

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.

**COMMENDATION 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.

One of the most significant aspects of the new program is the fact that this is the first time the Department has established "service goals" which postal management seems determined to keep. Additionally, the public has been assured by Postmaster General Blount that a 95 percent successful rate of performance can be expected—beginning not next year but by July of this year.

This is the type of performance which is indicative of the mail system which must service a nation like ours. And with the newly created Postal Corporation, I am convinced that the future will produce a mail system which will more than adequately meet the demands of the American public.

#### THE SUPREME COURT'S DEMAND FOR MORE BUSING OF CHILDREN

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

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, two things were given no consideration at all yesterday in the Supreme Court's decision upholding the forced busing of children. The two things were education and children.

Quality education cannot be provided under the conditions upheld by the Court. But education was not the subject. Taking little children out of their neighborhoods and busing them, sometimes for hours, to distant unfamiliar and unrelated schools, cannot be in the best interest of the child. But children were not the subject. The subject was what it has always been; race mixing for the sake of race mixing.

This decision will trigger a new round of accelerated protests by racial activists and a new round of court actions and a new round of even more drastic orders from the courts. There is no end to it except the destruction of public education. The people will not support a public education system over which they have no local control; no voice in matters such as hauling their children from pillar to post to achieve a racial mixing; a system they know will not provide the quality of education they want, they expect, and they deserve. They know, too, that this Court-approved system is discriminatory against the South and will not be pursued elsewhere in the Nation.

It is an approach to education that has no conscience and it will produce no desirable end. It piles chaos on frustration atop confusion. While previous decisions have cried out that all should be colorblind, this decision cries out that we cannot be colorblind.

It is an irrational decision and the ones to suffer will be the children of those who cannot flee the public school system. I regret what the Court has said and done and I predict more and more will join me in protest.

#### CAMPING ON THE MALL BAN

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

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Chief Justice Warren Burger's banning of the camping on the Mall by the Vietnam veterans is unfortunate. These men, many without arms or legs, have fought for the freedoms of speech and assembly and other constitutional rights in the fields of Vietnam. Now, is the Nation going to prohibit them from exercising these freedoms in a peaceful manner in the Capital of the United States?

Whether one agrees with the philosophy or position of these veterans is not at issue. There is only one matter to consider: Do these men deserve the right to petition their Government and speak out in disagreement with its policies?

I would hate to see a confrontation between park police and the veterans. It would be all too reminiscent of a similar incident after World War I. At that time the President sent troops to chase away the veterans.

If the campsite on the mall presents particular problems, the least that should be done is to find an alternate site. However, arrangements were made in the past for other groups to use the mall and certainly this group is entitled to the same considerations.

The greatest threat to democracy is the denial of rights of those who disagree with the Government policies. If we do not speak up now in defense of those whose rights are violated—whether they are in tune with our political philosophy or not—a time will come when our own rights are violated and there will be no one left to protest.

Let principles of freedom be our motivation and the Constitution our guide. These veterans have a right to protest and petition their elected representatives in Congress peacefully and without violence. To deny them that right after their sacrifices for us would be a heinous crime.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today placed on the Clerk's desk a discharge petition on H.R. 4103, known as the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971.

This bill has been introduced by sufficient membership of the House to indicate a strong interest in its adoption after a full debate in the House.

As you know, this act provides for a complete withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam by December 31, 1971.

I hope that sufficient membership of the House will sign this discharge petition, so that we can move with dispatch in resolving this issue which hangs so heavily over our country.

#### MORE PRODUCTIVE RELATIONS WITH CHINA

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon and the State Department deserve high praise for the recent positive turn

in our relations with the People's Republic of China. In years ahead, historians may well credit the developments of the past 10 days as the most significant foreign policy accomplishment of the Nixon administration.

In particular, the President should be congratulated for creating a climate that allows Peking to take a more cooperative attitude. It is clear that this administration has been working quietly yet purposefully for some time toward more productive relations with China. In his most recent world report, the President said:

In this decade there will be no more important challenge than that of drawing China into a constructive relationship with the world community . . . we are prepared to establish a dialogue with Peking.

While I would be among the first to emphasize that there are substantial philosophical differences that exist between our systems, and would caution that the recent exercise in "ping-pong diplomacy" does not make us "instant allies," I still feel now that long-closed doors are open we should make the most of it diplomatically. Recent events evidence that China is now ready to shed its self-imposed isolation. Such grave problems as Indochina, China's admission to the United Nations and the problem of the "two Chinas," should not be barriers to personal and economic contacts. One area that should be explored is nonstrategic trade, for certainly the restrictions on commerce with China should be no greater than with the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the events of the past 10 days can only be viewed as a beginning. President Nixon and Secretary Rogers, and other members of the administration team, deserve grateful credit for this most significant initiative.

#### THE POSTAL SYSTEM

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

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the new U.S. Postal Service on its determined effort to revitalize the postal system. The most recent evidence of this effort is Postmaster General Blount's establishment of a goal which will provide next-day delivery of 95 percent of ZIP-coded airmail to principal cities within 600 miles.

By setting this goal, the Postal Service is making an unprecedented promise that 95 percent of all air mail deposited by 4 p.m. weekdays in special boxes will be delivered the next delivery day in designated cities within a 600-mile radius. Furthermore, such mail will be delivered within 2 days after deposit in virtually all principal cities in the Continental United States.

This is only the first of several major plans in the works which will provide comprehensive service improvements for the American people. Members of Congress who helped pass the historic postal reform legislation can see this as the first



major evidence of the wisdom of our action.

**DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS**

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

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 months I have been trying to bring before the Democratic caucus the question of whether or not the only human being on this planet who has been legally elected to represent the American citizens in the District of Columbia, who pay taxes and send their sons to bleed and die for the freedom-loving people in South Vietnam, should be made at least a subcommittee chairman on the District of Columbia Colonialism Committee of this Congress.

I have said on numerous occasions that if the delaying tactics in the caucus continued, such as the one exercised today by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ASPINALL), when he demanded a quorum and said that a quorum should be present to conduct business, that I would do as much for the duration of the 92d Congress itself. According to that member of the tribal chieftains who run this Congress, a quorum is necessary in order to conduct business on the floor of this Congress. I have come to the conclusion there is no business more important before this Congress than the basic moral American question of whether the American citizens in this jurisdiction will be granted American democracy, so I intend to use my parliamentary prerogatives to that end.

**SUPREME COURT DECISION ON CAMPING OF VETERANS ON THE MALL**

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, several hundred veterans of the Vietnam war are in Washington this week attempting to explain to their Government and to the Members of their Congress the folly and futility of the dead-end war in Vietnam which the administration continues to pursue.

These are young men who have come to Washington, leaving their schools and their jobs—although, of course, many of them have not been able to find jobs upon their return from Vietnam—because they sincerely believe that this war must end. They are concerned veterans who have served their country. Many have suffered permanent injuries and the loss of limbs. I wish every Member of the House and the Senate could speak to them and hear them, as I have done. Perhaps then Congress would finally act to bring the war to an end.

Last night, the Chief Justice, acting upon an emergency petition from the Justice Department, reversed the order of the United States Court of Appeals which permitted the veterans to camp on the mall. Acting in his capacity as circuit judge for the District of Colum-

bia, Chief Justice Burger reinstated an injunction against overnight camping issued last Friday by United States District Court Judge George L. Hart, Jr.

I have joined in asking the Secretary of the Interior to meet with the veterans in an effort to find a suitable alternative site, and I have also called upon the Speaker of the House to grant them permission to use the Capitol grounds.

These Vietnam veterans are exercising their constitutional rights peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. It is unjust that the Government, which sent them to fight an undeclared war 10,000 miles away in Southeast Asia, should now deny them a place to sleep on public land when they attempt to hasten the end of the war.

These young men have been through a grim war and are in the Nation's Capital to tell a grim tale. The antipathy of the administration toward them is a sorry situation.

**SUPREME COURT DECISION ON BUSING**

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I fully suspected that there would be a number of harangues and diatribes coming forth from certain Members of the House today in response to the decision of the Supreme Court upholding the principle of busing to achieve integration.

I for one would like to be on the record as being grateful and fully supportive of that decision. It is time we stopped the hypocrisy and pretense in this country. It is time we moved ahead to implement the full integration of our public schools. To do anything less than that is to but heighten the alienation, division, and the polarization which have developed in this country. They have developed, in part, because we have lied to black Americans about the implementation of the 1954 Supreme Court decision, and we have reneged on our commitments to black Americans.

I support and applaud the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States regarding busing to achieve equality in education.

**CALL OF THE HOUSE**

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered. The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Abbutt	Camp	Diggs
Abourezk	Casey, Tex.	Dowdy
Anderson, Ill.	Celler	Dwyer
Anderson,	Clark	Edwards, La.
Tenn.	Clawson, Del	Fascell
Andrews, Ala.	Clay	Fish
Blanton	Corbett	Fisher
Blatnik	Corman	Fraser
Brooks	Crane	Frenzel
Brown, Mich.	Davis, Ga.	Gallagher

Goodling	Mann	Scheuer
Gray	Mathias, Calif.	Schwengel
Green, Oreg.	Moorhead	Sebelius
Griffiths	Murphy, Ill.	Shriver
Gubser	Patman	Sisk
Halpern	Pepper	Skubitz
Hanna	Powell	Steele
Harvey	Price, Tex.	Stelger, Wis.
Hicks, Mass.	Pucinski	Talcott
Kazen	Railsback	Teague, Tex.
Keith	Rangel	Thompson, N.J.
King	Reid, N.Y.	Wilson, Bob
Long, La.	Rooney, Pa.	Wolf
McCormack	Rosenthal	Wright
McCulloch	Ruppe	
Mailliard	Satterfield	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 357 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

**MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT**

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

**NEW U.S. POSTAL SERVICE OFF TO GOOD START**

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

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, 8 months ago the Congress passed the Postal Reorganization Act which created the new U.S. Postal Service. Although this semi-independent organization does not, technically speaking, begin operations until July, it is off to a good, businesslike start.

I am speaking of the Postmaster General's announcement that effective April 22 the Postal Service will strive for next-day delivery of ZIP-coded airmail to principal cities within a 600-mile radius. This is the primary focus of a new "national service goal" which will also mean that airmail deposited in special airmail-only boxes will be delivered within 2 days of deposit in virtually all principal cities in the continental United States.

I commend the Postmaster General and the Postal Service on the establishment of this bold new service standard, and wholeheartedly welcome Red Blount's promise that more service improvements are on the way.

**PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT**

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, during the time of the previous rollcall, when the roll was being called, I was on the floor, and I was called out on an important matter. I merely want the RECORD to show I was present during the time the rollcall was in progress.

**CALL OF THE HOUSE**

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

	[Roll No. 60]	
Abbutt	Erlenborn	Moorhead
Abourezk	Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.
Alexander	Fascell	Passman
Anderson, Ill.	Fish	Patman
Anderson, Tenn.	Fisher	Pelly
	Flowers	Podell
Andrews, Ala.	Fraser	Powell
Archer	Frenzel	Price, Tex.
Baring	Gallagher	Pucinski
Biaggi	Gaydos	Rallsback
Bingham	Goodling	Riegle
Blyanton	Gray	Rooney, Pa.
Boggs	Green, Oreg.	Rosenthal
Brooks	Griffiths	Satterfield
Brown, Mich.	Gubser	Scheuer
Camp	Halpern	Schwengel
Carey, N.Y.	Hanna	Sebellius
Casey, Tex.	Harvey	Shriver
Celler	Hastings	Sisk
Clark	Hébert	Smith, Calif.
Clawson, Del.	Hicks, Mass.	Springer
Clay	Hicks, Wash.	Steele
Cleveland	Hollifield	Steiger, Wis.
Collins, Ill.	Johnson, Calif.	Talcott
Conyers	Kazen	Teague, Calif.
Corbett	Keith	Teague, Tex.
Davis, Ga.	King	Vanik
Dellums	Link	Wampler
Dent	Long, La.	Wiggins
Dowdy	McCulloch	Wilson,
Dwyer	Maillard	Charles H.
Edwards, Ala.	Mann	Wolf
Edwards, La.	Michel	
Eilberg	Miller, Calif.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 334 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. A rollcall just disclosed the presence of a quorum.

Mr. JACOBS. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, Mr. Speaker, obviously not.

The SPEAKER. The Chair advises the gentleman that a quorum has just been established and no business has transpired.

Mr. JACOBS. At the moment I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's point of order is out of order.

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 92-94)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

##### To the Congress of the United States:

On September 15, 1970, I proposed a major transformation in the foreign assistance program of the United States. My purpose was to renew and revitalize the commitment of this Nation to support the security and development objectives of the lower income countries, and

thereby to promote some of the most fundamental objectives of U.S. foreign policy.

Today, I report to you on the progress of the last seven months in effecting that transformation and ask the Congress to join me in taking the next creative step in our new approach—the reform of the United States bilateral assistance program.

To achieve such reform, I am transmitting two bills—the proposed International Security Assistance Act and International Development and Humanitarian Assistance Act—and announcing a number of actions which I intend to take administratively. Taken together, they would:

—Distinguish clearly between our security, development and humanitarian assistance programs and create separate organizational structures for each. This would enable us to define our own objectives more clearly, fix responsibility for each program, and assess the progress of each in meeting its particular objectives.

—Combine our various security assistance efforts (except for those in Southeast Asia which are now funded in the Defense budget) into one coherent program, under the policy direction of the Department of State. This would enable security assistance to play more effectively its critical role in supporting the Nixon Doctrine and overall U.S. national security and foreign policy in the 1970s.

—Create a U.S. International Development Corporation and a U.S. International Development Institute to replace the Agency for International Development. They would enable us to reform our bilateral development assistance program to meet the changed conditions of the 1970s.

—Provide adequate funding for these new programs to support essential U.S. foreign policy objectives in the years ahead.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

U.S. foreign assistance is central to U.S. foreign policy in the 1970s in three ways:

First, we must help to strengthen the defense capabilities and economies of our friends and allies. This is necessary so that they can increasingly shoulder their own responsibilities, so that we can reduce our direct involvement abroad, and so that together we can create a workable structure for world peace. This is an essential feature of the Nixon Doctrine.

Second, we must assist the lower income countries in their efforts to achieve economic and social development. Such development is the overriding objective of these countries themselves and essential to the peaceful world order which we seek. The prospects for a peaceful world will be greatly enhanced if the two-thirds of humanity who live in these countries see hope for adequate food, shelter, education and employment in

peaceful progress rather than in revolution.

Third, we must be able to provide prompt and effective assistance to countries struck by natural disaster or the human consequences of political upheaval. Our humanitarian concerns for mankind require that we be prepared to help in times of acute human distress.

#### THE NEED FOR REFORM

We cannot effectively pursue these objectives in the 1970s with programs devised for an earlier period. The world has changed dramatically. Our foreign assistance programs—like our overall foreign policy—must change to meet these new conditions.

In my September special message to the Congress I spelled out the major changes in the world which require new responses. Let me summarize them here:

—Today the lower income countries are increasingly able to shoulder the major responsibility for their own security and development and they clearly wish to do so. We share their belief that they must take the lead in charting their own security and development. Our new foreign assistance programs must therefore encourage the lower income countries to set their own priorities and develop their own programs, and enable us to respond as our talents and resources permit.

—Today the United States is but one of many industrialized nations which contribute to the security and development of the lower income countries. We used to furnish the bulk of international development assistance; we now provide less than half. The aid programs of other countries have grown because they recognize that they too have a major stake in the orderly progress which foreign assistance promotes, and because their capabilities to provide such assistance have grown enormously since the earlier postwar period.

—Today the international institutions can effectively mesh the initiatives and efforts of the lower income countries and the aid efforts of all of the industrialized countries. We can thus place greater reliance on such institutions and encourage them to play an increasing leadership role in the world development process.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, is the Clerk reading from the summary or the message, and at what point?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk is reading the message.

Mr. GROSS. He is reading from the message. Then at what point is he now reading? This is so important an address I would not want to miss any part of this foreign giveaway message.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk is reading on page 3 of the message.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Chair.



The SPEAKER. The Clerk will continue the reading of the message.

The Clerk read as follows:

Our ideas on the reforms needed in the world of the 1970s have evolved significantly since I received the Report of my Task Force on International Development, chaired by Mr. Rudolph Peterson, and since my special message of last September, as the result of our own deliberations and our further consultations with the Congress, the business community and many other sectors of the American public, and our friends abroad. Before spelling out a new blueprint for our bilateral assistance program, however, I wish to report to you on the gratifying progress achieved since last September in reorienting our assistance policies.

#### PROGRESS TOWARD REFORM

First, the Congress in December passed supplemental assistance legislation for FY 1971 which represented a major step in implementing the security assistance component of the Nixon Doctrine. This legislation authorized additional funds for military assistance and supporting economic assistance for countries in which the U.S. has major interests and which have convincingly demonstrated the will and ability to help themselves—including Israel and Jordan in the Middle East and Cambodia, Vietnam and Korea in East Asia.

Such support is necessary to carry out one of the central thrusts of the Nixon Doctrine—moving us from bearing the major responsibility for the defense of our friends and allies to helping them achieve an increasing capability to maintain their own defense. This increase in security assistance enables us to continue to reduce our direct presence abroad, and helps to reduce the likelihood of direct U.S. military involvement in the future.

Second, the international development institutions have continued their progress toward leadership in the international development process. For example:

—The World Bank continues to increase the size and improve the effectiveness of its operations. It also has decided to broaden the scope of its lending beyond the traditional financing of projects to the provision of funds to support overall development programs in appropriate circumstances, and it is developing an improved internal evaluation and audit system.

—The United Nations Development Program has initiated a reorganization to improve its administration. In time this will enable it to assume a leading role in coordinating the international technical assistance effort.

—The World Health Organization has effectively guided and coordinated the worldwide effort to cope with the present cholera epidemic in Africa.

