland County (requalified), Colonial Beach area (part).
Wise County, Norton-Big Stone Gap area.

WASHINGTON

Chelan County, Wenatchee area (part).
Colville Reservation, parts of Ferry, Okanogan and Stevens Counties.
Douglas County, Wenatchee area (part).
Ferry County, Republic area (also see Colville res.).
King County, Seattle area (part).
Kitsap County, Bremerton area.
Klickitat County, Goldendale County.
Lewis County, Centralia area.
Lummi I res, Whatcom County (part).
Makah Reservation, part of Clallam County.
Okanogan County.
Pend Oreille County, Newport area.
Pierce County, Tacoma area.

Skagit County, Anacortes area.
Snohomish County, Seattle area (part).
Spokane Indian res. Stevens County (part).
Stevens County, Colville area.
Swinomish Indian Reservation, Skagit County (part).
Yakima County.
Yakima Reservation, parts of Klickitat and Yakima Counties.
Pacific County, Raymond area.
Benton County, Tri-City area (part).
Franklin County, Tri-City area (part).
Skamania County, Stevenson area.

WEST VIRGINIA

Barbour County, Philippi area.
Boone County, Logan-Madison area (part).
Braxton County, Gassaway area.
Calhoun County, Grantsville area.
Clay County.
Fayette County, Oakhill-Montgomery area.
Gilmer County, Glenville area.
Grant County, Petersburg area.
Greenbrier County, Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs area.
Hampshire County, Romney area.
Hardy County, Moorefield area.
Lewis County, Weston area.
Lincoln County, Hamlin area.
Logan County, Logan-Madison area (part) see Boone and Logan Counties.
Marshall County, Wheeling area (part).
Mason County, Point Pleasant area.
McDowell County, Welch area.
Mercer County, Bluefield area.
Mineral County.
Mingo County, Williamson area.
Monroe County, Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs area (part).
Morgan County, Berkeley Springs area.
Nicholas County, Richwood area.
Ohio County, Wheeling area (part).
Pendleton County, Franklin area.
Pocahontas County, Marlinton area.
Preston County, Kingwood area.
Raleigh County, Beckley area.
Randolph County, Elkins area.
Ritchie County, Pennsboro area.
Roane County, Spencer area.
Summers County, Hinton area.
Taylor County, Grafton area.
Tucker County, Parsons area.
Upshur County, Buckhannon area.
Wayne County, Huntington-Ashland area (part).
Webster County, Webster Springs area.
Wetzel County, New Martinsville area.

WISCONSIN

Adams County.
Ashland County, Ashland area (part). (See also Bad River Res.)
Bad River Reservation, part of Ashland County.
Bayfield County, Ashland area (part). (See also Red Cliff Res.)
Burnett County, Grantsburg area.
Crawford County, Prairie Du Chien area.
Douglas County, part of Duluth-Superior area Minn.
Florence County, Florence area.
Forest County, Cranston area.
Iron County, Hurley area. (See also Lac Du Flambeau Reservation).
Jackson County (requalified), Black River Falls area.
La Crosse County (requalified).
Lac Courte Oreille Reservation, part of Sawyer County.
Lac Du Flambeau Reservation, parts of Iron and Vilas Counties.
Menominee County, Neopit area.
Oneida Reservation, parts of Brown and Outagamie Counties.
Red Cliff Reservation, part of Bayfield County.
Rusk County (requalified), Ladysmith area.
Sawyer County (requalified), Hayward area. (Also see Lac Courte Oreille Reservation.)

St. Croix Reservation, part of Burnett County.
Taylor County (requalified).
Vernon County (requalified), Viroqua area.
Washburn County (requalified), Spooner area.

WYOMING

Wind River Reservation, parts of Fremont and Hot Springs counties.

GUAM

Guam, territory of.

PUERTO RICO

Puerto Rico.

AMERICAN SAMOA

American Samoa, (territory of).

VIRGIN ISLANDS

AREAS DESIGNATED AS "ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CENTERS" FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

(NOTE.—This list does not include economic development centers which are in "redevelopment areas.")

ALABAMA

Central Economic Development District: Montgomery (Montgomery County).
Southeast EDD: Dothan (Houston County, Dale County).

ARKANSAS

Central EDD: Little Rock-North Little Rock (Pulaski County).
Conway (Faulkner County).
East Arkansas EDD: Jonesboro (Craighead County).
North Central EDD: Newport (Jackson County).

Northwest EDD: Fayetteville-Springdale (Washington County), Harrison (Boone County), Mountain Home (Baxter County).
Southeast EDD: Pine Bluff-Sheridan (Jefferson County), Crossett-Hamburg (Ashley County).

South West EDD: El Dorado (Union County), Texarkana (Miller County).

West Central EED: Russellville-Dardanelle, (Pope County, Yell County), Hot Springs (Garland County).

Western EDD: Fort Smith-Van Buren (Sebastian County, Crawford County), Mena (Polk County).

COLORADO

Southern Colorado EDD: Alamosa (Alamosa County), Pueblo (Pueblo County), Trinidad (Las Animas County).

FLORIDA

Northwest Florida EDD: Panama City (Bay County), Marianna (Jackson County).

GEORGIA

Central Savannah River EDD: Augusta (Richmond County, Columbia County), Swainsboro (Emanuel County).

Chattahoochee-Flint EDD: Carrollton (Carroll County), La Grange, Troup County).

Coastal Area EDD: Brunswick (Glynn County), Hinesville (Liberty County).

Coastal Plain EDD: Tifton (Tift County), Valdosta (Lowndes County).

Georgia Mountains EDD: Gainesville (Hall County) Toccoa (Stephens County).

Heart of Georgia EDD: Dublin-East Dublin (Laurens County).

Lower Chattahoochee Valley EDD: Columbus (Muskogee County).

Middle Flint EDD: Americus (Sumter County).

Northeast Georgia EDD: Athens (Clarke County).

Oconee EDD: Milledgeville (Baldwin County).

Slash Pine EDD: Waycross (Ware County).
Southwest EDD: Albany (Dougherty County), Bainbridge (Decatur County).

IDAHO

Clearwater EDD: Lewiston (Nez Perce County).

ILLINOIS

Greater Egypt EDD: Carbondale (Jackson County), Mt. Vernon (Jefferson County).

INDIANA

West Central EDA: Terre Haute (Vigo County).

KENTUCKY

Barren River EDD: Bowling Green (Warren County), Glasgow (Barren County).

Fivco EDD: Ashland (Boyd County).
Lake Cumberland EDD: Campbellsville (Taylor County), Somerset (Pulaski County).

Lincoln Trail EDD: Elizabethtown-Radcliffe-Vine Grove Corridor (Hardin County).

Pennyrite EDD: Hopkinsville (Christian County), Madisonville (Hopkins County).

Purchase EDD: Paducah (McCracken County).

LOUISIANA

Capital EDD: Baton Rouge (E. Baton Rouge Parish, W Baton Rouge Parish).

Evangeline EDD: Lafayette-New Iberia (Lafayette Parish, Iberia Parish).

North Delta EDD: Monroe-West Monroe (Ouachita Parish).

Northwest EDD: Shreveport-Bossier City (Caddo Parish, Bossier Parish).

MAINE

Pride (Eastern Maine) EDD: Bangor-Brewer (Penobscot County).

MARYLAND

Delmarva EDD: Dover, Delaware (Kent County) Salisbury, Maryland (Wicomico County).

MASSACHUSETTS

Southeastern EDD: Fall River, Taunton.

MICHIGAN

Central Upper Peninsula EDD: Marquette-Negaunee, Ishpeming area (Marquette County).

East Central EDD: Bay City-Midland-Saginaw tri-city urban complex (Bay County, Midland County, Saginaw County) Tawas City-East Tawas (Closco County).

Western Upper Peninsula EDD: Ontonagon-White Pine (Ontonagon County).

MINNESOTA

Arrowhead EDD: Duluth (St. Louis County).

MISSISSIPPI

Central EDD: Jackson (Hinds County, Rankin County) Vicksburg (Warren County).

East Central EDD: Meridian (Lauderdale Co.), Forest (Scott Co.).

North Central EDD: Grenada (Grenada Co.).

Southern EDD: Hattiesburg (Forrest Co.), Pascagoula (Jackson Co.).

Southwest: McComb (Pike Co.), Natchez (Adams Co.).

MISSOURI

Bootheel EDD: Dexter-Bloomfield (Stoddard Co.), Sikeston (Scott Co.).

Lakes County EDD: Springfield (Greene Co.).

Ozark Foothills EDD: Poplar Bluff (Butler Co.).

South Central Ozark EDD: West Plains (Howell Co.).

MONTANA

Bear Paw EDD: Havn (Hill Co.).

Big Horn EDD: Hardin (Big Horn Co.).

NEW HAMPSHIRE

New Hampshire-Vermont EDD: St. Johnsbury-Lyndon (Caledonia Co., Vt.) Newport (Orleans Co., Vt.).

NEW MEXICO

North Central EDD: Santa Fe (Santa Fe Co.).

NEW YORK

Mohawk Valley EDD: Amsterdam (Montgomery Co.), Rome-Utica Corridor (Onelida Co., Herkimer Co.).

NORTH CAROLINA

Mid-East EDD: Washington (Beaufort Co.), Williamston (Martin Co.).

Neuse River EDD: Goldsboro (Wayne Co.), Kinston (Lenoir Co.), New Bern (Craven Co.).

Southeastern EDD: Fayetteville (Cumberland Co.), Wilmington (New Hanover Co.), Brunswick Co., Pender Co.).

OHIO

Buckeye Hills-Hocking Valley EDD: Marietta (Washington Co.), Athens (Athens Co.), Martins Ferry-Bellaire (Belmont Co.).

Ohio Valley EDD: Chillicothe (Ross Co.), Portsmouth (Scioto Co.).

OKLAHOMA

Central EDD: Sapulpa-Bristow Corridor (Creek Co.), Shawnee (Pottawatomie Co.), Stillwater (Payne Co.).

N.E.C.O. EDD: Uinita (Craig Co.), Claremore (Rogers Co.).

S.O.D.A. EDD: Ada (Pontotoc Co.), Ardmore (Carter Co.), Durant (Bryan Co.).

South Central EDD: Chickasha (Grady Co.), Duncan (Stephens Co.).

PENNSYLVANIA

Turnpike EDD: Huntingdon (Huntingdon Co.), Johnstown (Cambria Co.).

SOUTH CAROLINA

Lower Savannah EDD: Aiken-North Augusta (Aiken Co.).

Pee Dee EDD: Florence-Darlington (Florence Co., Darlington Co.).

Upper Savannah EDD: Greenwood (Greenwood Co.).

Waccamaw EDD: Conway-Myrtle Beach-N. Myrtle Beach (Horry Co.).

TENNESSEE

East Tennessee EDD: Knoxville (Knox Co.), Morristown (Hamblen Co.), Oak Ridge (Anderson Co., Roane Co.), Alcoa-Maryville (Blount Co.).

First Tennessee Virginia EDD: Tri-Cities: Bristol (Sullivan Co.), Johnson City (Washington County), Kingsport (Sullivan County), Tenn., Bristol (Washington County) Va.

Upper Cumberland EDD: Cookeville (Putnam County), Crossville (Cumberland County), McMinnville (Warren County).

TEXAS

Brazos Valley EDD: Bryan-College Station (Brazos County).

Central EDD: Killen (Bell County), Temple (Bell County), Waco (McLennan County).

Coastal Bend EDD: Corpus Christi-Aransas Pass (Nueces County, Aransas County), San Patricio County, Victoria (Victoria County).

Deep East EDD: Nacogdoches-Lufkin-Diboll (Nacogdoches County), (Angelina County).

Lower Rio Grande Valley EDD: McAllen (Hidalgo County).

North East EDD: Northeast Texas Municipal Water District (part) (Cass County, Morris County, Camp County, Upshur County), Sulphur Springs (Hopkins County), Marshall (Harrison County), Texarkana (Bowie County).

UTAH

Six-County EDD: Delta City (Millard County).

VERMONT

(See New Hampshire.)

VIRGINIA

Lenowisco EDD: Magisterial Districts of Powell and Taylor (Scott County).

WEST VIRGINIA

Upper Potomac EDD: Martinsburg-Charles Town Corridor (Berkeley County, Jefferson County).

AREAS OFFICIALLY CLASSIFIED AS AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT 6 OF THE PAST 12 MONTHS (ENDING MARCH 1971), NOT ALREADY DESIGNATED AS ELIGIBLE UNDER PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

MAJOR AREAS

State and Areas—Counties Covered

California

Anaheim, Santa Ana.
Garden Grove (Orange County).
San Bernardino, Riverside, Ontario (Riverside and San Bernardino Counties).
San Diego (San Diego County).
San Jose (Santa Clara County).

Connecticut

Bridgeport (Towns of Bridgeport, Easton, Fairfield, Monroe, Shelton, Stratford, and Trumbull in Fairfield County; Town of Milford in New Haven County).

New Britain (Towns of Berlin, New Britain, and Plainville in Hartford County).

Waterbury (Towns of Bethlehem, Thomaston, Watertown and Woodbury in Litchfield County; Towns of Beacon Falls, Cheshire, Middlebury, Naugatuck, Prospect, Southbury, Waterbury, and Wolcott in New Haven County).

Indiana

South Bend (Marshall and St. Joseph Counties).

Louisiana

Baton Rouge (East Baton Rouge Parish).
New Orleans (Jefferson, Orleans, St. Bernard, and St. Tammany Parishes).

Massachusetts

Brockton (Towns of Easton in Bristol County; Towns of Avon and Stoughton in Norfolk County; City of Brockton, Towns of Abington, Bridgewater, East Bridgewater, Hanson, West Bridgewater, and Whitman in Plymouth County).

Fall River (City of Fall River; Towns of Somerset, Swansea, and Westport in Bristol County, Mass.; Town of Tiverton in Newport County, R.I.).

Lawrence-Haverhill (Cities of Lawrence and Haverhill; Towns of Andover, Georgetown, Groveland, Merimac, Methuen, North Andover, and West Newbury in Essex County, Mass.; Towns of Newton, Plaistow, and Salem in Rockingham County, N.H.).

Lowell (City of Lowell; Towns of Billerica, Chelmsford, Dracut, Tewksbury, Tyngsborough, and Westford in Middlesex County).

Springfield, Chicopee, Holyoke (Cities of Chicopee, Holyoke, Springfield, and Westfield; Towns of Agawan, East Longmeadow, Hampden, Longmeadow, Ludlow, Monson, Palmer, Southwick, West Springfield, and Wilbraham in Hampden County; City of Northampton; Towns of Easthampton, Granby, Hadley, and South Hadley in Hampshire County; Town of Warren in Worcester County).

Michigan

Battle Creek (Barry and Calhoun Counties).

Detroit (Macomb, Oakland and Wayne Counties).

Flint (Genesee and Lapeer Counties).

Grand Rapids (Kent and Ottawa Counties).

New Jersey

Jersey City (Hudson County).
New Brunswick, Perth Amboy (Middlesex and Somerset Counties).

New Mexico

Albuquerque (Bernadillo County).

Oregon

Portland (Clackamas, Multnomah, and Washington Counties, Oreg.; Clark County, Wash.).

Washington

Seattle (King and Snohomish Counties).
Spokane (Spokane County).
Tacoma (Pierce County).

West Virginia

Huntington-Ashfield (Cabell and Wayne Counties, W. Va.; Boyd County, Ky.; Lawrence County, Ohio).

Wisconsin

Racine (Racine County).

SMALLER AREAS

Alabama

Centre (Cherokee County).
Cullman (Cullman County).
Florence Sheffield (Colbert, Franklin and Lauderdale Counties).

*Gadsden (Etowah County).

California

*Oxnard (Ventura County).

Colorado

Trinidad (Las Animas County).

Connecticut

Ansonia (Towns of Ansonia, Derby, Oxford, and Seymour in New Haven County).

Danielson (Towns of Brooklyn, Canterbury, Eastford, Killingly, Plainfield, Pomfret, Putnam, Sterling, Thompson, and Woodstock in Windham County).

Torrington (Towns of Burlington and Hartland in Hartford County; Towns of Barkhamsted, Canaan, Colebrook, Cornwall, Goshen, Harwinton, Litchfield, Morris, New Hartford, Norfolk, North Canaan, Salisbury, Sharon, Torrington, and Winchester in Litchfield County).

Georgia

Cedartown (Polk County).

Idaho

Jerome (Jerome County).

Illinois

Carmi (White County).

Iowa

Waterloo (Black Hawk County).

Kansas

Coffeyville (Montgomery County).

Wellington (Sumner County).

Kentucky

Fulton (Fulton and Hickman Counties).

Georgetown (Scott County).

Lancaster (Garrard County).

Louisiana

De Ridder (Beauregard Parish).

Jennings (Jefferson Davis Parish).

Monroe (Ouachita Parish).

Maine

Ellsworth (Hancock County).

Maryland

Pocomoke City (Worcester County).

Massachusetts

North Adams (City of North Adams, Towns of Adams, Clarksburg, Florida, New Ashford, Savoy, and Williamston in Berkshire County; Town of Monroe in Franklin County).

Taunton (City of Taunton, Towns of Berkeley, Dighton, Norton, and Raynham in Bristol County; Towns of Halifax, Middleboro, and Lakeville in Plymouth County).

Michigan

Adrian (Lenawee County).

Caro (Tuscola County).

Coldwater (Branch County).

*Jackson (Jackson County).

Roscommon (Roscommon County).

Minnesota

Princeton (Mille Lacs County).

Walker (Cass County).

New Mexico

Farmington (San Juan County).

New York

Norwich (Chenango County).

Oneonta (Otsego County).

Perry (Wyoming County).

Sidney (Delaware County).

North Carolina

Roxboro (Person County).

Oklahoma

Ada (Pontotoc County).

Altus (Jackson County).

Anadarko (Caddo County).

Claremore (Rogers County).

Marietta (Love County).

Shawnee (Pottawatomie County).

Oregon

Albany (Linn County).

Madras (Jefferson County).

Tillamook (Tillamook County).

Pennsylvania

Bradford (McKean County).

Candersport (Potter County).

Tunkhannock (Wyoming County).

Wellsboro (Tioga County).

South Carolina

Orangeburg (Orangeburg County).

Utah

Brigham City (Box Elder County).

Ogden (Precincts of Clearfield, Clinton, Kaysville, Layton, South Weber, Syracuse, and West Point in Davis County; Weber County).

*Provo-Orem (Utah County).

Virginia

Bristol (Washington County, Va.; Independent City of Bristol, Va.; Division of Avoca, Blountville, Bluff City, Bristol, Holston Valley, Piney Flats, and Weaver in Sullivan County, Tenn.), Va.-Tenn.

West Virginia

Clarksburg (Doddridge and Harrison Counties).

Martinsburg (Berkeley and Jefferson Counties).

Wisconsin

Antigo (Langlade County).

Arcadia (Trempealeau County).

Dodgeville (Iowa County).

Eagle River (Vilas County).

Manston (Juneau County).

Oconto (Oconto County).

Shawano (Shawano County).

Sparta (Monroe County).

QUALIFIED REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

(NOTE.—In addition to the above, the following areas are qualified to be "redevelopment areas" but are not designated at this time by the Secretary of Commerce for the purposes of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.)

ALABAMA

Dallas County.

Lamar County.

Vernon area.

ALASKA

Bristol Bay Reservation, part of Election District 13.

Cook Inlet Reservation, part of Election District 10.

Election District 3, formerly 4, Sitka.

Norton Sound Reservation, part of Election District 18.

ARKANSAS

Polk County, Mena area.

CALIFORNIA

Glenn County, Willows area.

Kern County, Bakersfield area.

COLORADO

Archuleta County, Pagosa Springs Area.

CONNECTICUT

Bristol area.

Hartford County (part) town of Bristol.
Litchfield County (part) town of Plymouth.

*These areas are Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas but are not part of the 150 areas regularly covered by the Dept. of Labor's area classification program.

Torrington area.
 Hartford County (part) towns of Burlington and Hartland.
 Litchfield County (part) towns of Barkhamsted, Canaan, Colebrook, Cornwall, Goshen, Harwinton, Litchfield, Morris, New Hartford, Norfolk, North Canaan, Salisbury, Sharon, Winchester.
 Bridgeport area.
 Fairfield County (part) towns of Bridgeport, Easton, Fairfield, Monroe, Shelton, Stratford & Trumbull.
 New Haven County (part) town of Milford.
 Danbury area.
 Fairfield County (part) towns of Bethel, Brookfield, Danbury, New Fairfield, Newton, Redding, Ridgefield & Sherman.
 Litchfield County (part) towns of Bridge-water, Kent, New Milford, Roxbury, Warren & Washington.
 Meriden area.
 Hartford County (part) town of Southington, New Haven County, towns of Meriden & Wallingford.
 New Britain area Hartford County (part) towns of Berlin, New Britain & Plainville.

GEORGIA

Douglas County, Douglasville area.
 Pulaski County, Hawkinsville area.

IDAHO

Adams County, council area.
 Payette County.
 Washington County.

ILLINOIS

White County, Carmi area.

INDIANA

Sullivan County, Terre Haute area (part).

KANSAS

Labette County, Parsons area.

KENTUCKY

Boyd County, Huntington-Ashland, West Virginia area (part).
 Fulton County, Fulton area (part).
 Hickman County, Fulton area (part).
 Lincoln County, Stanford area.

LOUISIANA

Acadia Parish, (Crowley area).
 Assumption Parish, Napoleonville area.
 Iberville Parish.
 St. John the Baptist Parish, Reserve area.
 West Feliciana Parish, St. Francisville area.

MAINE

Madawaska-Van Buren area, Towns of Grand Isle, Madawaska and Van Buren and Cyr and Hamlin, Plantations in Aroostook County.
 Dover-Foxcroft area, Piscataquis County, (except part included in Greenville area).

MARYLAND

Kent County, Washington County, Hagerstown area.

MASSACHUSETTS

Brockton area.
 Bristol County (part) town of Easton.
 Norfolk County (part), Towns of Avon and Stoughton.
 Plymouth County (part).
 City of Brockton and Towns of Abington, Bridgewater, Hanson.
 East Bridgewater.
 West Bridgewater and Whitman.
 Fall River area.
 Bristol County (part).
 City of Fall River, Towns of Somerset, Swansea and Westport.
 Newport County, RI (part).
 Town of Tiverton, RI.
 Lawrence-Haverhill area.
 Essex County (part), Cities of Lawrence and Haverhill, also Towns of Andover, Georgetown, Groveland, Merrimac, Methuen, North Andover and West Newbury.

Rockingham County, NH Towns of New-ton, Plalstow and Salem.
 Milford area, Norfolk County (part), Town of Medway.
 Springfield-Chicopee-Holyoke area.
 Hampden County (part), Cities of Chicopee, Holyoke, Springfield, Towns of Ag-wam, Ludlow and Westfield, Monson, Southwick, Hampden, Longmeadow.
 Hadley, East Longmeadow, West Spring-field.
 Town of Warren, Palmer and Wilbraham.
 Hampshire County (part), City of North-ampton, Towns of East Hampton.
 Granby, Hadley and South Worcester County (part).
 Bristol County (part).
 Ware area.
 Hampden County (part), Towns of Brim-field, Holland and Wales.
 Hampshire County (part), Towns of Bel-chertown and Ware.
 Worcester County (part), Towns of Hard-wick, New Braintree, Oakham, and West Brookfield.

MICHIGAN

Alcona County, East Tawas area (part).
 Allegan County, Barry County, Battle Creek area (part).
 Calhoun County, Battle Creek area (part).
 Genesee County, Flint area (part).
 Ionia County, Ionia-Belding-Greenville area (part).
 Iosco County, East Tawas area (part).
 Kent County, Grand Rapids area (part).
 Lapeer County, Flint area (part).
 Macomb County, Detroit area (part).
 Montcalm County, Ionia-Belding-Green-ville area (part).
 Muskegon County, Muskegon-Muskegon Heights area.
 Oakland County, Detroit area (part).
 Osceola County, Cadillac area (part).
 Ottawa County, Grand Rapids area (part).
 Shiawassee County, Owosso area.
 Wayne County, Detroit area (part).

MINNESOTA

Morrison County, Little Falls area.

MISSOURI

Taney County, Branson area.

MONTANA

Carbon County, Red lodge area.
 Park County, Livingston area.

NEW JERSEY

Atlantic County, Altantic City area.
 Hudson County, Jersey City area.

NEW MEXICO

Canoncita Reservation, Bernallillo, Valencia and Sandoval Counties.
 Otero County.

NORTH CAROLINA

Martin County, Williamston-Plymouth area (part).
 Perquimans County.
 Washington County, Williamston-Plym-outh area (part).

NORTH DAKOTA

Logan County.
 McIntosh County.
 Sheridan County.
 Sioux County.

OKLAHOMA

Seminole County.

OREGON

Jefferson County, Madras area.
 Klamath County.
 Malheur County, Ontario area (part).
 Marion County, Salem area (part).
 Polk County, Salem area (part).
 Sherman County, the Dallas area.
 Wallowa County, Enterprise area.
 Wheeler County, Fossil area.

PENNSYLVANIA

Clinton County, Lockhaven area.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Chesterfield County, Cheraw area.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Buffalo County.
 Mellette County.
 Shannon County.
 Todd County.

TENNESSEE

Roane County, Harriman-Rockwood area, (part).

TEXAS

Newton, Newton area.
 Hidalgo County, McAllen area (part).

UTAH

San Juan County, Moab area.
 Washington County, St. George area.

WASHINGTON

Clallam County, Port Angeles area.
 Columbia County, Dayton area.
 Grant County, Moses Lake area.
 Grays Harbor County, Aberdeen area.
 Jefferson County, Port Townsend area.
 Kittitas County, Ellensburg area.
 Spokane County, Spokane area.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cabell County, Huntington-Ashland area (part).
 Tyler County, Sistersville area.
 Wirt County, Parkersburg area (part).
 Wood County, Parkersburg area (part).

WISCONSIN

Door County, Sturgeon Bay area.
 Juneau County, Mauston area.
 Lafayette County, Darlington area.
 Lincoln County, Merrill area.
 Racine County.
 Waushara County, Wautoma area.

Mr. Speaker, section 205 of H.R. 5376 would amend the criteria established in section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 for designation of "redevelopment areas" eligible for financial assistance under the act. Although these amendments are essentially technical in nature, they will be extremely meaningful in many areas of our Nation, and, of course, to designate as a "redevelopment area" would make the area eligible for additional assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act. The criteria would be changed to:

First, increase from 40 percent to 50 percent of the national median, the maximum median family income under which an area can qualify;

Second, broaden the "special impact" area definition by redefining it to include communities or neighborhoods:

With large concentration of low income persons,

That are rural in nature, with substantial out-migration,

With substantial unemployment,

With an actual or threatened abrupt rise in unemployment due to closing or curtailment of major source of employment, or

With severe economic distress due to occurrence of a natural disaster.

Third, add the new criterion of a significant decline over a 10-year period in per capita employment.

It is not possible to determine at this time which specific areas would qualify under the broadened criteria.

SOVIET OPPRESSION OF JEWS

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from 1 week of personal surveys and discussions throughout my Congressional District over the Easter recess, I was very much aware of the fact that a large number of my constituents participated in Passover activities.

The Jews certainly know the meaning of gratitude and Passover reflects their deep appreciation to God for all of His spiritual support throughout a history of oppression and suffering.

Certainly all of us can lend that spiritual support to those Jews who remain oppressed today and continue in a determined effort to obtain their rights in all Nations, but the situation in the Soviet Union is worthy of special attention.

Mr. Speaker, the plight of more than 3 million Soviet Jews, who are being deprived of their rights to religious and cultural freedom in violation of the Soviet Union's own constitution, and who are being denied the right to emigrate freely, despite provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which the Soviet Union subscribes, has stirred public opinion and led to protests throughout the world. Their plight merits our compassion. In the name of humanitarianism, we must persist in our efforts to persuade the Soviet government to relent in its oppressive policies.

Sadly, oppression of Jews has had a long history, in czarist Russia as well as in the Soviet Union. Although persecution may no longer take the form of pogroms and mass exterminations, the present threat to the survival of a Jewish ethnic and spiritual identity is just as poignant and real. Through the suppression of Jewish culture and religion, Soviet Jews are faced with forced assimilation. And yet this assimilation is only apparent, since they are still subjected to abuse and discrimination, especially in education and employment, simply because they are Jews. Antisemitism, thinly disguised as anti-Zionism, has often been used as a political weapon by Soviet officials, and recently, has been stepped up, since the 6-day war in June 1967.

Soviet Jews have become increasingly bold in their demands for more cultural and religious freedom, and the right to emigrate. Despite harassment, reprisals, the risk of imprisonment, they have not hesitated to conduct sit-ins and stage demonstrations. We must support them in their actions, out of solidarity, to let them know that they are not alone, and as a means of applying pressure on the Soviet Government. A few incidents have shown that the Soviet Union is not insensitive to world public opinion, and will make a few, albeit slight, concessions to it. In the trial held last December, where several Jews were accused of treason for an alleged attempt at hijacking a plane, two of the defendants were sentenced to death. In the wake of world-wide protest, their sentences were later com-

mutated to prison-camp terms. Recent newspaper reports claim that the Soviet Union has permitted the emigration of about 15 Jews a day, as compared to about two a day in January, and six a day in February. This slight relaxation in the Soviet attitude must not be allowed to be temporary. The world must continue to be reminded of the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union. We must strengthen the determination of Soviet Jews in their fight for their rights, and we must compel the Soviet Government to insure those rights, through internal reforms as well as mass emigration.

CITIZENS OBJECT TO LAND MONOPOLY RULING

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues some of the opinions of responsible citizens and citizens' groups regarding the exemption of a huge area of southern California from the U.S. Reclamation Act's acreage limitation. This action is really most regrettable. It is not only a continuance of the ecological havoc perpetrated on southern California but also a victimization of the American taxpayer. The taxpayers of the Nation are being asked to pay for the development of this land, through water projects, for the benefit of a few, rich developers. This is not only wrong, it is disgraceful.

The material follows:

CALIFORNIA TAXPAYERS TO LOSE MILLIONS IF MITCHELL FAILS TO APPEAL WATER CASE

"Within the next three days U.S. Attorney General John N. Mitchell either will act to protect the public interest by appealing the January 5, 1971 decision by San Diego Federal District Court Judge Howard B. Turrentine, which would exempt a huge area of Southern California from the U.S. Reclamation Act's acreage limitation law or, by inaction, he will literally give away more than a quarter of a billion dollars in public tax subsidies to wealthy Southern California landowners and land speculators," John F. Henning, executive secretary-treasurer of the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO, warned today.

The Turrentine decision in a case titled, "United States of America vs. Imperial Irrigation District, et al.," held that excess land laws do not apply to the Imperial Valley Irrigation District.

"In essence, the lower court decision contends that although Congress voted in the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928 to finance reclamation construction, it was willing to let a few large landholders get as much of the benefits as they could. In Imperial Valley that means that 233,000 acres, or 54 percent of the land irrigated, will get benefits greater than Congress allowed under the original 1902 U.S. Reclamation Act," Henning said.

"But beyond that if the San Diego decision stands without review about a half a million acres would be allowed to receive public water free of the U.S. monopoly control law," he explained.

Some time ago, Henning noted, U.S. Bureau of the Budget studies indicated that the

range of the taxpayers' subsidies under the U.S. Reclamation Act in the 17 western states was between \$600 and \$2,000 per acre. A reasonable estimate of the subsidy involved is about \$1,000 per acre, he said.

"This means that in the Imperial Valley case alone some 800 landowners will benefit to the tune of a \$233 million tax subsidy. While most of these 800 landowners have a few hundred acres in excess, some, like the Irvine Land Company with 10,000 acres in the district will benefit by the tune of about \$10 million," he observed.

"The basic principle of U.S. Reclamation Law is that as broad a segment as possible of the public should benefit from the investment of public tax funds. The validity of this position has been unanimously upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court and failure of the Attorney General to appeal this case would amount to nothing short of a dereliction of the duties of that high public office," Henning declared.

The California Labor Federation has been joined in its efforts to urge the Justice Department to file the appeal by a number of other organizations including the Sierra Club, the National Farmers Union, the National Grange, the National Education Association, and the American Association of Junior Colleges as well as concerned church groups and others interested in preserving a decent environment.

Rather than abandon the 160-acre limitation as promoters of wealthy private interests have repeatedly sought, the AFL-CIO is supporting legislation recently introduced in Congress by Rep. Robert Kastenmeier (D-Wis.) which would permit the U.S. government to purchase "excess" lands and establish a Reclamation Land Authority to develop regulations governing their use through resale or lease to preserve open spaces and greenbelts.

This measure, H.R. 5236, calls for the transfer of a percentage of the net revenues at once to the Land and Water Conservation Fund for acquisition of park and seashore lands and for the transfer of 70 percent of the net revenues to finance public education. The State Labor Federation has asked all of California's 38 Congressmen to cosponsor this bill, Henning said.

This would be in keeping with the nation's tradition of land grants under which some 94 million acres of public lands were provided to assure public education for all, he pointed out.

Henning noted that Assemblyman John J. Miller (D-Oakland), who has also been vitally concerned about the impact of the Turrentine decision, is in the process of introducing legislation sponsored by the State AFL-CIO to establish a state 160-acre limitation law and to create a state Reclamation Land Authority to assure the distribution of public revenues derived therefrom to ease the educational crisis in California and reduce property taxes.

Assemblyman Edwin L. Z'berg (D-Sacramento) has already introduced another Federation sponsored measure, *Assembly Joint Resolution 26*, which would memorialize Congress to authorize the government to purchase excess lands on federal reclamation projects at their pre-water price in order to provide a ready market for their sale with the proceeds to be used to provide open spaces, agricultural greenbelts and water grants for education, the State AFL-CIO official said.

SIERRA CLUB,

San Francisco, Calif., February 23, 1971.

HON. JOHN A. MITCHELL,
Attorney General of the United States,
Justice Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MITCHELL: The Sierra Club, founded in 1892 and with national membership of 120,000, is deeply concerned over the

continuing alienation of man with nature, the degradation by man himself of his own environment.

On March 17, 1968 the Club's Board of Directors, seeking to assure preservation of a decent environment within the Government's reclamation program, went on record with the following policy statement:

"The Sierra Club supports the federal purchase of lands (over 160 acres limitation) under the 1902 Reclamation Act with the understanding that lands so purchased would be sold or leased under open space regulations."

Although the Club has not yet won authorization for the Government to purchase the excess lands that their owners are legally bound to sell, we are unwilling to lose any of the present advantages of reclamation law upon which our program is founded. Our immediate concern is the defeat in San Diego Federal District Court on January 5, 1971 of the Government's own position, viz., that acreage limitation provisions of reclamation law do apply to Southern California under the Boulder Canyon Act.

We urge strongly that the Government appeal this case at once to the Circuit Court of Appeals and, should this become necessary, to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Legal grounds for appeal are ample. The opinion of Judge Howard B. Turrentine in *United States v. Imperial Irrigation District* ignores, and destroyed the fundamental public policy justification in the law for the spending of public funds to reclaim private lands. In Imperial Valley alone are 233,000 acres receiving water under the Boulder Canyon Act in excess of the legal limit. We have seen no figures on how many more acres are similarly above the legal limit in either Coachella Valley or in the remainder of Southern California; the area must be huge, particularly in Orange County. Chief Counsel Reginald L. Knox, of Imperial Irrigation District, has reported that Colorado River water made available under the Boulder Canyon Act is supplied through the Metropolitan Water District "to some extremely large holdings on the coast."

Our environmental concern is this: If Judge Turrentine's decision should go unchallenged, the public will lose forever its present, and best, opportunity to plan and to preserve agricultural greenbelts and recreational areas as open spaces essential to a decent environment. This planning function and power will be lost to the public, left to the uncertain whims of private speculation. The record of speculation as motive for enhancement of environmental quality is notoriously low.

The Department of Justice's own explanation of how Imperial Irrigation District avoided acreage limitation in the first place, until currently challenged by the Government, has the ring of truth. In the closing month of the Hoover Administration, District Counsel Richard J. Coffey advised his superior, Assistant Reclamation Commissioner P. W. Dent, that the attorney for Imperial Irrigation District was "very anxious to get a ruling" on acreage limitation, but no "formal ruling, of course, if the Solicitor were to hold that the limitation applies" to his District. (71 I.D. 496 at 527) The Justice Department's court brief phrases it this way:

"Thus, the Wilbur letter (of 1933 eliminating application of acreage limitation to Imperial Valley) must be considered for what it was: A partisan effort by a lame duck administration to effect, by administrative interpretation, an exemption that proponents of the Project Act never dated risk seeking directly."

This position of the Government must not be allowed to be overturned by a local, lower court. We note with satisfaction that spokesmen for the Justice Department told the press that the Government would appeal the

District Court decision if necessary to sustain its position. (Brawley News, January 6, 1971)

Apparently Judge Turrentine himself shared the view of both parties at the time the case was pending, viz., that it properly is one to be heard by the nation's highest tribunal, not laid to rest at the lowest, local level. Referring to Judge Turrentine an Associated Press dispatch stated:

"He wants to 'get it tried and on its way to the Supreme Court.'" (AP dispatch, San Diego. Sacramento Bee, November 27, 1970)

The Sierra Club urges the Government to resist all pressures to drop the case and, instead, to stand fast on its sound position that acreage limitation public policy provisions do apply to Southern California under the Boulder Canyon Act, and to honor the promise of its spokesmen that, if necessary, the Government will appeal.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL McCLOSKEY,
Executive Director.

OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON

The Nation, under reclamation law, gives public waters to private landowners, together with money from the treasury to store the waters and convey the gift to them. In the interest of equity, and justice, and opportunity for the many, the law states that these waters shall be distributed widely and not monopolized by the few. This is the meaning of acreage limitation law, that places a ceiling on the quantity of water and amount of subsidy that any individual may receive.

In conferring these gifts of water and money the Nation has been generous. Congress has spent or authorized \$10 billion for the program. The question that remains too largely unanswered is whether the law requiring that benefits from these expenditures be widely distributed is going to be honored or breached. While they welcome the water and the money, landowners with tens and scores and even hundreds of thousands of acres resist the law that denies monopoly of these gifts.

Open efforts to persuade Congress to abandon the law have generally failed. Greater success has come from subtler pressures upon administrators to ignore the law or lay it aside. Judicial proceedings have had limited success in lower courts, but none in the highest. In 1957 the California Supreme Court repudiated the law against water monopoly by the few, but the United States Supreme Court unanimously reversed the lower court decision the very next year.

Today the National Administration faces a parallel prospect. Shall it allow the legal process to take its due course from lower to higher court? Or shall it halt the process, allowing a lower court rejection of acreage limitation law to stand without higher review?

A San Diego district judge in the lowest federal court has ruled that the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928, while conferring generous benefits in water and money, omits the customary mandate to distribute these benefits widely. The issue is one of magnitude. In Imperial Valley alone 233,000 acres, or more than half the total irrigated area, are owned in tracts that exceed the legal limit under reclamation law. In all of Southern California served with Colorado River waters probably a half million acres are owned in "excess," equal to more than half the area of the State of Rhode Island. By clear implication the lower court decision removes the legal limit from these lands.

Understandably the interest of large landowners is to let the decision stand without appeal. For them, as noted by the Los Angeles Times, it means "scaring" land values. A higher court, as it did before, might reverse the lower court ruling. For a broader public interest, however, the moral to be drawn from judicial precedent is precisely

the opposite: appeal should be taken to the highest court if necessary to uphold the law.

The principle guiding the tactics of interests seeking escape from acreage limitation provisions of reclamation law has never been stated more clearly than by one of the practitioners, Congressman, and later Senator Clair Engle. In 1955 he told Congress:

"I grant you, you start kicking the 160-acre limitation and it is like inspecting the rear end of a mule: You want to do it from a safe distance because you might get kicked through the side of the barn. But it can be done with circumspection, and I hope we can exercise circumspection."

The issue today is "circumspection" vs. unimpeded due process of law through the courts.

The Imperial Valley case began in 1933 with administrative "circumspection." An administrator wrote a letter saying he was not going to apply the law. This letter, says the current brief of the Department of Justice, "must be considered for what it was: A partisan effort by a lame duck administration to effect, by administrative interpretation, an exemption that proponents of the Project Act never dared risk seeking directly" from Congress.

Since 1933 top Government lawyers within three Administrations have said that under the Boulder Canyon Act acreage limitation law does apply. The press reports that Government spokesmen said the San Diego case would be appealed if the Government lost in the lower court, and that the judge himself said of the case that he wanted "to get it tried and on its way to the Supreme Court."

With a lower court decision again against the law, will "circumspection" be the guide that says drop the case, do not appeal? Or will the Government appeal, as the acreage limitation issue was appealed before to a favorable decision, to the United States Supreme Court?

The right to appeal expires with April 9. Time is short.

PAUL S. TAYLOR.

BERKELEY, CALIF.

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF OREGON,
County of Lane, ss:

Frank J. Barry, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That I reside at 2085 University Street, Eugene, Oregon; that I am a Professor of Law employed by the University of Oregon; that I teach Property, Environmental Law and Natural Resources Law;

That I served as Solicitor of the Department of the Interior from January 30, 1961, to April 7, 1968; that the Solicitor is the chief legal officer of the Department of the Interior; that a major part of the business of the Solicitor during the years that I held that office was the study, interpretation and application of the excess land provisions of the Reclamation Laws of the United States;

That I have read the opinion of the Honorable Howard B. Turrentine, Judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of California in the case entitled, "United States of America v. Imperial Irrigation District, et al." (No. 67-7-T of the files of said Court); that I have noted Judge Turrentine has held that said excess land laws do not apply to the Imperial Irrigation District; that this opinion is the opposite to the one I reached in my opinion of December 31, 1964;

That my said opinion was arrived at after careful study by the most experienced reclamation lawyers in the Department of the Interior; that it was concurred in by the Attorney General of the United States; that it was shared by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, Honorable Fowler Harper, in the Truman Administration (71 Int. Dec. 496, at 531-548) and by the Solicitor General in the Eisenhower Administra-

tion (71 Int. Dec. 496, at 555); that the circumstances of the issuance of the informal opinion of Secretary Wilbur "granting" the exemption, the fact that we were unable to find any evidence in the Department that Secretary Wilbur's Solicitor considered the informal opinion and the fact that none of those who recognized the exemption ever pretended to rely on more than that it was based on Secretary Wilbur's informal opinion, all raise doubts as to the correctness of the informal opinion;

That notwithstanding the conviction of the lawyers in my office, and of myself, and the lawyers in the Department of Justice, of the applicability of the excess land laws to the Imperial Irrigation District, we expressed a willingness to the representatives of the District and of the large landowners in the District to submit the entire issue for a judicial determination before taking steps to enforce what we thought and think to be the law; that this was the subject of the negotiations referred to by Judge Turrentine on p. 4 of his Memorandum of Opinion;

That the highest legal officers of three successive administrations have cast serious doubts on the validity of the informal Wilbur opinion; that I agree with Judge Turrentine that "the decision whether acreage limitation applies under the [Boulder Canyon] Project Act involves important considerations of national policy"; that, in my opinion, and with respect to Judge Turrentine, this case must be appealed to the highest courts so that these "important considerations of national policy" can be finally resolved; that, in such an important case as this, it is no more fitting that Judge Turrentine's opinion should be the last word than should the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

LET MY PEOPLE GO!

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues "The Brussels Declaration" by the World Conference of Jewish Communities on Soviet Jewry.

Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse for the treatment of Jews such as has been the case all too often in the Soviet Union. They have been denied the study of their culture, of their tradition, and worst of all even of their religion. They have been denied exit visas to the nation which they consider their own home, Israel. And, finally, they have been denied the right to exist as Jews through the policy of invoking lengthy criminal sentences when their only crime has been their wish to live in another country.

I commend this moving declaration on the human and religious rights of Soviet Jews to my colleagues in the House:

LET MY PEOPLE GO!

(Text of the Brussels Declaration by the World Conference of Jewish Communities on Soviet Jewry)

We, the delegates of this Conference, coming from Jewish communities throughout the world, solemnly declare our solidarity with our Jewish brothers in the Soviet Union.

We want them to know—and they will take encouragement from this knowledge—that we are at one with them, totally identified with their heroic struggle for the safeguard-

ing of their national identity and for their natural and inalienable right to return to their historic homeland, the land of Israel.

Profoundly concerned for their fate and future, we denounce the policy pursued by the government of the Soviet Union of suppressing the historic Jewish cultural and religious heritage. This constitutes a flagrant violation of human rights which the Soviet Constitution pledges to uphold and which is enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. To cut them off from the rest of the Jewish people, as the Soviet authorities are attempting to do, is a crime against humanity.

Soviet spokesmen claim that there is no need for Jewish culture and education, that there is no Jewish problem in the Soviet Union and that there is no anti-Semitism. These assertions have been proven false by the Soviet Jews themselves. The entire world has heard their protest.

Tens of thousands of Jews have petitioned the Soviet authorities for the right to settle in Israel and raise their children in the Jewish tradition and culture. Letters, messages and petitions, sent at the signatories' peril from the Soviet Union to individuals, to governments to the United Nations and other international organizations, all demand recognition of these rights.

The reaction of the Soviet authorities to this Jewish awakening has been to mount a campaign of harassment, arrests and virulent anti-Jewish propaganda. The Leningrad trial, shocking to the world, was but one manifestation of such persecution. Far from being crushed by such intimidation, Soviet Jews today demand their rights with ever greater courage and determination.

This conference urgently calls upon the civilized world to join with us and with the Jews of the USSR in urging the Soviet authorities:

To recognize the right of Jews who so desire to return to their historic homeland in Israel, and to ensure the unhindered exercise of this right.

To enable the Jews in the USSR to exercise fully their right to live in accord with the Jewish cultural and religious heritage and freely to raise their children in this heritage.

To put an end to the defamation of the Jewish people and of Zionism, reminiscent of the evil anti-Semitism which has caused so much suffering to the Jewish people and to the world.

We assembled in this Conference commit ourselves, by unceasing effort, to ensure that the plight of Soviet Jewry is kept before the conscience of the world until the justice of their cause prevails.

We will continue to mobilize the energies of all Jewish communities. We will work through the United Nations and other international bodies and through every agency of public opinion.

We will not rest until the Jews of the Soviet Union are free to choose their own destiny.

Let my people go!

REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT CONSTITUENTS

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1971

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN AMERICA

There are signs that the call for help from rural America is being heard. More people

are seeing more clearly that the quality of life in the city, as well as the country, can only be improved if rural America stops its decline.

We know that many of the problems in our urban centers stem from the migration from rural areas, and the solution of urban problems will require the acceleration of rural development. It is not in the best interest of the Nation to continue indefinitely the depopulation of rural and small town America and the building of ever-larger metropolitan complexes.

There is hope in the findings of recent national polls which show that as America becomes more urbanized, the longing for rural life gets stronger. More than half the Nation would rather live in the country, and a Nation longing for rural life is not likely to let it deteriorate.

The climate for rural development is enhanced by the growing concern over man's fouling of his environment. Hopefully, those who do not see the interrelationship between urban and rural problems in other circumstances will see it in the environmental crisis. Air and water pollution do not begin or end at the city limits.

There is hope for rural America in the expanding development of improved roads, better communications, new water systems and reservoirs and recreation areas, and in the spirit of vitality in some rural areas.

There is hope in the renewed interest in rural development in the Congress, demonstrated recently by "Rural America Day" in the House. In a series of speeches, several Members condemned the continued neglect of rural America. The Senate Agriculture Committee now has an active subcommittee to deal exclusively with rural development and the House Agriculture Committee will turn to the same subject soon.

The important Joint Economic Report of the U.S. Congress this year, for the first time in my memory, recommends increases in Federal expenditures for programs dealing with rural development, and focuses strongly on the need to improve the quality of life in rural areas.

The climate for rural development, then, has some favorable winds, and we in the Congress must work for a proper legislative framework to assure that the winds blow gently and steadily and ever more forcibly. Our present programs must be greatly improved in their potency.

EMPLOYMENT

Two basic elements of rural development are jobs and improved community facilities and services (the infrastructure). The problem here is a community needs the infrastructure to create the jobs and the economic activity to improve the infrastructure.

To develop better job opportunities in rural areas several steps should be taken. Systematic reporting of unemployment and underemployment will help guide people to jobs. Enlarged and expanded training and manpower programs will help, too, with emphasis on such fields as conservation, pollution control, recreation, health and education. Also, the Federal government might serve as a residual employer in those cases where employment is not available elsewhere.

COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

The revitalization of rural communities goes hand in hand with improved employment. Greater public investment is needed in improved health care, expanded education programs and vocational education training, and in improved utilities. Wherever possible, Federal government contracts and installations should favor rural areas. Private investment also must be encouraged through industrial parks and the whole range of economic inducements, including tax incentives, grants, loans, guarantees and subsidies.

ORGANIZATION

If rural development is going to succeed we must bring greater sanity into its organizational structure. Present Federal programs are uncoordinated, lack leadership and professional and technical assistance, and often duplicate and overlap other programs.

We need multi-county and multi-community organizations which can muster the resources and professional skills needed to compete with larger metropolitan areas to plan, promote, and implement vital development programs.

MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1970

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 represents a long-range commitment on the part of our Government to restore the United States as a first-rate maritime power. This program envisioned the construction of approximately 300 ships over a 10-year period, substantial improvements in the operating-differential subsidy program, and a number of other provisions to revitalize the U.S.-flag merchant marine. The legislation before us today would assist in implementing the provisions of the measure we enacted last Congress.

We have neglected our merchant marine. This neglect has been evident in various ways: Insufficient levels of funding to cover the Government's share in the construction of merchant ships to serve essential trade routes; inadequate proportion of cargoes to be transported by American-flag vessels; ineffectual planning to anticipate the Nation's need for shipping resources and lost opportunities to utilize U.S. shipyards in the construction of needed ships. The neglect has not always been deliberate, but we have allowed our merchant fleet to slip to a low priority item.

Our neglect has been disastrous. Though some new ships have been built and delivered, nearly three-quarters of the active U.S. shipping fleet today is composed of vessels 20 years of age or older. American-flag shipping carried approximately 30 percent of U.S. total foreign commerce in 1936, but less than 6 percent at present.

Hopefully, the mandate enacted in the Merchant Marine Act will unravel the negligence of the past 30 years and correct the persistent infirmities of the American merchant marine. However, the task of revitalizing our merchant fleet will require a full commitment by the Congress. We must continue our effort. We must enact this legislation before us today.

I consider the proposed maritime subsidies as an investment. The subsidies for ship construction mean jobs, and jobs mean people earning a living wage, people paying taxes, and people buying the products of our economy. Applied right, a subsidy brings far more benefit to the Government than it costs. Obviously, our

investment in the merchant marine should realize a healthy return.

Our competitors have learned the importance of a strong merchant fleet. The following figures will give an idea of the Russians' success. In 1961, the U.S.S.R. had 895 ships in her merchant fleet, while the United States had 973 ships. In gross tonnage, the United States had a commanding lead of 9.6 million tons to 3.8 million tons. A decade later, the Russians have nearly doubled the number of ships in their fleet and nearly tripled their tonnage, while our fleet decreased and gross tonnage remained the same.

We cannot afford to lose our merchant marine. The world is changing, and to keep pace with it we must be willing to change, to meet competition and foreign challenges and insure that the U.S. flag will fly from our ships delivering goods to ports around the world.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to my colleagues that the merchant marine revitalization program can serve as a model toward getting our economy back on the right foot. The administration must develop a program for the transition to a peacetime economy. To press ahead solely in bringing an end to this war without pushing forward in developing our peacetime economy would be wrong. We cannot tolerate widespread unemployment or recession. With courage and vision we can and must move ahead to help our economy and our way of life.

We must provide jobs. There is a recession in the maritime industry, and there is need to revitalize it. This is the lesson we must learn well and apply elsewhere in housing, education and pollution control. The Government must be willing to invest in America by committing its funds—funds which will maintain full employment and provide for the needs of all its citizens.

SUMMER CAMP

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to praise the efforts of the East Los Angeles Junior Chamber of Commerce and the U.S. Forest Service for their efforts in behalf of over 1,400 children from lower income families in the Los Angeles area who spent a week at camp in the mountains last summer. By raising \$35,000 from various civic minded organizations in the community, the East Los Angeles Jaycees were able to arrange use of a U.S. Forest Service campground in Angeles National Forest in which to establish an 11-week summer camp for these youngsters. In arranging this worthwhile program special thanks must go to Mr. Bill Dresser, the supervisor of the Angeles National Forest, Mrs. Sirel Foster, the director of the East Los Angeles Welfare Planning Council and the Department of Defense who furnished stoves

and refrigerators to the summer camp. As further explanation of the fine work of the Jaycees last summer I would like to insert the following article on the summer camp which appeared in the March 1971 edition of Future magazine:

EAST LOS ANGELES CHAPTER LEADS IN "NEW CONCEPT" SUMMER CAMP

Early this year Congressman Edward Roybal offered a challenge to the East Los Angeles Jaycees—develop a new concept, working with the U.S. Forest Service to offer an outing for the youth of Los Angeles.

A committee from the Jaycees chaired by Edward Avila met with Bill Dresser of the U.S. Forest Service and Supervisor of the Angeles National Forest and Mrs. Sirel Foster, Director of the Los Angeles East Central Welfare Planning Council. From this meeting the idea was developed. The new concept should:

- (1) Be totally community developed, working with the various City, County, State and Federal agencies.
- (2) Be a joint venture with the Jaycees and other East Los Angeles organizations.
- (3) Be a total outdoor experience for the youth of East Los Angeles.

The only criteria to be considered in selecting the youths would be they should come from East Los Angeles and otherwise be unable to attend Summer Camp because of financial reasons.

Moneys were raised to the tune of \$35,000 for the venture through the cooperation of the United Way, The Los Angeles Times Foundation, the Southern California Gas Company, and fund raising events on the part of community groups. In addition, services such as the loaning of tents, sleeping bags, camping equipment, food, and transportation were provided by various companies. These services were valued in excess of \$50,000.

The program lasted for eleven weeks with each group of children going camping for four days out of each week. Over 1,400 children between the ages of 11 and 14 were taken off the streets of Los Angeles and enjoyed exposure to camping.

UNARMED AND DEFENSELESS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, much has been written on the Calley trial both pro and con. I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Tribune of April 10, 1971, which contains some pertinent thoughts on the reaction of the American people to the trial of Lieutenant Calley.

The article follows:

UNARMED AND DEFENSELESS

The Army prosecutor of Lt. William L. Calley Jr., Capt. Aubrey M. Daniel III, has sharply questioned President Nixon's intervention in the case, stating that the President, "in the midst of public clamor . . . has damaged the military judicial system and lessened any respect it may have gained as a result of these proceedings."

Mr. Nixon has ordered Calley released from the stockade where he was held after conviction by a jury of six combat veterans of Viet Nam on a charge of premeditated murder of 22 South Vietnamese civilians in the hamlet of My Lai. Calley was sentenced to life imprisonment, but the President has also said

that he will review the final military judgment in the case.

Public reaction to the verdict has run at least 80 per cent in favor of Calley, some polls showing his sympathizers as 10 to 1. The whole affair has become so obfuscated that it escapes attention that the jury listened to evidence for four months and concluded that Calley's action in herding villagers into a ditch and shooting them—men, women, children, and babies—was in clear violation of Army regulations and the Geneva Convention.

My Lai was considered an enemy Viet Cong village. It was a "combat hamlet" of a "combat village." As Joseph Alsop, the Washington columnist, observes, all persons in a "combat village," from the age of 4 on up, are trained to kill. If they do not follow their training, they are killed themselves after a V. C. kangaroo trial.

William Greider of the Washington Post mentions that perhaps Calley was subject to such pressures as fear of combat, the threat of booby traps, and the Viet Cong's guerrilla tricks with women and children. But does that excuse him? No, say Greider and Alsop.

"When an attack succeeds," Alsop says "and the enemy throws down his arms and throws up his hands, Army regulations automatically begin to operate. No order concerning the attack can supersede those regulations. They make it a crime to kill prisoners who have already yielded. That is what the evidence says Calley did."

But all this has become confused by the outpouring of arguments on the subject. Some say Calley was a "scapegoat" and that his superiors, even up to the general of the division and perhaps even to the commanding general in Viet Nam, should be brought to trial. Some senators, such as Mr. Fulbright, have argued that Presidents Johnson and Nixon and Generals Westmoreland and Abrams may be "war criminals" under the definition of the Nuremberg code. Others, like Sen. Hatfield, say that Calley is no more guilty than the whole of the American people.

The verdict has been used by Senate "doves" and by antiwar groups as a club to beat American policy, but we find the argument far-fetched that a policy in Viet Nam which developed under four Presidents attaches a particular stigma to the present occupant of the White House, who had not been elected when My Lai occurred in March 1968. It is a dishonest contention, for the people who suggest it would probably have turned the argument inside out and tried to apply it even if the Calley verdict had gone the other way and he had been acquitted.

Capt. Daniel says that President Nixon's intervention has enhanced the image of Lt. Calley as a "national hero." One thing Calley is not is a hero. Capt. Daniel is correct when he says, "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 Lt. Calley—that it is unlawful for an American soldier to summarily execute unarmed and unresisting men, women, children and babies."

As Mr. Greider points out, the Army and the Marine Corps have already convicted scores of other soldiers and marines for killing Vietnamese captives in combat situations. Records show that 115 men had been charged with murder in the war zone. Eighty-one were Army, 28 Marine Corps, five Navy, and one Air Force. Fifty-nine were found guilty, 21 were convicted of lesser charges, and 35 were acquitted. Yet only the Calley case has caused a public commotion.

Capt. Daniel says at another point in his letter to Mr. Nixon that the victims were "innocent" persons. The innocence of a Viet

Cong "combat village" is doubtful. But unarmed and defenseless they certainly were, and once they were taken captive decency as well as Army regulations should have given them the cloak of protection. President Nixon was correct in an earlier appraisal of the My Lai incident.

He said on one occasion, "What appears was certainly a massacre, and under no circumstances was it justified."

He said again:

"An incident such as that alleged in this case is in direct violation not only of U.S. military policy but is also abhorrent to the conscience of all the American people.