Third, the industrialized countries have now agreed on comparable systems of tariff preferences for imports from the lower income countries. The preferences plan is a major step in the crucial international effort to expand the export earnings of these countries, and hence

to reduce their reliance on external aid. The European Community has indicated that it plans to put its tariff preferences into effect on July 1, and Japan has announced that it will do so before October 1.

Fourth, there has been satisfying progress toward achieving the untying of bilateral development loans on a fully reciprocal basis. This action will enhance the value of economic assistance to recipient countries, and eliminate the political frictions which tied aid now causes. Virtually all of the industrialized countries have agreed to the principle of untying. Details of a system offering suppliers of all participating countries a fair and equitable basis for competition are now being worked out in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

Fifth, I have established a Council on International Economic Policy, which I chair, to coordinate all aspects of U.S. foreign economic policy, including development assistance. It will provide top-level focus for our policies in this area, and accord them the high priority which they require in our foreign policy for the 1970s.

I am heartened by this progress, but much more remains to be done:

—I again urge the Congress to vote the additional funds which I have requested for the Inter-American Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank.

—We will shortly transmit legislation to authorize the U.S. contribution to the doubling of the resources of the International Development Association, the soft-loan affiliate of the World Bank, which stands at the center of the network of international financial institutions, and I urge the Congress to approve it.

—We are working with others to help establish a soft-loan window for the African Development Bank.

—We will shortly transmit legislation to authorize U.S. participation in the system of generalized tariff preferences for developing countries, and I urge Congress to approve it.

#### THE NEW U.S. BILATERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The next major step is the reform of the U.S. bilateral assistance program, incorporated in the proposed International Security Assistance Act and International Development and Humanitarian Assistance Act.

Our new bilateral assistance program must achieve several objectives. It must:

—Clearly identify our distinct aid objectives: security assistance, development assistance and humanitarian assistance.

—Be truly responsive to the initiatives of the lower income countries themselves and encourage them to play the central role in solving their own security and development problems. In the area of development assistance, this means working within a framework set by the international institutions to the maximum extent possible.

—Be concentrated in countries of special interest to the United States, and in projects and programs in

which the United States has a special ability to be of help.

—Recognize the improved economic capacity of many of the lower income countries in establishing the terms of our assistance.

—Assure improved management.

—Reduce substantially the number of U.S. Government officials operating our assistance program overseas.

Let me now spell out the details of our new approach, based on these principles.

#### SECURITY ASSISTANCE

I have repeatedly stressed the essential role played by our military and related forms of assistance in supporting the foreign policy of the United States and our own security interests. The primary purposes of this assistance have been, and will continue to be, the preservation of peace through the deterrence of war, and the support of efforts by allied and friendly countries to move toward self-sustaining economic growth and social progress. To abandon our responsibilities would risk magnifying the world's instability in the short run and impairing its peaceful development for the longer run, and therefore increase the threat to our own security both now and in the future.

The new course on which we are set, however, encourages others to take on greater responsibilities themselves. Our new security assistance program will seek to strengthen local defense capabilities by providing that mix of military and supporting economic assistance which is needed to permit friendly foreign countries to assume additional defense burdens themselves without causing them undue political or economic costs. If we are to move toward reducing our own physical presence, the effectiveness of our security assistance program will become of ever more crucial importance.

In Asia, this new strategy has already encouraged the nations of the area to assume greater responsibility for their own defense and provided a basis for a major reduction in our military presence. The funds which have been provided to assist the Government of South Vietnam have been essential to the progress of Vietnamization, and helped insure continued U.S. troop withdrawals. We have helped Cambodia to mobilize its manpower and other resources in defense of its independence and neutrality. We are providing Korea with equipment to improve and modernize its defenses and we are withdrawing some of our own troops.

Our friends and allies know that it is no longer possible nor desirable for the United States to bear the principal burden of their defense. A clear lesson of the 1960s is that deterrence against local aggression, or against subversion supported from outside a country's borders, cannot be achieved without a strong contribution by the threatened country itself. We can meet our security assistance objectives effectively only if we link our efforts closely with those of our friends and thereby build the foundations for peace in partnership with them.

To help do so, and also in recognition of the improved economic capability of

many of the countries receiving security assistance, I propose today significant changes in our authorities to provide military assistance to our friends and allies.

Our military assistance programs have suffered from undesirable rigidity. The only choice has been between grant assistance and sales on hard credit terms. Many of those nations that need our assistance are unable to meet the hard credit terms—so grant assistance has been the only course open for us to help meet their essential security needs. But as the lower income nations begin to develop an ability to shoulder the costs of their defense, we need to be able to assist them in doing so even though they cannot immediately assume the entire burden. Sales on concessional credit terms would permit earlier participation by some recipient countries in the financing of their essential defense needs and would thus engage their own assessment of priorities for the allocation of their resources at an earlier stage of development than is now possible.

To fill the existing gap between grant assistance and sales on relatively firm commercial terms, the International Security Assistance Act that I propose today includes authorization to finance sales of military equipment on concessional terms. Grant assistance will remain necessary for some nations whose financial resources are simply not adequate to meet their defense needs. But our objective is to move countries, as quickly as possible within the context of international security requirements and their own economic capabilities, along the spectrum from grants to concessional sales to the harder terms we have required for sales under the present act and finally to outright cash arrangements. We will also stress the transition from Government sales to those made directly by private industry to the extent feasible. By making these changes we would help countries move from dependence on the United States to independence in the creation and financing of their own security programs. We would not intend to provide concessional credits to countries able to meet the terms of the present program.

I am also asking, under the new act, greater flexibility to transfer funds among the various security assistance programs. Such flexibility is particularly important, for example, in this period of transition in Southeast Asia, where our troop withdrawals are freeing up substantial amounts of military equipment formerly used by our troops. I am asking that the ceiling on the amount of surplus equipment which can be granted to our friends and allies be increased; this will save us money as well as permit us to better help those of our friends who need it. In the long run, sound management of security assistance demands that there be enough flexibility to transfer funds among various programs in order to insure that the proper mix is used to meet our specific objectives in each instance.

For these international security assistance programs, I request authorization of \$1,993 million for FY 1972; \$778 million for supporting economic assistance,

\$705 million for grant military assistance, and \$510 million for military credit sales.

These security assistance programs are at the core of our relations with certain key friendly countries. They critically affect our ability to meet our bilateral and collective security commitments. They are central to the achievement of major objectives of U.S. national security and foreign policy.

I therefore intend to direct by administrative action a reorganization of our security assistance program to meet more effectively the objectives of the Nixon Doctrine. Various components of security assistance—military assistance, military credit sales, grants of excess military stocks, supporting economic assistance, and the public safety program—have been fragmented in different pieces of legislation and managed through a series of different administrative arrangements. My proposals would bring these programs under one legislative act to assure that each is viewed as part of a coherent overall program. Military assistance for Vietnam, Laos and Thailand will continue to be funded in the Defense budget because these country programs are subject to the uncertainties of active hostilities and are intimately linked to the logistical support systems of our own forces in Southeast Asia.

To assure effective policy control and management of this new security assistance effort, I would direct that a Coordinator for Security Assistance be established at a high level in the Department of State. I would also direct that the supporting economic assistance program be administered by the Department of State. The Department of Defense will continue to have primary responsibility for administering our military assistance and sales programs, and for relating these programs to overall U.S. national defense planning.

These new arrangements would be a significant step in the direction of improving the management of our security assistance program. They would therefore represent a significant step toward achieving greater accountability to the Congress and the public as well.

This new security assistance program would, I am confident, serve our national interest in the 1970's in a number of important ways. It would:

- enable us to meet U.S. commitments more effectively and at lower cost;
- strengthen the self-defense capabilities of nations to whose security the U.S. is committed by treaty, by special political ties, or by essential U.S. interests;
- help to reduce the need for, and likelihood of, U.S. military involvement overseas;
- foster increased local initiative and self-sufficiency;
- promote constructive political relations with foreign governments;
- support U.N. peacekeeping operations;
- reduce potential frictions by lowering the U.S. profile abroad.

I am also requesting in the International Security Assistance Act authority for \$100 million for the President's Foreign Assistance Contingency Fund for FY

1972. This would permit the administration, with due notification to the Congress, to meet worldwide contingencies—in the security, development and humanitarian areas—in ways compatible with our national interests. It is particularly important to have available uncommitted funds which can be used on short notice, when sudden crises in the international community require us to act promptly and decisively.

#### DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

The United States continues to have special national interests in particular lower income countries. We continue to have special capabilities in particular functional areas. We continue to need an effective bilateral development assistance program.

In order to advance such a program, I therefore propose legislation which would authorize the creation of two new development assistance institutions. Together with the two created by the last Congress, they would replace the Agency for International Development and enable us to develop a new approach based on the principles outlined above.

The two I now propose to create are:

- An International Development Corporation (IDC) to provide loans to finance development projects and programs in the lower income countries.
  - An International Development Institute (IDI) to seek research breakthroughs on the key problems of development and to administer our technical assistance programs.
- These would join two created by the last Congress:
- The Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) to promote the role of private investment in the development process.
  - The Inter-American Social Development Institute (ISDI) to provide special attention to the social development needs of Latin America.

#### THE U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The new IDC would administer our bilateral lending program. The authorities which I seek for it, and the operating style which I would direct it to pursue, would mark a major change in the U.S. approach to development assistance.

The IDC would make loans in response to initiatives from the lower income countries, rather than develop projects or programs on its own. It would have flexibility to tailor its loan terms to the needs of particular lower income countries, requiring harder terms from the more advanced and extending easier terms to the less advanced. Today's program has limited flexibility in this regard. Its lending volume to any particular country would be based on demonstrated self-help performance, and the quality of the projects and programs which that country presented to it. It would not seek to determine annual country lending levels in advance as is done at present.

The IDC would operate to the maximum extent feasible within a framework set by the international financial institutions. It would look to them to provide evaluations of the overall development prospects of particular coun-



tries, which would be a major consideration in its decisions to lend, rather than itself carrying out the extensive "country programming" which is now done. Within that context it would participate in non-project lending and international efforts to alleviate the debt burdens of particular lower income countries. It would participate for the United States in the international consortia and consultative groups, managed in most cases by the international financial institutions, through which the bulk of our bilateral assistance will flow.

The IDC would concentrate its activities in countries and regions where the U.S. has a major foreign policy interest in long-term development. For example, it would establish guidelines to assure that an equitable share of its resources is provided to the countries of the Western Hemisphere. But precisely because our interest is in the long-term development of these nations, the IDC would use its funds to pursue such interests rather than to seek merely short-term political gains.

The IDC would provide loans on the basis of both sound business standards and the pursuit of sound development purposes. The terms of its loans would be determined in large part by the financial situation of the borrowing country, rather than on the standard terms now offered to all borrowers. It would avoid loans to countries where the analysis of international financial institutions, and its own views, suggest an inadequate policy framework in which the loans could effectively promote development. The IDC would not be solely a lender of last resort as AID is required to be today, often financing the riskiest projects and programs.

The Corporation would work with and through the private sector to the maximum extent possible. It would give high priority to projects and programs which promote private initiative in the lower income countries, and to this end would seek to increase U.S. lending to local development banks and other financial intermediaries. I recommend that it also have authority to lend directly to private entities in the lower income countries.

The IDC would be governed by a Board of Directors consisting of outstanding private citizens as well as government officials, thus bringing the private sector directly into its decision-making process.

With this clear identification of specific instruments and programs with the specific objectives they are designed to achieve, we should not need to tie the hands of our managers—of the Corporation or any of our other new institutions—with the kinds of foreign policy and administrative restrictions which apply to the present program. Administrators should be held accountable for achieving program objectives. This is a central requirement of the businesslike approach which the new structure is designed to foster.

To insure the necessary continuity and stability of operations to permit this businesslike approach, and building on the initiative of the Congress in 1969 to provide a 2-year authorization for foreign assistance, I request that the Corporation be given a 3-year authorization. I

recommend an authorization of \$1.5 billion of directly appropriated funds. I propose also that the IDC be provided with authority to borrow, in the private capital market or from the U.S. Treasury, up to a total of \$1 billion during its initial 3-year period. This would help channel private capital more directly into the development process and bring private sector judgments directly to bear on the performance of the IDC. I recommend that it be authorized to use repayments of capital and interest on past U.S. development loans, which are now running at about \$250 million annually.

A Corporation based on these principles would enable us to reduce substantially the number of U.S. government personnel involved in development lending overseas. By responding primarily to initiatives from the lower income countries, we would reduce the need for Americans to chart foreign programs and priorities. By relying increasingly on the international institutions for information and analytical work, we would reduce our own requirement for itself in both Washington and the field. By reducing the statutory restrictions on the program, we would be able to concentrate available staff on effective program management.

I am confident that a U.S. International Development Corporation based on these principles would regenerate our development lending program. It would provide major support to the development objectives of the lower income countries. It would enable us to play our full role effectively among the industrialized countries in promoting the development process. It would thereby provide major support for important U.S. national objectives in the 1970s.

#### THE U.S. INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

The new IDI would administer a reformed bilateral technical assistance program and enable us to focus U.S. scientific, technological and managerial know-how on the problems of development.

The Institute would engage in four major types of activities:

—It would apply U.S. *research* competence in the physical and social sciences to the critical problems of development, and help raise the research competence of the lower income countries themselves.

—It would help *build institutions* in the lower income countries to improve their own research capabilities and to carry out a full range of developmental functions on a self-sustaining basis. I would expect it to place particular emphasis on strengthening agricultural and educational institutions.

—It would help *train manpower* in the lower income countries to enable them to carry out new activities on their own.

—It would help lower income countries, particularly the least developed among them, to finance *advisers* on development problems.

Like the Corporation, the Institute would finance projects in response to proposals made by the lower income countries themselves. It would not bud-

get funds in advance by country, since it could not know in advance how many acceptable projects would be proposed by each. It would look to these countries to select candidates to be trained under its program. Its research activities would be located in the lower income countries, rather than in the United States, to the greatest extent feasible. With its stress on institution building, it would seek to insure that each program could be carried on after U.S. assistance is ended.

Most importantly, the Institute would seek to assure that all projects which it helps finance are considered essential by the lower income country itself. To do so, the Institute would require that the recipient country make a significant contribution to each as evidence that it attaches high priority to the project and is prepared to support it financially after U.S. assistance ends. We would finance a project for only a definite and limited period of time, and would want assurance that the host country would then carry it on. In the past, all too many technical assistance projects have been undertaken which were of more interest to Americans than to the recipient countries, and had little or no lasting impact. Our new program is designed to insure that this does not happen in the future.

The international organizations are less advanced in research and technical assistance than in development lending. The Institute would thus be unable to function as fully within an international framework at this time as would the Corporation. However, it would work to help improve the capabilities of these organizations, especially the United Nations Development Program, and would seek to cooperate with them whenever possible. In fact, one of its objectives would be to help create an international framework for technical assistance comparable to the framework which has developed over the past decade for development lending.

By the very virtue of its separate existence, the Institute would be free to concentrate its efforts on the application of research and technology to the problems of development—a key feature of our new bilateral program which would distinguish it markedly from the present approach. The Institute would also concentrate its resources on the few most critical problem areas of development. Such concentration is necessary if it is to achieve the "critical mass" necessary to make real breakthroughs where they are most needed, and to attract the top cadre of experts and managers who can achieve such breakthroughs.

The areas of concentration would evolve in response to the requests of the lower income countries and management's assessment of where we can contribute most. They would undoubtedly shift over time. Experience suggests that limiting population growth, increasing agricultural production and training manpower would be among the concentration areas at first. Unemployment and urbanization problems could be early additions to the list.

While the Institute would provide grant financing, it would vary the effective terms of its assistance by varying the shares of the total cost of particular

projects that the recipient must finance itself—ranging from a small percentage in the least advanced countries to most of the cost in the most advanced. In addition, the Institute should have authority to provide advisers on a completely reimbursable basis to countries which no longer need concessional aid at all. At the other end of the development spectrum, the IDI would be conscious of the special problems of the least developed countries—most of which are in Africa—which will continue to need the more traditional types of technical assistance since they have traveled less distance along the road to economic self-sufficiency.

The Institute would be managed on a businesslike basis, and it would carry out its projects largely through the private sector. I propose that it be governed by a Board of Trustees including outstanding citizens from the private sector. It would stress evaluation of past projects to determine their payoff and to help guide future project development; there has been too little followup in these programs in the past. We would seek top flight technical managers, development specialists and scientists for the small staff of the Institute. This new approach would permit a major reduction in the number of U.S. government personnel operating abroad.

To achieve these goals, the IDI should have financial continuity. I therefore propose that the Congress authorize an appropriation of \$1,275 million for a 3-year period.

In short, the International Development Institute would provide a new dimension to our foreign assistance effort. It would enable us to focus some of our finest national resources—our capabilities in management, research, and technology—on the critical bottleneck problems of development. Its style of operation should enable us to forge a new and more mature partnership with the lower income countries, with the rest of the industrialized world, and with our own private sector. It holds promise of becoming one of the most significant additions to our national capability to engage meaningfully in the world of the 1970s.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION  
AND INTER-AMERICAN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT  
INSTITUTE

The new International Development Corporation and International Development Institute would join two development assistance institutions already created by the Congress: the Overseas Private Investment Corporation and the Inter-American Social Development Institute.

OPIC is already at work promoting the role of private investment in the international development process. The record of economic development shows that successful growth is usually associated with a dynamic private sector, and we therefore look to private investment—primarily domestic but foreign as well—to play an increasing role in the development process. It must do so, since no government or public agency has the resources or technical skills which are

necessary to meet the vast needs of the lower income countries.

OPIC's guarantees and insurance of U.S. private investment in lower income countries which seek such investment are already serving effectively the interests of both the U.S. investor and the host countries. Its early activities suggest that an independent corporation, directed by a joint public-private Board of Directors, can effectively manage a development assistance program; it thus augurs well for the structures which I propose today for the Development Corporation and Development Institute.

OPIC is operating within one of the most sensitive areas—private foreign investment—of the inherently sensitive overall relationship between aid donors and aid recipients. It is therefore essential that OPIC assist only sound projects which are responsive to the particular development needs of each country.