"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 Viet Nam with great courage and distinction."

Nor should it reflect on all of the countless American fighting men who did not shoot babies, who did not herd their victims into an irrigation ditch and dispatch them in cold blood.

EXTRAORDINARILY VALUABLE NEW RIGHTS—ARTICLE BY SYLVIA PORTER ON NEW FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, since the enactment last October of the new Fair Credit Reporting Act—Title VI of the Consumer Credit Protection Act—which I have always referred to as the "Good Name" Protection Act, numerous technical articles have appeared in trade journals and elsewhere on the provisions of this consumer legislation which becomes effective this coming Sunday, April 25.

As usual, however, columnist Sylvia Porter has been able to take the technical provisions of a complex law and reduce them to a series of practical steps for individuals to follow in exercising their rights under this statute. Her article in the "Your Money's Worth" column in last night's Washington Evening Star, entitled "Here Are New Credit Rights" is another example of Miss Porter's rare ability to provide guidance to consumers in a concise and readable form. I am delighted to place it in the RECORD for the attention of the Members, many of whom will undoubtedly be receiving inquiries from constituents about this law.

One statement in the article requires some amplification, and that is the reference to being able to find out the identity of sources of information in your credit file. This is true in routine credit reports, but the law differentiates between routine, factual consumer reports and investigative consumer reports, which contain personal and character data and subjective opinions obtained by interviews with neighbors, business associates, a former spouse, and so on. Usually, the identity of the sources of investigative information can be withheld, although the law provides for discovery proceedings where the identity of

the informant is essential to a successful court action permitted under the law.

MOST CREDIT REPORT ERRORS CAN BE QUICKLY CORRECTED

In my opinion, about 90 percent of the problems consumers have with their credit files fall into the category of errors in billing or in listing debts against the wrong names in the files, and these cases can quickly be cleared up under the rights granted under the new law. The other 10 percent involve more basic disputes or serious misstatements which the law will also help consumers to straighten out, but not quite as easily or quickly.

People are understandably concerned about the mass of data on their personal lives and habits which is sold by firms in the credit reporting industry. The purpose of this law is not to prevent the collection and dissemination of legitimate information businessmen need to know about prospective customers applying for credit or insurance, or about prospective employees, but we do want that information to be as accurate as possible, and its confidentiality strictly controlled.

As the sponsor of a much stronger bill than the one which finally became law, I am happy that the final version was nevertheless substantially improved in conference over the bill which had previously passed the Senate. For this, I am deeply indebted—as are all consumers—to Congressman PATMAN, BARRETT, and REUSS for supporting my strengthening amendments in the conference committee. We lost on some but we won on enough others to convince us this can be an effective consumer statute.

ARTICLE BY SYLVIA PORTER

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit for inclusion in the RECORD the excellent article in last night's Washington Evening Star on the Fair Credit Reporting Act, as follows:

HERE ARE NEW CREDIT RIGHTS

(By Sylvia Porter)

One week from today a great new array of defenses against credit status abuses by credit rating bureaus, credit reporting agencies, credit granters goes into effect. As of next Monday you will, among other things, be able to:

1. Obtain upon request and proper identification, from any consumer reporting agency which issues a report on you disclosure of all the information in your credit file—including the sources of that information.
2. Get the names of all who have received from any consumer reporting agency employment reports on you within the past two years and the names of all others who have received credit reports about you within the past six months.
3. Arrange for a reinvestigation of any item about you which you question.
4. Have that item deleted from the record if the reinvestigation finds it to be inaccurate or if the item can no longer be verified.
5. File a statement of about 100 words reporting your side of the story if the reinvestigation does not settle the matter—so that your side will be included in any future reports containing the item.
6. See to it, if an item is deleted or a statement added to your file, that the credit bureau informs those who have received employment reports about you within the past two years or regular credit reports about you in the past six months.

7. Get your record and a review without charge if in the past 30 days you have been denied credit because of a credit report from a credit bureau or received a notice from a collection department affiliated with the credit bureau. And under the same circumstances, have previous recipients of information about you notified without charge if an item is deleted or a statement from you is added . . .

These are extraordinarily valuable new rights. They come under the Fair Credit Reporting Act, signed into law last October and effective April 25.

Do not casually shrug off the potential significance of this law. Dossiers on practically every adult are in the files of the 2,500 credit bureaus across the land and of huge numbers of local merchants' associations. Included in these dossiers are facts on jobs, incomes, marital status, associations, personal histories and habits—and gossip too.

The bureaus freely exchange this information. They sell it to retailers, banks, other lenders, credit card companies, corporations—and a credit report almost surely will be issued on you when you apply for a job or insurance or credit.

The consumer credit reporting industry processes from 125 to 150 million credit reports each year. Just one computerized credit reporting company—TRW Credit Data, the largest, founded in Detroit in 1930—says it maintains 30 million files, enters four million "pieces of information" on individuals each month, services 14,000 subscribers and maintains on some individuals as many as 35 to 40 open accounts on which credit performance is reported.

The possibilities for abuse are unending. Yet, prior to this law, we had hardly any way to protect our financial standing and perhaps even our personal reputation.

Now, though, you will have the right under the law to obtain information—except medical—in your file and its sources. The law also forbids bureaus to send out adverse information which is more than seven years old, although bankruptcies may be reported for 14 years, and there are no time limits on information on you if you apply for a loan or insurance policy of \$50,000 or more or apply for a job with a salary of \$20,000 or more.

There are weaknesses in the law—particularly involving enforcement—but it is an indisputable advance.

Learn your new rights. Use them to the fullest for your protection.

AIMS OF THE GREEK REVOLUTION OF 1821: ANTICOLONIAL AND ANTIOPPRESSION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1971, was the 150th anniversary of the Greek Revolution of 1821, the uprising which brought about the liberation of Greece from the Ottoman Empire. The Greek community in the United States marked the event with a series of festivities. One of the most important was the gathering of Greek Americans of the Boston area at Hellenic College, Brookline, Mass., on Sunday, March 28.

The keynote address at this event was delivered by Prof. John Petropoulos, head of the history department of Amherst College. Dr. Petropoulos is a recognized authority on the history of modern

Greece and the Near East, and a devoted member of the Greek-American community and its religious and cultural institutions.

Professor Petropoulos' address represents the quintessence of the Greek-American spirit. It combines the highest Hellenic ideals with the tough and uncompromising civic spirit of America.

The consul in Boston of the present Greek Government, Nicholas Ladopoulos, walked out in the course of the delivery of this address. This is another reminder that the policies and ideologies of the regime which he serves are far removed from those principles which the Greek-American community of Boston gathered to commemorate.

We all will profit by reading Professor Petropoulos' speech. It commemorates the Greek equivalent of our Declaration and War of Independence. And it eloquently reminds us that the aims of 1821 are being ignored in Greece today:

ADDRESS BY PROFESSOR PETROPULOS

We are assembled here today to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Greek independence. I thank you for the honor of inviting me to address you at this commemoration. I only wish that I had time to mention by name the full roster of persons meriting our consideration whom we are assembled to commemorate, the heroes of 1821. They were a varied group, some culturally sophisticated types able to hold their own in any European chancery or salon, some prosperous merchants and shipowners engaged in international trade, some local landowners vested with civilian leadership of autonomous Greek communities, some military chieftains skilled in the use of arms, some bishops, monks, and simple priests. Women also played their role, a few, like Bouboulina, with some notoriety, most anonymously. Many were not Greeks in the narrow ethnic or linguistic sense, for instance Kolettis the Vlach or the Albanian Kountouriotis, but they were Greeks in the deeper sense of the term, men caught by the magic spell of Greek culture, Greeks by adoption. Finally, there were the common Greek peasant, shepherd, and sailor, who bore the brunt of the Revolution. All these types, who contributed their respective skills to the common undertaking, are worth studying and knowing. They are personalities with a universal appeal, both in their strengths and their weaknesses. Even after 150 years, they await their modern Homer, Herodotus, or Thucydides to immortalize them as their ancient prototypes have been immortalized. We have been remiss in not making them better known to ourselves, to our children, and to the world at large.

If we cannot here commemorate them each by name, we can perhaps honor them in a more basic way by trying to delve into the deeper meaning of the Greek Revolution which they initiated and sustained. I will try to pinpoint the legacy which they have thrust upon our shoulders and determine the relevance of that legacy to the world that we face today. In the process, I will focus on one of the many heroes, John Makrygiannes. He is my favorite because he embodies, I think, the best in all those whom we commemorate today. Of humble origins, almost totally illiterate until he reached adulthood, he fought nobly in the revolutionary cause, survived the revolution, taught himself to write as an adult, and left us in his memoirs a masterpiece of Greek prose. His work should be required reading for every Greek student. In my remarks today, he will serve as my guide.

What was the Greek Revolution all about? Quite obviously, it was a bid for independence from Turkish rule. Many charges were laid against the Turk, based upon legitimate

grievances against his rule. The Turk was depicted as a backward barbarian and his rule as one of injustice and oppression. Such charges and sentiments constitute the basis for the anti-Turkish rhetoric which all too often dominates Greek 25th of March speeches. The fact that the Turks were backward by European standards and oppressive by absolute standards of justice was incidental, however, as is shown by the fact that Greeks later opposed British rule in the Ionian Islands and Cyprus, even though the British were much more advanced and far less oppressive.

The Greeks really took up arms against two basic things going much beyond the Turks. The ultimate objects of attack were, first the relationship of colonialism and imperialism, the relationship of inequality between foreign overlord and indigenous subject, second, against injustice and oppression from whatever quarter. For many, the realization came only slowly that an oppressor can emerge from within as well as from without the nation. Independence and just government therefore constituted the dual vision that prompted the Greeks to take up arms. For them, the Turks personified both foreign and unjust rule, but the real enemy was any foreigner trying to dominate them and any oppressor, whether foreign or Greek. That is why the Greek Revolution, in this deeper sense, is an on-going process, a continuing struggle which must renew itself so long as foreigners seek to dominate Greek affairs, so long as the fact of oppression and injustice continues. At this level, the Greek Revolution bespeaks the aspirations of all peoples and has universal validity.

Only recently I was told by an educated Greek that the time was ripe for the Greek Revolution when it occurred. This is a common view, benefitting from the advantage of hindsight, but it is a distortion which tends to minimize the horrendous venture which the Greeks were undertaking. Only six years before 1821, Europe had emerged from a long war and had no taste for any venture which might precipitate another. A conservative political climate, symbolized by the so-called Holy Alliance, militated against any upset of the status quo. At the outset, none of the European powers were willing to support the Greek bid for independence. Indeed, the revolutionary leaders had good reason to believe that, if the Greeks did rise, the European Concert would intervene to suppress the uprising, as it so recently had in Spain and Italy. As for the Ottoman empire, it was, to be sure, only a shadow of its former self, but it was still a mighty state with the will and resources to mount a persistent campaign against Greek insurgency. Moreover, the vast majority of Greeks were peasants who, by the deliberate policy of the Ottoman Turkish government, were totally without military experience. As virtually all the Greek memoirs tell us, though the average Greek might talk big, when the chips were down he was paralyzed by the image of Turkish invincibility. The professionally trained Turkish soldier rightly frightened him. By experience, he was conditioned either to steer clear of the Turks or, in his dealings with them, to use the devices of the downtrodden everywhere—deceit, lies, obsequiousness. As any Black in this country will tell you, to confront the so-called superior as his equal is terrifying, at least the first time.

To take on this mighty state, without any prior commitment of support from Europe and with a popular base yet to be tested, was a risky, one might even say foolhardy, thing to do. Such later heroes as Germanos, Bishop of Patras, Zaimes, Lontos, and Mavromichales hesitated, when the moment of decision came. They argued that sufficient preparations had not been made. They pointed to the tremendous odds against them. And by any conventional and rational standards, they were right. Kolokotronis, Papaphlessas, and others, who forced their hand, seemed

to be reckless hotheads, ready to sacrifice all for a very dubious undertaking. But the hotheads knew something that the conservatives did not—that nothing significant would ever happen unless the Greeks took matters into their own hands, unless they were willing to lay their lives on the line and risk everything. I've often wondered which position I would have taken, had I then been confronted with this agonizing decision. I ask you to put the same question to yourselves. I suspect that virtually everyone in this room, including myself, would have agreed with the primates who hesitated and would have needed more than a nudge from the hotheads.

The odds were tremendous. How really great they were became obvious during that ominous year of 1826, when both Mesolongi and Athens fell to the Turks and when Ibrahim Pasha was wreaking havoc throughout the Peloponnese. In this state of hopelessness, many military chieftains in Rumely defected to the Turks and in the northern Peloponnese there was a widespread movement of submission under the direction of Nenekos.

And yet, the Greeks came through. They came through because, for the first and possibly the only time, they skillfully manipulated the international situation in such a way as to invite the intervention of Britain, France, and Russia in their behalf. They came through because, through such heroic feats as the monumental resistance at Mesolongi, they transformed a military defeat into a moral victory and thereby won the acclaim and sympathy of Europe. But, most of all, they came through because a determined leadership and a significant portion of the Greek people gritted their teeth and said "no", a "no" echoed once again in 1940, this time against the Italians. They came through because a new self-image was emerging among the Greeks. They were taught by their leadership to trust in themselves, they were taught that they were the equals of any Turks in the bearing of arms and in fearlessness. They triumphed over their traditional fears and self-doubts and, in the process, became what they knew they should be—free men confronting dire perils head-on rather than grovelling slaves whose only resource was accommodation.

This spirit is best reflected in a speech addressed by Makrygiannes to the Frenchman de Rigny, as he was preparing the Greek military positions at Myloi to fight Ibrahim. De Rigny was incredulous and skeptical. "What sort of war are you going to wage on Ibrahim from here?" he asked. By any rational calculations, de Rigny was right. Yet, missing from his calculation was that intangible factor of Greek morale and determination. Here is Makrygiannes' reply to him:

"The positions are weak and we are weak. But God who protects us is strong, and in these weak positions we shall show what our fortune is. And if we are few to be fighting against the masses of Ibrahim, we are somehow consoled by the thought that we Greeks have always happened to be few. That from the beginning to the end, in ancient times and today, all the wild beasts have been trying to eat us up and have failed. They eat up some of us, but the yeast remains. And the few decide to die. And once they make this decision, it often happens that they win, but a few times they lose. Such is the position in which we are here today. And we shall see what our fortune is, we few against the mighty."

Such was the faith and confidence, such was the sense of history, such was the new identity of Greeks trained in the difficult school of revolution.

The Greeks won. They disproved the realists, who doubted their chances of success, by creating a new reality. Spirit acted on matter and triumphed. Their legacy to us? Not that man adjusts to reality, as the psy-

choanalyst or the conformist might advise, but that reality must be adjusted to suit man's objectives. That this can only be achieved if men are willing to battle with reality, willing to chance being swallowed up by it. As Solomos reminds us in his great unfinished poem on the heroes of Mesolongi *The Free Besieged*, this is the true meaning of freedom—to triumphs over one's worldly attachments, over oneself, and finally, over the fear of death.

The Greek won, I said. But did they? Only in a relative and limited sense. To say that they won in an absolute and total sense is to ignore the full breadth of their vision and the magnitude of their reach. Independence from the Turks was achieved, but only for some 800,000 out of a total Greek population of over two million. The majority of Greeks remained unliberated. Even today, enosis for Cyprus remains ostensibly a distant goal. The Greeks won their independence from the Turks by 1830, but only at the gigantic price of having Turkish direct rule replaced by British-French-Russian tutelage, which seriously qualified Greek independence. In some ways, this was worse than Turkish rule, because it was disguised and superficially more benign, therefore less easy to attack. Ever since, Greek sovereignty has been limited by the interference of some world power or powers.

And justice, that other major goal of the Greek Revolution? To the surprise and disillusionment of many Greeks, oppression and injustice did not depart with the Turks. Turks were not the only oppressors. Greeks now oppressed Greeks. This became obvious during the Revolution itself. Peloponnesians found themselves pillaged mercilessly by Rumeliotis during the second civil war of 1824-25. Peasants often found themselves the prey of predatory chieftains. The villagers near Megaspelleon complained about the oppression of their local monks. A priest's wife there uttered the following lament:

"When the Turks came, we hid in the swamp water, so many souls, trying to save our lives. And the Turks came and took us. Our bodies were covered with leeches; they were eating us up. And the children were thrown in the water, floating like frogs, the water full of them. Some alive, some dying. And I was taken by the Turks and they slept with me, thirty-eight of them. And they finished me off, me and so many others. Why did we have to suffer all this? And where is justice now? We cannot find it anywhere. Nothing but fraud and deception."

And Makrygiannes, witnessing such acts of oppression committed by Greeks against Greeks, uttered in a moment of despair, the fatherland "has been despoiled, dishonored and is going all wrong because we have been found to be wild beasts," religious, political, and military leaders alike.

In the decades following the Revolution, the injustices remained, some of them dramatically obvious. Kolokotronis, in 1834, and Makrygiannes, in 1853, both sentenced to death after trials which were parodies of justice. Fortunately, the sentences were not carried out but neither was ever formally exonerated of the charges against him. Widows and orphans, whose breadwinners had made the supreme sacrifice, in a state of distress while newcomers and Bavarians reaped the material rewards of independent statehood. The sense of injustice was strong. By conventional and reasonable standards it was often exaggerated, but conventionality and reasonableness were not the standards that one would expect from men who risked so much for the Revolution. To their everlasting credit, their standards were higher than that. They constituted the conscience of the nation and Makrygiannes was their chief spokesman. As he himself tells it, he composed his memoirs because he could not bear to see the right stifled by the wrong. He spoke his mind and spoke it with confidence,

even though he knew that such free and outspoken speech would call down upon him the wrath of the authorities.

I stress these things, not because I wish to contrast Greece unfavorably with other nations then or now. Every nation, our own included, in some sense betrays its ideals. It is in the nature of man to fall short of his ideals and it is in the nature of things that the greater the ideals, the greater the distance between them and those who espouse them. And yet, no great nation can afford not to attempt to close the gap. To keep those ideals alive and to continue the fight to realize them, such gadflies as Makrygiannes in the nineteenth century and Socrates in antiquity are necessary.

Commemoration of Greek independence involves commitment rather than celebration. If it leads to mindless self-satisfaction, unwarranted pride in deeds we are unwilling ourselves to perform, it is not only pointless but dangerous. Such commemorations as these should be disturbing rather than satisfying, disturbing as reminders of how far we fall short of the example and standards of those whom we commemorate. We should take careful note of Makrygiannes' bold assertion:

"... this country of ours belongs to all of us, learned and ignorant, rich and poor, politicians and soldiers, even the least of the people. All of us who fought the war, each man as he could, must live here now. The reason why we all fought was that we might keep this country for all of us together, so that neither the strong nor the weak should say 'I'. Do you know when one can say 'I'? When a man struggles all by himself and all by himself makes or breaks something, then he may say 'I'. But when many people join together in the struggle and accomplish something, then they should say 'We'. In the life which we live it is 'We', not 'I'. And from now on let us learn wisdom if we want to be able to live together."

Greece belongs to all of its citizens—to political exiles, political prisoners, forcibly retired politicians, army officers, intellectuals, and civil servants, to all of the people, not just to those who happen to be in power. Until this is so, it will not be the Greece of Makrygiannes, the Greece that our forefathers so bravely fought to create.

For us Greek-Americans, the message is the same because the legacy of the Greek Revolution has universal validity. Solomos was no chauvinist when he said, "Take Greece completely into your heart and you will realize all that is good." He was talking about eternal Greek values, which are the monopoly of no one, not even ethnic Greeks, but the property of all men. It is our task here to see that these Greek ideals underlie our American society as they underlie Western culture. We must be ready to judge our government in terms of these ideals and to criticize it severely if it falls short. We must be vigilant that Blacks do not come to regard the United States as Greeks once regarded the Ottoman empire, as an alien and unjust rule in which they cannot play their proper role, Greek-Americans, of the first generation at least, know what it means to be a minority group, experiencing discrimination, even in as liberal a society as our own. And they should know, from the example of Greeks who once lived under Ottoman rule, that for some minorities it is not simply a matter of lifting oneself up by one's bootstraps. The social structure and social values of the majority must also change or that society is doomed. We must, finally, be vigilant against the suppression of dissent in this country and against the use of this country to aid and abet suppressive regimes anywhere in the world.

In concluding, I can do no better than quote a final passage from Makrygiannes.

"I wrote the naked truth so that . . . my children may see this and say 'This is what

we have, our fathers' struggles, our fathers' sacrifices . . . so that they may follow the example and work for the good of their country, their faith and their society, that they may become better themselves. Not that they should be conceited about the needs of their fathers, not that they should prostitute virtue and trample down the law and mistake influence for ability."

So saying, he was also telling us what we should and should not be doing here as we commemorate the men and women of 1821.

SHOCKING STATE OF AFFAIRS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. DRINAN, Mr. Speaker, as an election in South Vietnam approaches within a few months it is well for all of us to recall some of the continued repression and tragedies in that land.

The continued repression of the Thieu-Ky government is manifested in present plans to increase the size of the Vietnamese police force from 97,000 to 120,000 men.

The repression of newspapers continues and indeed has been increased. The Catholic biweekly Doi Dien—Face to Face—has been closed for 6 months and its editor, Father Chan Tin, has been sentenced to 9 months in jail. Father Truong Ba Can has also been sentenced to 9 months for an article which he published in the Catholic biweekly Doi Dien. As of March 1, 1971 Vietnam's largest circulation newspaper Tin Sang—Morning News—had experienced the suspension of 11 of its past 12 issues. Tin Sang is edited by a Vietnamese Congressman, Ngo Cong Duc.

It is also distressing to note the way in which the U.S. Government aids and abets the systematic repression of political dissent in South Vietnam. The 1970 report to the Ambassador from the Director of the USAID program in Vietnam notes that in 1971 the United States will pay \$30,000,000 for prisons and public safety whereas in 1970 the United States paid only \$20,900,000 for this category. At the same time the total expenditure for public health financed by the United States decreased from a total of \$27.8 million in 1970 to \$25 million in 1971. Similarly the total contribution of the United States to education in South Vietnam in 1970 was \$6.1 million whereas in 1971 it is only \$4.5 million.

American collaboration with the construction of new prisons for political dissenters is also most distressing. In February 1971 three new isolation blocks on the penal isle of Con Son were scheduled to begin. Each of the three blocks will contain 96 cells. The isolation compound will be categorized as a top 10 project and consequently will receive priority in the routing of supplies and the assignment of personnel.

It has been almost 2 years, Mr. Speaker, since I spent a good deal of time in South Vietnam with a team of eight Americans

investigating the imprisonment of some 20,000 South Vietnamese persons not because they are Communists or criminals but simply because they are opposed to the Thieu-Ky regime.

The State Department could give no plausible explanation at that time for this shocking state of affairs. The Congress of the United States has the solemn obligation, long before new elections are held in South Vietnam, to demand the elimination of the ever deepening repression of political freedom in that tragic land.

ANNA LAURA SHEWALTER

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary concerns of this or any other Congress is the quality of education in the country. But, despite the outpouring of public funds, innovations in curriculums and teaching methods, or new technological innovations, the heart if quality education is still the dedicated teacher.

Recently, a constituent brought to my attention the demise of one such educator, Miss Anna Laura Shewalter of Springfield, Ohio. His letter briefly tells a story which should be an inspiration to all those who want the best education available for our children.

The letter follows:

VALPARAISO, IND.,
Feb. 15, 1971.

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE,
Congressman, 2d District of Indiana,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EARL: I see that you are on the Education Committee so I would like to help you get a splendid and helpful article inserted in the Congressional Record which, I believe, would help raise the standard of our future teachers.

I feel that we have too many "would be" teachers that we could class as: "high class baby sitters." A close relative of our family has just mailed me an obituary of my late wife's life long closest friend and associate in many activities of church and society.

Miss Anna Laura Shewalter, a teacher for 49 years, died Feb. 4, 1971, in her home city of Springfield, Ohio, at age 90. She began her teaching in 1901 at Clifton School. Then later, became first grade teacher at Jefferson Elementary School, Springfield, where she remained until her retirement in 1950. She spent 30 years in the same classroom.

Miss Shewalter once summarized her philosophy of teaching: "Little folks are real people and are worthy in their own right of our respect and consideration."

In dealing with "little folks," she believed, a teacher should be friendly, be just and fair. Use a kind tone of voice. Laugh with the children whenever a good chuckle bubbles forth—but expect and get obedience. DO NOT CONDONE FOOLISHNESS."

She always began her classes by telling Bible stories and by singing devotional songs. "Since half our pupils are not taken to church," she once said, "and this indicates no religious training at home, it becomes our responsibility, to my thinking, to do something to make up this lack."

She said that "the surest foundation for good health and sound mind is the Christian faith with its fruits of right living and right thinking," and that this is what she worked for.

Miss Shewalter was a member of the Ohio Retired Teachers Association, Central United Methodist Church, Home City Chapter 258, Order of Eastern Star, and Lagonda Chapter D.A.R. She attended Wittenberg University for two years to gain extra knowledge in the education field, despite the fact that having a high school diploma and passing a teacher exam were the only teaching requirements in 1901.

Born March 16, 1880, in Springfield, Ohio, Miss Shewalter was the daughter of John S. and Anna Chenoweth Shewalter. She died February 4, 1971.

Your friend,

JAMES O. COX.

CARACAS IPU MEETING PROMOTES UNDERSTANDING

HON. ROBERT McCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the recent meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Caracas provided an opportunity for Members of our U.S. Congress and representatives from more than 50 other nations to discuss common problems and to share ideas relative to their solution.

The chairman of our U.S. group, Congressman Edward Derwinski, will soon prepare a detailed report of this conference and the specific activities of our delegation.

At this time, I would like to call to the attention of the membership an editorial that appeared in the April 14, 1971 issue of the Daily Journal, Venezuela's English-language newspaper. The editorial points up one of the significant aspects of this conference—the promoting of improved international understanding:

THE UNITED NATIONS IN CARACAS

The current sessions of the Interparliamentary Union, taking place in the Halls of Congress, have made something like a little United Nations Plaza out of that area. There are over 500 delegates, representing over 60 nations; each delegate has his name and country on his lapel, and the perusal of these lapels constitutes a really unique experience.

There are delegations from the Western European countries and of course from the United States, Britain and Canada. There is a large delegation from the new Chile. There are representations from the Soviet Union and the European communist countries. And there are delegations from such relatively exotic places as Nigeria, Ghana, Nepal, Vietnam and Laos. Many of these delegates are in native costume, and the Babel of languages is fascinating. Besides the "regular" languages (English, French and Spanish) there are interpreting booths for Russian and Japanese; and it is a stimulating experience to talk, as we did, successively to Dutchmen, Germans, Japanese, Indians, Russians, Israelites and Allendistas.

This kind of get-together has, we think, one overriding value: it serves as an occasion for interchange among the most diverse peoples; since many of them have gone to more than one meeting, they greet each other as old friends.

This is every bit as important as agenda and resolution.

**RICHARD G. CAPEN, JR., TO RESUME
NEWSPAPER CAREER**

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, Dick Capen has been Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs for the past 2½ years. There is no doubt Dick contributed substantially to the Secretary's effort to maintain national security requirements during a most challenging time in our Nation's history.

All of us who worked with Dick appreciated his cooperation and assistance in maintaining an effective liaison between the Congress and the Department of Defense. I am sure Rady Johnson will follow in Dick's path and continue to reflect credit on the Office of Legislative Affairs.

I wish Dick well on his return as vice president of Copley newspapers where I know that he will continue to work for a realistic national security posture.

At this point I include the DOD press release:

**RICHARD G. CAPEN, JR., DEFENSE LEGISLATIVE
AIDE, RESIGNS TO RESUME NEWSPAPER
CAREER**

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird today announced the resignation of Richard G. Capen, Jr., as Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs. Mr. Capen is returning to California where he will become Vice President of Copley Newspapers, publishers of 15 daily newspapers in California and Illinois.

Succeeding Mr. Capen will be Rady A. Johnson, manager of federal government affairs for Pittsburgh Plate Glass Industries, Inc., of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The change will be effective May 1, 1971.

In accepting Mr. Capen's resignation, Secretary Laird stated:

"Dick Capen, a long-time personal friend, has set a high mark of excellence in his public service. His expert direction of Congressional affairs in the Department of Defense has come during a particularly challenging period of reduced budgets, changing priorities and complex world affairs. During the last two years he has helped materially in our efforts to maintain an adequate national security posture. His special involvement in the prisoner of war issue has resulted in wise counsel and strong action as we seek to resolve this difficult problem. His meetings with hundreds of family members of those men has been a sustaining influence during their anguish over the fate of their loved ones. I wish Dick and his family every success as they return to California."

Mr. Capen was one of the early Department of Defense appointees in the Nixon Administration. Secretary Laird named him Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs effective January 20, 1969. He served in this position until January, 1970, when he was appointed Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs.

Before coming to the Department of Defense Mr. Capen served eight years as corporate director of public affairs for Copley Newspapers. In March, 1969, he was selected as one of the "Five Outstanding Young Men" in California by the California Jaycees.

**THE NEW AFRICA REPUBLIC IN
MISSISSIPPI—THE LATEST CON-
STITUTIONAL CRISIS**

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the so-called Republic of New Africa persists in its illegal efforts to found a colony in Bolton, 12 miles west of Jackson, Miss. I had earlier called to the attention of our colleagues this subversive group and their goals in my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 115, part 1, page 130. To date they appear to enjoy favorable press by the national communications' financiers as well as a hands-off attitude by the Federal Government. Seemingly, their announced program to establish a separate nation in the Southern States finds great support in various Northern quarters, even extending to the associate editor of the New York Times, one Tom Wicker.

This, despite the clear intent of article IV, section 3 of the Constitution which reads:

But no new State shall be formed or erected within the Jurisdiction of any other State; nor any State be formed by the Junction of two or more States, or Parts of States, without the Consent of the Legislatures of the States concerned as well as of the Congress.

There has been no consent by the Mississippi Legislature nor by Congress for any colonial establishment within our Nation. Such activity must be regarded as pure insurrection and rebellion. Can this be what President Nixon means by his new American Revolution?

If those in the Federal Government who hold responsibility for enforcement of our basic laws do not act through legal channels, then it can only be surmised that they are hoping to capitalize on action at the local level or that failure to act is out of fear of political retaliation. For if the Federal Government is now so weak that it is unable or incapable of protecting itself and safeguarding the integrity of its States, then our citizens must understand that the Constitution has already been obliterated, if not overthrown, in which case American citizens are free to re-establish their own colonies which they could call the United States of America as being needed to reestablish constitutional government for their people and their posterity.

A most interesting report on the currently tolerated agitation by the New Africa Revolution appeared in the April 14 "Review of the News," which I insert in the RECORD at this point along with a newsclipping for the information of all Members:

BIGTIME STUFF IN JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

(By Medford Evans)

Something is cooking in Mississippi. Nobody knows what it is yet—not even, one feels sure, the cook (whoever that is). But one week here we had Communist Stokely Carmichael speaking at predominantly black Tougaloo College, which many consider the chief spawning ground of revolutionary con-

cepts in Mississippi. (Last year, for instance, they hosted Communist Party double-dome Herbert Aptheker.) The very next week, at Millsaps, predominantly white Methodist soul brother of Tougaloo, we had none other than Associate Editor of the *New York Times* Tom Wicker.¹ For Jackson, that is bigtime stuff.

Funny thing, though, about media publicity. Three, four years ago anything Stokely Carmichael did was news. If he had made a speech in Jackson then, exhorting blacks to organize, not for offing pigs now, but for some fine future Day of Jubileum-Ragnarok (how Loki can you get?), it would have been on Huntley-Brinkley and front-paged in the *New York Times* followed by an in-depth story in *Newsweek*. This time the media couldn't have been less interested if it had been husband's day at the Jeudi Esprit club in Pontotoc.

Then what about Tom Wicker? Here is a mover and shaker of the first magnitude. Ask Turner Catledge if you don't believe it. And Tom is a Southern boy. A Southern boy who has risen the rough way to be Associate Editor of the world's most influential newspaper comes to a Southern town and speaks at a three-day forum on the same program with the News Director of one local TV station and the General Manager of another (this one owned by the owners of the morning and evening papers) and it is not news? Don't you think it would be news if Tom Wicker wanted it to be? But maybe what he said was not fit to print.

I missed Wicker. No! I didn't try to do that. I missed hearing him speak. The paper (there was an advance story, but no coverage) didn't say which night he was on. I had something else to do Friday and thought it would be Saturday anyhow. He spoke Friday. Guess I saved some time. Saturday noon at the registration desk of this "Southern Conference on World Affairs." I asked a young fellow how Wicker had been. "He was out of his field," was the somewhat cryptic reply.

His field? What is the field of an Associate Editor of the *New York Times*? The world? Or the one he left in North Carolina? His announced subject was "Violence and Its Alternatives." Maybe Tom Wicker doesn't know any alternatives to violence. There are times when nobody does.

Stokely was here March 18, Wicker March 26. But the tantalizing news began March 24, when twelve representatives of the Republic of New Africa were arrested by Jackson police and Hinds County deputies on a variety of charges centering around possession of concealed weapons and marijuana. Actually, one hears, the officers found much more ammunition than required for the confiscated weapons—some of the ammo didn't even fit any of the guns—so a question arises whether there is a cache of weapons not yet found.

To be contemptuous of weapons held by Republic of New Africa freaks has not seemed prudent since March 30, 1969, when 22-year-old Detroit police officer Michael Czapski was shot dead with eight bullets in his chest, and his fellow patrolman Richard Worobec, 28, was shot three times in the back and right leg while crawling to the squad car to radio for help. On arrival, the "help" took appropriate action, which, however, was significantly negated the next day by a pro-Communist black Federal Judge named George W. Crockett, Jr. *The Review Of The News* dated April 9, 1969, gave the scoop, in part like this:

"DETROIT, March 30.—Police shot their way into a Black Nationalist meeting in a West Side church last night and arrested 135 per-

¹ Millsaps never had Aptheker, but did have Robert McNamara. Both Tougaloo and Millsaps have had John Kenneth Galbraith. You think we don't hear it down here?

sons after one officer was killed and another wounded outside the building. Four persons inside the church were wounded as police faced riflemen kneeling behind church pews in the New Bethel Baptist Church . . . arresting officers confiscated seven rifles, three handguns, and a large quantity of ammunition."

The Review Of the News continued with details regarding the new African "republic" already committed to take five Southern states from the U.S. and to demand hundreds of billions in reparations." It also gave background information on Judge Crockett, and quoted the naturally indignant president of the Detroit Police Officers Association, Carl Parsell, as saying the jurist has given people a free license to shoot policemen . . . without fear of punishment."

A specific point of similarity between the incident in Detroit and the one here now in Mississippi is the apparently copious supply of ammunition held by the black adventurers in both cases. Evidently they expect a long war.

The latest story started to break when Joseph Arthur Cobb, 27, of Dorchester, Massachusetts (part of metropolitan Boston), and Henry Earl Tucker Jr., 21, of Dover, Massachusetts (very near Boston), at 2:30 a.m. in darkest Jackson ran a red light on South Gallatin Street. Patrolmen Jack Kilgore and W. R. Sumrall stopped the blue station wagon. Leaving Sumrall in the patrol car Kilgore walked toward the station wagon and ordered the driver to get out. When his feet touched the ground the driver [Cobb] put his hands in the air and I could see the butt of a gun in a shoulder holster on his left side," said the officer.

At this point Sumrall joined Kilgore, they got Tucker as well as Cobb out of the station wagon, had both Negroes put their hands on the roof of the wagon, and searched them and the vehicle. The gun officer Kilgore had seen in Cobb's shoulder holster was a .38 revolver. Tucker was also packing a .38, a Colt. Oh yes, Cobb, besides a revolver, had a .25 automatic in his left hip pocket. In the station wagon were three carbines, one rifle, six boxes of ammunition, two ammunition clips, and two two-way radios. The *Jackson Daily News* of March 25, had a good clear photo of the pair of Massachusetts blacks and their traveling arsenal.

Cobb was charged with carrying a concealed weapon and running a stop light. Unable to pay the combined fines of \$115 he was jailed. Tucker, too, was booked on the concealed-weapon charge, and in addition bound over to the grand jury under \$5,000 bond on the (in Mississippi) much more serious charge of possession of marijuana. One suspects that if Tucker and Cobb ever get out of this mess they will probably be court-martialed by the military establishment of the Republic of New Africa. It was pretty dumb to run that red light.

The ten N.R.A. guerrillas picked up in Bolton (twelve miles west of Jackson) by Hinds County deputy sheriffs were perhaps less careless, but just as unlucky. Their names, by the way, are at this writing not available. Sheriff Fred Thomas is playing it close to the vest. My impression at the moment is that his office is the best informed around here, if not in the country, on what New African Republicans are doing. That wouldn't be too illogical. After all, it seems that a tract of land on the edge of Hinds County has been selected as the capital of the Republic of New Africa, and was dedicated to that high purpose here Sunday, March 28, in a ceremony of which we shall say more anon.

The Jackson Daily News has reported Sheriff Thomas as saying that "his deputies had been observing the activities of the group in Hinds County for several months." I have talked to men from the Sheriff's office, and

I am convinced they know what they are doing. Not that any of us yet know enough about this thing. But it's awfully easy for us city boys (and the Jackson "power structure" is liable to be closer in outlook to New York, 1,400 miles away, than to Brownsville, Mississippi, 14 miles away)—it's awfully easy for us to forget that, just like Chairman Mao said, the country is where it's at.

When Sheriff Thomas's men broke the lock on that door in Bolton and arrested eight men and two women for possession of a stolen automobile (out of New Orleans) they found not only a cache of weapons and ammunition, but little red Bible-like books entitled—guess what—Thoughts Of Chairman Mao. (By the way, maybe you better start getting used to place names like Bolton and Edwards and Utica and Raymond, Mississippi. Those are, incidentally, big towns compared to Brownsville. I've lived in Jackson nine years and never heard of Brownsville till yesterday. Now they're putting the capital of the black world there. Well, no not in Brownsville, out from Brownsville. Wake up, urbanite, the countryside is moving in on you.)

Seems that Mayor Russel Davis' Jackson Police Department got their two guerrillas sort of by accident, but Sheriff Thomas's deputies got their ten on purpose. Anyhow, more power to both outfits.

The afternoon of Sunday, March 28, I went out to the dedication ceremony of the capital of the Republic of New Africa. I'm going to tell you a little bit about that in just a moment, but first let's fill in some background on what the R.N.A. is. By chance I got hold of some of their printed material, which shows what they say they are, and that has some kind of relationship, though who knows what kind, to what they really are.

I have here by my typewriter a copy of *The New African*, dated August 1, 1970, Vol. 1 No. 6, issued from P.O. Box 50896 New Orleans, La. 70150, Tel. AC504/488-9109. It is priced at twenty cents and said to be published by "Ministry of Information, The Republic of New Africa." The masthead has one ear, on the reader's right—an image of the Communist clenched fist.

The first thing one notices on looking at this newspaper now is that the move into Mississippi is seven, nearly eight months late. The column-one story is datelined New Orleans and begins with the statement: "New African President, Brother Imari, announced that the Republic of New Africa will move to its own land in Mississippi early in August." "Brother Imari," by the way, is the self-chosen name of one otherwise known as Richard B. Henry, formerly employed as a technical writer for the U.S. Army Tank Auto Command at the Detroit Arsenal. He is the brother of Milton R. Henry—Brother Galdi (Swahili for "guerrilla")—a Yale Law School graduate who has been the attorney for the notorious Communist Robert F. Williams.

Williams fled North Carolina in 1961 via Canada to Cuba, where with Castro's aid he operated "Radio Free Dixie" till 1966, when he moved to Peking. In both Cuba and Red China he published *The Crusader*, a typed and multilithed magazine credited by many with teaching enough blacks how to make Molotov cocktails to account for all the orgies of urban arson with which the country has been afflicted since the Watts area of Los Angeles was burned out in August 1965. The issue of *The Crusader* for May-June 1964 articulated Williams' ideas on sabotage as follows:

"The weapons of defense employed by Afroamerican freedom fighters must consist of a poor man's arsenal. Gasoline fire bombs (Molotov cocktails), lye or acid bombs (made by injecting lye or acid in the metal end of light bulbs), can be used extensively. During the night hours such weapons, thrown from roof tops, will make the streets impossible

for racist cops to patrol. Hand grenades, bazookas, light mortars, racket launchers, machine guns and ammunition can be bought clandestinely from servicemen, anxious to make a fast dollar. . . .

"Extensive sabotage is possible. Gas tanks on public vehicles can be choked up with sand. Sugar is highly effective in gasoline lines. Long nails driven through boards and tacks with large heads are effective to slow the movement of traffic on congested roads at night. . . . Derailing of trains causes panic. Explosive booby traps on police telephone boxes can be employed. High powered sniper rifles are readily available. Armor piercing bullets will penetrate oil storage tanks from a distance. Phosphorus matches (kitchen matches) placed in air conditioning systems will cause delayed explosions which will destroy expensive buildings. . . ."

Williams was the first "President" of the Republic of New Africa and Milton Henry was his Henry Kissinger. But somehow, I know not how (I'm not really in on these things, you know), Milton and Richard Henry fell out, and Richard, "Brother Imari," who was originally R.N.A. Minister of Information, moved from Detroit to New Orleans and set himself up as President.

Perhaps he was impatient with the apparent inaction of Robert Franklin Williams, who after three years' operating out of Peking (he commuted quite a bit to Tanzania, one understands), returned to the U.S. under some kind of deal with the federal government which let him land from London in Detroit on September 12, 1969, where he was flown in a specially chartered T.W.A. plane, on which he and Milton Henry were the only passengers. Until Uncle Sam stepped in, the commercial airlines had refused to carry Williams.

When he deplaned in Michigan, Comrade Williams was wearing a Mao-type cap and jacket and having deep thoughts. He told reporters that if he ever went back to North Carolina, which was somewhat languidly seeking to extradite him to face kidnaping charges, it would mean "war." The Feds, who had perfunctorily picked him up as a fugitive from North Carolina, turned him loose in Michigan on easily made bail. Williams went out of his way to accuse the C.I.A. of having harassed him in London. There can be small doubt that it was indeed the C.I.A. which got him back to the United States, where he has apparently had little trouble in retaining his freedom and achieving almost perfect privacy. Do you know where he is? He is working for the University of Michigan's Center for Chinese Studies—on a grant from the Ford Foundation.

Maybe he would have had more trouble, though, if he had become active as President of the R.N.A. Maybe that's why Brother Imari and lawyer brother Milton Henry had a falling out. It is doubtful whether they really have time to be mad at each other, but Milton, being Williams' attorney and all, couldn't very well supplant him. Richard was the only available choice. But that Milton is the brains of this outfit is the opinion of Robert Sherrill, no fool himself, who interviewed Milton Henry for an article in the January 1969 *Esquire*. And *Esquire*, by the way, is a real *vade mecum* (it's in your Webster) for all this black nationalist stuff. Besides Sherrill, they've got a sagacious black named William Worthy and that old black magic master Dr. Garry Wills. *Esquire* says the plans to establish the Republic of New Africa include:

"Arm the black communities of the north and west, and if whitey tries anything rough, blast hell out of him. 2) Ship about a million well-armed blacks into Mississippi, take over all of the sheriffs' jobs through the ballot box, seize the government, and then move on to Alabama and repeat the process; the next three Southern states would be seized in no special order, but it would be done in the

same way, by shipping in armed blacks who would first try to get the government by voting, and, if that didn't work, by guerrilla warfare."

Anyhow, here it is spring of 1971 and Brother Imari has made his move into Mississippi, which for founding a new nation and all is not too long after the target date of August 1970. Let's look at *The New African* some more. All through it you see "Go South," "Come South," "Go South, Go Home, Go South Blackman, Go South, Now We Have a Nation." Maybe the most important concept is on Page 7, headlined: "We Are Not An Organization." Not an organization? No. Then what the —? All right, listen:

"... in reality the Republic of New Africa is not an organization at all. We are a nation of black people. . . . We are one of the largest nations in the world. We are larger than France, Great Britain, Italy. . . . Our nation lies in the states which used to belong to America. The land was called Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia, and South Carolina.

"We are a nation for two main reasons: (1) because we say we are one and (2) because we function like one and our actions have won us recognition of the Black People. Our concern is not for a small group of people but for the Black African People of the entire world. . . ."

I think that is real interesting for lots of reasons, not the least of which is that it closely parallels what Stokely Carmichael said at Tougaloo College near Jackson just a week before Brother Imari's cohorts surfaced a few miles away in Hinds County. You see, this R.N.A. is not just for Negroes already in Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia, and South Carolina. (The order, which seems a bit strange geographically, is apparently the order in which the R.N.A. forces expect to take the five states.) No, the Republic of New Africa is for "the Black African People of the entire world."

Especially, as Milton Henry explained to Robert Sherrill two years ago, they expect Negroes from the Northern and Western cities of the United States to go South, or come South, however you look at it. That's why the New African has that repetitious slogan, "Go South." You know, I hate to say this, but I'll bet you these cats can raise white, non-Communist money (of course they are Communists, but they get all the non-Communist money they can) from people in some cities I could name who would (pardon me) cotton to the idea of sending all those Negroes back South where they came from. And, these people might argue, if the U.S. had to surrender sovereignty over five Deep South states it would be a small price to pay. Besides which, wouldn't all that smart Yankee money be a good enough control over the blacks they were giving Dixie to? (Well, it wouldn't, and I don't really think that, but you know how ideas will run through a man's mind.)

So the R.N.A. is a nation, not an organization. The Black Panthers, now, they are a party. They are an organization, a "vanguard" organization. They say that. So the Panthers and the R.N.A. crowd are not competitive. They are complementary. We have to watch our own preconceptions. We tend to feel naturally that a nation is more than a party, outranks it. But that is because we are not Communists. To a Communist the Party is more than any nation. Still, the Panthers, created by the Party as a party, are still not THE Party, just a party. So whether they outrank the R.N.A. or vice versa, who on the outside can say? They will work together the best way they can to destroy us. But that the R.N.A. defines itself as a nation is important.

Consider these consequences of the concept. There are three basic stages to the plan. Stage One is now history, Stage Two is what's happening here in Mississippi now, Stage Three may or may not be in the future.

Stage One. The Republic of New Africa issued a "Declaration of Independence" from

Detroit on March 31, 1968. In this document, which is reproduced in *The New African*, they declared themselves "free and independent of the jurisdiction of the United States of America" and asserted that they claimed no rights from the U.S. except universal human rights, which include "the right to damages, reparations, due us for the grievous injuries sustained by our ancestors and ourselves by reason of United States lawlessness." During this stage, as Brother Imari explains (*New African*, Page 9), the people of the R.N.A. are a nation, but a captive nation. To get out of captivity they must move to the next two stages.

Stage Two. This involves the acquisition of land and the organization of a state—specifically, Mississippi—for a "plebiscite." This first acquisition of land is apparently to be made by normal commercial means. Milton Henry told Robert Sherrill that the R.N.A. had, in 1968, acquired 100 acres in Mississippi, but it is not known whether he was telling the truth, and if he was whether that was the same land Brother Imari's followers occupied in Hinds County.

During this stage the R.N.A. plans to build "model communities," and a well-prepared flyer was distributed here last week describing such a community. It is, of course, a commune. The economics is as Marxist-Leninist as the revolutionary action. From the model community or communities as a base, the R.N.A. will conduct its "plebiscite" throughout the entire state, polling all blacks "to decide whether the state stays with the U.S. or comes under the Republic." (*New African*, Page 9.) It is taken for granted that the vote will be for the R.N.A. (You understand, it is taken for granted by the R.N.A.)

Stage Three. Now comes the crunch. Morally armed with the plebiscitary support of the Black People of Mississippi, the R.N.A. cadres will prepare to defend their territory against hostile aliens. But now "Their territory" does not mean the little tracts of land they have acquired by purchase, squatter's rights or however, but the entire state. So that every white person in Mississippi who does not promptly swear allegiance to the R.N.A. becomes an alien, occupying land to which he has no just claim. *Defense* of their land then becomes, for the R.N.A., running the whites off the land which those honkies are so prejudiced as to think is theirs. This is likely to require a good deal of shooting, and that is the chief contingency for which preparation seems to have been made. "The Republic plans to hold and defend the land against all enemies," says Brother Imari, and to that end he has stocked up lots of ammunition.

There's your program—simple: Declare yourselves independent. (Done.) Get yourself a foothold of land and drum up popular support, or the reputation of popular support (Doing.) Fight like hell. (May be necessary—on both sides.)

You and I don't like to think about things like that. Brother Imari loves it. On Page 12 of *The New African* appears in big black (what else?) letters: "America is the Black Man's Battleground." Page 5 is entirely occupied by a poem entitled, "The Fire Next Time—This Time," dedicated to Hubert "Rap" Brown, which concludes with the stirring lines: "we got to start killing crackers, or we can forget it."

The foregoing product of the muse is signed "kuwaka mwandishi Blackpoet/writer," just like that—the B is the only capital. Brother Imari himself usually speaks with more majesty, also more attention to means as well as the end. For instance, on Page 3 a reaction to publicized events of last May:

"NEW AFRICA CALLS FOR ARMS FOR SOUTH'S ERA OF SELF-DEFENSE"

NEW ORLEANS.—The President of the Republic of New Africa, proclaiming the killings at Jackson State College and Augusta have projected the South into an "Era of

Self-Defense," has called for monied white "friends" of the Black Man to buy truckloads of ammunition for stock-piling in black communities.

"Brother Imari, New Orleans-based President of New Africa, said that the ammunition should be 'delivered to and stockpiled in Black Churches that are committed to defense of non-violent people.'

"In the first of several letters to monied white groups associated with the civil rights movement, Imari told newly elected UAW President Leonard Woodcock that a gift of ammunition now 'would do more to keep the South non-violent and assure progress than a hundred speeches, marches, and memorial centers.' He asked UAW for ten truckloads, 80 cases each, of M-1 rifle ammunition for each of ten Black Communities and placed the cost at \$94,000."

You know, you kind of got to hand it to old Imari. When he's not killing crackers (just getting ready to) he can sure call a hypocritical professional "Liberal's" hand. In a column adjoining the foregoing, Imari directly appeals to his readers to send "chickens, or money, or whatever they can" to his post office box number.² "The Republic," he adds, "is especially concern [sic!] about obtaining ammunition for .30 caliber carbines and 30.06 rifles." And the Republic sure obtained some, as Jackson Patrolmen Kilgore and Sumrall, and Sheriff Thomas' deputies, found out last week.

I was going to tell you all about my trip out to see the groundbreaking of the new capital. I believe I could color it up pretty good, but I've used up nearly all my space, and I guess there wasn't really all that much to it anyhow. But it was sort of weird, driving over this rolling, lonesome, idyllic grazing country on a two-lane blacktop, wondering if you are actually going to find the place, deciding maybe the whole thing was one big hoax—as in its own way it certainly is. But I mean maybe there wouldn't even be a meeting of African Republicans, maybe there wouldn't even be a dedication of their new capital.

Well, there was. All of a sudden I came around a curve and saw a whole line of cars parked on both sides of the road—about three different clusters of cars—and off to the right, on a kind of grassy hill (I didn't even see them at first, I was watching the cars I had to pass between) the devotees of the cult, the first citizens of the Republic of New Africa. I saw a turban, and a dashiki, and some kind of scattered-around Negroes out there—good-looking Negroes, I would say—mostly men, young men (this thing is military, man) but one or two women. The Minister of Information is a woman, name of Aisha Ishtar Salim. How about that!

Must have been between one and two hundred people out there in the field, fifty or sixty on the road. Most of those on the road were onlookers, like me. Some of the onlookers were black, and we spoke to each other in friendly fashion, as Negroes and white folks will do in Mississippi. But it was a very brief moment of normality. That bunch in the field were something else.

The question in everybody's mind—what were they really doing there? I mean this thing is kookie! You know, they could be wiped out if they really wanted to fight, and here they were staking out a claim to five of the states that Lee and Jackson and Forrest couldn't hold, who commanded maybe a million of the flower of the Confederacy. Somebody told me there were 160 Negroes out there in the field today. And somebody said they damn sure were ready to fight, were armed to (and no doubt including) the teeth.

A local television man whom I heard a few nights before say on the air that these looked

²How do you suppose the Post Office is gonna get all them chickens in that little postal box?

to him like peaceful citizens, was out there today real shook up. He's young, not more than thirty, and healthy, but he looked like the Ancient Mariner. "I've learned a lot in the last few days," he said. "I'm not too sure just what he has learned, but one thing he told me, he said, "You see those tall grasses, still brown and dead from the winter, beyond all that short green grass where they are?" Yes, I saw the tall grass. "They've got guys with automatic weapons stationed all in those grasses," he said, and he is a brave young man, but he was a little bit shook.

And you know what? I was on a fact-finding mission, but I took his word for it, I didn't go back there and check it out, whether there were R.N.A. sentries with automatic weapons in that tall grass or not.

Actually, the situation was pretty well under control. Down at one end of the line of parked cars was a bunch of men from the Sheriff's office, and they had binoculars and maintained good surveillance. Half a mile back on the other end of the line was an inconspicuously parked car of the Mississippi Highway Patrol. You know there *couldn't* be any real danger. Well, maybe not, but one of the sheriff's men reminded me (I told you they were well informed) that tomorrow is the second anniversary of the shoot-out at the New Bethel Baptist Church in Detroit. One thing struck me, there were all told half a dozen press and television men out there, and I know (say) half of them. They really are sophisticated guys. Maybe it was me, but somehow they didn't look very sophisticated today.

Coming back, you get to thinking again. What's up? You realize those 160 blacks out there were not in the main local people—maybe none of them were. One bus brought fifty from the Pacific Coast. The only militant I heard say anything was talking to a good colored family I had spoken to earlier. The new breed was saying, politely and with some conscious humor, "Yeah, we got people here from South Carolina, Louisiana, everywhere—even Mississippi!" You couldn't tell if he even meant it. On the whole, this thing was in Mississippi, but certainly not of it.

So how did it get here? It took money, and the work that led to this day took a lot more money than that. What may well lie in the future will take still more, much more. Where is it coming from, Red China? Milton Henry actually told Robert Sherrill the Red Chinese would give the R.N.A. nuclear weapons, but you and I know that R.N.A. Negroes might get those nearer at hand; might, indeed, help ferry some the other way. Mao Tse-tung obviously did think it worthwhile to pat Robert F. Williams on the back, but Mao would hardly send money to America; he would expect the flow to run in his direction.

The Republic of New Africa cannot mean what it says, but it means something very serious. Milton and Richard Henry, even when they change their names, can't account for it. Robert F. Williams and Stokely Carmichael can't account for it.

There's a Whitey in the woodpile somewhere. Or, more likely, a Redie.

Maybe Tom Wicker knows. An Associate Editor of the *New York Times* knows so much. It was only after Wicker's curiously unpublicized visit to Jackson the weekend of the R.N.A. caper that I read in a three-year-old copy of the *Times* (February 15, 1968) Wicker's column concluding, "In fact, it may be the flat assertion of black identity, and the uncompromising demand for white recognition of it and respect for it, that offer something like a racial *modus vivendi* in America."

Modus vivendi? Method of living? I'd say *modus moriendi!* Brother Imari's Republic

of New Africa seems to be primarily interested in flatly asserting its identity with ammunition for .30 caliber carbines and 30.06 rifles.

[From the Washington Post, April 5, 1971]
MISSISSIPPI'S NEW BLACK "NATION": HOSTILITY, THREATS IN STARTLED TOWN
(By Philip D. Carter)

BOLTON, Miss.—Here in the heartland of the old Confederacy, a small and obscure band of black secessionists has founded the capital of a new "nation" on boundless rhetoric and 20 acres of green pastureland.

For the self-proclaimed citizens of the Republic of New Africa, who number perhaps 300, this pastoral site is the future metropolis or an independent black nation encompassing this entire state, plus Alabama, Louisiana, Georgia and South Carolina.

For the startled white residents of the area, though, it is a threat. Taking the group at its word, they have responded with anxious hostility.

Twelve RNA members have already been arrested on charges ranging from "obstructing justice" to possessing concealed weapons and marijuana. RNA spokesmen, who contend the men were "framed," declare the group has also been threatened by the Klu Klux Klan.

In the state capital of Jackson, 40 miles away, Hinds County Sheriff Fred Thomas said, "We're not going to let these niggers take over the county." And on Friday, state Attorney General A. F. Summer wrote U.S. Attorney General John N. Mitchell urging the Justice Department to determine the government's position in the event of a conflict with RNA.

The Constitution forbids forming new states from existing ones without approval of the state legislatures concerned and Congress, and it guarantees protection of the states against invasion, Summer said.

"The acts and statements of the Republic of New Africa appear to be in the nature of an armed insurrection against not only the state of Mississippi but the United States of America," he said.

"The officials of Mississippi, both state and local, have asked that in the event of a conflict between the Republic of New Africa and the state and local governments, what will be the position of the United States?"

Urban black frustrations, the vagaries of chance and a prosperous black farmer from Bolton named Lofton Mason have combined to make this west Mississippi farm town of 800 people the new and improbable nexus of the nation's black separatist movement.

The Republic of New Africa, one of a recent succession of black nationalist organizations, was founded three years ago as the embodiment of the Marxist dreams of Robert Williams, a North Carolina black who had fled the country for Communist China as a fugitive from the FBI.

RNA training and propaganda documents emphasize secret paramilitary training and promote a "New African Ujama (Economics)" reminiscent of the pure communism preached in 19th century American utopian communities and in "hippie" communes today.

AMBITIOUS PLANS

The Nation of Islam—the Chicago-based Muslim sect led by Elijah Muhammed—is farming two large tracts totalling several thousand acres in rural Alabama. But the Muslims' stated ambition is creation of a separate black economy, not political separation from the United States.

On paper, the RNA's plans are more ambitious.

"Come To The Land," proclaims a recent RNA leaflet circulated in New Orleans, pres-

ent headquarters of the movement. "Independence . . . is the only way we can once and for all solve the great problems that face us as a people. With independence we can have power, the respect of the world, wealth as a people."