And it is clearly for each country to decide the conditions under which it will accept private foreign investment, just as it is for each investor to decide what conditions are adequate to attract his investments. We as a Government ask only that the investments of our citizens be treated fairly and in accordance with international law. In nearly all cases they have been. However, unjust acts by a country toward an American firm cannot help but adversely affect our relationship with that country. As President, I must and will take such acts into account in determining our future assistance and overall policy toward such a country.

The Inter-American Social Development Institute has also begun to develop its programs, which seek to promote the social development of the Latin American and Caribbean people. Working mainly through private organizations and international institutions, it represents a new innovative channel in seeking to promote solutions to basic economic and social problems in these areas. I propose that it be renamed the Inter-American Foundation, to characterize more accurately its proposed style of operation.

HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE

U.S. humanitarian assistance programs cover a wide spectrum of human needs: disaster relief and rehabilitation; famine; refugee and migration relief and assistance. They aim to help people around the world recover from unfortunate situations by which they have been victimized. In the past year alone, such help has been extended to refugees from civil war in Nigeria and Jordan, earthquake victims in Peru, flood victims in Romania and Tunisia, and cyclone victims in Pakistan.

These activities rely heavily for program implementation on private voluntary agencies. In the past year alone, U.S. voluntary agencies registered with the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid contributed \$370 million of their own resources in over 100 countries.

At present, humanitarian assistance programs are carried out through numerous offices in the U.S. Government. I propose to centralize the responsibility for coordinating all humanitarian assist-

ance programs under a new Assistant Secretary of State. We would thereby assure a coherent effort to carry out this vital and literally life-saving aspect of our foreign assistance policy. This new approach would also improve our capability to respond quickly and effectively through better contingency planning, additional stockpiling and training, and the maintenance of closer and better coordinated relationships with the United Nations, other donor countries, and the private voluntary agencies.

COORDINATION

I have outlined the overriding need to separate our overall foreign assistance program into its three component parts: security assistance, development assistance, and humanitarian assistance. I have indicated that we would pull together all parts of our security assistance and humanitarian assistance under central management, so that each can function effectively as a total program within the context of U.S. foreign policy. And I have also proposed the creation of two new institutions, to go along with the two created by the last Congress, to carry forward our development assistance program in the 1970s.

There is thus a need for new mechanisms to assure effective coordination of our new foreign assistance program.

First, there must be effective coordination among the several components of the new development assistance program. This would be done through my appointing a single Coordinator of Development Assistance, responsible directly to the President, as Chairman of the Boards of the IDC, IDI, and OPIC.

The Coordinator would also chair an executive coordinating committee composed of the chief executive officers of each of these institutions and ISDI. He would be available for congressional testimony on our overall bilateral development assistance policy and the operations of the several institutions. Both the Congress and I could look to him as the administration's chief spokesman on bilateral development assistance policy and programs.

Second, the Secretary of State will provide foreign policy guidance for all components of our new foreign assistance program. His representatives would be members of the boards of each of the development institutions, and he would have direct responsibility for both security and humanitarian assistance. In each country our Ambassador, as my personal representative, will of course be responsible for coordination of all of our assistance programs.

Third, foreign assistance issues which raise broader questions of foreign economic policy will be handled through my new Council on International Economic Policy.

Finally, coordination among the three major components of our assistance program, and between them and our overall national security policy, would be handled through the National Security Council. We will thus establish strong management, coordination, and policy guidance over all of our foreign assistance programs.



CONCLUSION

This Nation can no more ignore poverty, hunger and disease in other nations of the world than a man can ignore the suffering of his neighbors. The great challenge to Americans of this decade, be they private citizens or national leaders, is to work to improve the quality of life of our fellow men at home and abroad.

We have a unique and unprecedented opportunity. We do not have all the answers to the questions of poverty, nor adequate resources to meet the needs of all mankind. We do possess the greatest scientific and technological capacity, and the most prosperous and dynamic economy, of any nation in history. More importantly, we have, as a vital element of the American character, a humanitarian zeal to help improve the lives of our fellow men.

We are therefore a nation uniquely capable of assisting other peoples in preserving their security and promoting their development. By doing so, we accomplish three major objectives:

- We strengthen international cooperation for a peaceful world.
- We help to relieve the poverty and misery of others less fortunate than ourselves.
- We help to build firm foundations of friendship between this Nation and the peoples of other nations.

I have seen for myself just how important is our aid in helping nations preserve their independence, and in helping men achieve the dignity of productive labor instead of languishing on crowded streets. I have seen its importance to children whose chances for a rewarding life have been increased because they have adequate nutrition, schools and books. It is right that we, the richest nation in the world, should provide our share of such assistance.

And such help, in addition to being right for its own sake, also creates strong bonds.

I recognize that whenever an American firm is nationalized without prompt, fair, and effective compensation; whenever an anti-American demonstration takes place; or whenever a leader of a developing country criticizes the United States, many question the effectiveness of our aid.

But the headline reporting the occasional anti-American act overlooks the many countries which do thank us for providing them the means to preserve their own security; and it also overlooks the countless number of villages where farmers do appreciate our helping provide the know-how and the tools necessary to grow larger crops, the school children who cherish the education our assistance makes possible, and the people everywhere who recognize our help in eliminating disease.

For these people, our aid is a source of encouragement. And they, not those who demonstrate or destroy, are the real revolutionaries—for they, in quietly attempting to preserve their independence and improve their lives, are bringing about a quiet revolution of peaceful change and progress. They are working

hard to build the foundations for a better tomorrow and they recognize that we have helped provide them with the tools to do the job.

But while such appreciation is gratifying, foreign assistance has a more basic purpose. Foreign assistance is quite clearly in our interest as a nation. We are a people whose sons have died, and whose great statesmen have worked, to build a world order which insures peace and prosperity for ourselves and for other nations. We are aware that this world order cannot be sustained if our friends cannot defend themselves against aggression, and if two-thirds of the world's people see the richer third as indifferent to their needs and insensitive to their aspirations for a better life. To these people it is critical that this be a generation of peace, and our foreign policy is directed at helping to make it so; and for the impoverished it is equally important that it be a generation in which their aspirations for a better life, improved health conditions, and adequate food supply can be realized—a generation of development, a generation of hope.

Foreign policy is not a one-way street. It requires that other nations understand our problems and concerns, but it also requires that we understand theirs. We cannot ask the lower income countries of the world to cooperate with us to solve the problems which affect our vital interests unless we cooperate with them to help solve the problems critical to their vital interests—the problems affecting their security and development, and thus affecting the quality of life of their people.

The legislation I propose today, along with the corollary administrative actions which I will take, will permit this Nation to carry out the major reforms which are necessary to improve the effectiveness of our foreign assistance program and to fit it to our new approach.

I believe that this new approach is of major importance in promoting the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States in this decade and beyond. I believe that it is sound, and will blend as effectively as possible our special strengths with those of other nations and institutions. It is an approach through which we can focus the energies and resources of this great Nation on the security and development problems of those peoples living in poorer nations who wish to improve their lives, but lack the resources and the expertise to do so. I believe that this program is worthy of your support.

I therefore reaffirm my commitment, and the commitment of this administration, to seek an effective U.S. foreign assistance program for the 1970s. It is our objective to work for peace, not only in our time but for future generations, and we can make no better investment toward that end than to participate fully in an international effort to build prosperity and hope for a better tomorrow among all nations. I urge the Congress to join with me in making the reforms

I propose today so that together we can achieve these great goals.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 21, 1971.

The message, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. One hundred twenty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Abbitt	Frenzel	Powell
Abourezk	Garmatz	Price, Tex.
Anderson, Ill.	Gibbons	Pucinski
Andrews, Ala.	Goodling	Rallsback
Biaggi	Green, Oreg.	Reid, N.Y.
Blanton	Gubser	Rooney, Pa.
Brooks	Halpern	Rosenthal
Brown, Mich.	Hanna	Roy
Camp	Hansen, Wash.	Scheuer
Carey, N.Y.	Harvey	Schwengel
Casey, Tex.	Hawkins	Sebelius
Clark	Hébert	Shriver
Clawson, Del.	Hicks, Mass.	Smith, Calif.
Clay	Hollifield	Springer
Conyers	Kazen	Stafford
Corbett	Keith	Staggers
Davis, Ga.	King	Steele
Denholm	Lent	Steiger, Wis.
Diggs	Long, La.	Talcott
Dowdy	McCulloch	Teague, Tex.
Dwyer	Mailliard	Udall
Eckhardt	Mann	Wilson, Bob
Edwards, La.	Murphy, Ill.	Wilson,
Esch	Murphy, N.Y.	Charles H.
Fascell	Passman	Wolf
Fisher	Patman	Young, Fla.
Fraser	Pepper	Young, Tex.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 352 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT, PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT, AND APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT EXTENSIONS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 373 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 373

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5376) to extend the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule.—

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Indiana that there has been no completed business at all since the Chair has just announced the presence of a quorum.

The Clerk will continue reading the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

It shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Public Works now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule, and said substitute shall be read for amendment by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. After the passage of H.R. 5376, the Committee on Public Works shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 575, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 5376 as passed by the House.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

	[Roll No. 62]	
Abbutt	Frenzel	Pucinski
Abouzeck	Frey	Railsback
Alexander	Gettys	Rarick
Anderson, Ill.	Gibbons	Reid, N.Y.
Andrews, Ala.	Goodling	Rooney, Pa.
Barrett	Green, Ore.	Rosenthal
Blanton	Gubser	Ruppe
Brooks	Halpern	Scheuer
Brown, Mich.	Hanna	Schwengel
Buchanan	Hansen, Wash.	Sebelius
Camp	Harvey	Shriver
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Sikes
Casey, Tex.	Hicks, Mass.	Smith, Calif.
Clark	Horton	Staggers
Clawson, Del	Jarman	Steele
Clay	Kazen	Steiger, Wis.
Collins, Ill.	Keith	Stephens
Collins, Tex.	King	Talcott
Corbett	Landrum	Taylor
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Tierman
Davis, Wis.	Lujan	Van Deerlin
Devine	McCloskey	Vigorito
Diggs	McCulloch	Waldie
Dowdy	McFall	Whitten
Dwyer	McKay	Widnall
Eckhardt	Mailliard	Wiggins
Edwards, Calif.	Mann	Wilson, Bob
Edwards, La.	Mathias, Calif.	Wilson,
Esch	Moorhead	Charles H.
Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.	Wolf
Fascell	Nichols	Yatron
Fisher	Powell	
Fraser	Price, Tex.	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois), on this rollcall 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT, THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT, AND THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT EXTENSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee and I reserve the balance of my time.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

One hundred ninety-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

	[Roll No. 63]	
Abbutt	Fisher	Pepper
Abouzeck	Fountain	Peysner
Adams	Frenzel	Pike
Alexander	Frey	Podell
Anderson, Ill.	Goodling	Powell
Andrews, Ala.	Green, Ore.	Price, Tex.
Ashley	Griffiths	Pucinski
Barrett	Gubser	Railsback
Blackburn	Halpern	Rees
Boggs	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Boland	Hanna	Rooney, Pa.
Brademas	Hansen, Wash.	Rosenthal
Brooks	Harvey	Scheuer
Brown, Mich.	Hicks, Mass.	Schneebell
Camp	Horton	Schwengel
Carey, N.Y.	Jarman	Sebelius
Casey, Tex.	Jonas	Shriver
Celler	Kazen	Smith, Calif.
Clark	Keith	Staggers
Clawson, Del	Long, La.	Steed
Clay	McCloskey	Steele
Collins, Ill.	McCulloch	Steiger, Wis.
Conyers	McFall	Symington
Corbett	McMillan	Talcott
Davis, Wis.	Mailliard	Udall
Dellenback	Mann	Vigorito
Diggs	Martin	Whalen
Dowdy	Mathias, Calif.	Wiggins
Dwyer	Melcher	Wilson,
Edwards, La.	Miller, Calif.	Charles H.
Ellberg	Montgomery	Wolf
Evins, Tenn.	Moorhead	
Fascell	Murphy, Ill.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 336 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT, PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT, AND APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT EXTENSIONS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 373, provides for an open rule of 2 hours of general debate and consideration of H.R. 5376. This legislation is what is known as the public

works bill. Ninety percent of the congressional candidates during the campaign last fall told the people of their districts that they would support legislation to eradicate unemployment, curb inflation, and get the economy of our country back on the track so that prosperity can be restored for millions of families who are on relief and welfare or are unable to provide their children with the proper education and other necessities. This legislation is an amended and an extension of the Public Works Acceleration Act and the Economic Development Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act. The program originally started back in 1962, and at that time the bill called for increasing employment, helping communities provide facilities, such as water and sewer works, hospitals, roads and highway improvements, and public buildings, and so forth.

Under this bill, projects will be authorized and eligible areas have been limited to those designated as in high unemployment and low-income areas which have suffered vast unemployment.

Two billion dollars have been authorized for grants for these qualified and unemployed depression areas over the Nation.

Title II of the bill would amend the Public Works and Economic Development Act which provides Federal financial and technical assistance, in cooperation with the States, for the creation of new jobs.

Grants are authorized for public works and development facilities conducive to the development and operation of private enterprise.

At the present time \$500 million annually is authorized until June 30 of this year. H.R. 5376 would extend the authorization for 2 years and increase it to \$550 million annually.

Loans of up to 100 percent of project cost are authorized to finance public works and development facilities and business development loans of up to 65 percent are authorized for the purchase or development of land and facilities within redevelopment areas.

The annual authorization until June 30 of this year is limited to \$170 million. This authorization is extended for 2 years.

Grants-in-aid are authorized up to 75 percent of the cost of planning and administrative expenses to appropriate public and private nonprofit State, area, and local organizations.

An appropriation of \$50 million for fiscal year 1971 is presently authorized. This authorization would be extended for 2 years.

Multicounty economic development districts containing two or more redevelopment areas and at least one growth center are designated and 10 percent additional funds for projects within those areas are authorized. Designated areas would not be terminated in less than 3 years from date of designation.

The \$50 million is authorized annually until June 30 and this authorization would be extended for 2 years.

Appropriate economic development



regions and the procedures for establishment of appropriate multi-state regional commissions are authorized.

The present authorization is \$255 million for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30. This authorization would be increased to \$305 million for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973.

Title III of the bill extends the non-highway programs of the Appalachian regional development program for 4 years—from June 30, 1971, to June 30, 1975—and the Appalachian development highway and local access road program for an additional 5 years—from June 30, 1973, to June 30, 1978. Administrative expenses are authorized for an additional 4-year period. The total new authorization in this title is \$1,544.8 million.

It is estimated that over 6 million heads of families are seeking employment without success throughout the Nation, and primarily in the large urban areas. There are now over 50 labor and industrial areas reporting "substantial unemployment," meaning over 6 percent. Unemployment is growing which is illustrated by the fact that last fall there were only 35 major labor areas in the substantial unemployment list.

It is now incumbent upon this Congress to take the lead and initiate work programs which will attack and curtail further growth of a depression which is now scouring our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district, the Calumet region of Indiana, is one of the communities rapidly growing stagnant and industrial plants not operating full capacity, tax revenue declining and public service diminishing. My area is one of 50 labor areas throughout the Nation that could be revitalized by the initiation of public works projects that have been on the shelf for lack of adequate financing. This situation can be remedied by passing this legislation and making funds available under this accelerated public works bill.

This legislation is not a Federal hand-out. The workers need jobs and the country needs their skills and production.

Many projects over the Nation, including highways and transportation have studies completed and blueprints and architectural designs are ready for consideration, but are tied up by lack of money and this legislation can create new jobs, payrolls, and immediately make millions of our workers taxpayers instead of relief and welfare recipients. I urge the Congress to adopt this rule and pass this public works bill by a vast majority.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

House Resolution 373 makes in order for consideration of H.R. 5376 under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Before I explain the purpose of this legislation, I would like to voice my support for the extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1971 for 4 more years and for the continuation of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

This unique and innovative Federal-State-local governmental partnership has been an invaluable tool to the economic and social development of my district

and, for that matter, for the entire 13-State Appalachian region.

The Appalachian Regional Commission which has done significant work in Tennessee's Appalachian counties, was organized with the specific goal of stimulating the development of a diversified economic structure capable of a self-sustaining pattern of growth in Appalachia.

The rate of unemployment in the Appalachian region has consistently exceeded that of the Nation. An important part of the mission assigned to the Appalachian Regional Commission has been to help decrease unemployment by increasing local economic activity and employment.

Mr. Speaker, there have been definite signs of improvement since the Appalachian Commission began operation in 1965.

In 1969, the rate of unemployment in Appalachia exceeded that in the rest of the Nation by only 0.4 percent, the lowest since the Commission came into operation. At the same time the rate of growth in employment exceeded that in the Nation by 0.2 percent.

My own district in Tennessee has greatly benefited from the fine programs of the Appalachian Regional Commission. In Carter County, Tenn., the Appalachian Commission was instrumental in assisting with improving the Elizabethton State Area Vocational Education Center, and in Washington County, the Johnson City Mental Health Center has received significant assistance. Both of these projects will help improve the economic and social climate of this area. They are but a sampling of the fine programs being carried out by this Commission.

As I said recently here on the floor, the Appalachian Regional Commission is also doing everything it can in assisting with the plight of the Big Springs community in Hancock County, which is also in my district. With the help of this unique Federal-State-local agency, the residents of Big Springs will have access to their county seat without having to drive 34 miles out of their way. The only way to get across the Clinch River, which separates the 163 residents of Big Springs from the county seat of Sneedville, is in a leaky wooden boat or a rickety old swinging foot bridge.

This is the epitome of the type of communities that the Appalachian program helps. With such improvements, the Appalachian Regional Commission is attaining the goal of developing a "diversified economic structure" that is self-sustaining. These programs, such as Big Springs, help the people help themselves.

These types of improvements, together with the Appalachian development highway system, the health programs, the environmental programs, and many others, must continue in Appalachia if this vast area that was left behind by the rest of the Nation is to catch up economically.

The mechanism of the Appalachian Regional Commission, which is made up of the 13-member Governors and a Federal cochairman appointed by the President, is unique among Federal programs.

The Commission works from the ground-level, that is from the people, and is not a huge, insensitive bureaucracy that dictates its wishes on the citizens.

Another rather significant point I would like to make about the Appalachian Commission is that it spends only 1.25 percent of its appropriated funds for administering the entire program.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that abandonment of the Commission before its task is completed would result in the loss of the maximum impact of the substantial investment already made and would be a cruel disappointment to the people of the Appalachian region.

The purpose of the bill before us here today is to: First, reactivate the Public Works Acceleration Act and authorize \$2 billion for its implementation; second, to extend the Public Works Economic Development Act for 2 years, and third, to extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act for 4 years and the highway programs under the act for an additional 5 years. Total authorizations contained in the bill are \$5,495,300,000 through fiscal 1978.

Title I is unnecessary and should be eliminated. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this section of the act is nothing more than a pork barrel and I strongly urge that it be stricken. It reactivates the 1962 Public Works Acceleration Act, amends it in several major instances, and authorizes \$2 billion to be appropriated with out fiscal year limitation.

The bill grants this sum to the President for his use in making grants for public works projects—Federal, State, and local in nature. Grants of 80 percent in normal circumstances and up to 100 percent where a State or local government has exhausted its taxing or borrowing resources are to be available to qualified areas. In order to qualify, a community must have been designated as a "redevelopment area," an "economic development center" as those terms are now defined by the act or must have unemployment of 6 percent or more. Projects for which grant assistance will be available include water and sewage treatment plants, sewer and water systems, hospitals and health facilities, public buildings, street and road construction and improvements, and any other type of construction of a public nature.

The committee's report notes that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 sets forth stringent and time consuming requirements to ensure that environmental factors are fully weighed and public hearings held before any such construction is undertaken. The report calls on the President to streamline such procedures, but it is not very clear how this will be done in view of the law's requirements.

Title II extends the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, whose purpose is to assist in the economic development and elimination of unemployment in the Nation's less developed areas. Under the act five regional commissions have been created to oversee programs in various areas. The act provides grants to develop facilities necessary for industrial development—roads,

airports, water and sewage systems, and similar works. The bill extends the grant authority programs, both basic and supplemental, for 2 additional years—through fiscal 1973—and authorizes \$500 million annually in such grant assistance. Also extended is the technical grant assistance program, authorized at \$50 million annually for 2 years. Further, the bill extends for 2 years the concurrent program providing for development loans to businesses and a guarantee loan assistance program, both aimed at encouraging businesses to locate plants in such areas. This program is authorized for 2 additional years at an annual rate of \$170 million. Finally, the administrative costs for the five regional commissions are authorized for 2 years at an annual rate of \$305 million.

Title III of the bill extends the non-highway programs of the Appalachian Regional Development Act for 4 years—through fiscal 1975—and the act's highway programs for 5 years—through fiscal 1976—and authorizes appropriations totaling \$1,544,800,000 for the projects over the next 5 fiscal years.

The authorization for completion of the Appalachian highway program totals \$925 million. Approximately 50 percent of the 2,572-mile system has been completed to date.

Programs continued by the bill include those to fill in abandoned mines and reclaim strip mining areas, and grant assistance programs for land acquisition or construction projects needed to encourage industrial expansion. These programs are extended for 4 years and authorize \$302 million for the 2-year period, fiscal 1972-73, and \$314 million for the 2-year period, fiscal 1974-75.

Authorizations contained in the bill are as follows:

Title I Public Works Acceleration Act—\$2 billion.

Title II Public Works and Economic Development Act—\$1,945,500,000.

Title III Appalachian Regional Development Act—\$1,544,800.

This sum is proposed to be expended over the 5-year period, fiscal 1971-76.

The bill was reported by House rules by a voice vote. There are no departmental letters.

Minority views are filed by seven Members. They basically support the bill but oppose enactment of title I, believing that public works construction jobs will solve very little of the problem of unemployment since so much of that situation is related to reduction of defense-related and aerospace employment of skilled and technical employees. They also point to the strict requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which must be adhered to in any public construction project. This, plus normal delays in starting any new program, indicates to these Members that title I can have very little effect in removing the short-term unemployment problem now existing.

Supplemental views are filed by another seven Members also opposing title I. They cite the same problems of delay in implementation and the skills of so many of the unemployed as reasons to reject the title.

The letter of request asks for a 2-

hour open rule, with provision to insert the language of the House-passed bill into S. 575, which has been referred to the Public Works Committee.

I have no further request for time, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Two hundred twenty-four Members are present, a quorum.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. Two hundred twenty-one Members are present, a quorum.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to revise and extend my remarks and also that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. QUILLLEN) and others be allowed to revise and extend their remarks.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman when he does extend his remarks will explain this unusual rule that has not been explained.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5376) to extend the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill H.R. 5376, with Mr. SLACK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK) will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege and honor to present to the House today H.R. 5376 which amends several important major acts dealing with economic development and unemployment. I believe this to be one of the most important pieces of legislation that we shall act upon during this session of the Congress for it deals with a human problem—to provide useful employment to the unemployed and underemployed.

Two subcommittees of the Committee on Public Works held 5 days of public hearings during the week of March 16 and took testimony from 107 witnesses and received statements from a number of others.

This bill will do three things:

First, title I will reactivate the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 and modifies it to meet the economic conditions confronting us in 1970.

This act was originally designed to accelerate construction of public works in an effort to assist in the relief of unemployment. The proposed modifications include an immediate authorization for an appropriation of \$2 billion, broadens the criteria for designating areas eligible for receiving financial assistance and liberalizes the conditions under which assistance can be granted. I shall explain these changes in more detail later.

Second, title II will extend for 2 years the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The purpose of this act is to provide Federal help, in cooperation with the States, to assist communities, areas, and regions in the United States which are suffering from excessive unemployment or underemployment by providing financial and technical assistance needed for the creation of new jobs. Unlike the Public Works Acceleration Act, its emphasis is on long-range planning and programing for economic development.

Among the changes proposed in this title is one to increase authorizations of \$1,945.5 million for the fiscal years 1972 and 1973 to carry out the purposes of titles I thru V. There are no proposed changes in titles VI and VII. In addition, revisions and additions are made in the technical criteria for the designation of areas as redevelopment areas eligible for financial assistance under this act. Another important change is that no designated area may be terminated in less than 3 years from the date of designation.

Title II also extends the five regional commissions, the Ozarks Regional Commission, the New England Regional Commission, the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, the Four Corners Regional Commission, and the Coastal Plains Regional Commission. The Regional Com-



missions are now at the completing stage of presenting their regional economic development plans that have taken years of effort to produce.

Title III of H.R. 5376 will extend the Appalachian Act for 4 years and the highway provisions for 5 years. The total new authorizations total approximately \$1.5 billion.

Six years ago Congress passed the Appalachian Regional Development Act to assist in resolving the severe economic problems which had been afflicting the Appalachian region. The purpose of the act, is:

To assist the Region in meeting the special problems, to promote its economic development, and to establish a framework for joint federal and state efforts toward providing the basic facilities essential to its growth and attacking its common problems and meeting its common needs on a coordinated and concerted regional basis.

The Congress expected that, as the region obtained the needed physical and transportation facilities and developed its human resources, it would generate a diversified industry and develop a self-sustaining economy. There is general agreement on both sides of the aisle that this program has been highly successful and should be continued.

Before proceeding to discuss in more detail the changes in title I, I would like to express my appreciation and to commend my colleagues who in the face of many other pressing problems devoted a great deal of hard work and time in bringing this important legislation before you early in this session of the Congress.

I would also like to acknowledge the splendid contributions made by my colleague Ed EDMONDSON of Oklahoma who will explain title II, and Bob JONES of Alabama who will explain title III. Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to all of my colleagues on the committee on both sides of the aisle for their constructive help and criticism.

I would particularly like to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the House Public Works Committee, the Honorable WILLIAM HARSHA.

To assist in understanding the significance and importance of title I, I would like to briefly summarize the economic conditions now confronting this Nation.

The report issued on Friday, April 2, 1971, by the Secretary of Labor shows that unemployment is now 6 percent with over 5 million persons unemployed. This is about one-third higher than a year ago. Also the Joint Economic Committee in its report of March 30, 1971, on the February 1971 Economic Report of the President, expects unemployment to remain at about 5½ to 6 percent throughout the year.

Many of the jobless are drawing unemployment compensation which, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, may exceed \$5 billion. In the month of January alone, payments amounted to about \$560 million or 70 percent above those of a year ago.

From the short-range standpoint, we are experiencing throughout the Nation very high unemployment and that unemployment is not uniformly spread over the

Nation. There are spots where it is worse, and spots where it is better. Title I is designed specifically for this type of situation. It is primarily short-term legislation—to accelerate in areas of high unemployment public works projects and programs already authorized by the Congress. It is designed to provide jobs quickly in those areas where they are needed. Unlike unemployment compensation and welfare payments, the construction of such projects as sewers, hospitals, nursing homes, and water supply will be an investment that enhances the value of our communities and the Nation and will provide benefits and services for years to come. No one, of course, can evaluate the tremendous intangible benefits of providing gainful employment to those seeking work.

We have a multibillion-dollar backlog of public works on the shelf at Federal, State, and local levels. Much of this work is planned and should be gotten underway quickly.

We are faced with a situation today not too much different than we had in 1962. The 1962 act was designed to meet the problems of unemployment at that time by providing work for the unemployed and construction and rehabilitation of many local facilities. Under that act we built 7,769 public works projects involving expenditures of \$861 million. Of this amount 82 percent was allotted to grant-in-aid projects of State and local communities and 17 percent to direct Federal projects. Only about 1 percent of these funds were spent for administration costs since we used existing Federal agencies.

During this period we constructed waste treatment, water and sewers, hospitals, and other health facilities together with streets and a variety of other facilities. The Department of Commerce estimated that by June 30, 1964, approximately 210 thousand man years of on-site and off-site employment had been generated.

The projects to be constructed under the provisions of title I, as was the case of those constructed under the original 1962 act, are those which can be started quickly, meet an essential public need, be essentially completed in 12 months, contribute significantly to the reduction of unemployment and also be consistent with existing local plans. They should be small- and medium-size projects, with priority given to those requiring large amounts of labor.

I do not regard this bill as a complete answer to all our economic problems.

Obviously other means will be required to restore full employment on a satisfactory basis including budgetary, monetary, and an income policy. However, I do regard it as a timely and effective means of stimulating the economy. The March 30, 1971 Joint Economic Report clearly points out the need for stimulation. I would like to quote from page 21 of that report:

Because of the strong possibility that the proposed policies will not produce the vigorous recovery projected by the Administration both the Administration and the Congress should stand ready to enact an appropriate combination of expenditure programs and

tax reductions to further strengthen the economy.

I firmly believe that this bill stands four-square with the recommendations of the Joint Economic Committee report and with the Unemployment Act of 1946. One of the advantages of public works expenditures is that they can be directed to areas of greatest unemployment and at the same time provide a community with needed public facilities to assist in meeting its present and future requirements.

There are also a few amendments to the 1962 act which I would like specifically to bring to your attention. The bill emphasized congressional recognition of communities and areas burdened by substantial unemployment and underemployment. Eligible areas include those redevelopment areas or economic growth centers and areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as suffering from substantial unemployment under the criteria specified in the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965. In addition, eligible areas also include those which the Secretary of Labor designates each month as having been areas of substantial unemployment for at least 6 of the previous 12 months.

The discussion of title II will make clear the specific changes in criteria which will effect the designation of redevelopment areas and correspondingly their eligibility under title I. At the present time it is estimated that about one-third of the counties in the United States will be covered under existing criteria but this number will be increased as a result of the revised criteria.

In my opinion title I also corrects a major weakness in the 1962 act; that it failed to provide financial assistance to some communities that needed help most, but were too poor to provide the required local matching share—in some cases they could not even put up 25 to 50 percent of the total project cost. The bill as amended would provide Federal participation to 80 percent and up to 100 percent of the project cost if the State or local Government has exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing authority and is unable to assume the financial obligations required.

Funds allocated under this act are available to any State or local government for either a basic or supplemental grant to cover its share of the contribution to a federally assisted or federally constructed project. As in 1962 not more than 10 percent of the funds may be allocated to a single State.

In an effort to improve further the quality of life, the bill requires that the President give priority to public works for which there is an urgent and vital public need. Works for storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water and sewage treatment and sewer facilities are specifically mentioned. As in the 1962 act grants cannot be made for educational programs.

Another significant change from the 1962 act is the revision of the maintenance of effort by the State or local government, by eliminating the requirement for an increase in the non-Federal

construction expenditures as a condition for receiving a grant. However, it prohibits the President from making any allocation if the proposed or planned total expenditure—exclusive of Federal funds—of such State or local government during such fiscal year for all its capital expenditures is decreased.

With an updated public works program and with several billion dollars of projects in Federal and State levels now on the shelf, people will be put back on the payrolls, taken off the welfare rolls, and off unemployment compensation. At the same time we will help improve the quality of life and brighten our communities—urban and rural—and help revive our sagging economy.

At this point I would like to call the attention of the membership to the testimony before the Committee of Robert Nathan, eminent economist. This is quoted on page 7 of the report before you.

In his testimony Mr. Nathan pointed out the importance of distinguishing among the types of construction projects to be included in an accelerated public-works program. Some can be started quickly and are more essential than others. Many can enrich our lives by providing more and better facilities with limited funding. He also emphasized the importance of providing fruitful and productive work for the unemployed:

Waste human, financial, and material revenues can be converted into useful services sorely needed by our citizens. And finally the prospects for a sluggish economy for 1971 and 1972 can be heartened through such a constructive program.

I subscribe to Mr. Nathan's views based on my experience in Minnesota with the 1962 Act and also my evaluation of the economic and unemployment situation now confronting us. I am sure that other members have had experience similar to mine.

In this connection I would also like to direct your attention to the committee's report on title I where attention was called to the \$11 billion in funds being withheld as of February 23, 1971 by the administration from appropriations already made by the Congress. A review of the items on the list of withheld funds shows a large amount of construction funds or loan grants that would affect construction and unemployment. I strongly urge that pending the enactment of this bill the administration review this list to determine whether any of these funds can be released to assist in meeting the unemployment problems now confronting those areas of the Nation that would be assisted by the enactment of title I.

In closing, I cannot overemphasize the importance of an imaginative and aggressive administration. We must assume this will be provided and that a cooperative and willing administration can make this program a success. We can with the same resolve as in 1962 get this country on the move.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me address myself to two titles of the bill—titles II and III, which extend the authorizations for the Economic Develop-

ment Act and the Appalachian Act, respectively.

I wholeheartedly endorse both of these measures. The Economic Development Administration has helped communities to build facilities essential to industrial expansion. It has encouraged economic growth, development and employment. The long-range objective of the Federal assistance provided is to create not temporary, but permanent jobs. A prerequisite to participation is the preparation of long-range plans for development and growth. This is referred to as an overall economic development plan or OEDP. It is not just an exercise in planning. An OEDP is an inventory of local resources and needs. It lists community goals and sets priorities to assure an orderly, effective, development process. Participation in the preparation of an OEDP brings all factions of a community together to work for a common cause—the full development and growth of the area and the creation of new job opportunities.

Overall, the EDA program has been administered effectively and efficiently and it brings local communities into the picture. They must determine their needs, initiate the application and justify the expenditure of Federal dollars to assist them.

It is the same with the Appalachian Act and its Regional Commission. Here again action at the local level is the key. A Federal, State, and local partnership has been established. In this title, we have not only extended the act for 4 years, but we have provided for block grants. Local people and the States determine where the money will be spent. This has been one of the most successful Federal-aid programs ever devised. It is, in effect, a revenue-sharing program. It requires the most vigorous participation at the local level. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the House to approve titles II and III of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I do object, however, to title I of H.R. 5376, the so-called Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971. The passage of title I of the bill to allegedly combat unemployment in the Nation would be like using a hammer to fix a leaky faucet. This legislation is the wrong tool for the job, and all of the good intentions in the world are not going to make it right.

The APW approach endeavors to cure the ills of 1970 with the patent medicines of the early 1960's. Title I implies that unemployment across the country varies in degree, but not in kind, and this is just not so. The great bulk of today's unemployed are skilled, highly trained people. Many were formerly employed in aerospace, defense and other technical industries. They are scientists, engineers, and technicians. These skills cannot be easily adapted to the construction trades. I simply cannot conceive of an accelerated public works program that could possibly help unskilled laborers and unemployed scientists at the same time.

When we passed the 1962 act, the unemployed were not the same kind as they are today. Unemployment in the construction industry was higher than it is now. We were not making the transition from a wartime economy to a peacetime

economy. Nor were we experiencing a cutback in employment related to national defense in 1962 as we are today.

What we really have before us is a proposal to resurrect a 9-year-old law which was designed to cope with the problems of 1962. It is now supposed to help us solve the new, more complex, demands of the 1970's. The 1962 act did not successfully resolve the problems then, and its outdated nostrums will not succeed now. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons the Economic Development Act was devised in the first place was because accelerated public works did not get the job done. Its resuscitation cannot possibly provide jobs for the new unemployed from aerospace, defense, and other technically oriented industries.

Figures from the report on H.R. 5376 prove the old law was not effective—even under the favorable circumstances of 1962 when you had a Congress that wanted accelerated public works, a Senate that wanted accelerated public works and an administration that wanted accelerated public works. Even though all of them worked together to expedite the program, results, were disappointing. It was 9 months before any appreciable increase in employment actually occurred and it was not until 22 months after enactment that the peak of employment in the program was reached—only a little over 1 percent of the total unemployed.

The committee report urges that projects of immediate potential impact be emphasized. They were in the 1960's. But the construction process did not respond to legislative exhortation then, nor is it likely it will now. To begin with, the same set of favorable circumstances do not now exist. The Environmental Policy Act, for example, will impose delays from 90 days to 4 months. Under the circumstances, you cannot possibly bring immediate help to the unemployed. To say that you can, is to delude them—and the American people.