The leaflet estimates the "new nation's" initial financial needs at \$7.5 million, which is to be raised by subscription. The money, according to RNA theory, would provide for creation of a "new community" supporting 2,500 people.

After an apparently lengthy but unsuccessful search for land in the South, RNA learned of Bolton's Mason, a black farmer with a well-deserved reputation for independence.

Mason, a sturdily built man of 65 with an eighth-grade education, started farming on his own at 19 with a plow and an old mule. Two years later, he says, the mule died, but he bought a younger one and persevered. Today, he lives with his wife in a roomy, white, frame farmhouse near Bolton and drives a turquoise Pontiac.

His relationships with the area's whites have not been entirely friendly. "They didn't used to bother me much until (at the height of the Mississippi civil rights movement in 1964) I started voting," he recalls.

Mason said that someone, whom he identified as the Ku Klux Klan, cut his fence about 75 times. "They caught my bull and killed it and put it in my hay house. It was a registered Hereford. Later they set the hay house on fire and I lost 500 bales of hay at a dollar a bale. They punctured all the tires on my farm equipment and they put sugar and honey in my tractor to ruin it."

This year, he says, he was approached by the RNA. "They knew about the stand I'd taken. They'd been around through the country trying to buy some land and nobody would sell any. They recognized the stand I'd taken, and figured that if anybody would sell to them, I would. And I did. It was the Lord that gave me the courage to do it."

He also got a good price—\$25,000, he says—for 20 acres of pastureland that normally sells for \$300 an acre. The group put \$5,000 down, with four years to pay the balance.

At that rate, it would cost the Republic of New Africa hundreds of millions just to acquire Hinds County—part of a vast, 5.5 million-acre tract Congress bought from the Choctaw Indians in 1820 for \$20,000 plus a quickly broken promise of land forever in Arkansas.

But, says Mason, "I feel like since they got a starting point, somebody else is going to sell 'em something. Because I've got a mind to sell 'em some myself."

MASON WELL ARMED

Mason says he is well armed against white reaction, with a rifle, a pistol and a shotgun. And, if all goes according to the RNA's schedule, there will soon be an armed guard of turbaned black "Forcemen" trained in marksmanship, karate and presumably in the arts of living in Klan country, in an open pasture, next to a rural road.

The nearest neighbor of this nascent city of El Mallik (named for Malcolm X) is a black farmwoman named Elnora Butler. She expresses only a quiet indifference when asked of the new people across the hill. "People like I am, I've got nothing to do with them, and they've got nothing to do with me. I'd sure like to own that pasture."

While a guinea fowl cackles in her yard and a wandering Hereford moos faintly, she draws attention to a more immediate problem.

"This is a nice place, except for all these hedges," she says, pointing to a clump of thorny bushes. "I don't know what they are. Some say they come from Texas, blew here in a storm."

WHITES UPSET

Whites are considerably less relaxed. "It's bound to have been upsetting," says Bolton's white police chief, Herschel McGraw. "It was like a bunch of foreigners trying to come in here and take over the United States. That's what it looked like to me. Any time you denounce your citizenship, aren't you classed as a foreigner?"

Three policemen serve under McGraw, all of them black. "We've never had any trouble here before," he says.

Chief McGraw's post, at 7:30 on a weekday morning, is at Bolton's principal intersection, opposite Gaddis and McLaurin, General Merchandise and Cotton Buyers—general store and gossip center, heart of the town's economic life.

There, amid bright bolts of cloth, bins of seed corn and rows of horsecollars, Mayor Alex Pay, Jr., a shareholder in the corporation that runs the store, mulls over the new crisis.

"We've always had real good race relations here in Bolton," he says. "The school is integrated. We've never had a boycott or anything—and that's unusual." And, despite the general exodus of the area's farmers, white and black, to the cities, "We gin about 4,500 bales of cotton."

AARON BURR CITED

But with all that said, he confesses a certain angry perplexity. "Aaron Burr tried to do what these people are up to, and they called him a traitor," he says. Burr was arrested in 1807—in Mississippi—on suspicion of the high treason of trying to create a new nation in the Southwest; he escaped and later was exonerated, and Mississippi had little further truck with setting up separate states until 1861.

Across the street, at a beer tavern called Caraway's Grocery, four or five black men drink from quarts and eat peanuts vended by the town's strolling "peanut lady" from her big black purse.

"They're going to make it, there's no way they're not going to get it," says a middle-aged man who introduces himself as Roy. "I was born and raised in Bolton," he says, "and the way they're going, they're going to get the land. I got a feeling they're going to get it."

But for the moment, "they" are nowhere in sight. The pasture-city is deserted, and a rain-sodden campfire, a few scattered empty orange drink cartons and two unused Molotov cocktails tucked behind a fence are the only evidence of last week's celebration of the creation of El Mallik.

Alojo Adegbololo, minister of defense, and RNA President Inari Abubakari Obadele are reportedly back in New Orleans, planning the next phase of their nation's development.

And in Jackson, Sheriff Fred Thomas sits with his feet on his desk and a cigar between his teeth, telling a deputy about not letting "the niggers take over the country."

"We're peace-loving people here and hope to keep it thataway," he tells a reporter. "We're going to keep it thataway. Regardless."

TV STATION WETA ADVOCATES MASSIVE CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, those who voted for the recent appropriation bill for the Office of Education and related agencies—which included a \$30 million subsidy to the Corporation for Public

Broadcasting—should take particular notice of this afternoon's Evening Star.

On the TV and radio page is a large nearly half-page ad announcing that WETA, channel 26, Washington, D.C. Public Broadcasting Service, is turning its educational facilities over to radicals to urge protest and demonstrations against the U.S. Government.

Since the ad does not indicate otherwise, one must assume that it too was paid for by taxpayers' dollars unless it was offered free by the newspaper as a public service.

This must be what is meant by revolutionary education.

I insert the text of the ad at this point:

[Advertisement from the Washington Star, Apr. 20, 1971]

TONIGHT AT 9:00 WILLIAM KUNSTLER MAKES A CASE FOR MASSIVE CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE TO PROTEST THE WAR IN VIETNAM—ROGER FISHER, PROFESSOR OF LAW AT HARVARD, MAKES A CASE FOR POLITICAL ACTION WITHIN THE SYSTEM TO PROTECT THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Tonight on the eve of demonstrations planned across the nation to protest United States fighting in Indochina, Advocate Kunstler, best known for his defense of the Chicago 7, takes the position that those who wish to bring an end to the Indochina war should be free to go beyond the bounds of normal political activity.

Fisher will argue that civil disobedience which is directed against a target other than the problem itself, diverts attention from the real object of contention.

Two ways to protest the war in Vietnam on . . .

The Advocates, WETA Ch. 26, Public Broadcasting Service.

SENATOR ELLENDER URGES A COUNTERATTACK BY CONGRESS AGAINST FUND FREEZE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, said recently that Congress may have to refuse administration appropriations requests unless \$12 billion in funds appropriated by the Congress are released from the deep freeze in the Office of Management and Budget.

Certainly this suggestion is worthy of merit and I direct the attention of all my colleagues to this suggestion in the event OMB persists in this flagrant disregard of congressional mandates and appropriations.

In this connection a copy of an article from the Washington Post concerning Senator ELLENDER's statement is placed in the RECORD herewith because of the interest of my colleague and the American people in this most important matter.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1971] SENATOR ELLENDER WARNS ON FUND FREEZE

The chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee said yesterday Congress may have to refuse administration spending re-

quests if President Nixon doesn't unfreeze nearly \$13 billion in appropriated funds.

At issue, said Sen. Allen J. (D-La.), is whether the executive or the legislative branch will determine spending priorities.

One "get tough" possibility, he said, is "for the members of Congress, individually and as a body, to say 'no' to other policies whose approval is being sought by the President."

Ellender said that "although in the past I have tried to judge each issue on its merits, I myself am being brought around slowly to this point of view particularly in areas where it seems the welfare of foreigners is being given priority over that of our own people."

For example, he said, the administration impounded \$12.9 billion in domestic appropriations, then asked Congress for an additional \$732.9 million for foreign use.

Excerpts of Ellender's speech, prepared for the Red River Valley Association in Shreveport, La., were made public in Washington. Among the impounded appropriations is nearly \$3 million for the Red River Waterway.

PLIGHT OF PRISONERS OF WAR AND MISSING IN ACTION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as President Nixon conducts the effective implementation of the Vietnamization program, our major concern remains the plight of the prisoners of war and the missing in action.

The positive effects of the intense public, as well as government, interest in this question is vitally described in an article by the Copley Press international correspondent, Dumitru Danielopol, which appeared April 6 in the Aurora, Ill., Beacon-News.

The article follows:

NINE SAN DIEGO "MAILMEN" HAVE LEFT IMPACT ON NORTH VIETS
(By Dumitru Danielopol)

PARIS.—Those young "mailmen" from San Diego who came to Paris two months ago have left their mark on the Vietnam negotiations. The nine young people parked tons of letters and petitions from the United States bearing 26 million signatures before the North Vietnam and Viet Cong delegations to protest Red treatment of U.S. prisoners of war.

"You should keep it up," said a foreign diplomat well schooled in North Vietnamese psychology. "The Communists are trying to pose as humanitarians. They accuse the United States of barbarism. They have worked hard to build this image."

Ever since they came to Paris more than three years ago the Communists from North Vietnam and their stooges in the south have pursued a vigorous propaganda campaign. A major effort is directed at Indochinese and other Asians living in France. They have had some effect, particularly as a source of material for the French Communist party, but free Vietnamese journalists are publishing their own newspaper, "News From the Homeland." It has neutralized this front in the propaganda war.

The prisoners of war issue has been one of the free Vietnamese weapons.

"Why is it, if Hanoi is so humanitarian, that it calls American prisoners of war 'war criminals' without even having tried them?" the pro-Saigon paper asks. "Why doesn't Hanoi allow the International Red Cross to take a hand at easing their captivity?"

The impact of the visit to Paris of the POW letter carriers was tremendous, says my diplomat friend. It touched a chord of public opinion. The Communists were clearly embarrassed.

"They tried to twist their propaganda," he said. "They said the letters showed a selfish interest in American lives." The Communists now say, "You see, the Americans care nothing about the Vietnamese, they are only interested in their people."

No one believes them, says my friend, but he urged U.S. groups to also show anxiety about the 3,500 South Vietnamese who are in Communist hands.

Why do the Reds hold on to the Americans and refuse any exchange prisoners?

"They believe that the United States will be forced to make political concessions in the South Vietnam in exchange for the prisoners of war," he says, "despite statements by President Nixon and Defense Secretary Melvin Laird that such a trade is out of the question."

"The more publicity you give the POW issue, the better for your men," says the diplomat. "Ask the Communists to give you lists of names and go on asking. It can only help."

With the Communists definitely worried about the outcome of the war and their own survival, the POWs promise to become an even larger issue. The young people from San Diego made a dent in the Communist wall of silence. Now more pressure is needed.

SEEKS ADEQUATE INCOME FOR FARM POPULATION

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, over the last months many of my colleagues and I have spoken out on the necessity for action which will provide an adequate income for those in our farm population, including an increase in the price support level for milk to the full 90 percent of parity authorized by law.

The fact remains that in Wisconsin when our farmers are in economic straits, so is the economy of the State. The same is true for every State in our country.

In light of this, I would like to insert the following resolution recently passed by the Wisconsin State Legislature indicating their concern over the need for obtaining a viable farm economy in the RECORD.

The text of that resolution follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION 35

Petitioning the Hon. Clifford M. Hardin, United States Secretary of Agriculture, to increase the support level of manufactured milk to the maximum permissible percent of parity for the coming marketing year, beginning April 1, 1971, and memorializing Congress to increase the support levels to 100% of parity based on 1910-1914 base levels.

Whereas, farm costs have risen at an alarming rate since the start of the current marketing year and costs in dairying have risen even more, farm wage rates being up 6.5%, interest and taxes up 8% and feed costs up 9%; and

Whereas, the present \$4.66 support level for manufactured milk has slipped to about 81% of the parity equivalent and may fur-

ther decline to 80% by the end of this marketing year; and

Whereas, if current trends continue unabated, an addition of approximately 50 cents per CWT to the present support level is needed to bring the price of manufactured milk to the 90% parity level; and

Whereas, manufactured milk production in the 12 north central states has shown a marked decrease; and

Whereas, this combination of increased milk production costs and reduced prices has continued the exodus from the farms of the nation thereby contributing dangerously to urban as well as rural instability; and

Whereas, these trends have been intensified by inadequate restrictions on "milk substitutes" insidiously masquerading as dairy products; and

Whereas, a per capita decline of milk production threatens the health and welfare of our nation; and

Whereas, the Agricultural Act of 1949 empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to increase the support level; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the assembly, the senate concurring, That this legislature respectfully petitions the Secretary of Agriculture, the Hon. Clifford M. Hardin, to raise the support level for manufactured milk for the coming marketing year as soon as possible to the maximum permissible percent of parity; and, be it further

Resolved, That this legislature respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the permissible support level for manufactured milk to 100% of parity based on 1910-1914 base levels; and, be it further

Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the secretary of the senate of the United States, the clerk of the house of representatives of the United States and to each member of the congressional delegation from Wisconsin.

Representative **ROBERT T. HUBER**,
Speaker of the Assembly.
THOMAS P. FOX,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

COUNTRY MUST TAKE STEPS TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH CARE OF THE POOR, THE ELDERLY, THE YOUNG, AND THE WORKER

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, today the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee began hearings on the health manpower bill, H.R. 5614, which will provide vital funds for nursing education. President Nixon's proposed budget for 1972 decreases the funds for nursing education by \$6.6 million, while it increases the budget for other health professionals by \$90 million.

No health care system can work without adequate numbers of qualified nurses. Yet, while other health professionals—doctors, dentists, and others—have basic support grants, nursing has none, and the grants approved by Congress in 1968 have never been funded. Not only does this show that the President does not understand the critical role of the profes-

sional nurse, but also that he does not respect the contributions of the professional woman.

This is a time when our country must take substantial steps to improve the health care of the poor, the elderly, the young, and the worker. I am deeply concerned that the critical need for nurses is not reflected in the President's budget for 1972, and I would urge all Members of Congress to provide the necessary money for quality nursing education.

FOUR POINTS TO PONDER IN CALLEY AFTERMATH

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I attach herewith an excellent editorial with regard to the Lieutenant Calley decision which was printed in the weekly, the Town Crier, from Weston-Wayland, Mass.

This perceptive editorial, in the April 8, 1971, issue of this valuable weekly, points out in a most logical way the enormous implications of the national debate in which this country is now engaged with regard to the verdict in the case of Lieutenant Calley:

FOUR POINTS TO PONDER IN CALLEY AFTERMATH

It's virtually senseless to argue the merits of the case against Lt. William Calley, editorially or otherwise, because of the "free Calley" fever now rampant, but there are some things which need to be said in perspective.

First of all, if we do not intend to punish Calley, we are basically saying that the United States is the kingdom and the power, that we give life and we take it away and that we nor anyone acting in our name is subject to judgment, either here or in the hereafter.

Second, the one thing which we have failed to consider in our mass emotion is that the people who were massacred at My Lai were not the enemy. Supposedly, they were our allies, the people we had gone to war over.

This is an important thing to remember because of all the emotional arguments about guys in this war and others who participated in the bombing or devastation of cities, towns and villages occupied by the enemy. Japan and Germany during World War II were avowed enemies, while North Vietnam is an enemy of our own choosing, but a justifiable enemy in terms of that country's invasion of South Vietnam after our own troop build up.

These factors may not make warring against women and children morally right, but historically they have always been the unfortunate victims whenever two or more sides have gone at each other. However, we didn't purposely kill the French people in their villages during the liberation of France in World War II.

So, in the Crier's view, the people in the villages of South Vietnam are our allies on at least a technical basis. Now, if they were damn sick and tired of us raising havoc with the countryside in our devastating purges of the communist menace and they somehow resisted, they might be mistaken for the enemy—but women and children making war

against our troops? If that was the case, our best bet as humane people would have been to back on out of there and leave them alone, especially when it became obvious the real enemy had disappeared.

And then there's the matter of shoving people into ditches and systematically slaughtering them. Once they were captured and rendered harmless (although none of them were even proven harmful), if we still considered them the enemy, they should have at least been treated as prisoners of war, subject to the accords of Geneva.

Third, Calley has not been singled out for punishment. He is one of 13 men whose parts in the Mylai incident have been reviewed thus far. The charges against seven of the men were dismissed outright. Two others—S Sgts. Kenneth L. Hodges and David Mitchell—were acquitted of assault to commit murder after court martials because the evidence wasn't strong enough to convict them.

At least two other officers, and possibly a third later, are being tried for what they knew about Mylai—Capt. Ernest L. Medina because of the orders he allegedly gave to Calley, and the other Col. Oran K. Henderson, who is charged with covering up the incident.

Even if Calley winds up the only man convicted, the army has been fair in its investigation. People are asking: Why single out Calley for punishment? The bare facts are he has not been singled out, but even if he were, justice must make its stand wherever it can. Asking the question is like asking why the Boston Strangler or Charles Manson should be singled out for punishment when so many other murders are never caught.

Fourth, if the entire system or country is suddenly at fault for Calley's aberration, it is only because, again in the Crier's opinion, he was allowed to become an officer in the first place. He was not qualified, but that does not excuse his actions at Mylai because he is first a human being. He is as personally responsible for the action he took as he would be if he wandered into someone's house in this country, either predetermined to "waste" everyone or to "waste" everyone if he encountered the slightest difficulty.

Calley admitted at the trial that he never recognized the South Vietnamese as any ally and that he never considered treating them at the least as prisoners: "I never sat down and analyzed whether they were men, women and children. They were the enemy, not people," he testified.

As susceptible as a person of Calley's background was to military indoctrination and the code of conduct, he was not taught how to kill unarmed, defenseless people. In fact, Calley, responsible as he was because of his physical presence and his actions in leading his 25-man patrol into Mylai on Mar. 16, 1968, acted contrary to his officer's training. He panicked himself, he lost his head, and in so doing the end result was no better than what could be expected of an unruly, undisciplined mob.

But these were harsh times. He and his men were fatigued. Calley himself probably knew he was not officer material and probably felt a sense of frustration at being unable to cope with the situation he faced. He probably shouldn't have been ordered into the village in the first place. Our country certainly shouldn't have been in there any longer considering that we had become so strongly suspicious of these our allies that we were ready to shoot any Oriental we encountered, including women and children. Because of these mitigating circumstances, Calley was not given the maximum sentence and rightfully so, but life imprisonment of itself is not a harsh punishment for his part in the crime at Mylai.

LEGISLATION TO MUFFLE JET AIRCRAFT NOISE IN THE UNITED STATES

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the persistent problem of ear-splitting jet aircraft noise near large airports throughout the Nation impels me today to introduce a measure which would at last effectively attack this menace. The noise levels currently produced by existing aircraft can be substantially reduced by undertaking a retrofitting program for jet engines. Such a process would begin under the provisions of the bill I am proposing.

There can be no doubt that this legislation is badly needed. As I have said before, air and noise pollution are definite health hazards—even killers. They do not bring on the quick death that America has gotten used to through war and television violence, but they take their toll nonetheless. People existing adjacent to airports such as Los Angeles International, Kennedy, Logan, O'Hare, and others, are daily being exposed to an increasingly menacing danger brought about by the fact that available technology is not effectively utilized, because the cost is high and the powers that be and their special interest groups would rather avoid paying it. So I join the distinguished senior Senator from our State of California, Senator ALAN CRANSTON, in introducing this new legislation which he has originated in the Senate.

Representing a congressional district which includes Los Angeles International Airport has caused me to learn first-hand the seriousness of the noise pollution problem. Two schools in my area have actually been forced to close due to intolerable interruptions by shattering jet aircraft noise. My response to this particular situation has been to introduce legislation to make Federal funds available for soundproofing classrooms lying under flight paths.

Homeowners are also adversely affected by jet noise pollution. The total costs—if they were known—of replacing shattered glass and plaster, as well as other structural home damages, would add up to a formidable sum. During the last Congress I sought legislation which would compensate homeowners who suffered jet noise or sonic boom damages to their homes. In addition, I sought to amend President Nixon's airport and airways development proposal to establish a noise abatement trust fund.

I have consistently supported this legislation because jet aircraft noise makes its passage vital. But most of these bills deal with the effects rather than the causes. That is why the retrofit bill I am now introducing is especially worthwhile. Its passage will allow us to go directly to the source of the aircraft noise problem—the jet engines. In October of 1969, I asked:

Must it take years of research to come up with the startling discoveries that we are definitely subject to hearing loss and psychological disturbances due to the increasing din of our environment? Must we always act after the fact instead of preventatively?

The passage of a retrofit bill will be tantamount to answering these questions with a resounding "No!"—pardon the noise.

The technical ability to eliminate a large share of severe jet noise is at hand. Let us use it. The bill I propose today is designed to reduce within 5 years the present jet noise levels to between one-half and less than one-fourth of their present levels. By January 1, 1976, the estimated 1,700 to 1,900 present type jetliners would fly retrofitted. This process calls for lining the nacelle, or cowl, of a jet engine with soundproofing material and also enlarging the size of the exhaust outlets.

Although the FAA has ruled that future aircraft put into service after January 1, 1972, must employ this process, the ruling does not include present planes, of which there are 1,700. And most of this fleet will be in service for years to come. The retrofitting bill would remedy this serious shortcoming. The 747, 737, 727, 707, DC-8's and DC-9's would be affected.

The bill would allow the airlines to raise fares 1½ percent to help cover the \$1 billion cost of the program. Initial capital would be made available through Government loan guarantees.

A most worthwhile side effect of this program—particularly in view of our aerospace and technical unemployment problem—would be the 2-year employment of 35,000 people to develop and install the retrofits. Another 105,000 jobs would be indirectly generated outside of the aerospace industry, according to the Aerospace Industries Association.

This legislation is truly national in scope. The 10 busiest airports are Chicago-O'Hare, 315,000 flights per year, Los Angeles International, 219,000, New York-Kennedy, 199,000, Atlanta, 157,000, San Francisco, 149,000, New York-LaGuardia, 126,000, Miami, 128,000, Dallas-Love, 122,000, Washington, D.C.-National, 118,000, and Boston-Logan with 104,000 flights annually. In three of our largest cities, the noise conditions under which airport area residents live would go from FAA's "unacceptable" to FAA's "acceptable" for 285,000 New Yorkers, 340,000 Chicagoans and 183,000 Bostonians. Similarly dramatic improvements would be made all across the country.

In California, for example, where the jet noise problem is extremely serious, conditions for an estimated 1 million residents living near the State's 18 jetports would be vastly improved.

Completing research and development on effective retrofitting methods could be done in 2 years if the \$35 million which the bill would authorize for this work were made available. A company which perfected and sold a successful retrofit program would be required to repay research and development grants out of its profits until full repayment had occurred. Over the last 5 years, \$25 million has been spent on noise reduc-

tion research by the FAA. Retrofits for 707's and Douglas DC-8's have been successfully tested already by Boeing.

I believe this legislation deserves broad support. It would significantly reduce the presently disastrous levels of jet noise pollution and make life bearable for millions of Americans who are now battered by airport area din and roar. What is more, the void of unemployment which the demise of the SST has created could be filled for thousands of talented but unemployed workers by implementing this program.

Waiting for 10 years to have new, quieter aircraft is unthinkable, particularly in view of the fact that current planes would still belch forth ear-splitting volume. We must have a program for retrofitting or retiring these planes now. With Government helping industry to eliminate noise pollution—as this bill would do—we can succeed in this vital effort.

A COMMEMORATIVE STAMP HONORING WILLIAM HOLMES MCGUFFEY

HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to declare my support for the issuance of a postage stamp honoring William Holmes McGuffey, compiler of schoolbooks and teacher of millions. Of the many educators in American history, none has had the influence of William Holmes McGuffey nor accomplished so much in the national behalf.

Born in 1800, and reared on a pioneer homestead in the "Western Reserve," McGuffey had little in the way of formal education until he had reached his teens, when his parents arranged for private lessons in Latin, provided by the pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Youngstown, Ohio. Yet his striking capacity to memorize marked him as a prodigy. During his studies with the pastor, he committed to memory entire books of the Bible and much other literature. In 1818 he entered the Old Stone Academy of Darlington, Pa., and thence proceeded to Washington College, from which he graduated with honors in 1826. Between his periods of college attendance, he taught school, chiefly in Kentucky.

In the early days of college education in the United States, McGuffey became known as one of the outstanding lecturers in several fields, principally moral philosophy. He never used notes, having only to recite from a vast store of knowledge he had memorized by heart. He was associated first with Miami University in Oxford, Ohio; later with Ohio University, where he served as president; later still at Woodward College, in Cincinnati, and the University of Virginia. He also played a leading role in the organization of the College of Teachers, an association formed to promote the interests of education, and labored for creation of a public school system in Ohio and Virginia.

Despite his long career as a college and university professor, which was surely

unparalleled at the time, McGuffey is best remembered as author of "McGuffey's Eclectic Readers," for use at the elementary school level. While teaching at Miami University he began, at the solicitation of a publishing firm, to compile a series of schoolbooks which have made his name a household word. McGuffey's Readers told you how to do everything. How to figure sums, how to spell, how to act in social situations, how to draw up a contract, how to deal with creditors, and almost everything else. They were phenomenal. The First and Second Readers were published in 1836, the Third and Fourth in 1837. These books—with the Fifth Reader, added in 1844, the Eclectic Spelling Book, added in 1846, and a Sixth, added in 1857—went through edition after edition, were revised and enlarged, and reached the fabulous sale of 122 million copies. Even the simplest lessons were designed to win the interest of the pupil, and the more advanced selections included well-chosen extracts from the greatest English writers.

McGuffey's Readers served to introduce thousands of American boys and girls to the treasures of literature and many other aspects of education. Their influence, moral and cultural, on American traditions of the 19th century, were absolutely tremendous.

On that ground, I declare my support for the issuance of a postage stamp honoring William Holmes McGuffey.

AMERICAN POW'S IN NORTH VIETNAM

HON. PAGE BELCHER

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to speak out of order on the issue of American POW's in North Vietnam.

Seven years and 25 days ago Capt. Floyd Thompson was captured in South Vietnam and became the first American prisoner of war.

Unfortunately, since Captain Thompson's capture we have seen that number grow substantially. Of course, it is impossible to determine the exact number of American prisoners, because of the lack of cooperation on the part of the North Vietnamese to disclose information to the immediate families of prisoners who have experienced a love one missing in action.

No one can dispute that this conflict has become increasingly more unpopular with each passing day; but regardless of the expressed support or nonsupport of the Vietnam conflict, I believe that everyone stands united in their concern for these brave American fighting men who have given so much to their country.

Seven years is certainly a long time for a family to be separated, and in this light I pray that the North Vietnamese will demonstrate humanitarian concern and provide for the immediate release of our servicemen.

TESTIMONY TO THOMAS W. GLEASON

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Thomas W. Gleason, the honored guest at this year's "Salute to St. Patrick" at the National Democratic Club in New York. Tom Gleason distinguished himself as a marine in World War II and is now a most notable and successful attorney. His father, Thomas W. Gleason, Sr., international president of the International Longshoremen's Association, was also a guest of honor. Mr. Thomas I. Fitzgerald, public administrator of New York County was the toastmaster of the affair. Also present were the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Philip J. Murphy, director of Catholic Youth Organization of the Archdiocese of New York; Patrick J. Cunningham, dinner chairman and Democratic leader of Bronx County; William H. Prendergast, president of the National Democratic Club; and, the Honorable James A. Farley, known as "Mr. Democrat" and first vice president of the National Democratic Club.

I insert in the RECORD, the statement made by Thomas W. Gleason on this occasion:

While I am deeply grateful for the honor you have bestowed upon me this evening, and which I accept in all humility, I must say that were it not for my wonderful parents, my family, my associates, my good friends in the International Longshoremen's Association, and all of you—my dear friends, I would not be worthy of being up here tonight. To all of you—my heartfelt thanks.

The real occasion of this dinner is to honor St. Patrick, the patron saint of that beautiful little country known as Erin. Every year traditionally in New York City, we celebrate St. Patrick's Day with a big parade, dinners and partying, with all our friends, though they be Jewish, Italian, black, Greek or any other race or nationality. Everyone loves to be part of the Irish heritage which has produced great personalities and contributed much in the fields of literature, entertainment, politics, philosophy, religion, science, labor, and industry. Just to name a few: George Bernard Shaw, James Joyce, Sean O'Casey, Siobhan McKenna, the Kennedys, Al Smith, George Meany, Cardinal Cooke, our friends here on the dais, Tom Fitzgerald, James A. Farley, Patrick Cunningham, the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Philip Murphy, William Prendergast, and Congressman John M. Murphy, and especially my father, Ted Gleason. There are many, many more.

Indeed, St. Patrick's Day is usually a great day for the Irish.

However, this year we cannot look forward to that day with much happiness or enthusiasm, for, once again, as in the past, that little country across the sea, is strife-torn. People are being tortured and murdered, they say in the name of our Lord who lived and died for peace on earth, good will toward all men. Actually, these horrible atrocities are being committed solely for political prestige and gain. Once again the Irish Catholics are being oppressed and slaughtered in cold blood by those with political power and control.