Mr. Chairman, we have been exposed to all kinds of fanfare about how a reincarnation of this program will solve our current ills and it just is not so. The program will not only thwart efforts to curb inflation but its implementation will itself be inflationary. Its greatest impact will not come for 2 to 3 years. This is borne out by the majority report of the committee. Thus, the full impact will only be felt as administration efforts themselves are peaking. Conceivably by that time, there could be full employment in the country. If that is the case, this program will drive employment costs even higher and inflation will be rekindled. As I see it, we are gambling with the welfare of not only retired persons living on fixed incomes, but of the entire Nation. In conjunction with other irresponsible actions that the Congress has already taken, enactment of title I of H.R. 5376 will do violence to the full-employment budget principle and the budget discipline needed to make it work. As examples, of other inflationary actions, I cite the following:

First. Social security amendments, Public Law 92-5, which added \$4.1 billion to the fiscal year 1972 deficit, and



which will increase budget outlays in future years by \$2 billion more than the President has proposed;

Second, H.R. 6531, the military pay increase bill, which would add \$1.7 billion to the fiscal year 1972 budget.

Third, The 1972 education and related agencies appropriation bill (H.R. 7016), passed by the House, which would add \$273 million to fiscal year 1972 spending. Later actions on related education appropriation bills may raise this amount to \$400 million.

All of these actions—and, especially title I of H.R. 5376—would seriously weaken our ability to exercise fiscal restraint in the years beyond 1972.

Budget restraint is not the responsibility of the President alone. The Congress must do its share. The inflationary actions we take now cannot be offset later. The three additions I enumerated would add over \$6 billion to 1972 spending. No significant spending cuts have yet been made by the Congress and it is unlikely that we will make any that even approach \$6 billion. That is why it is so important that we consider the implications of the spending action we take here today.

Now I should like to address myself to what the administration is doing to alleviate the unemployment situation and to bolster the economy. President Nixon has proposed a bold, four-pronged effort to create more jobs, raise family incomes, and expand public services. His recommendations include:

First, a full employment Federal budget in fiscal year 1972, calling for \$229 billion in Federal expenditures, over \$17 billion more than will be expended during the current fiscal year.

Second, general revenue sharing, which in its first full year will allocate \$5 billion in unrestricted funds to State and local governments.

Third, a \$4.5 billion welfare reform measure, which would place a floor on the income of poor families, provide new manpower services and create at least 200,000 public service jobs for welfare recipients.

Fourth, the Manpower Revenue Sharing Act of 1971, which was introduced last month.

These actions will have a far-reaching impact on both the level of employment and the adequacy of public services. Coupled with a more flexible monetary policy, they will stimulate our economy and, in the months ahead, add vast numbers of peace-oriented jobs. It is important to remember that all of these programs are included in the President's "full employment budget." Each is designed to create jobs in a noninflationary manner, with a maximum of price stability.

A closer look at the President's budget shows that total Federal outlays for public works construction in fiscal 1972 will be almost \$3.2 billion greater than in 1970 and almost \$1.4 billion greater than this year. These sums represent substantial increases in public works spending. Additionally, the Postal Service will construct several hundred postal buildings in 1972 under a lease-construction program using private capital. This will create even more jobs in the construc-

tion industry. The General Services Administration is asking the Congress for similar authority.

In addition to the foregoing, the President has recommended to the Congress a \$2 billion waste-treatment facilities construction program. This amount is more than double any previous Presidential request for environmental enhancement and protection of our waterways. If approved, a vast number of jobs in the construction and allied industries will be created. But here again remember, this effort was formulated within budgetary guidelines and is aimed at providing jobs without the inflationary pressures which title I will undoubtedly produce. In other words, the President's recommendations will lead to economic improvement with the price stability that is lacking in title I.

Quite obviously, the President's proposals will create far more new and additional jobs in the public works area than title I of H.R. 5376 ever will. And they will do so without the inflationary impact and ramifications of title I.

Throughout my remarks and in our minority views we have alluded to the fact that H.R. 5376 would not reach the unemployed engineer, scientist, and highly skilled technician. The record of the hearings bears this out. That is the reason the President, recognizing that a greatly expanded public works program will not reach the people who need help most, has ordered a multi-million-dollar technology mobilization and re-employment program. This effort is designed to provide jobs and retraining for those unemployed who would not benefit from a title I type of program. It is under way now, and we will begin to see results from it in the near future. Its impact will be immediate; whereas accelerated public works will not. No, the APW program contained in title I is not an answer to today's problems. It will foster inflation without materially affecting today's unemployment. It will not do what its proponents hope, but it very likely will, if enacted, seriously interfere with sound long-range efforts to restore balanced noninflationary growth in our economy. At best, title I offers an uncertain and imperfect cure for our present difficulties. Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, I shall offer a motion to strike title I.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude my remarks with a further word about Appalachia. Since August of 1965, my home State of Ohio has been an active participant in the Appalachian program. The program has experienced considerable success in Ohio in influencing the course of economic development. For this and other reasons, I favor its extension.

In the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, Congress recognized Appalachia as an area which, though rich in natural resources and economic potential, had seriously lagged behind the rest of the Nation in economic growth. Congress also found that the region, historically dependent on a few basic industries and marginal agricultural activities, did not possess the kind of economic infrastructure needed to become self-sustaining. We, therefore, created the Appalachian Regional Com-

mission as a Federal-State partnership to promote orderly, accelerated economic development in the region.

A fundamental goal of the Commission was the development of human resources in the area. We recognized that large portions of Appalachia suffered from severe health and educational deficiencies which resulted in the chronic inability of many residents to compete effectively in the labor market. They were, thus, unable to achieve adequate living standards. The Commission was charged with the responsibility of assisting Appalachian residents to improve their health and develop their skills in order to enable them to compete for jobs wherever they might choose to live and work.

The enabling legislation established specific programs for achieving these goals. Primary emphasis was placed on the development of a road network to open up areas in the region with a potential for growth. Other programs focused on upgrading the quality of the region's human resources through the development of health and educational facilities tailored to the unique needs of Appalachia. A special effort was directed toward providing assistance for planning and other preliminary expenses of proposed housing projects. Such incentives have helped to stimulate the construction of over 7,000 new units of badly needed low- and moderate-income housing.

Appalachia's economy is more resource-oriented than most other areas of the Nation. Because of this, the Commission has had to deal with serious environmental problems. Mine and water pollution, for example, has posed both health and safety hazards. It has also inhibited new industry from locating in the area. To overcome such problems, the Commission has concentrated on developing plans to assure that in the future Appalachia's resource endowment will be managed more effectively.

Section 214 of the 1965 act provided for supplementary grants to enable certain applicants to participate in regular Federal programs where they did not have sufficient funds to meet the usual Federal matching requirements. Since all Appalachian funds flow through the States, this special supplemental fund had the advantage of permitting the States to participate in the planning of projects in cases where normal Federal procedures would otherwise have bypassed them. This overcame complaints of several Governors that Federal programs frequently did not allow for a State voice, even in cases where they had a significant impact on State programs.

Finally, in an attempt to achieve maximum local participation in development-planning and decisionmaking, the legislation contained a provision for assistance in funding multicounty development districts. There are presently 57 such districts operational in the region.

In carrying out these programs, the Commission has emphasized participation and coordination at all levels of Government. The philosophy behind this approach is that, as the region obtains the necessary physical and transportation facilities, and as it develops its human resources, a more diversified

industrial and economic infrastructure will develop and the region will eventually become self-sustaining.

A second characteristic of the Commission's strategy should also be emphasized. With certain exceptions in the area of human resource development, Commission investments were concentrated in areas of relatively-high economic growth potential. This was done in recognition of the fact that a program the size of Appalachia could not participate in development activities in every community in the region. By concentrating investments in areas of relatively-high growth potential, it was felt that the Commission could maximize the impact of its economic programs. In this connection, it should be emphasized that the States were responsible for the selection of growth areas and for the development of investment plans suited to the needs and potential of their people.

Overall, the Commission program has had a tremendous impact. I have already cited some of the gains made. Others include:

Over 500 miles of Appalachian development highway completed and another 374 miles under construction.

Over 260 vocational and technical training centers approved and, as of last June, 155 in operation. Prior to the program, only 20 percent of the region's manpower needs could be met through vocational and technical education programs. Today, approximately 40 percent of these needs are being met through such programs.

Twelve demonstration health projects providing comprehensive health services to multicounty areas in operation and 231 health facilities receiving or approved for funding. Other programs are directed towards increasing the supply of doctors and medical personnel in the region. In my own State, for example, 48 licensed practical nurses are enrolled in a training program. Sixteen have already graduated. All are enrolled in Ohio's health demonstration project.

Other programs address themselves to environmental problems. These have included solid waste disposal, control of land erosion, water pollution abatement, and mine area reclamation.

The list of the Commission's concrete achievements is lengthy. It includes many more undertakings than mentioned here. But tangible achievements are not the only results of the program, although they are many. There are also many intangible accomplishments.

Heading the list, in my judgment, is the new sense of optimism reflected by the people of Appalachia. Also evident is the improved capacity of all levels of Government in the region to respond more effectively to the specific needs and concerns of the people of the area.

The Appalachian program has indeed been a successful experiment. But the job is not yet done. Another 4 years will be needed to accomplish its mission. Given the outstanding record to date, I believe the Commission should have the opportunity to complete its task and I

urge enactment of title III of this legislation in order to enable it to do so.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred and three Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES).

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I shall briefly address myself to title III.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding to me.

I rise in support of this bill and, in particular, would like to address my remarks to title I, the Public Works Act amendments.

The purpose of these amendments is to renew the activities of the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 to meet the severe economic conditions confronting the country here in 1971. The purpose of the 1962 act was twofold in that it was intended to increase employment in those areas of greatest need and to provide the basic facilities such as water and sewer works, hospitals, road improvements, public buildings, and the like. The construction of many of these facilities would not only provide immediate employment in the accelerated program but would create the potential for further permanent employment in the facilities constructed such as water and sewer plants, hospitals, and so forth.

Title I of this legislation would broaden the coverage of that of 1962 and liberalize the conditions under which assistance could be extended in order to more effectively meet the critical conditions of unemployment and underemployment which exists today in many areas of the country and in all kinds of job skills.

The Secretary of Labor in his report of April 2, 1971, showed unemployment at the 6-percent level with over 5 million unemployed, or about one-third higher than a year ago. Unemployment has averaged this 6-percent figure over the last 3 months and, according to the Joint Economic Committee in its report to the President expects unemployment to remain at 5½ to 6 percent through the year. Many of the unemployed are drawing unemployment compensation which for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, may exceed \$5 billion. In the month of January alone, payments amounted to \$560 million, or about 70 percent above those of a year ago.

The 1962 act authorized the expenditure of \$900 million and under that act, 7,769 public works projects were accomplished involving expenditures of \$861 million. State and local communities were allotted grant-in-aid projects totaling 82 of this amount and direct Federal projects totaled 17 percent. Only 1 percent was used for administration since exist-

ing Federal agencies were used primarily in administering the program.

The proposed 1971 legislation would authorize \$2 billion to be spent on an accelerated public works program with the same purpose in mind as in 1962. There is currently a backlog of about \$6 billion in applications for Federal funds from communities throughout the country to help build over 6,000 waste treatment plants, waters and sewers, hospitals, nursing homes, public health centers, and so forth. These total project costs would run over \$13 billion when Federal and non-Federal funds were combined.

The manner in which the accelerated public works program would operate is that the bill would authorize the appropriation of \$2 billion to be made available immediately to the President for accelerated public works employment through Federal and local government projects. The proportions to be used for each category of projects would be determined by the President on the basis of need and the contribution that would be made to increasing employment.

The success of the accelerated public works program will require aggressive administration. Unemployment represents one of the most serious economic and human problems confronting our country today. The public works accelerated Act of 1971 is geared to alleviating this problem.

The present administration is in a negative step holding back, as has been noted so many times lately, over \$11 billion in appropriated funds. If that money were released it would also be a significant help toward increasing employment but would by no means detract from the need for this accelerated public works legislation we have before us today.

H.R. 5376 represents a positive step toward increasing the quality of life in the entire Nation while at the same time moving the Nation forward economically where the present need is most—the pocketbook of the American who needs job.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, title III of H.R. 5376 amends and extends the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 was to assist the Appalachian region that had traditionally lagged behind the rest of the Nation in its economic growth. Its intent was to assist the region in meeting its special problems, to promote its economic development and to establish a framework for joint Federal and State efforts toward providing the basic facilities essential to its growth. It was expected that as the region obtained the needed physical and transportation facilities and developed its human resources, that it would generate a diversified industry and it would then be able to support itself through the workings of a strengthened economy.

Considerable study, planning and preparation of several years went into developing this legislation by a Presidential Commission and the Conference of the Appalachian Governors. What resulted was a unique, new approach of establishing a Federal-State partnership in a



Federal program to attack the economic problems of the region.

The Appalachian program has enjoyed remarkable support during the past 6 years. It has the enthusiastic, unanimous support of every one of the 13 Governors in the region. As far as I know, it has the approval of every Member of Congress from the region. The strength of public support for the program has gained since its original enactment and is now universally firmly accepted.

The reason for its support and success can be attributed to great extent to the way the program was established. The act has provided one of the few mechanisms in the Nation of promoting a true partnership. This partnership between the Federal and State government has returned responsibility and decisionmaking authority to the State and local people. It has established, through the Commission, an organization capable of developing a Federal-State-local strategy for a balanced urban and rural growth. The lessons learned in this program could well be applied to other parts of this Nation. The program has encouraged local leadership and local action, thus assuring effective participation.

The initiative is on the local people to draw up the plans to pinpoint the needs of the locality. They have the advantage of knowing how many dollars will be available to implement their plans within the broad framework of principles adopted by the States and the Federal Cochairman on the Appalachian Regional Commission. The hard decisions of priorities in the use of these funds are made at the State and local level and not by the Federal Government. National interests are also met through the participation of the Federal agencies and the vote of the Federal Cochairman.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Today we are beginning to see the accomplishments of this program. At our hearings Federal Cochairman Whitehead advised the committee that the President had directed that an evaluation of the program be made. Although the evaluation is still underway, it is providing valuable data and insights as to the program's accomplishments.

A statistical review of accomplishments through the Appalachian program is impressive. As of December 31, 1970—

Five hundred miles of Appalachian development highways were completed and another 367 miles were under construction. Of the 2,571 miles of the system requiring construction, 2,507 miles are in some stage of route location, preliminary design, right-of-way acquisition, or construction.

Two hundred and sixty vocational and technical training centers have been approved by the Commission and, as of last June, 155 of them were in operation. This involves an annual enrollment capacity of 165,000. The impact on the region has been profound. In 1965, only 20 percent of the regional manpower needs were being met by the vocational and technical schools. Today, over 40 percent of the needs are being served by the new vocational and technical system.

Throughout the region, improvements are being made to health services. In selected sections of the region, comprehensive networks of health services are being developed. Fifty-one new health services were inaugurated in fiscal 1970 alone. A total of 230 projects have been approved involving planning, construction, and operation of facilities. Some of these health programs are among the best in the country.

The Appalachian Housing Fund, approved by Congress in 1967, has helped to initiate \$98 million in construction of low- and moderate-income housing. Fifty-nine projects have been approved representing over 7,000 new units of housing.

Work has been completed on 28 mine area reclamation projects, including 16 mine fire extinguishment projects, six mine subsidence projects, and six surface reclamation projects. Another 16 are underway, and there are 13 additional projects awaiting contract for a total of 57 projects.

Communities with potential for growth are improving their public facilities. Under the section 214 supplemental grant programs, the Commission has approved a total of 995 projects representing an Appalachian program investment of \$171 million of a total Federal and State investment of \$951 million. The projects involve the construction of public facilities in the areas of education, health, water and sewage, airports and others.

#### ECONOMIC RESULTS OF THE REGION

This numerical review of the program, of course, does not tell the economic impact the program has had on the region. These investments have created a new sense of hope and optimism to the people of the region. The program has improved the capacity of the State and local governments, particularly through the development district program.

At our hearings a summary economic report was presented to the committee by the executive director of the Commission, Ralph Widner.

The report would indicate that the goal written in the legislation in 1965, "to build a self-sustaining economy in the region" is becoming a growing reality in 1971.

All along the Appalachian development highway system and the interstate system, new development projects are in being or underway. New industrial parks, educational complexes, housing, health services, and manufacturing plants are being developed. Over 1,000 new manufacturing facilities have been located along these new arteries of transportation. This confirms the judgment that an adequate transportation network is essential to the development of the region.

The unemployment gap between Appalachia and the United States has steadily closed since 1962. By 1969, the gap was only 0.4 percent greater than the Nation. The recent surveys of major Appalachian labor markets indicate that Appalachia is holding its own reasonably well and our rates of unemployment have increased less than some other areas of the country. This is substantial progress for a region that has

traditionally seen its unemployment rates rise faster and sooner than in the rest of the United States.

This does not account for the estimated 500,000 persons who could work, but are not looking for work, because they believe jobs are unavailable, nor does the overall figure indicate the still serious problems in many parts of the region. As you know, these persons are not counted in the official unemployment statistics.

Unfortunately, some of the lowered unemployment rate can be attributed to outmigration of unemployed labor from Appalachia. However, net outmigration from the region during the decade 1960-70 was approximately half of what it was during the previous 10 years—1.1 million as compared with 2.2 million in 1950-60. But that is not the sole explanation. An improved rate of employment growth in the region has become evident. Since 1965, well over 500,000 new jobs have been added to the Appalachian economy.

Of course, the picture varies considerably from one part of the region to another. The unemployment rate in eastern Kentucky is still twice that of the Nation—it was three times the U.S. rate in 1962—and, average per capita income in the region is less than half that of the United States.