Our parents and grandparents loved Ireland—its beautiful way of life, its tuneful songs, the good cheer of the Irish and, above all—the warmth of their hospitality.

But when they could no longer stand being crushed under the heel of England, they fled and migrated in large numbers to this country. They have never forgotten that beautiful land of Erin. They nostalgically still sing its songs and dance its dances—even as they did in the old country.

How long can we, in America, continue to look upon these brutal conditions, without crying out against them?

If there is to be any meaning in our celebration here tonight and in the celebrations on the streets of New York, Chicago, Savannah, and other great cities next Wednesday, March 17th, it will stem from a unanimous agreement among all of us—Irish—friends of the Irish—and indeed all decent human beings—to beseech the President of the United States (who also traces his ancestry back to Ireland) and the Secretary-General of the United Nations to immediately call upon Great Britain to take the necessary steps to insure liberty, freedom and equality for all.

This can be achieved with very little effort—if only Great Britain has the will to act.

We must do all we can so that next year, when we celebrate Saint Patrick's Day, it will be with greater joy in our hearts, and with greater pride in the land of our forbears.

In closing, I am reminded of the words in one of my favorite Irish songs—Galway Bay—especially the last few lines—"and if there's going to be a life hereafter, and fate I'm sure there's going to be, I'll ask my God to let me make my heaven, in that dear land across the Irish sea."

RED-BEAKED VULTURES HOVER OVER FBI

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, once again I feel compelled to give expression here in the House of Representatives to the deep admiration and sincere gratitude felt by countless Americans for the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover's outstanding record of service to our Nation as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigations.

Such dedicated service should certainly be continuously recognized and it is tragic when our expressions of support must be given in the context of a defense against irresponsible charges. In some political quarters, however, it appears to be open season for villifying attacks and accusations against this distinguished public servant.

Those of us who are grateful for the leadership provided for so many years in the FBI by J. Edgar Hoover and who are proud of the high ideals for which he has always stood cannot listen in silence to these ill-founded defamatory remarks. One American who has given such fine expression of his support for the FBI Director is well-known news commentator Paul Harvey. I was extremely gratified upon hearing the April 5, 1971, edition of the Paul Harvey News and want to share an excerpt from this commentary with my colleagues in the House at this time:

RED-BEAKED VULTURES HOVER OVER FBI

The little jackals again are yapping at the heels of the lion. And the red-beaked news-

hawks are circling, hoping to dine on the carcass of J. Edgar Hoover.

But you and I have seen him outlive generations of them—and he will again.

When the FBI Director reported an East Coast conspiracy to sabotage our nation's capital and to kidnap a high-ranking government official, he kicked open a hornet's nest.

"Now we've caught the Director with an indefensible exaggeration," the Hoover-hounders decided.

"If it's true, Mister F.B.I., why don't you show your evidence to a grand jury and get the guilty indicted."

So he did—and they were.

Now the red-beaked newshawks and at least one member of Congress, with egg all over their faces, appeared pretty silly.

Thus personally angered—and determined to throw a smokescreen over the accused brothers Berrigan—they launched a counter attack.

It's not the first time the vultures have sought to get the un-gettable Mr. Hoover. I saw another generation of these same birds gang up on him when his agents arrested reds in 1940 and periodically since.

Then, as now, they sought to portray accused conspirators as persecuted and the Director as the persecutor.

Then, as now, they said the FBI was a "gestapo" and the Director should be forced to resign.

And the now-generation of cynics cannot conceive of any public official without a personal skeleton in his private closet. So this time their tiresome attack has included "surveillance" of the Director.

One of the Lilliputian scandal-mongers assigned his own "agents" to follow Mr. Hoover around; to wait outside his home and trail him to the office, to watch from a restaurant table near his.

Ostensibly, this childish charade is intended to show the Director how uncomfortable it feels for "an innocent person to be watched."

Actually, of course, the FBI does not conduct surveillance of any person except in instances wherein there is already evidence of a Federal crime.

His detractors, amateur and professional, know that. But what they are trying to do is to throw their own shadows over him.

One yellow journalist found a letter which the bachelor Director had written to a long-time family friend which Mr. Hoover had signed with the word, "Affectionately."

And the obviously innocent letter, when published, appeared under the headline: "Hoover's Letters to a Washington Widow."

Our nation's Number One Lawman, the personification of integrity, is not personally vulnerable. Always, however, there is a real danger that false charges might seriously injure the image and effectiveness of the FBI. That is Mr. Hoover's concern, and we must make it ours.

Congress passed a law in 1960 allowing Mr. Hoover to retire at full pay. Such is this man's love for his country than for ten years he's been working for us for love; not money!

Generations of taxpayers and eight Presidents have appreciated that rare degree of selfless loyalty; so do I.

THEIR SHIRTS AREN'T BROWN

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, in the March 12 issue of the New York Times there appeared an article authored by Maj. Gen. Ferd L. Davis,

adjutant general of the North Carolina National Guard.

Entitled "Their Shirts Aren't Brown," the article dealt with the twofold mission of the National Guard in working with the regular Armed Forces and civilian authorities. General Davis explained in detail the threefold mission of the Guard when working with civilian authorities during times of civil disorder. The article has received favorable comment from throughout the Nation and I commend it to my colleagues:

THEIR SHIRTS AREN'T BROWN

(By Ferd L. Davis)

In America we National Guardsmen have a twofold mission. First we provide immediate back-up support for the regular Army and Air Force our secondary but more highly publicized mission is that of providing military support for civilian authorities.

Military support of civil authority includes such duty as search for missing persons, service during hurricanes and other natural disasters, and restoration of order in civil disturbances. Normally our civil disorder duty is state duty, and it has resulted in some elements of our society regarding us as storm troopers.

National Guardsmen are neither *Sturmabteilung* nor *Schutzstaffel*; we have no desire to be regarded as either. In North Carolina we have avoided such characterization by having responsible commanders and capable troops carry out plans embodying both firmness and restraint during civil disturbance duty.

These commanders, upon my order as Adjutant General, leave their civilian pursuits and move into the troubled communities with armed troops and a variety of special forces including infrared sniper teams, gas and shotgun squads, and air-support groups.

Using the same rules of engagement as the regular Army, the guardsmen usually complete the task of restoring order with dispatch. For the North Carolina commander, however, restoration of order is but the first step of a threefold mission.

The commander then moves into what I am pleased to call a mission of mercy, because that is exactly what it is. After the breakdown of normal municipal operations and control, there are always people who are cold and hungry, in need of medical attention; we attend to their needs, get them back on their jobs, and get their children back in school. This phase usually requires about twice as long as the mere restoration of order.

The third aspect of the guard mission involves restoration—sometimes even the beginning—of communication between divergent groups in the community. By executive order of Governor Robert W. Scott, the North Carolina National Guard task-force commander is charged with coordination of all state forces in the disorder-ridden community, and we are diligent in using all our resources including Good Neighbor groups. When people start talking instead of fighting, they may not solve their problems; but at least the opportunity for solution exists.

Aside from the benefit to the community, the guard helps itself by this activity, since it lessens the chance of our having to return again to the same area. The financial loss sustained by a guardsman during civil-disorder duty varies according to rank and civilian occupation, but in most cases it exceeds \$100 in pay differential alone.

Obviously morale is helped by the fact that civil disturbance duty in a given municipality is a one-time proposition of short duration, and thousands of tax dollars are saved for other causes.

We work hard to keep the communications media and the public informed. As a practical matter, we have found that when we

make all the facts available, we usually do not have to worry about editorial interpretation.

Our method of operation is one that I used when I was a troop commander; when I became Adjutant General, I imposed it on the entire North Carolina National Guard. So far as I know, it has not cost me the friendship of any of my friends in the ghetto, on the campus, or elsewhere; but more important, it has not taken the life of any person and it has not resulted in injury to any of my guardsmen, to whom I owe a special obligation.

I believe this policy is sensible and humane; the Attorney General of North Carolina has approved it as being entirely in accordance with state law; and it is acceptable to the public.

Recently in Wilmington, for instance where we had a week of civil-disorder duty, we left with the thanks of local authorities and the white press. The Wilmington Journal, the local black newspaper, praised our efforts, reciting that we were "very cooperative and courteous. In 1898, the black press was burned. In 1971, the National Guard helped us."

Surely you will understand my pride of association with the fine young citizens who comprise the North Carolina National Guard. Their performance under stress surely justifies my appraisal of them as neither bumbling nor hardnosed, but efficient and disciplined, entirely worthy of the special trust reposed in them by a strong and thoughtful Governor.

I left my law office for the Adjutant General's office with considerable reluctance, not all induced by financial considerations; and I still miss the practice of law. But in Wilmington I realized all too well that when I returned to my law office, I should also miss participating in a conscientious effort to discharge a painful duty with both responsibility and imagination.

THREE SISTERS BRIDGE

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 18 years is a long time to wait for a bridge. And many of our colleagues in Congress are tired of waiting.

Eighteen years ago a bridge was proposed at or near the Three Sisters Islands in the Potomac River, to be a major link in the transportation system connecting the District of Columbia to Maryland and Virginia. Later, after careful study and evaluation, the Congress approved a balanced highway and rapid-rail system for the Washington metropolitan area, and included as an integral part of that system was the so-called Three Sisters Bridge.

That bridge has still not been built, Mr. Speaker, in spite of repeated mandates by our colleagues in the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Appropriations that it must be built, and in spite of the fact that desperately needed additional funds for construction of our subway/rapid-rail system have been held hostage to its construction.

As I believe all who read this RECORD will be enlightened by a chronological listing of background data on this con-

troversy. I insert such a listing at this point in the RECORD:

CHRONOLOGICAL LISTING OF BACKGROUND DATA ON THE THREE SISTERS BRIDGE PROJECT—UPDATED FEBRUARY 1971

1953: Bridge location recommended in report "Highway Transportation in Washington Metropolitan Area of Virginia" prepared by Wilbur Smith and Associates for the State of Virginia.

1959: Incident to the Metropolitan Transportation Study plan of 1959, exhaustive traffic studies by Wilbur Smith and Associates reaffirmed the need for a bridge at the Three Sisters site.

June 1960: Bureau of Public Roads approved Route 266 to the Interstate System—Key Bridge.

August 12, 1960: Board of Commissioners approval of Six Year Public Works Program continuing Three Sisters Bridge project.

November, 1960: NCPC approved D. C. Budget which included a request for engineering funds for the Three Sisters Bridge.

March, 1961: Bureau of Public Roads approved Three Sisters on the Interstate System instead of Key Bridge.

July, 1961: NCPC approved, in principle, the alignment of the Three Sisters Bridge (NCPC Plan 104, 1-517) July 13, 1961.

October, 1961: NCPC approved D. C. Budget which included funds for initial construction for Three Sisters Bridge.

November 22, 1961: Public Hearing.

1961: In D. C. Budget for Fiscal Year 1962, Congress approved funds for the design of Three Sisters Bridge.

March 1, 1962: NCPC reapproved the bridge site revised plan.

May 10, 1962: NCPC deferred motion for approval of modified plan for Three Sisters Bridge Interchange. (Mr. Wirth questioned the need for the Three Sisters Bridge).

July 19, 1962: NCPC Transportation Committee recommended that the subject of the Three Sisters Bridge be deferred.

1962: In D. C. Budget for Fiscal Year 1963, Congress approved funds to construct substructure of Three Sisters Bridge.

1962: In Conference Report No. 2548, it was stated that the Committee of Conference agreed that the Three Sisters Bridge project should proceed according to the plan set forth in the budget.

November 1962: NCTA report attacks need for Three Sisters Bridge, proposing a rail transit line to serve that corridor.

June 1963: Letter of June 1, 1963, from President Kennedy to Commissioner Tobriner requesting reexamination of certain requirements of D.C. Freeway System, including Three Sisters Bridge, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, HHFA, Commission of Fine Arts, NCTA, and the Department of the Interior.

July 1963: Establishment of Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) for purposes of reexamination requested by President Kennedy.

November 1963: Letter of November 7, 1963, from Commissioner Tobriner to President Kennedy, transmitting recommendations of PAC for the construction of a bridge downstream of Key Bridge, and indicating that it was hoped it would meet with the approval of the Commonwealth of Virginia. (Note: This is not the Three Sisters site.)

February 1964: Due to strong objection from Virginia to the location proposed by PAC, the District and the Commonwealth of Virginia agreed to secure the services of an engineering consultant to study each proposed bridge location.

September 1964: Receipt of consultant's (Howard, Needles, Tammen and Bergendoff) report of location studies. Study included three possible sites.

1964: Public Hearing.

March 1965: On March 17, 1965, PAC agreed

by a vote of 5-2 to locate the proposed new bridge crossing at still another site (Site No. 3 in above consultant's report) or upstream from the original Three Sisters site. Dissenters were NCPA and Park Service who challenged the need for any bridge in that area and indicated that they had devised a number of alternatives to prove it.

1965: On March 26, 1965, the Engineer Commissioner, D.C., forwarded a letter to NCPC requesting the inclusion of a Potomac River Bridge item on the agenda of the April 8, 1965, meeting of NCPC.

April 1965: April 1, 1965, letter from NCPC to the Engineer Commissioner stated that it would seem appropriate to postpone consideration of a Potomac River Bridge because the Department of the Interior's alternate plan was not complete.

April 26, 1965: The Engineer Commissioner, D.C., wrote a letter to NCPC indicating that the District of Columbia and the National Park Service had studied the Department of Interior's (National Park Service) proposal, and again requested that the bridge project be placed on the NCPC agenda, this time for the May meeting. There was no reply thereto, and the agenda did not include the bridge item.

May 25, 1966: National Park Service, the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Virginia entered into a Tri-Party Agreement, which recommended, among other things, a crossing of the Potomac River in the vicinity of Spout Run.

May 25, 1966: PAC endorsed the Three Sisters Bridge as a result of the Tri-Party Agreement referred to in the above item.

May 31, 1966: Board of Commissioners, D. C. approved PAC Agreement of May 25, 1966 including item involving construction of Three Sisters Bridge.

June 1, 1966: Arlington Planning Commission voted that if bridge was necessary, then it should be installed at the Three Sisters site.

June 5, 1966: Arlington County Board unanimously opposed any new bridge between Memorial Bridge and Chain Bridge.

June 9, 1966: NCPC voted 6-5 to approve a complete freeway system, including the Three Sisters Bridge.

September 13, 1966: NCPC holds public hearing—Three Sisters Bridge is among projects considered.

September 15, 1966: NCPC approved Stage 2 for I-266 Potomac River Bridge, from the north bank of the Potomac River to the south bank of the Potomac River.

September 20, 1966: Board of Commissioners, D. C. approved Central Potomac River Crossing. (Essentially the Three Sisters site).

September 27, 1966: Arlington County Board announced plans for legal block to proposed construction of Three Sisters Bridge.

September 28, 1966: District of Columbia entered into a contract for the design of a proposed river crossing in the vicinity of Three Sisters site.

November 30, 1966: Suit filed to stop work on four major freeway projects in the District of Columbia, including the Three Sisters Bridge.

March 9, 1967: NCPC approved general alignment of the Potomac River Freeway from the river crossing to 31st Street, N.W.

April 6, 1967: NCPC voted to request the Department of Transportation to study the feasibility of constructing a tunnel across the river at this site—the report was to be furnished to the Commission's staff by April 19, 1967.

May 2, 1967: Commission of Fine Arts rejected the proposed designs for the Three Sisters Bridge.

May 4, 1967: Letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Chairman,

NCPC indicated that the evaluation and feasibility study concluded that a bridge is the better alternative at this site.

May 5, 1967: NCPC agreed to Stage 3 approval of the bridge, provided that the Department of Transportation determined that additional laneage was needed in this corridor.

July 13, 1967: Requested to be placed on NCPC agenda.

August 24, 1967: Letter from the Chief Planning Engineer, Department of Highways and Traffic, D.C. to the Chairman, NCPC requesting Three Sisters Bridge item be placed on next Commission agenda.

September 14, 1967: At NCPC meeting, the Engineer Commissioner attempted to have bridge item placed on agenda for Stage 4 approval—attempt failed by a 5 to 5 vote to sustain the actions of the Chairman in disapproving agenda item.

September 20, 1967: Commission of Fine Arts approved unanimously the newest design for the proposed Three Sisters Bridge.

September 22, 1967: Requested to be placed on October NCPC agenda.

December 29, 1967: Favorable action by Council of Governments required under Section 204.

February 9, 1968: Court of Appeals order to stop all work.

August 23, 1968: 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Act signed by President Johnson.

December 11, 1968: NCPC adopted Major Thoroughfare Plan with Three Sisters.

December 12, 1968: City Council approved Major Thoroughfare Plan as presented by NCPC (Resolution 68-73).

January 17, 1969: Federal Highway Administrator eliminated Three Sisters Bridge and other projects.

August 9, 1969: D. C. Council action to comply with 1968 Federal-Aid Highway Act.

August 13, 1969: Turner (Federal Highway Administrator) rescinded January 17, 1969 letter.

August 27, 1969: BPR authorizes construction.

September 24, 1969: Start construction on river piers.

October 8, 1969: Army Corps of Engineers approval to excavate for piers.

October 15, 1969: Federal Highway Administrator stated Section 4(f), (DOT Act) and Section 138 of Title 23 had been met.

October 15, 1969: Request for temporary restraining order was denied by Judge Sirica.

October 20, 1969: Request for preliminary injunction on the bridge was denied by Judge Sirica.

November 5, 1969: The Appeals Court denied the appeal for preliminary injunction.

January 12, 1970: Judge Sirica ruled on summary judgment in favor of the defendants.

April 8, 1970: The Appeals Court panel of Bazelon, Wright and McKenna remanded the case to Judge Sirica's court for a hearing concerning compliance with Title 23 of the U.S. Code. This judgment was appealed for an "En Banc" judgment by the Appeals Court. The request was denied.

May 6, 1970: As a result of the Appeals Court ruling, a motion was made for a preliminary injunction to stop construction on the bridge. This was denied by Judge Sirica.

August 7, 1970: Judge Sirica issued final judgment concerning his findings of compliance with Title 23. His judgment enjoined the District of Columbia from continuing with the final project.

August 15, 1970: The Bureau of Public Roads and the Highway Department entered a contract with the Portland Cement Company to build a one-tenth scale model of the proposed Three Sister's Bridge for safety testing of the bridge's design.

December 14, 15, 16, 1970: Design Public Hearing held.

WE MUST CHANGE, OR GOD HELP US

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, once in a while one comes across a piece of writing which points up a strong and general public conviction on a major national issue, with unusual eloquence and feeling.

This week I came across such a piece of writing. It is by Charles M. Cooper, editor of the Pryor Daily Times in Pryor, Okla. and takes the form of an open letter to his three children, written in the aftermath of the conviction of Lieutenant Calley, and published in the Times of April 1, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I know there is a divergence of opinion on the conviction of Lieutenant Calley, and I do not expect all my colleagues to agree with Mr. Cooper's remarks on that subject.

At the same time, the issue goes much deeper than the merits of the verdict of one court-martial; it goes to the very root of such major questions as our national unity and our national defense. These are issues to which Mr. Cooper addresses himself, and I believe his thoughts on this issue are both moving and impressive.

I include Mr. Cooper's open letter, "We Must Change, Or God Help Us" in the RECORD:

WE MUST CHANGE, OR GOD HELP US

MARCH 31, 1971.

DEAR BILL, CHIP, DELILAH, AND JACK: I scarcely know how to begin this letter to you, because even in the beginning I'm on the defensive. Bill, you are a devout, practicing Christian, not due to your home influence even though we are spasmodic Sunday school attenders, but with more power to the mysterious ways of the Lord, probably more in spite of it. You are number one in the lottery draft, in good health, and know that sometime in the future service to our country as a member of the Armed Forces is a fact, either before or after you complete medical training.

Chip, you are also a talented young man, with basic intelligence beyond that of your parents, and a personality and brilliance of wit that portends a great future for you in any chosen profession, whatever it may be. You, too, will serve, in one capacity or the other.

Delilah, the light of my eye, the delight of my heart, this goes to you, too. Even though you are a young woman, the young man whose engagement ring now graces your finger, is now serving our country aboard an aircraft carrier . . . a floating battlefield . . . which in a few short months will again be in an arena of combat against that nebulously described foe, "the aggressors . . . the Communists . . ." He is Fighting There to keep From Fighting Here. (The capitalization is mine but you can hear it in the tones of every politician's voice wherever they speak.)

And to you, Jack, the last product of your mother's and my love, although you are only 11½-going-on-12, the United States has been involved in Vietnam since 1954 when the Air Force helped evacuate French from the fallen capitol of Dienbienphu . . . that's 17 years ago this coming May 8 . . . over five

years before you were born . . . we've been in war or near war since 1939—this too will apply to you because the conviction of Lt. William Calley, Jr., will be a point of crystallization of American opinion. It will be a focal point in the destiny of the United States and the world as we know it.

Changes in the world come now with such speed that my mind is overwhelmed. A man on the moon. A living, breathing, human being much as you and I actually walking on the moon. Imagine it!

Pictures of Mars. Radio analysis of the atmosphere of Venus. Transplants of human organs, although not always successful, still a body continues to think and feel and breathe. Complicated pieces of machinery which, at man's puny directions, spurt out complex calculations beyond comprehension faster than the speed of light; vast new discoveries; exciting new concepts in the sciences; further exploration of space and the depths of the seas which cover four-fifths of this small dot in the Universe called the earth.

No wonder the American public flees at night to its electronically controlled cave for protection against Beasts and Bugs and Things that Go Bump in the Night. No wonder escapism through drugs or sex or alcohol or communes or flowers or long hair. It boggles the mind.

How to tell you that an event of three years ago, at a little cross roads in Vietnam so small that news maps don't even show it, has brought about changes that will effect the history of mankind. How to tell you that all your mother and I have tried to teach you may have been wrong.

We've tried to let you grow, each separate from the others, and each as an individual because you are each individuals. We've tried to impart right and wrong, do's and don'ts with a minimum of parental guidance.

I know that you've probably rolled your eyes when I recall, "did I ever tell you about the time during the War . . ." I know that you've probably snickered, even with fondness and love in your heart, as you saw me proudly, a little self-consciously, put on my American Legion cap, and march out the door just a little bit straighter, a little bit prouder, than my five foot seven inch 135 pound body should be, or has any right to be. And probably snickered again when sometimes I would come bouncing off the walls, cussing mildly, later on in the evening, carooming gently from here to there, perhaps humming discordantly, the dog barking, the shoes dropped. Kerplunk. Pause. Grunt. Kerplunk. Collapse.

But, kids, I had been for a few brief moments out of the month a sincere part of an organization dedicated to the principles of right over might, preservation of law and order, committed to upholding and defending the Constitution of the United States, the greatest document in the history of mankind, firmly believing in a 100 percent Americanism for an America composed of all the races known to man: I had pledged devotion to peace and good-will on earth, based on a sense of individual obligation to the community, state and nation, and only a few short hours before, vowed to transmit to you, my posterity and your peers the principles of justice, freedom and democracy.

We've tried to teach you that this great, sprawling, busy, wonderful country of ours is worth fighting for, and we still believe that. To deny it would be throwing a lie in the teeth of our heritage. It would make the lives of generations of your forebears a lie.

Conquered Croesus said to Conquerer Darius that no man in his right mind prefers war to peace, for in war, the fathers bury their sons while in peace, the sons bury the fathers.

I had much rather you had to bury me than I you. I have no desire to go again as a member of the Armed Forces, firmly believing, as a confirmed civilian, that two wars on one 43-year lifetime, are enough. But, ah, my children, my loves, fruit of my loins, there's the difference . . . it was then . . . when I went . . . A WAR!

In big, screaming four-inch headlines. A WAR! There was no doubt; there was no ideological dissent; no intellectual quibbling. It was WAR full blown, drum beating, pulse racing, bands playing, flag waving, give-all-for-our-country-WAR. The lines are not so clear now, but Lt. Calley's war is still war. You get just as dead now as then.

Your grandfather was in the Naval Air Force in Italy in 1917 when the only bombs they had were six pieces of metal spikes with stabilizing vanes.

Your great-grandfather's brother, until the day he died, at the age of 97, had a suppurating shin wound received on a little rise above the plains of Cuba named after St. John. Your other great-grandfather's uncle was Gen. Douglas H. Cooper who fought, we are told, gallantly and well . . . and probably killed some civilians . . . during the Civil War. Fought there for an unrealistic dream . . . a separate and equal Confederate States of America.

Further back, not counting the renegades, when the fledgling Colonies were flexing their wings to give the American Eagle wings, your ancestors fought for independence against the madman German, the old Crazy George III, an English king, who could scarce speak the King's Own English.

Yes, you have a heritage; you are typical Americans for in your veins flows the blood of English, Irish, Scotch, French, German, Indian, and God knows what other ethnic groups. You have a heritage but who am I to tell you what to do with it when almost everything I have believed comes crashing down with a verdict which condemns a man who has done no more or less than your ancestors . . . when a man is condemned to life imprisonment at hard labor for the rest of his natural life . . . for doing his job . . . killing the enemy.

Ecclesiastes tells us (Bill, you can probably cite verse and chapter) that to everything there is a season. A time to keep . . . to cast away; a time for silence . . . and to speak; a time of war . . . and of peace.

It is time to speak out in this time of war; a time to cast away that which is bad and a time to keep that which is good. It is time, maybe, to revise our teachings that our government can do no wrong; the democracy will continue; the republic will survive.

I believe it is time that we examine our society and our peerless leaders who bring us to this great chasm of dis- and un-belief in the precepts which we have crushed to our heart. They bring us here, you know, only because we let them.

(Unbelievably, within the hour that Calley's penalty was announced, the Selective Service System announced a Defense Department request for a 15,000 man draft call for May! What unmitigated, bare-faced, ludicrous ironic timing!)

My loved ones; my friends; my children; my posterity, I believe that from this day forward (mark the date well), unless the American people take a prayerful, soul-searching look at themselves and their government; unless new priorities and new thrusts, to use the gobbledygook of today, are found; from this time when the system trains a man to kill and then takes away his dignity and honor for doing what he has been trained to do; from this time forward, the decline of the American Republic is as fore-ordained as the fact that the sun will continue for millions of years. From this time forward . . . unless rapid and peaceful, meaningful and truthful changes are immediate.

Your mother and I have but one goal in life; to feed and clothe; to educate, to teach, train and instruct you in the best possible manner we know and the best possible paths that we can direct. I remain a hawk if labels are necessary, firm in my conviction that for freedom of the majority, sacrifices must be made. But the sacrifice of Lt. Calley as a scapegoat cannot in consciousness receive my support.

I don't deny—because Calley has never denied—that he killed.

Who can deny the fact of a napalm bomb? Or the B-52 bombers; or the atomic bomb, the most heinous crime ever committed against mankind although justification can be found when a million lives estimated to be lost in an invasion are weighed against 300,000 lost to the bomb?

Are we to go back in time and try Harry S. Truman who gave the order for Nagasaki and Hiroshima? Or the pilot and bombardier of the Enola Gay?

I do deny that the common, ordinary, hard-working, everyday, middle-class American citizen such as I is going to stand still, quiet and meek, while Lt. Calley is a sacrificial lamb.

The vast unprecedented American reaction to the Calley findings, as I said, provides a pivotal point in the annals of America; and of mankind. We will examine ourselves and bring about change for the better or we shall wither and die; a young nation, the strongest nation the earth has ever seen, will re-examine our path or we shall grow sere and sapped by our own hates and mistrusts; our own lack of direction.

We can no longer go on as a nation riven by ideological differences. Race against race, workers against drogues; hawks against doves, republicans against democrats, youth against age, establishment against anti-establishment, pigs against protestors.

You deserve a better inheritance than that. We must change.

I see this hope, this faint glimmer of hopeful light shining ahead. Reaction to the Calley trial will once again weld us into a nation of peacekeepers, a nation of doers, of activists; a nation, indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

It must weld us together, for if it doesn't, God forgive us.

If it doesn't, God save us.

Love to you all,

YOUR DAD.

OUR POISONING OF VIETNAM

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today when every politician has his pollution program, when protection of the environment is a major tenet of most political speeches, the United States continues to unleash ton after ton of tear gas, herbicides, and defoliants in Vietnam against men and environment. Since 1961 when our policy of defoliation began, 15 percent of South Vietnam, an area the size of my own State of Massachusetts, has been sprayed to the saturation point. Thirty percent of the tropical hardwood forest, a major staple of the Vietnamese economy, has been doused with chemicals. The equivalent of 600,000 man-years of food, 500,000 acres, has been destroyed.

These are frightening figures, more frightening, because they represent only a portion of the violence and destruction

reigned upon Vietnam. This ecological devastation is part of our heritage to this Asian country which the United States went to defend and protect. It is a bitter heritage, lasting longer than American troops or commitment. These are thoughts we should all reflect upon as the Senate begins its deliberations over the Geneva Protocol of 1925, banning the "use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases." I recommend to my colleagues Anne Wyman's article "Our Poisoning of Vietnam" which deals eloquently with this subject:

OUR POISONING OF VIETNAM

(By Anne Wyman)

Just under half a century ago the United States played a leading role in drawing up the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning "the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases." This spring the US Senate, which under the Constitution must give its advice and consent to the ratification of treaties by a two-thirds vote, is deliberating whether to join 96 of the world's nations as a signatory to that protocol.

The thing that holds up ratification now is the diminished but continuing use of tear gas and herbicides or defoliants by US forces in Vietnam. And, if the Senate does advise ratification of the Protocol, it must also decide whether or not to consent to Administration reservations allowing that program to continue.

The defoliation program in Vietnam operates under the ironic code name of "Operation Ranch Hand" with the cheery motto—reminiscent of our national parks and Smokey the Bear—"only you can prevent a forest."

Since 1961 when defoliation began, 15 percent of South Vietnam (an area larger than the whole of Massachusetts) has been sprayed to the saturation level. Thirty percent of the tropical hardwood forest has been doused with chemicals. More than half of the coastal mangrove trees have been wiped out. Crops over 500,000 acres, the equivalent of 600,000 man-years of food, have been destroyed.

This trail of ecological devastation will be the heritage of the Asian country the United States went to defend and pacify, long after American troops have been withdrawn. And these attacks on nature have continued at a time when protection of the environment was a major platform in every political speech on the home front.

Yet only last Aug. 27, the Senate voted 48 to 33 against an amendment to the military procurement bill that would have banned the use of defoliants in Vietnam. On Aug. 19 (nine months after he promised to do so on Nov. 25, 1969), President Nixon sent the Geneva Protocol to the Senate with a report by the Secretary of State stating that the Protocol does not prohibit the use in war of chemical herbicides. While not as strong as a formal reservation, this "understanding" leaves the use of tear gas and defoliants wide open.

Herbicides have been used in Vietnam to clear the perimeters of friendly bases as a prevention of surprise attacks, to open roads so that friendly forces could move without fear of ambush, to expose enemy infiltration routes to aerial surveillance, to uncover enemy bases so that hostile camps had to be moved, and to destroy crops being grown for enemy forces.

It is argued that defoliation of the mangrove forests between Saigon and the sea successfully hindered attacks on cargo vessels and that the chemical treatment of the triple-canopy jungle north of Saigon was effective in exposing enemy sanctuaries and infiltration routes. And the U.S. Mission to Vietnam stated in 1968 that "the military benefits in terms of lives saved and other

factors have far outweighed certain adverse economic effects."

In fact, it has become increasingly difficult to balance the military effectiveness of defoliation with the moral and practical objections.

In the case of Operation Junction City, which involved spraying large areas of jungle near Cambodia in 1967, defoliation was only part of the "pacification" tactic so its effectiveness cannot be clearly calculated. Where roads have been sprayed, friendly forces become more visible targets still within rifle range, while the enemy easily finds alternate routes. Even the spraying of the deep jungle has adverse military effects since the resulting penetration of sunlight produces an impassable tangle of bamboo and vines. Further, because it takes many days to act, defoliation gives the enemy warning of a coming offensive.

Crop destruction has proved still less productive. As early as 1967, two studies by the Rand Corp. based on interviews with Viet Cong prisoners, showed that less than five percent of the enemy depended on locally grown crops, that varied rice portions were unrelated to crop-sprayed areas, that surrender due to hunger was not allied to crop spraying and that the drift of herbicides from spraying had serious effects on friendly farmers.

The greatest effect has been on the Montagnards of the Central Highlands, a sturdy independent people who are looked down on as an inferior race by the South Vietnamese and considered by American troops among our staunchest allies. Because of their animist religion, the Montagnards believe the spraying constitutes a curse on their terraced valleys. As a consequence they sacrifice their animals including water buffalo, and move away to wind up in refugee camps.

Herbicides were dropped in sufficient quantities to destroy the food of the entire Montagnard population. And although crop spraying was supposed to be limited to "remote unpopulated areas" until it was finally stopped just before the Senate opened hearings on the Protocol on March 5, photographs show that there were freshly thatched huts in the valleys.

Closer to Saigon, the loss of major hardwood forests stretching in an arc from the Cambodian border to the South China Sea will have a lasting effect on Vietnam's economy. Nearby Malaysia which has similar forests, earns \$300 million a year from the export of forest products.

And the mangrove swamps, once South Vietnam's major source of high-sheen charcoal fuel and an important source of nutrients for fish, are now bleak turfy bogs of raw mud, open to erosion and killing invasions of salt sea water.

Last summer's vote on an amendment that would have cut off funds for the use of herbicides for crop destruction warfare had only four supporters among the New England delegation. They were Sens. Kennedy (D-Mass.), Muskie (D-Maine), Pastore (D-R.I.) and Ribicoff (D-Conn.).

Opponents of the amendment included Sen. Edward W. Brooke, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island, who is presently chairman of the foreign relations subcommittee on ocean, space and the environment. Other key figures in this year's vote will be Sen. George Aiken (R-Vt.) who submitted the new Nelson resolution barring the use of herbicides under the Protocol at this year's hearings, and Sen. Thomas J. McIntyre (D-N.H.), chairman of the Senate Armed Services subcommittee on research and development, charged with reporting on such things as chemical-biological warfare.

The United States stands in a distinct

minority before the United Nations on this subject, having been one of three nations which voted in December 1969 against a resolution by the General Assembly stating that the Geneva Protocol prohibited all chemical weapons in "international armed conflict" specifically mentioning "chemical agents of warfare . . . which might be employed because of their direct toxic effects on man, animals and plants . . ."

Eighty nations voted in favor of the resolution, 36 nations abstained and only Australia, which is participating in the Vietnam war, and Portugal, which uses herbicides against African tribes in Angola, sided with the U.S.

Yet crop destruction violates a current US Army field manual and two international treaties to which the United States is a signatory. The field manual, 27-10, issued in 1956, states that soldiers can destroy food crops by harmless chemical or biological agents if they are intended solely for enemy forces and if that fact can be determined. This is based in part on a Hague convention of 1907 forbidding the use of "poison or poisoned weapons" in war and on a 1949 Geneva agreement which states that occupying powers may not destroy food supplies in an occupied nation.

Last April, President Nixon banned the use in Vietnam of agent "Orange" containing a defoliant known as 2,4,5-T. Yet military sources in Saigon have revealed that this defoliant was used five times between May 8 and Aug. 19, 1970, by the Americal Division in two northern provinces.

Last Dec. 26 the White House announced an "orderly, yet rapid, phase-out" of herbicides, using up supplies remaining in Vietnam only on "the perimeters of firebases and US installations or remote unpopulated areas." Since remote unpopulated areas have included valleys densely populated by Montagnards, it is clear that the White House order allowed the continued use of herbicides against our own friends in Vietnam.

It is not a commendable picture. It is not even a sensible one. In addition to violating environmental principles preached in America, the use of defoliants and herbicides hurts South Vietnam more than it hurts the enemy and leaves the country economically weakened at the very time the United States is trying to withdraw.

Ironically, passage of the 1925 Geneva Protocol as submitted by the President, will not end defoliation in Vietnam, or elsewhere. Only by rejecting the "understanding" which exempts the use of tear gas and herbicides, and by approving the Protocol with a clear agreement that it includes all forms of biological and chemical agents in international conflict can the United States end a tactic that makes more enemies than friends.

HISTORY OF THE GENEVA PROTOCOL

1922—Washington Treaty banned "the use in war of asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases." Ratified by the US Senate but never came into effect because France rejected it.

1925—Geneva Protocol included the above language and also banned "the use of bacteriological methods of warfare." Approved by the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Debated one day on Senate floor in December, 1926. No vote taken.

1927-'47—Protocol remained in Foreign Relations Committee.

1928, Feb. 8—Geneva Protocol became effective. To date it has been joined by 96 nations including every major country except the United States.

1943—President Roosevelt pledged that the United States would never be first to use chemical-biological agents in war.

1947-'59—Protocol returned to Executive Branch without Senate action.

1959—Rep. Robert W. Kastenmeier (D-Wis.) introduced a resolution (H Con Res 433) calling for reaffirmation of "the longstanding policy of the United States that in the event of war the United States shall under no circumstances resort to the use of biological weapons or the use of poisonous or noxious gases unless they are first used by our enemies." The resolution was opposed by Departments of Defense and State. No action taken.

1969, Feb. 14—President Nixon confined US activities on toxins to defensive research.

1969, April—Sen. William J. Fulbright (D-Ark.), chairman Senate Foreign Relations Committee, asked President Nixon to resubmit the Geneva Protocol.

1969, Nov. 25—President Nixon renounced the use of lethal biological or germ weapons and ordered Department of Defense to dispose of existing stockpiles. He also promised to resubmit the protocol.

1969, December—United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution stating that the Geneva Protocol prohibited all chemical weapons (a move aimed directly at US chemical activities in Vietnam). The vote was 80-3 with 36 nations abstaining. Opposing were Portugal, Australia and the United States.

1970, Aug. 19—The protocol was resubmitted to the Senate with a reservation on the right to retaliate with chemical weapons and an understanding that herbicides are not included.

1970, Dec. 26—President Nixon announced a phase-out of the use of defoliants in Vietnam and restricted the use of herbicides to clearing areas around allied base camps.

1971, Mar. 5—Hearings open before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

HOW NEW ENGLAND SENATORS VOTED

A breakdown of the Senate vote of Aug. 27, 1970, on the Nelson-Goodell amendment to the military procurement authorization—aimed at cutting off funds for the use of herbicides for crop destruction warfare—showed seven New England senators voting against the ending of crop warfare, four in favor and one absent. The amendment was rejected 48 to 33. The President took no stand.

Connecticut: Abraham Ribicoff (D) yes; Thomas J. Dodd (D) absent. (Dodd has since been replaced by Lowell P. Weicker, a Republican.)

Maine: Edmund S. Muskie (D) yes. Margaret Chase Smith (R) no.

Massachusetts: Edward M. Kennedy (D) yes. Edward W. Brooke (R) no.

New Hampshire: Thomas J. McIntyre (D) no. Norris Cotton (R) no.

Rhode Island: John O. Pastore (D) yes. Claiborne Pell (D) no.

Vermont: George Aiken (R) no. Winston L. Prouty (R) no.

LEGALITY OF HERBICIDES

At the American Association for the Advancement of Science annual meeting in Chicago, Dec. 29, 1970, Prof. George Bunn of the University of Wisconsin law school, a disarmament expert, cited the following grounds for finding the use of herbicides in war illegal:

1907 Hague Convention, to which the United States is a party, forbids the use of "poison or poisoning weapons" in war.

1949 Geneva Agreement, to which the United States is a party, forbids occupying powers from destroying food supplies in an occupied nation.

1956 Army Field Manual 27-10, still in current use, says soldiers can kill crops only if they are solely for use by enemy troops and if that fact can be determined. It further states that the principles of the 1949 Geneva pact apply "in areas through which troops are passing and even on the battlefield."

INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY AND IMPORTS

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago our unenviable trade position was attributed to our booming economy. It was said that the boom attracted imports while at the same time it dampened exports because our home market was more attractive than foreign markets.

As our economy contracted, it was taken for granted imports would decline while our firms would turn with greater zeal to exports. This would turn the tide.

Now it is clear that our imports have continued to rise, moving from \$36.05 billion in 1969 to \$39.9 billion in 1970. This was an increase of slightly over 10 percent, compared with a rise of only 4 percent in our gross national product. In other words our imports grew over twice as fast as our GNP.

Mr. Speaker, it should be obvious to everyone that we are overexposed to import competition. We badly need trade legislation that will bring imports under control.

It is often said that our inability to compete with imports convicts our industries of inefficiency. This is a false accusation and should be shown up for what it is. Recently the shallowness of the claim was exposed in a speech by O. R. Strackbein, whose competence in the field of trade needs no testimonial to Members of Congress expect those who have only recently been elected.

Mr. Strackbein analyzes the concept of industrial efficiency, especially as it bears on import competition. I ask unanimous consent that his speech may appear at this point in the RECORD, and I recommend that it be read by all Members for the light it throws on efficiency and competition:

REMARKS OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, PRESIDENT, THE NATION-WIDE COMMITTEE ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY, AT CLAREMONT MEN'S COLLEGE DISCUSSION, CLAREMONT, CALIF.

AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL EFFICIENCY, VIS A VIS, IMPORT COMPETITION

As the share of world exports enjoyed by the United States has continued to decline and as a growing number of domestic industries have come under increasing import pressure, the question of relative American industrial efficiency has come to the fore.

Since the great majority of our industries find themselves in a deficit position in world trade, which is to say that imports exceed exports of their products, the reason for this unenviable position has become a matter of major concern. Too many economists jump to the conclusion that lagging exports in relation to imports of the same product represent an indictment of relative inefficiency of our domestic producers.

A considerable burden thus rides on the word "efficiency," and it would be useful to define it. There is perhaps no better measure of comparative efficiency than the average output per man-hour or man-year of workers employed in producing the product in question, assuming roughly equal quality.

Thus the relative efficiency of steel mills could be measured by the average tonnage of crude steel produced per man-hour or man-year by each mill. Coal productive efficiency would be measured in the same manner. While such measurements are not precise in terms of ounces or milligrams, no such precise measurement is necessary. Tonnage measurement is close enough to serve all practical purposes.

Too often "efficiency" is thought of as personal willingness to work or speed of movement. Yet we have only to imagine a coal miner with a shovel working himself into a lather in a vain effort to keep up with a mammoth coal digging machine that may scoop 200 tons in one bite, to recognize that something other than fast muscular movement is the decisive factor. The phenomenon of labor-displacement by machinery in this country is well enough understood without belaboring the question. Output per man-hour or man-year is the ultimate test.

However, there is another aspect of "efficiency" that is not always understood. Inefficient mining may mean nothing more disparaging than working low-grade ore, even if the most productive machinery is employed. Inefficient agriculture can also mean farming poor land, or having small acreage in relation to the machinery employed. A twenty-acre field of wheat cannot be operated efficiently even if the most advanced machinery is used, assuming that the machinery were devoted entirely to this small plot. It would represent a wasteful use of capital. Relative inefficiency in the economic sense therefore does not of itself suggest slow movement of the workers or even poor methods of production. In the modern technological world it more surely means use of antiquated or obsolete machinery or the use of modern machinery and methods on an unrewarding resource (a low-grade ore, infertile soil or the like) or in bad proportion (as in over- or under-capitalization, thus representing deficient management or judgment.)

The indictment of a domestic industry as "inefficient" on the mere grounds of inability to compete with imports is therefore to be shallow, brash and imperceptive. Without a bill of particulars such an indictment cannot be entertained seriously.

If a domestic industry were indeed backward technologically in comparison with its foreign counterpart it could properly be indicted for relative inefficiency.

A further observation that is commonly encountered is that it is the "labor-intensive" and relatively low-wage paying domestic industries that are most vulnerable to import competition, while the "capital-intensive," which is to say the highly mechanized industries, need have little fear of import competition even though they pay the highest wages. Usually they are identified as the export industries.

For years academic economists feasted on this dubious fare and recommended it to all and sundry, especially the students of economics in their classes. Today they know better.

It was said that we had but to look over the landscape of trade for identification of industries that enjoyed the highest exports and which ones, on the other hand, were most beleaguered by imports. Surely the automotive industry led the list of "capital-intensive" and efficiency industries. Moreover it paid the highest wages, and, as might be expected, it was a leading exporter. The steel industry, too, it could be seen, was capital-intensive, and it too paid high wages, and it also exported much more steel than we imported.

Today these eager voices are muted. The economic thought that produced the earlier

conclusions was too shallow. Both the steel and automotive industries have shifted from a comfortable export position to a deficit in exports. Yet both are still in the forefront of high wages and capital intensiveness. It was not their capital intensiveness that underlay their previous success in exports. Rather it was the technological backwardness of their foreign competitors. It was not the fact that these industries paid high wages that they were able to display a high competitive prowess. True enough, their high wages reflected high productivity; but today these high wages, which are still neither more nor less justified than before by high productivity, represent a competitive liability.

Why? Other countries have overtaken us or have come within shouting range of our productivity while their wages are still far behind. They have not fully understood that mass production has no future without mass consumption, supported by mass purchasing power, the latter depending on wages high enough to absorb mass output.

Therefore it was not our capital intensiveness or our high wages considered in a vacuum that gave us competitive muscle. It was the lack of equal capital intensiveness abroad that brought us our advantage. When other industrial countries adopted our system after World War II and installed modern machinery and equipment they too became highly productive per man-hour; not because their workers worked themselves into a lather, but because the new machinery greatly enhanced worker output. Their competitive advantage then does not arise from their superior efficiency but from somewhat equal technological standing, backed by lower wages than the Americans. Had the foreign wages risen in proportion to the increased productivity, the competitive status of the foreign industries would have remained the same. Since the wages, or, better, total earnings, did not keep pace in those countries with rising productivity their industries improved their competitive position *vis a vis* their American counterparts.

It is, of course, true that not all industries are equally advanced in point of technology. Some product-manufacture appears to defy mechanization or at least does so until some inventive genius finds a revolutionary principle and succeeds in applying it. Inventiveness, however, cannot be scheduled. Some of it is accidental. In any event an industry that is in the forefront of technology in its own field is as efficient as any other industry that is similarly in the forefront in its own industry, even though the former is not as far advanced technologically as the latter. It will be no less competitive with its foreign counterpart that depends on the same or lower level of technology than its more advanced technological brother industry. One makes steel, let us say, and the other pottery. Steel-making has been the beneficiary of more inventive skill than pottery, possibly because the product is more homogeneous. The steel industry could therefore pay higher wages, and, so long as its foreign counterparts still lagged in modern technology, it could compete successfully in foreign markets despite the lower foreign wages. It had no fear of import competition. Pottery could not compete, not because of relative inefficiency in the technological sense but because output per man-hour was not far enough ahead of its foreign competition to overcome the wage-gap.

It is at this point of comparison that the textbook economists perform a neat sleight-of-hand. Since the lesser capital-intensive industry lacks the higher productivity of the highly mechanized industry it cannot pay as high wages. It is vulnerable to import competition. The economists, ridden by their doctrinaire concepts, take advantage of the

economic definition of inefficiency and apply it to the low-technology industry such as pottery. Thus they succeed in saddling the industry with the sobriquet "inefficient" which in the popular mind means something quite different, such as laziness, incompetence, poor judgment or lack of energy and ambition, rather than technological lag.

Yet the owners and managers of the technologically backward industry may be in the very vanguard of personal efficiency, both here and abroad. They may be wide awake, dynamic, innovative, sound of judgment and vigorous. They are nevertheless berated for inefficiency, i.e., economic inefficiency, as previously described, while the brand in the eyes of the public takes on the color of guilt or culpable backwardness. Inefficiency is not admired in this country. No distinction is drawn between personal inefficiency and technological lag. It is possible therefore to say and to be believed, that since such and such an industry cannot compete with imports it is inefficient and is entitled to no sympathy or public concern. Yet in a few years' time some unheralded invention might boost productivity to the point of competitive equality or better.

This blind and prejudicial indictment is then followed by the judgment that any industry that cannot compete with imports should be allowed to fall prey to imports. The resources which it employed should be shifted into other fields of production in which we are more "efficient."

To this peremptory dismissal there need be no objection if the industry or industries were inefficient in the personal sense. No one would wish to maintain a slothful and incompetent ownership or management in being by public support of any kind.

Should the "inefficiency", however, be of the other kind, i.e., resulting from low grade ore, inferior soil or technological lag, several considerations must first be entertained and disposed of. If we insist on keeping open mines having only low-grade ore when high-grade ore is available, and should protect them with a tariff or an import quota, the action would be uneconomic. Only some other consideration, such as national security, could justify continuation of the operation. If no national security justification could be sustained, the operation should indeed not be publicly supported.

If, however, the industry or mine or farm, did not suffer by comparison in point of technology, ore analysis or soil fertility, with that of their foreign competitors, i.e., if everyone were equally unfavored by nature, the domestic industry should not be dubbed inefficient if it were confronted with a wage differential operating to its competitive disadvantage in its competition with foreign producers or operators. After all, it has little or no control over the wages it has to pay.

In other words, an American industry is not properly called inefficient without examining the factors of competition and determining that the industry is indeed the victim of sloth, incompetence, mismanagement, nepotism, extravagance or the like. A bill of particulars should be spelled out. It should say, if it were to be credible, that the domestic industry on the whole has not availed itself of the modern technology available to it, that it has been asleep, so to speak, and has not bestirred itself as becomes competent management in the premises.

Even under these circumstances it should be ascertained that the failure to invest in new plant and equipment is not traceable to a form of import competition that enjoys such a wide margin of advantage, because of lowness of wages, that even available modern technology could not overcome its lead, or, that the domestic industry must operate at such a narrow margin that it has no surplus capital available.

This is to say that the imputation of inefficiency should not be loosely applied to an industry. The competitive disadvantage in relation to imports may be wholly without blame. No industry can properly be blamed for not making a productional discovery that would lift its productivity if it has applied itself diligently to this endeavor. To be sure, investment in research and development may be helpful in this direction, but it carries no guarantee; also, it is expensive. If an industry does its best and is indeed in the forefront in this respect it may still fall victim to a competitive disadvantage through no fault of its own and for reasons that lie well beyond its control.

CLASSICAL EXAMPLE OF ACHIEVING COMPETITIVE STATUS

We have a classic example of what is involved in becoming sufficiently efficient to compete with a variety of competitors. This is supplied by the coal industry.

Coal mining was a thriving industry during World War II and a few years beyond. Then it was confronted with several developments that faced it with a very cruel choice: become competitive or take the road to extinction. Diesel oil, imported residual fuel oil and natural gas were the competitors.

In relation to these other sources of power coal was "inefficient." It could not produce energy fuel at costs that could compete with its new rivals. It was not, however, a question of how fast the picks and shovels could be made to move. What was needed was machinery that would displace platoons of miners working with pick and shovel. No one could properly say that the coal miners were lazy or that management was incompetent; but, in relation to the other fuels, coal mining in the economic sense had become inefficient.

The question was: where is the road to adequate efficiency and how is it to be found?

Contrary to some notions, *employee compensation* is indeed the predominant factor in production-costs. In American corporations it is some 80% of total cost. The rest is interest, rent, profit, etc., and even interest and rent are not free of the employee compensation burden.

Very well: were wages too high in the coal industry? Or was output per worker too low? If so, what could be done about it? One or a combination of two possibilities presented itself: namely, wage reduction or worker displacement or both. No point would be served by considering the first alternative. The United Mine Workers stood in the way. Contrary to possible expectations the Union did not obstruct the second alternative; and that was the path taken.

In 1950 some 483,000 mine workers were employed in the coal industry. By 1965, after the introduction of mammoth coal extracting machinery the number had declined to 140,000; and today it is lower yet. Upward of two-thirds of the miners were displaced. Today American coal is competitive throughout the world. We export about 50 million tons per year, or some 10% of our output, some of it as far away as Japan and Italy.

Meantime in 1965 the Appalachian Regional Commission was established to help at rehabilitation of the displaced miners. The cost is not far short of \$300 million per year.

THE COST OF INCREASING EFFICIENCY

Thus we gain some perspective in the field of increasing efficiency. The cost, when the rise in efficiency must be as great as it was in the coal industry, is high both in money and in human consequences.

Our steel industry is hard pressed by imports. Presently a self-restricting arrangement by the leading exporting countries has contained some of the potential damage. Imports have been cut back from about

18 to 14½ million tons a year out of well over 100 million tons.

To become wholly competitive the domestic steel industry would have to cut costs some 20% or more. 1.3 million workers are employed at making steel, from ore and coal mines, to railroads, etc. A 20% reduction in the number of workers would not cut the cost precisely 20% but would go far in that direction. This would mean disemployment of 260,000 workers.

We would thus soon have another Appalachian problem.

Should the same cost-trimming process spread to the textile industry, the electronic, the footwear and a score of other industries, any hopes of full employment in this country could quickly be dismissed. The textile and apparel industry could perhaps, but not surely, achieve competitiveness at the sacrifice of 500-600,000 jobs. A more likely reduction would be over a million jobs.

American industry and agriculture are in a peculiarly vulnerable position *vis a vis* imports. Our wages are the highest in the world. Our efficiency in terms of output per man-hour or man-year is no longer *sufficiently* above that of our foreign competitors to offset the lower wages prevailing in the foreign countries. There are exceptions, but even these are fading.

Not the least deplorable aspect of this condition lies in the loss of the species of expanding demand, that in the past opened up a vast domestic market for new goods enjoying an elastic demand, such as the automobile, refrigerators, washing machines, radios, etc., in response to lower production costs proceeding from mass production. Today imports, arising from foreign exploitation of our patents, through licensing or establishment of branch plants abroad, rob our economy of such job-breeding developments. Television sets, tape recorders, record-players, etc., are made more cheaply abroad and by this fact they crash and sometimes pre-empt the waiting mass market tapped by lower prices, that in the past was looked-for bonanza offered by new products.

An elastic demand does not distinguish between foreign and domestic products. The lower prices on foreign goods soon drain the domestic market to which new industries could look in the past. The effect is much the same as abolition of the patent system. We can no longer enjoy the fruits of our own inventiveness.

The need for legislation, as represented by the Mills bill, should be self-evident. If we do nothing to curb imports one industry after another will be badly disrupted by imports, whether the industry be new or old. The pressure to move abroad will increase. We need a market-sharing concept in practice—one that will extend to imports a fair share of our market while preventing their running wild. A sharing of our market growth is also justifiable but it does not follow that we should deliver our market to imports willy-nilly.

We control and regulate nearly all other aspects of our economy, and so does the rest of the world. Our economic planning, including full employment, will be outflanked on the seaward side if we do not guard these flanks. There is little likelihood that foreign wages will rise sufficiently in relation to our own to bridge the wage gap; and therein lies the trouble. There is nothing mysterious about it.

To run an efficiency race with other industrial countries today is a losing contest. The side effects in the form of unemployment alone are intolerable. A regulated economy such as ours must be controlled all around or liberated all around. It cannot tolerate free trade while depriving our producers of nearly all competitive flexibility.

The striving for greater efficiency demanded by import pressure beyond that of

domestic competition can only result in a growing employment problem because our success can be matched by the foreign. Our competitive position is then not improved. How then absorb the 2 million new workers coming on the domestic scene each year?

PRODUCING WORSE OFFICERS

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the opportunity to ask our distinguished former colleague, the Secretary of Defense, about his views on a volunteer military force. Mr. Laird, in reply, made what I thought was a very pertinent observation, namely, that if a volunteer force were to be successfully obtained we would have to acquire a better attitude in this country toward the military profession than we currently have.

In this connection it seems to me highly important that we stop attacks upon the ROTC program, the ROTC being the prime source from which we obtain trained and educated officers with a civilian orientation and background.

I commend to the favorable attention of my colleagues the following editorial on this subject from the Arizona Republic, which was reprinted in last Sunday's edition of the Chicago Tribune:

PRODUCING WORSE OFFICERS

Anti-military critics frequently note that Lt. William Calley flunked out during his freshman year at Palm Beach Junior College while Capt. Ernest Medina never made it past high school. The implication is that the military is composed of dumdums and that we could use more educated officers in the military.

In a fascinating article in the December, 1970, issue of *Alternative*, publication at the University of Indiana, a professor explains how the very people who talk about the need for educated officers have done most to prevent our having them.

Ward Elliott, assistant professor of political science at Claremont College, says that these are the people who pressure colleges to get rid of R. O. T. C., the mainstay of our efforts to procure educated Army officers. Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth and Columbia have already dropped it, and it is under heavy attacks in all but a handful of campuses where it exists.

But, Elliott argues, R. O. T. C. answers the special needs of a country that sends the top third of its young people to college and has long feared and avoided a large professional army. As C. Wright Mills observed, military control in history has been far more the rule than the exception. The U. S. has been one of the few exceptions because we have not until recently had a large standing army and we have relied heavily on nonprofessional undertakings. Yet today, when we have a large standing army, there is strong sentiment for professionalizing the army by abolishing R. O. T. C.

Prof. Elliott notes that the Army R. O. T. C. produces much better officers than officer candidate school at far cheaper cost [\$5,000, against \$12,000]. O. C. S., he says, is geared to produce small-unit leaders in the combat arms. It draws in people like Calley and

Medina, who know how to fight but cannot handle intellectual challenges beyond the high school level. It teaches them rudimentary military skills and discipline, then sends them out in charge of a platoon.

R. O. T. C. develops a much better range of talent, perhaps because the colleges have succeeded in cornering most of the talent. Indeed, a recent study indicated that the overall achievement of R. O. T. C. cadets was notably higher than that of West Point cadets. And the elite schools, which produce only a few hundred of the 15,000 to 20,000 lieutenants commissioned each year, produced superior officers—the ones more likely to know how to think, those more likely to have been exposed to the intellectual mainstream. Yet it is at those schools where the anti-R. O. T. C. bias is greatest.

The article brilliantly destroys the arguments against withdrawing credit for R. O. T. C. or forcing it to relocate away from campus. But its most cogent argument is that we cannot afford to segregate the military, to banish it to second-class citizenship, to isolate its members from intelligent appraisal, concern, and restraint.

War is not a problem to be dealt with from ignorance, Elliott says. And if we continue our attacks on R. O. T. C., making these attacks a favorite intellectual pastime, we should not be surprised by the result.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK E. WASHBURN

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, compassion for our fellowman is a quality which has made America the great nation that she is, and is a characteristic in America which distinguishes us from other, more regimented societies.