Even in the Appalachian heartland of eastern Kentucky and West Virginia and Virginia and Tennessee, there is now cause for hope. There has been an increase of 115,000 jobs in this area. Employment has increased by 20.7 percent since 1965, compared to 18 percent in the United States. New manufacturing employment, particularly in sectors which had never located in this area before, accounts for much of this increase.

The region can support its present population, but income levels must rise and new opportunities be created if we are to hold succeeding generations at home. A substantial measure of the economic improvement in the region can be related to the efforts made under this program and to the new confidence in the future which has become a major force in the region.

#### WHY THE EXTENSION OF THE PROGRAM IS NEEDED

It is essential to the future of the region that the basic commitments made in the Appalachian Act in 1965 be continued until completed. It is particularly critical that the development highway network as established early in the program be completed. The remarkable efforts which have been started to improve the basic levels of health and education in the region must be carried forward. To stop these efforts in midstream would be to waste millions of dollars in unfinished programs.

#### WHAT THE TITLE DOES

Title III amends and extends the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 as amended. This title of the bill basically extends the Appalachian development highway and access road program for an additional period of 5 years through fiscal year 1978 and the other programs for a period of 4 years through

fiscal year 1975. The total new authorizations for the Appalachian programs is \$1,544.8 million.

#### HIGHWAY AUTHORIZATIONS

The 1965 Appalachian Act authorized a development highway system and access road program to open up the region to commerce. In 1967, we added additional corridors to this system in New York and Pennsylvania. Since that time no additional corridors have been added; however, new Federal highway safety standards, new Federal relocation assistance requirements, and continuing inflation have all combined to increase the estimated cost of the system. Appropriations through fiscal year 1971 have totaled \$820 million. Construction on about 500 miles of the system has been completed and construction is underway on another 367 miles of the little more than 2,500 miles requiring construction. It is now estimated that an additional authorization of \$890 million is needed to complete the construction of this system.

The new authorizations total \$925 million to permit the completion of the system and to provide \$35 million to continue the local access road program.

#### MINING AREA RESTORATION

The mining area restoration section is amended to make it clear that the reasonable value of donated land, materials, and services may be included in the computation of the local share of cost in this program. The existing 75-25 Federal-State cost sharing ratio for restoration projects is continued.

Testimony of the hearings made it clear that the reclamation of surface lands is being limited by the inability of many local communities to provide the required 25 percent matching share in cash. The present language requires that the State and local matching share be made only in cash; no credit is allowed for land or equipment or personal services donated to the reclamation project. Several projects in the more mountainous areas of the region where local cash resources are most severely limited, have been unable to go forward because of the inability of the local communities to provide all cash for the required matching share.

In each of these instances, however, the testimony was that the local sponsors have been able to marshal what scarce resources they do have. They have arranged to have the land donated to the local government; they have public works departments with bulldozers, trucks and men, that they are willing to commit to the reclamation work; and other volunteer groups have indicated a willingness to help. We believe that such admirable local efforts to help themselves should not be thwarted and have amended the act so that the reasonable value of land, equipment and services be recognized fully in computing the total costs of such projects.

#### OTHER PROGRAM AUTHORIZATIONS

For all the other programs other than highways the title authorizes \$302 million for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 and \$314 million for fiscal years 1974 and 1975. The increases authorized over the

existing level of funding are to permit the continuing increase of emphasis on programs to develop the region's human resources; to provide additional authorizations for supplemental grant assistance for airports; safety improvements at existing airports; and to assure that the commission will be able to undertake pilot programs for solid waste disposal to remove this irritating environmental problem afflicting the region. These authorizations are provided in a block to allow flexibility to the Commission in determining its priorities as to the investment of these funds.

#### HEALTH AND EDUCATION

Two vital programs to the region have been in the areas of health and education. Testimony received at our hearings renewed our attention to the need of these services in the region and the progress being made.

Severe health problems reflected by inadequate health facilities, a critical scarcity of professional health manpower and high incidence of disease has been sapping the human resources of large areas of Appalachia and impeding regional development. The Appalachian health program has provided a comprehensive approach involving all aspects of the health care system which has begun to improve the quantity and quality of health services and to reach persons previously without access to essential care in selected areas.

There is a particularly strong need for vocational education in Appalachia. The region's dropout rate is higher than the Nation's and the proportion of students continuing their education beyond high school is considerably lower than the U.S. average.

At the same time, there is a high interest in vocational education in the region. The Commission is influencing the trend toward curriculums which are better tailored to existing and future job opportunities. Each application for assistance is required to demonstrate that course offerings will relate to job opportunities in the locality and surrounding areas. These facilities are the key elements for the training and upgrading of labor force entrants in skills required in the jobs created by the industries locating in the area.

Further emphasis should be given to these programs if they are to be truly effective. The general authorizations have been increased for these programs over prior levels by an additional \$8.5 million in fiscal years 1972 and 1973 and by \$25.5 million for fiscal years 1974 and 1975.

#### AIRPORT SAFETY

Because of the mountainous terrain throughout the region, where many times airports are constructed on mountain tops, it is particularly hazardous to general aviation and the flow of air traffic and commerce throughout the region. This undoubtedly has affected the growth of air commerce which is essential for economic growth. This potential cannot be developed without improvements to safety facilities. Existing airports must be made safe for the flow of air traffic. The recent air crash in West Virginia has focused attention on the hazards to com-

mercial aviation that exist in the region. An increase in the general authorizations to be implemented through the supplemental grant program of \$20 million in each biennium is recommended to improve the safety of existing airports in Appalachia.

#### ABANDONED CARS

No one who visits the Appalachian region can fail to note how the junk cars mar its beautiful landscapes, but a 1967 Bureau of Mines' report documents the magnitude of the problem. For example, the report estimated that, excluding junk dealer inventories and scrap yards, there was one junk car for every 21 persons in the rural area of Knox County, Tenn. Cities were also suffering from the problem; the report noted approximately 4,000 abandoned cars in Pittsburgh and nearly the same number in Knoxville, Tenn.

Some Appalachian States have already started removing abandoned cars and other durable waste from the roadsides, residential areas, and other places of casual dumping. The committee was impressed by an outstanding and highly commendable effort initiated by Gov. Arch Moore in West Virginia. At our hearings, Governor Moore described how his State had spearheaded a drive in a nine-county-pilot area, in full cooperation with private citizens, to collect abandoned cars into central locations for processing and shipment to firms which recycle scrap. The State utilized State police to locate the junk cars, obtain releases and waivers from residents where the abandoned cars were located in front yards or on the roadway, mark the cars, and notify the State's National Guard and the department of highways. These units, using their equipment, removed the identified abandoned cars. Nearly half of the 12,000 abandoned cars in the nine-county area have been collected in this way.

Five million dollars is recommended in the general authorization for fiscal years 1972 and 1973, for the purpose of permitting pilot waste clearance demonstration projects under section 302 of the act.

#### TECHNICAL CHANGES

Consistent with the extensions provided in the bill the following technical changes are made:

Section 302—amends section 105 of the act to extend the administrative expenses for the Commission at existing levels of funding for 4 additional years.

Section 303—amends section 106 of the act to extend the authority of the Commission to lease office space for 4 additional years.

Section 306—amends section 214 of the act to make supplemental grant assistance under this section available for Federal grant-in-aid programs enacted prior to December 31, 1974.

Section 308—amends section 405 of the act to extend the termination date of the act for other than the highway programs for 4 more years until July 1, 1975.

Section 309—adds a new section to prohibit discrimination because of sex under any program funded under the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

I would like to submit a chart for the



RECORD that gives a breakdown of the new funding authorized by title III:

*Administrative expenses*

Section 105:	
Fiscal years 1972, 1973.....	\$1, 900, 000
Fiscal years 1974, 1975.....	1, 900, 000
Subtotal .....	3, 800, 000

*Highway and access road program*

Section 201:	
Fiscal year 1973.....	10, 000, 000
Fiscal year 1974.....	180, 000, 000
Fiscal year 1975.....	185, 000, 000
Fiscal year 1976.....	185, 000, 000
Fiscal year 1977.....	185, 000, 000
Fiscal year 1978.....	180, 000, 000
Subtotal .....	925, 000, 000

*Other Appalachian programs*

Fiscal years 1972, 1973.....	302, 000, 000
Fiscal years 1974, 1975.....	314, 000, 000
Subtotal .....	616, 000, 000

Total new authorizations for title III..... 1, 544, 800, 000

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee and Mr. ABERNETHY, at the request of Mr. JONES of Alabama, were granted permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague and friend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) in supporting H.R. 5376 which provides for a 4-year extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission with provision for a 5-year extension of the Appalachian highway program.

I have been a strong and consistent supporter of the vital and important programs of the Appalachian Commission which is laying the foundation for great progress in Tennessee and other areas of Appalachia. Previously I have introduced a bill providing for the continuation of this program which is just beginning to have a real impact.

Progress is becoming visible in the form of highways, vocational trade schools, hospitals, health centers, airports, and other important development projects.

Much progress has been made—but the work is just beginning.

We must continue to open up and develop the great natural resources of the Appalachian region.

I am especially interested in the assistance which this program has provided for vocational and technical education—nothing is more vital and important to our region where the high school dropout rate is relatively high and the proportion of students continuing their education after high school is relatively low.

One-fourth—or \$105 million—of all appropriations for Appalachian programs since the passage of the Appalachian Regional Development Act has gone into the construction and equipment of 260 vocational education facilities. We must continue this vital program of vocational education assistance which has the highest priority in most Appalachian States.

This is an important bill—a significant bill—important to Appalachia and to the Nation.

I urge the passage of this bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, it was the desire of the Congress when it approved the Appalachian region program, to put in motion a special effort to develop communities in an area that was poor and primarily rural. The Congress determined that to get this job done the States and local areas were to work in cooperation with the Federal Government through a regional commission. A special opportunity was made available to Appalachia and good use has been made of it.

New communities are being constructed or planned in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, and several other States.

We have a good example of one of these concentrated development projects in my own district, known as the Golden Triangle.

The Golden Triangle area of Mississippi consists of parts of three counties, each of which contains an existing small city. The three cities and counties are: Starkville—Oktibbeha County; West Point—Clay County; and Columbus—Lowndes County. These cities, located 18 to 22 miles apart, form a triangle, within which are located two of Mississippi's higher educational institutions—Mississippi State University and Mississippi State College for Women. The Tombigbee River passes through the area.

About 5 years ago, the Mississippi Research and Development Center examined the impact of what is now a congressionally authorized Tombigbee River development project, and concluded that the triangle area could become a major new center of service and employment. With the prospects of this impending growth, and the need for expanding air carrier services, plans were developed for a regional airport.

Through the cooperation of the three cities, their chambers of commerce and local industrial foundations, agreement was reached on locating the new airport about the same distance from each of the three Golden Triangle cities.

The three cities and Lowndes County issued bonds and used the proceeds to purchase 1,300 acres of land in the center of the triangle area for the location of the airport. An airport commission—including one representative from each city involved in the project—was appointed to administer all business pertaining to the airport, including the 1,300 acres of land, employment of engineers, architects, approval of airport plans, submission of applications for Federal funds for the airport and access roads, and supervision of the construction of the airport, and employment of a manager.

The Appalachian Regional Commission has invested over \$3 million in public facilities in the Golden Triangle area including \$506,000 in the airport alone. Major investment effort, however, has been for educational facilities with over \$1.8 million in Appalachian funds being invested in the Golden Triangle Vocational-Technical Center and the Oktibbeha County vocational education facility.

This reflects the State's plan and desire to offer quality education at all levels, with particular emphasis upon vocational-technical skills in order to

provide higher wage employment in growing industries that will upgrade the area's economic base.

The goals that the area is attempting to attain are:

To upgrade the current conditions where low-wage industries are predominant and the economy is underdeveloped.

To overcome present inadequacies in highways, water transportation and in facilities for handling aircraft.

To upgrade facilities for vocational-technical training.

To overcome flooding and water pollution problems.

To increase water supply.

To develop new, large industrial sites to accommodate new industries.

To increase the supply of good housing for low- and moderate-income families.

Leadership in the Golden Triangle effort has come from the business and civic interests of the cities and counties. Individuals have played an important role in moving ahead the regional airport and other important facilities. The recently organized Golden Triangle Planning and Development District, with the assistance of the State's Appalachian development office, is playing a key role in the planning and development of this area.

An industrial park will be located at some point within the vicinity of the Triangle Airport. The Northeast Mississippi Industrial Development Council has indicated to the airport commission that it plans to locate a large industry in the industrial park.

A number of low- and moderate-income housing units will be located in the area.

Access roads and utilities have been approved by the Appalachian Commission.

It is our hope that by the time the job is finished we will have created in Appalachian Mississippi the third largest center of growth in the State.

Development and progress under the Appalachian program have not by any means been confined to the Golden Triangle area. Twenty counties inhabited by many people of substandard income, have benefited therefrom. Educational institutions, other than those I have mentioned, have benefited under the program and thus said benefits passed on to our educable young college students. Hospitals and medical facilities have been expanded which otherwise would have never been were it not for this program.

Our people are grateful for this much needed assistance. I join with them in urging you to support this bill.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT).

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5376. I wish to speak mainly to what I consider to be one of the outstanding features of this legislation.

Title II of H.R. 5376 would extend the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 for 2 more years through fiscal year 1973.

I thank our distinguished chairman, Mr. BLATNIK, and our esteemed ranking member, Mr. HARSHA, for their leadership

as well as the full interest shown by all the members of the subcommittee. Prompt action is necessary.

Without such an extension, this time-proven and grassroots approach to economic needs would end with the current fiscal year. In my view, as we undergo the economic adjustment from a wartime to a peacetime economy, this program is more important than ever.

The original program has brought aid and development tools to economically distressed communities of our country. Many have been suffering since the great outmigration of the thirties—from loss of young people, low incomes, antiquated public facilities, declining tax base. This has created a general crippling cycle of economic deterioration.

In order to develop these lagging areas Congress passed the Economic Development Act of 1965 for economically underdeveloped areas suffering from chronic unemployment, and under employment. The Department of Commerce was authorized to do this by loans for private industry development, grants for public facilities, technical and planning assistance, and through a concept of development districts and regions for comprehensive programs of economic development.

Title II of the bill before us would extend, through fiscal year 1973, authorizations for EDA's grants, supplementary grants, public work loans, business loans, working capital guarantees, technical assistance, and research. These are absolute nuts and bolts essentials. This title would extend assistance to the economic development districts and the economic development regions, referred to as Title V Regions, and the Federal Field Committee for Alaska also for two more fiscal years. I also believe these to be integral parts of any successful economic development effort of national scope.

The total authorization proposed for title II of this bill is \$1,945,500,000—a \$150 million increase over the current 2-year rate of authorization.

Among other things, these programs will ease the strain of the adjustment of our current economy. They should also do much to assist in reversing the present trend of migration into already compacted cities.

I believe that it is through this type of legislation that we can best assist the creation of a sound economic base for our lagging areas and at the same time help local communities to protect and improve their quality of life. When people are reasonably content and happy and can enjoy the benefits of our great society, they will not be so concerned with leaving their home towns and States in search of their "fair share."

I would like to discuss for a moment some of the amendments which have been proposed by the committee. In order to assist EDA in its long-range economic planning and aid to more needy areas, the committee adopted amendments to liberalize and enlarge upon the criteria for the designation of eligible areas under the Economic Development Act.

Under present law, an area is eligible for EDA designation as a redevelopment area if its median family income does not exceed 40 percent of the national median family income. Testimony indicated that this was too limiting—left out too many communities in need of help. So, the committee changed the figures from 40 percent to 50 percent.

It is estimated this change would increase the number of areas designated for this purpose alone, by 150 more than the 172 now designated according to the latest figures available. This would mean more than 300 eligible areas—instead of only 172.

The committee also adopted an amendment to broaden the "special impact" area criteria, added with 1969 amendments, to include communities and neighborhoods, rural or urban, which are experiencing problems due to concentrated low income, rural outmigration, substantial unemployment, or a threatened rise therein, or because of a natural disaster.

Another amendment adopted would add new eligibility criterion referred to as "per capita employment." This refers to an economic condition which hits many communities. In economic terms, an area undergoes a "structural decline." This means a gradual decline in economic vitality. The area undergoes a subtle deterioration, a long-range economic weakening. So, "per capita employment" may be defined as the ratio of the total employed residents of an area to that area's total population. Such ratio changes over a period of time reflect the economic well-being of a community by showing the average number of people who are being supported by a single job.

The committee also adopted an amendment to extend the present minimum 1-year life for an eligible area to a minimum 3-year life for designation. The committee has noted from testimony, as well as from experience, that a 1-year minimum life is too short to promulgate an acceptable economic plan and then attempt to implement such a plan.

So much for amendments. Now—to a brief discussion of one very important EDA tool—the economic development district. My own State of Arkansas is the only State to be completely divided into economic development districts.

District programs have great potential in dealing with economic problems. The Arkansas districts were formed and established in line with carefully selected criteria. Guidelines were established to minimize interagency conflicts of interest and encourage local leaders to work together toward their common economic and social goals. These districts were established to be properly representative of the people by making the chief administrative officers of the various counties and cities members of the district governing board as well as representatives of the entire economic spectrum and social strata of the communities. The governing board selects full time professional staff. We learned our lessons under a previous program in that purely voluntary organizations, without

professional staff, cannot do the job required.

E.D.D.'s were not only formed with the full knowledge and assistance of the Governor's office, but were also created, implemented, and partially funded through the appropriation process of the State legislature.

The district concept operates in Arkansas as an umbrella organization. It provides leadership and cooperation at all governmental levels.

I believe it is a practical Federal, State, partnership providing an effective Federal program delivery system for Arkansas.

Economic problems and inequalities are often interstate in character extending across State lines, thereby making it difficult, if not impossible, for one State to cope with them. To meet these problems the economic development regions were created with an emphasis on raising per capita income by accelerating economic growth, or closing the income gap. These regions have not had adequate funding to cope with the tasks confronting them. For example, the Ozarks Regional Commission has most of its planning accomplished and now needs money for action more than for extensive further planning.

Mr. Chairman, we must not permit this highly successful program to lapse when we are beginning to reap its benefits. We must not disappoint those who have under our legislative direction worked so hard to bring their communities into the mainstream of economic well-being. I urge adoption of H.R. 5376.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT) for the presentation he is making on this subject, and for the effort the gentleman has genuinely exerted to get adequate funding for both the Ozark area and other districts covered under the Economic Development Act.

I also think that the gentleman has made a very fine addition to this legislation through the amendments which he has advanced for further broadening of criteria for redevelopment areas. I want to acknowledge in the Committee of the Whole the constructive role the gentleman from Arkansas has played in connection with this legislation.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I am most grateful for the comments made by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma. I and many of our colleagues recognize the great interest that my friend and neighbor (Mr. EDMONDSON) has had since the beginning of this legislation in 1965. I thank him for the leadership that he has furnished to the subcommittee through his past chairmanship and as now as the ranking member, I also commend the gentleman for his great contributions to this legislation.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I make



the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Ninety-four Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

Abbott	Ewins, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.
Abourezk	Fascell	Murphy, N.Y.
Addabbo	Fish	Obey
Alexander	Fisher	Peyster
Anderson, Ill.	Fraser	Pike
Anderson, Tenn.	Frenzel	Podell
	Fulton, Tenn.	Powell
Andrews, Ala.	Goodling	Price, Ill.
Arends	Green, Oreg.	Price, Tex.
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Pucinski
Brooks	Griffin	Quile
Broomfield	Gubser	Quillen
Brown, Mich.	Halpern	Rallsback
Buchanan	Hanna	Rarick
Byrnes, Wis.	Hansen, Wash.	Rees
Cabell	Harvey	Reid, N.Y.
Camp	Hastings	Riegle
Carey, N.Y.	Hébert	Rooney, Pa.
Carney	Hicks, Mass.	Rosenthal
Casey, Tex.	Jarman	Ryan
Chisholm	Kastenmeier	St Germain
Clark	Kazen	Scheuer
Clawson, Del.	Keith	Schneebell
Clay	Kluczynski	Schwengel
Collins, Ill.	Koch	Sebellus
Conyers	Kuykendall	Shriver
Corbett	Landrum	Skubitz
Crane	Leggett	Smith, Calif.
Davis, Ga.	Long, La.	Staggers
Diggs	McCloskey	Steele
Dingell	McCulloch	Steiger, Wis.
Dorn	McMillan	Talcott
Dow	Mailliard	Watts
Dowdy	Mann	Whitten
Dwyer	Martin	Widnall
Edwards, Ala.	Metcalfe	Wilson
Edwards, Calif.	Mikva	Charles H. Wolf
Edwards, La.	Mills	
Esch	Moorhead	

10 percent in 1968, 1969, and 1970, when the average jobless rate was 12.1 percent. In December, just a few months ago, 16.4 percent of the working force in Chico and Oroville was unemployed.

In Grass Valley in Nevada County, according to data compiled by the Human Relations Agency of the California Department of Human Resources Development, 12.6 percent were unemployed last year. Four months ago, the latest available information shows that 16.5 percent were out of work. And in February of 1970, 18.1 percent were seeking employment.

Placerville, in El Dorado County, had approximately 14 percent unemployed in 1970, while Quincy, in Plumas County, and Susanville, in Lassen County, had jobless rates exceeding 11 percent. In Quincy, the level of unemployment reached 17.1 percent in December, and in February of last year a disastrous 20.4 percent of the job force was out of work. The city of Sonora, in Tuolumne County, also had high unemployment, although figures are not yet available for 1970.

Redding, in Shasta County, is one of the cities that has been hit hardest by unemployment in the construction industry. Last year, 10.3 percent of the work force was unemployed. Right now, however, the jobless rate is running at about 15 to 16 percent.

Obviously drastic action must be taken to reverse the long-range trend toward greater and greater unemployment. The attack must be waged on many fronts, not the least of which is a broadened and extended economic development program which we consider here today. These programs are based, of course, upon long-range, permanent employment. In northern California we have a critical and urgent need in the construction industry. One of the fastest ways we can get substantial numbers of people back to work and off the unemployed rolls is through stimulating public works construction of all types.

Unemployment statistics as they relate to northern California's construction industry are not just alarming; they are frightening.

Hundreds have exhausted their unemployment insurance and have had to seek work in other parts of California or in other States—while their families stayed behind at home. Hundreds have been forced to take jobs in other trades while waiting and waiting for construction work.

The State Building and Construction Trades Council of California, AFL-CIO, has provided me with the latest available statistics on unemployment in the hardest-hit counties in northern California. These figures document the need for legislation that will spur construction of needed public facilities and thereby reduce unemployment in these hard-hit areas.

In Alpine, Amador, and Calaveras Counties, and in San Joaquin County, construction industry unemployment reached 35 percent in December 1970. Bill Dorsey, of the Building and Trades Council in that area, reports that:

Even during the summer months, which

usually show a drop in unemployment percentages, we had 20 per cent of our total membership unemployed. A lot of the members (are) forced to work away from home, even out of state, to provide for their families.

In Butte, Plumas, and Glenn Counties, unemployment in the construction industry has been very high for about 4 years. In December 1970, the grim unemployment figures stood like this:

	Percent
Electricians	85
Sheet metal workers	80
Plumbers	75
Carpenters	60
Laborers	50
Roofers	50
Painters	50
Operating engineers	40
Cement masons	30
Teamsters	25

In Redding and northeastern California the situation was worse. The December 1970 jobless figures were:

	Percent
Cement masons	90
Laborers	90
Plumbers	90
Carpenters	85
Electricians	60
Painters	50
Engineers	40
Sheet metal workers	25

Almost half of the unemployed construction workers in this area have exhausted their unemployment insurance claims.

I think it is important to remember that this is not an experimental project. It is a proven program. The Public Works Acceleration Act signed by President Kennedy on September 14, 1962, provided an \$861 million shot-in-the-arm for our economy through June 30, 1964. More than 7,700 public works projects were built with funds from that program, and thousands found meaningful employment.

The fundamental concepts of this legislation, however, go much farther back in history, back to the New Deal days. I would like to insert a cogent and appropriate editorial recalling the history of the Work Projects Administration. The editorial is from the February 5, 1971, Redding Record-Searchlight in Redding, Calif.:

WE FORGET GOOD OF WPA

In vetoing a manpower training bill, President Nixon said "WPA-type jobs are not the answer." In the Environmental Action Bulletin, two scientists criticized the space program and the supersonic transport plane as "nothing more than a meaningless WPA project."

Judging by these aspersions, one who has no personal memory of the Great Depression would assume that WPA was the biggest, most wasteful boondoggle in history.

But can something that gave employment to a total of 8.5 million persons between 1935 and 1943, and indirect support to 30 million of their dependents, have been an unmitigated "boondoggle"?

In cold statistics, this is some of what the Works Progress Administration (later renamed Work Projects Administration) accomplished in its lifetime, solely in construction activities:

Nearly 644,000 miles of roads were constructed.

More than 77,000 new bridges and viaducts

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SLACK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 5376, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 318 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. JONES.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California, Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, as a Representative from California, I am particularly aware of the urgent need for an accelerated public works program and continuation of Economic Development Administration—EDA—projects. As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I am also familiar with and very much in favor of extending the Appalachian Redevelopment Act.

California and the Second Congressional District have been very hard hit in recent years. Unemployment has been well above national averages and extremely high in the construction industry. Let us look at some of the basic unemployment statistics affecting my area.

In the Chico-Oroville vicinity in Butte County, unemployment has been above

were built and 45,000 others were reconditioned.

A total of 285 new airports were built and more than 500 existing ones were enlarged or improved. Improvements included 700 miles of new runways and huge numbers of hangars and other buildings.

About 16,000 miles of new water lines and 24,000 miles of storm and sanitary sewers were installed in communities and military bases.

Some 122,000 public buildings were constructed or improved during the period, among them libraries, schools and hospitals.

Other construction work by WPA "shovel-leaners" included parks, playgrounds, athletic fields, swimming pools, firebreaks, irrigation systems, dams, reservoirs and tunnels.

Among the "meaningless" WPA projects enjoyed by Americans today are the Philadelphia Art Museum, New York's Central Park Zoo and Chicago's waterfront.

Mention must also be made of the WPA's contribution to culture by giving employment to jobless painters, writers, actors and cinematographers. Not reducible to any statistics, however, is simply the morale boost which the WPA gave a stricken nation.

In accepting the final report of the WPA in December, 1942, President Franklin D. Roosevelt wrote:

"The Work Projects Administration has reached a creative hand into every county in the nation. It has added to the national wealth, has repaired the wastage of depression and has strengthened the country to bear the burden of war . . . It has brought to the people renewed hope and courage. It has maintained and increased their working skills; and it has enabled them once more to take their rightful places in public or in private employment . . .

"With the satisfaction of a good job well done and with a high sense of integrity, the Work Projects Administration has asked for and earned an honorable discharge."

How easily we forget.

We must get this Nation moving again. This legislation is not a cure-all, but it is an important step forward and an important tool. The backlog of demands for funds to combat pollution and build better health facilities must be met, and our areas of long-term and high unemployment must be helped.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GRAY).

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I commend our distinguished chairman, Mr. BLATNIK, and the members of the Public Works Committee for bringing the Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971 to the floor early in this session. This is indeed a constructive measure and deserves the support of every Member. I am proud to be a coauthor of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, as in 1962, we are again faced with a serious unemployment problem in many regions of the country. In 1962 we had 4 million unemployed; today we have over 5 million. Unemployment benefits are also running at the multibillion-dollar level.

We used public works to provide useful employment in 1962 and by so doing, we benefited not only the unemployed but also the citizens of those communities by improving and providing badly needed public facilities.

I am certainly impressed with the pub-

lic facilities that were constructed under the 1962 act. Hospitals and health facilities, water supply, and other public utilities, waste treatment and sanitation facilities as well as many others. We are still reaping great benefits from these projects. Certainly the construction of these facilities, representing the investment of the services of the people who were unemployed on these projects, was a better investment of public funds than unemployment compensation and welfare payments. No one can place a value on the human benefits received by the unemployed who were again used in the community on productive work.

Today our need for public facilities in both urban and rural areas is greater than in 1962 because our population is larger and the services required are more extensive. The demand for improving our environment alone has placed a heavier demand on States and communities than we had in 1962. I am also glad that the amendments in this bill reflect the experience of the 1962 act by increasing the Federal Government's participation in the financing of various community facilities. At that time, many communities were unable to participate because they could not comply with the local contribution requirements. By increasing the participation to 80 percent and making provision for up to 100 percent participation under special circumstances, we can provide the means of giving greater assistance to many financially hard-pressed communities.

There is no question in my mind that the reactivation of the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 is needed. It has been of tremendous help to my district in southern Illinois and I know it will be of great help to other sections of the country when passed. I urge the enactment of this all-American bill. Thank you.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. WAGGONER).

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 5376, and in particular title I, the Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971. This is, by any standard, a very necessary bill. Also, by any standard, it is a modest bill, but when put into effect along with other legislation which will be forthcoming we will see the beginnings of a change in our economic situation. It is beyond me that the richest country in the world cannot do more for its millions of citizens, in seeing to it that they have the vital public works so necessary for their health and the quality of living standards. It is beyond me that the Government does not take aggressive and positive action to alleviate the suffering of the unemployed who are begging for gainful work. So it is in this direction that title I takes. It insures required public works, which have been so very badly required for the past several years, are to be built and those people who need the employment will be utilized in construction of these projects.

A careful study of the published eco-

nomics program of the administration indicates to me that even should their fondest dreams—and dreams they are—become reality we would still have an unemployment rate in the 5 percent range during 1971. No economically healthy country can afford such a high rate of unemployment. It will only add to the economic stagnation and may turn what the optimistic call a passing recession into a more serious depression. The problems connected with the latter situation are too much to even contemplate. No one wants that to happen. Everyone who can do something to see that it does not will do his duty, I am sure.

As I said, this is a modest bill, but I feel the criteria laid down within its provisions will immeasurably help those communities which are faced with even more serious problems unless something is done, and done as soon as possible. The record of the hearings on this legislation show that shocking economic distress exists in many areas throughout the Nation. While some communities are less affected, those on the other end of the spectrum feel as if they are in the doldrums of the early 1930's—and these conditions exist when predictions call for a gross national product in excess of \$1 trillion. How can this be? Who can explain it? It does seem contrary to all the laws of economics as taught through the years. Maybe the time has come for us to resort to those techniques which have worked before—any beginning is a step in the right direction and this bill is that step. My feelings are that it should pass this House immediately.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I will confine my remarks to the Appalachian program, its value and the need to extend it. My district is located in Appalachia, and I have firsthand knowledge of the successes of this program.

The Appalachian program was established by Congress to meet the special needs of the Appalachian region, and should not be engulfed in the President's revenue sharing plans. When the Federal Government established the Appalachian program, it made a commitment to the people of Appalachia. The Government has now completed only one-half of the program and should carry it to full completion.

I am convinced that the Appalachian program has made more progress per dollar spent in the district that I represent in Congress than has any other Federal program. The Appalachian program has already made an impact on economic conditions in Appalachia by attracting industry and tourism through better roads, airports, and vocational education facilities. The problems which this program was designed to solve are now on their way to solution, but we must not stop midway in the job.

Outmigration from the Appalachian area has been reduced from 2.2 million between 1950 and 1960 to 1.4 million between 1960 and 1970. We want to stop



this outflow of young talent from the Appalachian area and ease the problems of our large cities by providing opportunities for work and a good life available right at home. Many of our city problems have been created by people being forced by cruel economic necessity to leave areas such as Appalachia to seek employment in overcrowded urban areas.

Of the 2,575 miles of Appalachian corridor highways authorized, about 20 percent has been completed, another 15 percent is under construction, and 93 percent is in some stage of development or planning. To stop this road program now would be folly. While the Appalachian Act authorized the Federal Government to contribute up to 70 percent of the highway costs, the States have actually paid 50 percent of the highway costs, thereby showing their enthusiastic support for the program. The Appalachian program was conceived and approved by Congress as a unique and innovative effort to meet the special needs of the Appalachian region. It is not right and not fair to Appalachia for these funds authorized by Congress for this regional program to be made a part of a nationwide pool for revenue sharing.

This program is one of the Nation's best examples of teamwork by Federal, State, and local units of government. In my opinion, it is the best administered program in Washington. Its strength in part lies in its adaptability from State to State, using it to solve its own problems and to meet its own needs. Improvement programs originate locally, are matched by local funds, are approved by the Governor of the State, and brought by the Governor or his representative to the Appalachian Commission for approval.

The Appalachian program has been one of the Nation's best demonstrations of how States and local units of government can make effective use of shared Federal revenue.

This program has permitted national goals to be translated into workable procedures to meet local needs. It is providing hope and economic uplift to an important section of our Nation, and it deserves the continued support of Congress. It must be extended in order to complete the task for which this State-Federal partnership was created.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska, (Mr. BEGICH).

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Public Works Committee for the forward legislative proposal embodied in the Public Works Acceleration Act Amendment of 1971. This legislation is timely and has my full support. I urge its enactment.

In 1962 the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 assisted in meeting the unemployment problem then prevailing in many areas of the country and left, as a legacy, improved public facilities in many of our communities—both urban and rural. Its reactivation in 1971 and the proposed amendments will assist us in dealing with similar problems confronting us today. While not a panacea, as

the committee report so clearly states, it will help us to get the Nation moving again.

This bill makes available an appropriation authorization for \$2 billion to be channeled into areas of high unemployment to construct needed public facilities. Emphasis is to be placed on small and medium sized projects where the planning is completed and construction can get underway quickly. The major part of the construction work should be completed within 12 months from the time a contract is awarded. One of the proposed amendments before us will liberalize the financial arrangements with State and local governments and make it easier to get the program underway. This amendment corrects a weakness in the original 1962 act. Many communities could not meet the financial requirement though they had serious unemployment and a backlog of needed public facilities.

There are those who will say the program is inflationary. There are those who will say that it will take too long to get public works projects underway. There are those who will say that this will end up in a leaf raking program.

I see no grounds for these fears. We are faced with unemployment of over 5 million persons and unemployment compensation payments at a \$5 billion annual rate.

Is it inflationary to provide the means of using some of those funds going into unemployment compensation and welfare payments for the construction of needed public facilities? I do not think so when we have substantial unused industrial capacity. Nor do I see, with the backlog of planned public facilities at the Federal, State, and local levels, why there should be any delay in getting work underway. I think this is true since we have had substantial experience in regional planning since 1962. Certainly we should benefit from this experience.

Those who believe that this program will result in "leaf raking" projects are suggesting that a real need for increased employment does not exist and that there are not enough truly necessary public projects around to supply such employment. Those who hold that view are sadly disillusioned, and the following statistics gathered from Alaska clearly show the true nature of the need for this program.

First, in terms of unemployment, the national rates of near 6 percent would seem unbelievably low in every area of Alaska, where unemployment is running as high as 30 percent in many areas. Even in late 1969, before the Alaska economic decline caused by the delay in oil production, the following Alaska towns and areas qualified for assistance under this Act, having an unemployment rate of over 9 percent: Barrow, Bethel, Bristol Bay, Cordova-McCarthy, Kenai-Cook Inlet, Ketchikan, Kubuk, Kodiak, Kuskokwim, Lynn Canal-Icy Straits, Nome, Palmer-Talkeetna, Prince of Wales, Seward, Upper Yukon, Valdez-Whittier, Wade-Hampton, Wrangell-Petersburg, and Yukon-Koyukuk.

The situation is now far worse, and I believe that it can be responsibly stated that virtually the entire State of Alaska now qualifies for assistance. The following statistics, gathered from labor unions in the construction sector only a few weeks ago, are indicative of the need existing when able-bodied, and willing workers can simply not find a job.

CARPENTERS

LOCAL 1281—ANCHORAGE

Membership, 1,100.  
Out of work, 384.  
Working, but not as carpenters, 516.  
Only 200 of 1,100 working at their trade.