The Judea-Christian ethic, "Love thy neighbor," has been embedded in us since childhood, and our society has reaped the benefits many times over.

No where is this more evident than in business' practice of hiring the handicapped. In an act that was initiated out of compassion, business has found that it is "good business" to hire those who appear to be disadvantaged. As a result, human compassion has been an economic benefit for the business, as well as the individual concerned.

Businessmen have discovered that the special skills developed, in order to overcome a disadvantage, have become an asset in industry. They have discovered that handicapped workers are, very often more satisfied with their task than those who do not have an apparent disadvantage.

An individual who has been bringing this message to the business community for years is Frank Washburn, the chairman of the South Bay Mayor's Committee on Employment for the Handicapped.

Employed by the Garrett Corp. in Torrance, Calif., a firm that has had an active policy of employment of handicapped persons, Mr. Washburn is presently serving as chairman of the South Bay Mental Health Committee on Employment for the Handicapped, and was a committee member of the California Department of

Rehabilitation Statewide Planning Committee.

He has served as master of ceremonies for the annual National Employment of the Physically Handicapped Week kick-off luncheon for the past 5 years, and in 1968, he served as a panelist at the annual President's Committee Meeting in Washington, D.C.

As a member of the Torrance Chamber of Commerce and as a member of the business community, he is a strong advocate of improving attitudes in the business sector in order to allow wider acceptance of the handicapped individual into those occupations at which he is skilled or can be trained.

Mr. Washburn's compassion is shared by his wife, Betty, and his daughter, Pam, and I am sure that their dedication matches his.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased to join the applause of both the business community and the handicapped in commending Frank Washburn for his efforts in behalf of his fellow man.

THE ADMINISTRATION CHEATING THE ELDERLY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, the problems of the senior citizens in America who constitute at least 10 percent of our population have been brought out very vividly by an expert in this area in the Boston Globe. I quote herewith a recent column by Mr. Joseph Levin entitled "The Administration Cheating the Elderly."

The revelations in this column constitute one more reason why a select committee on the problems of the aging would perform a very valuable service in the Congress of the United States:

THE ADMINISTRATION CHEATING THE ELDERLY
(By Joseph Levin)

Pardon me if I don't join in the cheering over the belated passage of the Social Security increase by the US Senate. It should have been passed a year ago. You can read the details in the news columns. The measure, if accepted by the House and signed by the President, offers little or no political credit to either Republicans or Democrats.

Meanwhile, an inquiry into the steady disintegration of the Federal Administration on Aging, the key government agency for the elderly, is already under way. Last week kicked it off with a rugged confrontation between President Nixon's special advisor on aging—John B. Martin—and the House Labor and Education Committee's so-called select Subcommittee on Aging.

At the same time, Chairman Frank Church of the Senate's Special Committee on Aging and Sen. T. F. Eagleton, who chairs a subcommittee on aging in the Senate Welfare Committee, announced a joint hearing on Mar. 25, 29 and 30.

The senators, in this year of the decennial White House Conference on Aging scheduled for the fall want to know:

—Why appropriations for AoA were cut back from \$32 million for fiscal 1971 to \$29.5 million for fiscal 1972 (which begins

July 1). Actually, Congress authorized \$105 million for AoA spending.

—Why the slow pace of preparations for the White House Conference.

—Why the continued downgrading of AoA by cutting its Title III funds heavily and transferring Titles IV and V programs to another agency. Title III programs—community services—are considered the backbone of the agency.

—Has the Older Americans Act of 1965 creating AoA been nullified by administrative actions, and does a constitutional crisis exist as a result.

Also disclosed last week is a confidential White House plan to dismantle VISTA, the embattled domestic volunteer service agency sometimes described as a domestic Peace Corps.

The Nixon plan would replace VISTA with four new corps for public safety, health, ecology, and education. Lost in the shuffle would be the vital VISTA services for the elderly.

The transfer of AoA's Title IV and V programs for research and training to another agency—where they will lose visibility and easily be scrapped next year—and the move to junk the elderly roles under VISTA apparently spell out a Nixon administration decision to slash spending in behalf of the elderly.

Senior Set welcomes signed letters from readers.

AN OUTSTANDING TEENAGER

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, 17-year-old David D. Jaques, a senior at Depew High School and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Donald Jaques of 82 Rossiter Avenue in Depew, N.Y., represents the finest example of outstanding young leaders in my 39th Congressional District.

For over 2 years, David worked relentlessly and successfully to organize the S. J. Chart Chapter of Demolay. For his service to this character-building organization of young men, 14 to 21 years of age, he was awarded the high honor of Demolay master councillor.

In addition, David was selected this year as an outstanding teenager for 1971 in recognition of his unselfish service to his community and other accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, David is chairman of Young Adults for Good Government and the recipient of a \$50 U.S. savings bond from the Lancaster Order of Elks in recognition of his youth leadership.

While maintaining an 85 scholarship average, David has quarterbacked his high school football team for the past 2 years, is a member of the volleyball team which has been undefeated for two seasons, the varsity track squad and the school band and chorus.

Majoring in music, he plays the trombone and baritone tuba.

David's goal is to teach elementary education.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to know, and to have such a young man as David Jaques among my constituents.

STRATEGIC ARMS IMBALANCE

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the Reader's Digest of February 1971, draws attention to the growing imbalance between the strategic forces of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Mr. Charles J. V. Murphy outlines some of the military areas which should be of the greatest concern to all those citizens who understand that Soviet nuclear superiority and the long term, and perhaps even short term, survival of the United States as a free nation are incompatible.

Mr. Murphy understates the Soviet strength in some areas, probably due to reliance on our continually low intelligence estimates of Soviet deployment rates. There are now 17 Soviet Y class ballistic nuclear submarines operational rather than 15. There are also approximately 88 nuclear launchers at sea on Soviet G and H class ballistic nuclear submarines. Within the next 3 months the number of Soviet Y class, these are similar to our Polaris, is expected to increase to 20 with 15 more in some phase of construction.

Mr. Murphy points out that the Soviets are well ahead of the United States in the area of active ballistic missile defense measures. This defense includes four ABM complexes—ABM-1—operational in the area around Moscow which is referred to as the Soviet heartland. This Galosh System, as it is known, uses multistage, solid fueled missiles, carrying a 1-2 megaton warhead with a range of several hundred miles. It appears suitable for high altitude area defense.

In addition to these four ABM complexes already operational the Soviet surface-to-air missile No. 5, quite a number of which are deployed, may well have an ABM capability when integrated with the appropriate radar. It should be remembered in connection with the current SALT talks that this integration—inter-netting—with the radars cannot be detected by means of aerial observation.

If we wish to preclude the possibility of the Soviets secretly achieving a greatly increased ABM capability it will be necessary to insist that adequate on-site inspection be part of any agreement dealing with ABM limitations.

While the defensive capability of an aggressor nation may not seem, at first glance, to be of great importance when considering those factors which make nuclear war unlikely, in reality this is not the case. When it is recalled that a first strike capability, that is the ability to achieve a favorable decision using nuclear weapons, is achieved by enhancing ones offensive and defense strategic capability through a combination of counter-force weapons and ballistic missile defense systems to the point where one lowers the possible retaliatory damage to an acceptable level, the meaning of the

growth of the Soviet defensive capability against our counter-city weapons takes on added significance.

The authors figure for SS-11's should be upped from 800 to 900. The SS-11 is deployed in hardened silos and could serve quite well in the capacity of a counter-city reserve force. A counter-city reserve force in this context is one which is held in reserve after the main strike is launched against our land based ICBM's and B-52's and used as a bargaining counter to surface that portion of our Polaris-Poseidon fleet which has not been destroyed in port.

Since this article appeared Senator HENRY JACKSON has reported, and this report has been partially confirmed by the Department of Defense, that the Soviets are deploying an entirely new missile equal in size, or larger than, the currently operational SS-9 25-megaton missile. Senator JACKSON reports that the Soviets have the capability to deploy in 1 year 60 to 70 of these massive new missiles. This type of deployment would by itself have more total megatonnage—destructive power—than we have currently deployed in our entire Minuteman force.

The article, optimistically entitled, "Our Strategic-Arms Advantage Is Fading Fast," follows:

OUR STRATEGIC-ARMS ADVANTAGE IS FADING FAST; THE QUESTION NOW IS: DO WE LET THE UNITED STATES SINK INTO SECOND-CLASS STATUS?

(By Charles J. V. Murphy)

Eight years ago, in the last hours of the Cuban missile crisis, a cryptic warning was flung out by Soviet negotiator Vasily Kuznetsov. Meeting with a personal representative of President Kennedy, Kuznetsov knew full well that his Kremlin colleagues were in humiliating retreat, and that U.S. power was vastly greater than Russia's. Yet at the end of the discussion he said bitterly, "This is the last time you Americans will be able to do this to us."

Clearly, despite the circumstance, this was a cold threat: At the next showdown, it would not be the Soviet Union that would buckle for want of the strategic military advantage. That ominous danger is now rapidly materializing around us.

In the aftermath of the Cuban miscarriage, Soviet planners made a crucial decision: to strike out for military superiority on earth. And, in the years since, Soviet military technology has exploded.

In the field of missilery, the Soviets have the 100-foot-tall SS-9, which generates about three quarters of a million pounds of thrust and costs about \$30 million in its silo. The first SS-9 was spotted about 1963. In the summer of 1968, an SS-9 spewing three separate re-entry vehicles—no doubt the start of a multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicle (MIRV) warhead—was tested in the western Pacific. By the end of last summer, nearly 300 of these monster missiles—each capable of throwing a 25-megaton warhead or three separate five-megaton warheads—had been marked by U.S. intelligence as being operational or under construction.

Seven years ago, the Soviet navy possessed no ballistic-missile submarine comparable to the U.S. Polaris. But three years ago, a full-blown Soviet equivalent went to sea. Like the Polaris, it was armed with 16 missiles, and their 1500-mile range was, in a developmen-

tal sense, only a step or two behind the then current Polaris weapon. Now, at least 13 of these Y-class nuclear-bombardment submarines are at sea, and currently at least 15 new ones are under construction or being outfitted for sea. The force is being increased by six to eight vessels a year and the ways on which they are built are seldom empty.

Should the present construction rate be maintained, the Kremlin's Y-class force will outnumber our Polaris force by 1973-74. What's more, the Russians have lately tested a naval missile, possibly for the Y-class forces. This weapon has a range approaching 3000 miles, which matches that of the present Poseidon, a more accurate MIRV-equipped Polaris.

The Illusion of Parity. Counting all of their strategic-missile systems—the land-based and on submarines—the Russians now muster about 1700 weapons on launchers. That is about as many as the United States has, not counting, of course, the approximately 300 bombers that are to remain in the Strategic Air Command's active inventory well into the 1970s.

But the arithmetic, to the extent that it suggests parity or balance, is illusory. Since the mid-1960s, the Soviet Union has more than tripled its total number of strategic-range missile launchers, and has just about quadrupled the megatonnage "throw weight" of its strategic offense forces. In the same period, by reason of the retirement of SAC's oldest bombers and the early intercontinental ballistic missiles, U.S. megatonnage was actually shrinking by some 40 percent, and our strategic forces have been standing still. The U.S. Polaris force, for example, stopped at 41 in 1967; the Minuteman force stopped at 1000 in silos earlier that year (actually the bulk of the force was in place several years before); and the last B-52 bomber came off the assembly line in 1962.

The momentum of the Soviet strategic-weapon systems shows little sign of slackening. The Russians are now developing or have deployed no less than five separate ICBM systems. In 1967, they began the testing of a space bombardment system—the Fractional Orbital Bombardment System (FOBS). They have flown in prototype and could well be preparing for production a strategic-range supersonic bomber whose performance the U.S. Air Force can match only in a blueprint.

On the strategic defensive side, they have been building and testing anti-ballistic missile systems for a decade, and have an elaborate and costly ABM system functioning in the crucial Moscow-Leningrad corridor. "In strategic defense," says John R. Foster, Jr., U.S. director of Defense Research and Engineering, "there is no parity."

No. Choice. In 1969, when Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird warned that the Soviet SS-9 force in being or in preparation numbered 220 missiles, the estimate was widely ridiculed by those pushing for nuclear disarmament. Now the number is close to 300 and continues to grow. It has been estimated that a total of 420 such missiles, each carrying a triple warhead, would be sufficient to paralyze the entire U.S. Minuteman force in a single blow. The Soviet force could reach this level by 1974-75.

In the meantime, the other part of the Soviet land-based ICBM force, consisting of SS-11 and SS-13 missiles armed with warheads in the Minuteman range (about one megaton), already numbers more than 800 weapons on launchers. It is rapidly drawing abreast of our Minuteman force numerically and is improving in quality. The more recent warheads have penetration devices for outfoxing radar defenses and are now armed, like the MIRV versions of the Minuteman and submarine-launched Poseidon, with multiple, separate re-entry vehicles.

Overall, the strategic balance is shifting so rapidly against the United States that by 1975, according to conservative Pentagon calculations, the U.S.S.R. will have a substantial edge in both numbers of launchers and aggregate "throw weight" potential. Few among us want to admit the implications, but on the evidence the Russians look to be moving deliberately to a first-strike posture, whatever name they may give it. It was this rising prospect that induced Secretary Laird to say in a recent interview that the United States would have no choice but to embark on another tremendous increase in defense spending if the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) should fail to bring a slowdown in the Soviet buildup by the fall of 1971.

Critical Expertise. It is not alone the vast acquisition and deployment of strategic-weapon systems that causes the Soviet Union to cast so menacing a shadow across the future. Rather, it is the already huge and ever-increasing Soviet investment in technological research and development and in the technical manpower to serve it.

In the history of industrial nations, there has never been anything to equal the Soviet Union's single-minded concentration on the task of training and mobilizing a technical elite. Six times as many engineers now graduate as did a decade ago; that's five new Russian engineers for every one being graduated by American universities. Should the present trends continue, the Russians, by 1985, will be pouring half a million new engineers into the state bureaucracy each year, while the United States will be adding a mere 50,000. The Russian strategy is obvious: this is the expertise critically needed for devising military applications for scientific discoveries.

During the past five years, the Soviet high command has raised its spending on high-technology, defense-related Research and Development (weapons, space vehicles and atomic energy) by more than 50 percent—from \$10.4 billion a year in 1965 to an estimated \$16.1 billion this year. Meanwhile, the American investment in R & D has been leveling off, principally because of the high cost of an infantry war in Vietnam. Today, with a considerably smaller total military budget (about \$60.4 billion in 1969, compared to a total of \$84.4 billion for the United States), the Soviet Union spends more on the advanced military technologies than does the United States.

Soviet annual funding for purely military R&D (apart from space and atomic weapons) is currently running at about \$10 billion a year, and lately has been increasing by \$1 to \$1.5 billion annually. The American figure, about \$7 billion, continues to sink. In truth, the gap is widening faster than figures show, for inflation is sapping the purchasing power of the U.S. dollar for scientific and engineering purchases by as much as eight percent per year. In Russia, there has been no inflation as we know it because of their controlled economy.

Who Is No. 1? The United States still commands unmatched reserves of capital, machinery, research facilities and a unique competence in organizing intricate projects. In quality, U.S. technology remains superior to that of the Soviet Union, although probably only marginally. But the overwhelming American strategic dominance has disappeared, and with astonishing speed.

That outcome was inevitable. The growth of U.S. strategic forces was deliberately arrested in the mid-1960s, on the reasoning that the Russians sought only parity or balance—the power to deter, that is—and that once they achieved this on the strategic side, the nuclear arms race would slow down. The unabating growth of the Soviet strategic

forces suggests the contrary. Far from settling for balance, the Russians seem bent on reversing the strategic inferiority which compelled them to back out of Cuba. Now the question is: Do we allow the pendulum to continue to swing, and let the United States sink into second-class status?

Safety scarcely lies in that choice. Being second in the field of strategic technology could, as John Foster has pointed out, render the United States vulnerable in a sense we have never known. "It stands to reason," he says, "that a capital investment in R&D exceeding our own by several billion dollars a year will yield the Russians important, perhaps even decisive, discoveries."

"By 1975, if the present disparity in investment should continue, I would fully expect to find the Russians with major new weapon systems deployed, or ready for deployment, which will represent a technological surprise to us; systems we do not now see, or may not know about or even suspect, but which may be in intense development. Mr. Kosygin's successor will have more choices in weapons and strategy than Mr. Nixon's will have."

From this point on, if we are to escape uncomfortable technological surprises, if we are to avoid the very real danger of our allies deserting us for a stronger power, we Americans had better start bracing ourselves in a sensible way for the severest challenge we have ever experienced. Only a few months ago, President Nixon told legislative leaders, "If present trends continue, the United States, a very few years hence, will find itself clearly in second position—with the Soviet Union indisputably the greatest power on earth."

In September, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Rep. L. Mendel Rivers of South Carolina, finally said aloud what more and more men around the President have been privately thinking. At the end of a long and detailed analysis of the weapons and technological situation, Rivers reminded the House of the President's prophecy and said, "I am afraid that that day has already arrived."

U.S. POLICY TOWARD GREECE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a decade our Government's foreign policy has been confined within the boundaries of a misleading and obsolete conception of world politics. The consequences of our country's disastrous involvements throughout the world have signaled the necessity for rethinking and redrawing the course of American diplomacy, and yet our policymakers stubbornly cling to what former United Nations Ambassador Charles Yost calls "the simplistic conception of an apocalyptic bipolar global struggle."

That Mr. Nixon and his advisers still view the world through this severe political myopia means that our foreign policy will continue to lead us through a labyrinth of international blunders and fiascos.

U.S. policy toward Greece is an excellent illustration of this tragic misperception. Amply supplied with outdated strat-

egies designed to contain a nonexistent monolithic Communist threat, our political leaders have enabled our Government to become willing bedfellows with an unconstitutional, repressive, and totalitarian military regime. In the name of pro-Americanism, the United States has ironically bolstered a dictatorship committed to the very antithesis of our own Bill of Rights.

It is quite conceivable that the Papadopoulos dictatorship is only the first sign of a malignant cancer. Should U.S. policy continue in this direction, the result could well turn out to be the destruction of European Democratic institutions.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter in the RECORD the following article by John A. Nicolopoulos, professor of history, State University of New York at Albany.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD GREECE

The recent rash of political incidents involving the military in a number of countries maintaining defense ties with the United States should alert all thoughtful Americans to an urgent, if not entirely new, problem facing the formulators of U.S. foreign policy.

It is, in effect, becoming increasingly clear that U.S. appeasement of the Papadopoulos dictatorship in Greece has encouraged similar tendencies in the neighboring NATO countries, Italy and Turkey. Extremist elements connected to the military establishments of these countries interpreted American support of the Greek junta as an extension of the so-called Mann doctrine—providing for a "pragmatic" attitude toward dictatorial regimes in Latin America as long as they do not threaten U.S. foreign policy interests "directly"—to the Mediterranean. In reaching this conclusion, they were amply assisted by the propagandists of the Athens regime.

The institutions developed by the Greek colonels since 1967 were perhaps even more influential in this connection than their propaganda: the Papadopoulos group came up with a formula for "legitimizing" and perpetuating military domination for the political process, which has been the distinguishing feature of post-World War II dictatorships outside the Communist bloc, in a way at least superficially acceptable to the major defender of Western democracy, the United States.

The key to the political structure devised by the Greek colonels is the Supreme Council of National Defense, an omniscient body in which the ostensibly civilian Prime Minister is superseded by the Chief of the Armed Forces, who, in his turn, presides over a pyramid of armed forces councils organized along the junta's constitution, rubber-stamped by the totalitarian plebiscite of September 29, 1968, and hailed by the State Department as a step toward the restoration of democratic government in Greece.

Papadopoulos' formula opened new avenues for Right-wing extremism, caught in a political cul-de-sac since World War II and the disgrace of the pre-war Fascist parties. The army could now take the place of the totalitarian party as the vehicle of the great "Conservative Revolution" which would save "Western civilization" both from Communism and its own "weakness."

The work of synthesis accomplished by the Greek military law-makers is indeed remarkable. They resurrected the rhetoric of the Truman Doctrine and the Greek civil war, picked up the concepts developed by the French "ideological colonels" in the

course of the colonial wars in Indochina and Algeria and subsequently improved upon the American theorists and practitioners of counter-insurgency, added a dash of Arab national socialism—and served up the mixture with the ceremonial of a Latin American "National Revolution".

It should be noted that before the Papadopoulos breakthrough the prospects of the military as a political force in Europe were marginal. De Gaulle had had no great difficulty in checking the French colonels who repeatedly attempted to seize power in the course of the Algerian war; statesman-like Turkish generals did likewise, the most recent instance being the limited intervention against Premier Demirel followed by the retirement of twenty activist officers who favored a Greek-style takeover, the Greek high command itself had been able to snuff out a colonels' coup in the course of its execution in May, 1952, and several more in the making later. It was due to a remarkable comedy of errors that Papadopoulos was given the chance not only of seizing power, but of consolidating his dictatorship by a vertebrae Hitlerian Gleichschaltung disguised as an "operation" on the diseased body politic of Greece which would bring about a "healthier" democracy.

Papadopoulos' emulators in Turkey and Italy have now suffered setbacks and the realization of the slogan shouted by Italian Neo-Fascists during the recent disturbances, "Ankara—Athens—Rome", does not seem imminent. But the abyss will not be entirely drained unless the United States decisively abandons the mealy-mouthed vocabulary of "pragmatism" in order to clearly and unequivocally dissociate American policy from the enterprises of extremist cliques under the cover of Pro-Americanism. Otherwise, the danger of Fascist restoration in Europe will remain with us, the ultimate advantage of Communism, which is a more effective form of totalitarianism, bound to prevail in any kind of confrontation.

THE BATTLE IS DECLARED

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, taxpayers in many parts of the country are on the verge of revolt. Taxes have become too high. Taxpayers cannot afford to pay for the services their State and Federal Governments are providing for them.

I recently read an editorial by editor Richard Higgin in the Lake Lilliam Crier which contained a lot of good common sense on this tax situation.

I liked particularly editor Higgin's concluding paragraph:

Somehow we've got to get back to dependence on ourselves, forsaking government help, before the tax problem will get a bit better.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert this editorial in the RECORD and commend its reading to my colleagues and all of those who read the RECORD:

THE BATTLE IS DECLARED

It should be no surprise to see taxpayers revolting against oppressive taxes. Many have seen it coming for many years and are only surprised that it took so long for people to wake up and realize they're being victimized.

Now we find in both Kandiyohi and Meeker counties taxpayers' groups growing madly and taking steps to get government on all levels to hold the line on spending and to get an amendment to the state constitution passed which would limit the amount of taxes which can be levied against property.

Meeker taxpayers are sponsoring a rally at the Litchfield Armory, Mar. 27, 1 p.m., when Charlie Berg of Chokio, head of the taxpayers' group, will speak. At this meeting a statement will be passed around for signatures of those who will pledge to withhold payment of taxes unless a satisfactory tax amendment goes into effect.

Concerned Taxpayers of Minnesota are planning a march on the State Legislature, 10 a.m., April 3, to demand just tax legislation. And throughout the state many other actions are being taken.

Are they justified? I think so. Property taxes have been increasing constantly, and took a terrible jump this year. They are at the point where they actually are oppressive and might close to being confiscatory.

Will they get the results they ask? I rather think they will. Disgruntled taxpayers are numerous enough and are becoming organized enough so they can force the legislators to do something.

But, will it solve the problem? This I doubt sincerely. There are too many angles to this matter which aren't even being considered by the taxpayers' groups. Perhaps they are already tackling a big enough order without getting bogged down on other ramifications.

The root of the problem, of course, is that while these same taxpayers are demanding that the line of spending be held and that taxes be lowered, they still want more and bigger services from the various units of government. And they keep voting for the people who put them even further into a hole.

What we must have first of all is a genuine desire by all people to not only reduce taxes, but to decrease government service, as well. Nothing else will help.

Unfortunately, we have a governor and a legislature of the same type we've had for many years. As they've done for many years, they sympathize with the overburdened real property taxpayers and utter platitudes, and promise, not a holding of the line, not cutbacks in spending, not less demands by state agencies on local governmental units—but of all the silly dodges—they promise a "broader tax base."

What's a broader tax base? Does it mean that I will pay a much smaller portion of the cost of government? Of course not! It's merely another way of picking your pocket so you don't know whose hand is in there.

The politicians will tell you they're going to "plug the tax loopholes and make the tax dodgers pay your share", or that they're going to find "new" sources of tax revenue, or that the rich corporations and those who have bigger incomes are going to have to pay the taxes.

Don't let them fool you. There are no new sources of tax money! Only new ways of hiding taxes. They may plug the loopholes, but the extra money won't even be noticed in your reduced tax burden. The tax burden cannot be shifted onto the rich corporations and those getting higher incomes. These people will insist on holding their own and will compensate for paying higher taxes by demanding higher salaries and by charging you higher prices for everything you buy!

There will not be genuine tax relief, only more hidden taxes and governmental manipulation of your life until you and I resolve that we're going to hit at the root problem—your demands and mine for ever more and bigger services and control of our lives by government.

Somehow we've got to get back to dependence on ourselves, forsaking government help, before the tax problem will get a bit better.

A BILL GUARANTEEING EQUAL BENEFITS FOR WOMEN FROM THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to decrease from 20

years to 10 the length of time a divorced woman must be married in order to collect widow's or wife's benefits from her husband's social security insurance. I feel this is an important step in guaranteeing women fair and equal benefits from the social security system.

I believe that 10 years is long enough to entitle a woman to the benefits accrued by her husband. During the time of marriage money has been accumulated in the social security fund by the cooperative endeavors of both the husband and wife. The woman deserves an equal share of the benefits they saved together.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 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?

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, April 21, 1971

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles L. Stetler, associate pastor, Greater Bedford Lutheran Parish, Bedford, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father in Heaven, we give You thanks for the many blessings of life which You bestow upon us: for the gifts of homes and families, and also for this land and the life we have. We confess that we have not always followed Your will. Forgive us for these mistakes and strengthen us that we might better follow Your ways rather than our own selfish desires.

We pray Your guidance and wisdom might be granted to all who share the responsibilities of government, and we ask Your blessings upon the Members of this House and their families. For those who are in sorrow, grant them comfort and assurance; and where there is sickness, may You restore health. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

PROPOSED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION REGARDING ESTATES

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

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I invite the Members' attention to the fact that the Subcommittee on Judiciary of the District of Columbia Committee has scheduled hearings for Tuesday, April 27, at 10 a.m., in the committee room on the following bills:

H.R. 2594 to amend chapter 19 of title 20 of the District of Columbia Code to provide for distribution of a minor's share in a decedent's personal estate where the share does not exceed the value of \$1,000;

H.R. 6431 to amend the District of Columbia Code to increase the jurisdictional amount for the administration of small estates, to increase the family allowance, to provide simplified procedures for the settlement of estates, and to eliminate provisions which discriminate against women in administering estates.

H.R. 6637, companion bill to H.R. 6431.

Those wishing to offer testimony will please notify the clerk of the committee on or before Friday, April 23, 1971.

CONDUCT OF VETERANS

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I, along with other Members, have met with delegations of the Vietnam veterans who are here this week protesting the war and asking for additional veterans benefits.

I feel we in the Congress, the Capitol Police, and staff personnel have gone out of our way to be courteous and listen to their views. I would think in return these men, who represent only a small fraction of the Vietnam veterans, would show the same respect to the people of Capitol Hill and Washington.

This morning in an open hearing of a House Armed Services Subcommittee, some members of the group showed discourteous behavior to some of the Members of Congress including myself, plus the Commandant of the Marine Corps, who was testifying.

These young men are only hurting their cause through such actions.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this group represents only a fraction of the American veterans.

We appreciate what all veterans have done but those here this week are going to have to behave themselves.

A SHOCKING DECISION ON SCHOOLS

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme

Court decision on school desegregation is even more shocking than its first ruling on that subject in the 1950's. We learned not to expect anything better from the Warren Court, but the present Court had shown more evidence of responsibility to our Nation and its Constitution. The new ruling apparently strips away any remaining right of self-determination by parents and local school officials on matters pertaining to busing and neighborhood schools. The ruling to ignore State and county lines in carrying out the Court's order will result in total confusion in school taxing and operational problems. The requirement finalizes the efforts of the extreme liberals to make the schools a vehicle for integration rather than a place for educating children. Until there is a complete turnover in the Court—something which will require years—it is doubtful that there is a remedy from that source. Parents should have a voice in the type of education their children receive and local officials should have the right to provide it. Private schools will help, but there are many who cannot afford them. State and local officials and elected Federal officials must begin all over again to explore legal means to reassert control over the operation of school systems.

COMMENTATION OF U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

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

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great amount of personal pleasure that I publicly commend the U.S. Postal Service for measures being taken to improve the U.S. mail service.

More specifically, I am referring to Postmaster General Winton M. Blount's recent announcement concerning new airmail delivery standards. According to Mr. Blount's order, the Postal Service will begin a new program in some 500 cities which calls for next-day delivery of ZIP-coded airmail between other principal cities within 600 miles. Scheduled to begin early in May, the program also sets a goal of second-day delivery of ZIP-coded airmail between most major cities within the continental United States.