LOCAL 2247—JUNEAU

Membership, 100.  
Out of work, 10 percent.

LOCAL 2162—KODIAK

Membership, 35.  
Out of work, 25.

LOCAL 1243—FAIRBANKS

Membership, 630.  
Out of work, 285.  
Working but not as carpenters, 315.  
Only 30 out of 630 are working in their trade.

TOTALS—CARPENTERS

Membership, 1,865.  
Out of work, 704.  
Working as carpenters, only 250.

SHEET METAL WORKERS

Local No. 23, Anchorage.  
Membership, 120.  
Out of work, 8.  
High employment due to construction of several large buildings in Anchorage.

BRIDGE, STRUCTURAL AND ORNAMENTAL IRON WORKERS

Membership, not given.  
Out of work, 290.  
Mr. Spashoff, the Financial Secretary, in his letter of March 30, 1971 said:  
The 1970 construction season was one of the worst in 20 years for the iron worker in Alaska.

PLUMBERS AND PIPEFITTERS—SOUTH CENTRAL AREA

Membership, 600.  
Out of work, 170.

JUNEAU

Membership, 50.  
Out of work, 12.

FAIRBANKS

Membership, 240.  
Out of work, 100.

TOTALS—PLUMBERS

Membership, 890.  
Out of work, 282.

PLASTERERS AND CEMENT MASONS

Statewide—140 members, 130 out of work.

PILEDRIERS—LOCAL 2520—ANCHORAGE

Membership, 214.  
Out of work, 170.

CONSTRUCTION AND GENERAL LABORERS ANCHORAGE

Membership, 1,000.  
Out of work, 850.

KETCHIKAN

Membership, 165.  
Out of work, 141.

## FAIRBANKS

Membership, 500.  
Out of work, 390.

## TOTALS—GENERAL LABORERS

Membership, 1,665.  
Out of work, 1,381.

## LONGSHOREMEN—ANCHORAGE

Men working, 35.  
Casuals working only a day or so a week, 80.

## TEAMSTERS—STATEWIDE

Membership, 3,500.  
Out of work, 550.

OPERATING ENGINEERS  
ANCHORAGE LOCAL

Out of work, 85 percent.

As distressing as these statistics are, they are only half of the story. What is not shown is the even greater unemployment in the rural areas of Alaska, where the programs included in the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971 are even more necessary.

The remaining question is whether or not there are projects which are necessary and which meet the requirements of the act. Among the following essential and already proposed programs are the answers to a wide range of human needs in Alaska.

Angoon—improvements to the small boat harbor.

Hoonah—cold storage project.

Sitka—Whitestone Narrow project and small boat harbor.

Petersburg—water system.

Kodiak—water system, waste treatment system.

Dillingham—airport improvement, water system improvement.

North Pole—sewage treatment system.

Tetlin—roadwork project.

Bethel—flood control project, community center.

Unalakleet—housing project.

Point Hope—sea wall project.

Barrow—air terminal facility, incinerator facility.

Noorvik—water and sewer systems.

For each project listed here, there are dozens more. In the areas of sewer and water facilities, health care facilities and housing, Alaska is simply able to demonstrate a tremendous level of need. I have restrained myself from listing all of the specific possible projects, but would assure those considering their vote on this question that we will be doing no "leaf raking" in Alaska.

Finally, I would make it clear that although I am pleading the case for Alaska, I am aware it is at the same time the case for the Nation. The Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971 is an important answer to a clear need. I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. STUBBLEFIELD).

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of the proposal now bearing the number H.R. 5376, I have been delighted to observe the wide support from various sections of my district for the enactment of this bill.

As has been discussed here this afternoon, H.R. 5376 is designed to give prompt relief to those out of work in the hardest hit unemployment areas and substantially assist qualifying communities in rebuilding their economy by making available Federal funds for much-needed public works facilities.

In my congressional district alone, there are five areas—Bardwell, Eddyville, Mayfield, McLean County—part of Owensboro labor area—and Smithland—that have a history of persistent unemployment reaching the level of 8.75 percent or higher. These communities need to know that the U.S. Congress cares and is doing something in a real and tangible way toward providing immediate relief. In the early 1960's legislation similar to H.R. 5376 proved highly successful in stemming the tide of economic catastrophe. I firmly believe that this legislation can serve the same purpose in the early 1970's.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge prompt enactment of an accelerated public works law in order to give relief to the persistently unemployed, who are capable and desirous of work, provide Federal funds to communities in great need of public works facilities, and help the entire Nation toward economic recovery.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA).

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5376, the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971.

At the outset, I would like to commend our Committee on Public Works, chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. BLATNIK), for its expeditious consideration of this legislation which is designed to accomplish two worthy objectives: First, to alleviate the tragedy of current high unemployment and, secondly, to provide for the construction of urgently needed public facilities in communities throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, millions of Americans today are in desperate need as the result of the inability of the present administration to cope with the concurrent problems of unemployment and inflation. We in the Congress cannot afford to sit idly by during the current recession—we must act now to provide employment and thereby renew the faith of those Americans who are out of work.

These people do not seek a handout. They want only an honest day's wages in exchange for an honest day's work. Passage of the bill we are now considering would help to insure that they get that chance, especially in the construction industry which has been particularly hard-hit by unemployment. We can help to relieve unemployment without adding to inflationary pressures.

The Public Works Acceleration Act, the most important of the three separate parts of this bill, authorizes the appropriation of \$2 billion immediately for accelerated public works employment through both Federal and local government projects, such as waste treatment

plants, water and sewers, hospitals, nursing homes, and public health centers. It is estimated that this part of the legislation alone would create about 420,000 jobs.

The construction of these public facilities will itself have a decidedly positive effect on the economy of local communities. Localities will be more attractive to industry once such facilities as modern sewage treatment plants or municipal buildings are available without unduly distorting local tax structures.

Mr. Chairman, the two remaining parts of the bill, cited as the "Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971" and the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 1971," together with the first part provide a strong triad of legislative proposals to shore up our sagging economy and at the same time to provide much-needed public works facilities. The provisions under each of the three titles are needed to do the complete job. As the Committee on Public Works so aptly points out in its report, this legislation is not intended as an end-all panacea to unemployment. Other means must also be adopted to restore full employment. But let us give the package, which the committee has so carefully put together, a fair chance in achieving the twin goals for which it is intended. Let us support the bill as reported and reject any weakening amendments.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. GRASSO).

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Chairman, the marked economic decline over the past 3 years shows signs of general improvement on the national scene; and I am hopeful that the measures designed to strengthen the economy in the larger sense, such as authorization for conversion education, aid to the urban areas, and extended use of the EDA program will be seriously considered. However, Congress must turn its attention to areas suffering from inordinately high rates of unemployment. The Sixth District of Connecticut which I represent is one of those areas, with one city suffering a rate of unemployment in excess of 20 percent of the labor force. Mr. Chairman, we are facing a depression, not merely a recessionary cycle as some optimists would have us believe. These areas must have immediate attention. The amended Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971, under consideration today, is designed to aid those unemployment-impacted communities as designated by the Secretary of Labor.

Historically, before the advent of the Economic Development Administration, the 87th Congress passed the Accelerated Public Works Act (Public Law 87-658). This act is still in force and is designed to provide immediate useful employment as an antirecession measure by the inauguration of public works projects to prevent imminent recessions. In the instant case we are faced not with the prospect of imminent recession, but rather with persistent depression—all



the more reason for revitalization of the Accelerated Public Works Act.

The updating of this act as embodied in this bill and related bills gears this important legislation for today's needs and serves as an extension of the philosophy of EDA. In my testimony before the Committee on Public Works I suggested an amendment to the bill which would have more clearly spelled out the qualifications for aid under this accelerated public works program. While this amendment was not accepted as submitted, the committee did redraft the original language so as to simplify the criteria for eligibility.

Under the new criteria the Secretary of Labor will set the administrative standards for eligibility. While it cannot be determined how this will work until the act takes effect, I am hopeful that the Secretary will recognize the severity of the problem and will adopt administratively the general eligibility figure which is unemployment at a rate which is or exceeds 150 percent of the national average for a 90-day period.

Mr. Chairman, I call on all my colleagues to overwhelmingly support this measure.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ANDERSON).

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5376, legislation made necessary by the present economic situation in our country.

California's unemployment rate rose to 7.1 percent in March, from 6.7 percent in February. A year ago, the unemployment rate was 5.2 percent.

In Los Angeles County we are witnessing a 13-year high in unemployment with a jobless rate of 7.5 percent.

Mr. Chairman, 675,000 Californians are looking for work.

The Public Works Acceleration Act, first employed in 1962, provided useful work for the unemployed, and opened areas for industrial and commercial development by improving public facilities. In its 2-year history, this act accounted for the construction of 7,769 needed projects such as sewage treatment plants, hospitals, nursing homes, community buildings, as well as urgently needed work in our national parks and recreation areas.

Last year, Congressman McFALL recognized the need to reinstitute the Public Works Acceleration Act and I joined with him in introducing H.R. 18741. This legislation died in the 91st Congress. However, we reintroduced this measure on the first day of the 92d Congress, and the Public Works Committee, of which I am a member, began consideration of the bill shortly thereafter.

The Public Works Acceleration Act, title I of H.R. 5376, as reported by the Public Works Committee, would authorize the appropriation of \$2 billion immediately to be made available to the President for accelerated public works employment through both Federal and local government projects.

Projects for assistance in the construction of basic public works for which there is an urgent and vital public need are given priority, and only Federal projects which have been specifically authorized by the Congress, or other projects which are eligible for Federal aid, are qualified for this program.

Grants can be used for three purposes. First, a grant can be used to start a project; second, to supplement an original grant made by a Federal agency or, third, to contribute to the local share of a project to be built by a Federal agency. In the case of grant-in-aid for local public works involving local cost sharing, a grant can be made to cover up to 80 percent of the cost of such projects with a further proviso that a 100-percent grant can be made if the State or local government has exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing capacity for such purposes and, as a result, does not have the financial capability to assume all of the additional financial obligations required.

Projects are authorized for areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as "redevelopment areas" or as "economic development centers." In addition, an area would be eligible if the Secretary of Labor found that the rate of unemployment is 6 percent or more, and that the unemployment rate will remain at, or exceed, 6 percent during the next 2 months.

Title II of H.R. 5376 amends the Public Works and Economic Development Act to provide Federal help in conjunction with the States—to assist communities, areas, and regions which are suffering from unemployment, by providing financial and technical assistance needed for the creation of new jobs. Its long-range objective is to enhance domestic prosperity by establishing stable and diversified local economies.

Mr. Chairman, there is a need for jobs in this country, but there is also a need for public works projects. In the President's Manpower Report, released in April 1971, the Department of Labor states that—

Less than one-third of the Nation's population is served by sewage systems as well as adequate waste treatment plants \* \* \* solid waste facilities are inadequate and antiquated. It is estimated that 94 percent of existing land disposal operations and 75 percent of incinerator facilities are substandard \* \* \*.

This legislation, H.R. 5376, is designed to meet the needs of our Nation by stimulating 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 waste disposal facilities. This legislation would meet the current needs of our citizens and, at the same time, pave the way for the further expansion of employment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Chairman, the

House today is considering legislation to continue what I regard as one of the most successful and innovative domestic programs in the history of our country. Since its inauguration in 1965, the Appalachian regional development program has attained new levels of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States. I believe much of its success can be attributed directly to the freedom and flexibility it has accorded to the Governors of the region, allowing them to design and develop programs tailored to the special problems of their States.

The Appalachian regional development program as enacted in 1965 was directed toward the special needs of a 13-State area, including a large segment of my own State of Kentucky. For a great many reasons this area had lagged far behind the rest of the Nation in providing social services and offering economic opportunities. Incomes in the region were considerably lower than the national level. Education and educational facilities were substandard. Unemployment was high even in the face of the Nation's greatest period of prosperity. As a result, many residents of the region migrated to other areas of the country, principally the cities of the North. But, rather than improving themselves, many survived only by joining the burgeoning public welfare rolls of the big northern cities.

It is unnecessary to state at this time that the goals envisioned by the program's proponents in 1965 have not been realized. What is important, however, is that significant and measurable strides have been made toward the fulfillment of those goals.

Work has been started on 93 percent of the approximate 2,600 miles of development highways—about 500 miles have been completed and another 367 miles are presently under construction.

Enrollment at vocational and technical high schools has increased by 34 percent. Post-high-school enrollments have doubled and adult enrollments have increased by 67 percent.

Improvements in health facilities and health services have been achieved throughout the region.

Seven thousand new units of housing are being initiated under the Appalachian housing program. Nearly 1,000 projects in health, education, water pollution control, libraries, airports, and other forms of public improvement have become realities under the supplemental grant program.

The unemployment gap between Appalachia and the Nation as a whole has steadily narrowed since 1962. Whereas in the past unemployment rates in the area rose faster and to higher levels than elsewhere in the country, this trend has now been checked and presently the rate is slightly below that of the Nation.

Title III of the legislation before us today would extend for another 4 years all programs other than development highway and local access road programs. The latter would be extended for an additional 5 years. The total new authorizations for the programs extended through fiscal year 1978 is \$1,544,800,000.

The Appalachian region still ranks low among the States of the Union in wealth, health, and jobs. Most of its problems are chronic in nature and of long standing. It is less than realistic to expect this area to have solved its total problems in a relatively brief period of 5 or 6 years. The area still suffers to a greater degree than the rest of the country from environmental pollution due to the reckless exploitation of its natural resources. It is still plagued by substandard housing, the lack of a diversified economy, from continued outmigration of many of its talented young people, from unemployment, isolation, and poor health.

The success of the past 6 years, however, is sufficient testimony to the effectiveness of the original concept of the program—that the domestic problems of Appalachia, whatever their exact characteristics, are subject to solution. Time, however, is needed to bring to fulfillment the many programs that have been devised to meet the needs of this region.

Passage of the measure before us will provide the time and opportunity to continue programs that have already demonstrated their value in the fight against some of the most adverse problems in the Nation.

I urge its support and passage.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington, (Mr. ADAMS.)

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Accelerated Public Works bill, H.R. 5376, which is urgently needed to provide jobs immediately in the Seattle-King County area of the State of Washington. I was an original sponsor of this legislation during the 91st Congress and again cosponsored it this session. I oppose the attempt to, by the other side of the aisle, to strike title I of the bill which provides the accelerated public works portion of the legislation.

#### I. STATUS OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST IN 1971

You will notice from the chart in the Chamber that Seattle has the highest rate of unemployment among major cities in the United States and this is steadily climbing each week. Our unemployment began to rise in January of 1969, and many of our unemployed exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits in 1969 and 1970 and have become welfare recipients. The result has been that during 1969-70 public assistance recipients in the Seattle reporting area increased over 50 percent, the number of recipients of aid to dependent children has doubled, and the number of persons receiving food stamps has trebled.

Last week I met with representatives of the Boeing Co., our largest single employer, to discuss their employment status. From a high employment of 105,000 in 1968 they will have terminated approximately 68,000 people by April 1971, and unless there is a dramatic upturn in the economy or an unforeseen major change in the company's military or space contracts, the total terminations will reach over 76,000 by the end of this year.

The drastic reduction in the 2.6 million per year new housing starts projected by the national administration in 1969 has caused a severe recession in Washington State's lumber products industry, which is a second major employer in our State. Our third major industry is agriculture and this has been operating at a reduced level for the last 3 years.

#### II. IMMEDIATE PUBLIC PROJECTS FOR SEATTLE-KING COUNTY

The bill which we are debating today is patterned on the Public Works Acceleration Act which President Kennedy signed on September 14, 1962, and has two principal purposes:

First. To provide immediate useful work for the unemployed; and

Second. To open the areas for industrial and commercial development by improving public facilities.

The \$2 billion proposed in the bill would create 170,000 jobs nationwide in on-site construction, and as additional employee incomes and business profits are spent, there would be a multiplying boost to production and employment of about 250,000 or more. It also renews assistance for the economic development areas.

In the Seattle-King County area the local officials have already prepared a list of specific public works and local funds are available to match Federal funds to create immediate employment. For example, in Seattle the following categories are proposed:

1. Streets and sewers.....	\$16,810,000
2. Parks and recreation.....	1,322,500
3. Fire .....	2,623,000
4. Water .....	3,245,000
5. Building (engineering personnel building, and purchase and conversion of armory in Seattle Center)....	5,050,000
6. City light (undergrounding wires) .....	8,678,800

Total .....

37,729,300

All of us know this program is not a panacea, but we desperately need any help we can obtain at this time. Section IV on page 13 directly provides authorization to help our area because of our sharp rise in unemployment.

#### III. OTHER EMERGENCY RELIEF

a. Extending unemployment benefits.

Last year many of us sponsored and were successful in obtaining passage of the Unemployment Compensation Amendments (Public Law 91-373) which granted additional Federal money to help the States pay extended unemployment compensation. I am sponsoring this year H.R. 6876 to permit Federal sharing of the cost of extending unemployment compensation benefits to 52 weeks.

Public service jobs and temporary economic assistance.

The Congress also last year passed an Employment and Training Opportunities Act, which I supported, authorizing \$1.4 billion for public service jobs over a 3-year period. President Nixon, showing his callous disregard for the Nation's unemployed, vetoed that bill.

This year we in the Congress are moving rapidly to reenact this vitally needed public service jobs bill. The House has completed hearings on H.R. 3613, which will create these public sector employment opportunities in periods of high national unemployment. The Senate passed its bill on April 1, 1971. The Democratic Party is strongly committed to providing working opportunities for the unemployed, including those on public assistance. I believe we are prepared to override a Presidential veto if the President pursues his policies of the past.

Other proposed immediate relief bills.

Some of the bills I have sponsored during the 92d Congress and on which I hope speedy action will be taken are:

H.R. 4122, to involve our defense and space oriented scientists, engineers, and technicians in efforts to meet our transportation, housing, health, social, and other domestic research and development needs. I have also requested NASA to reprogram funds to continue the development of parts of the SST technology in the titanium and pilot guidance systems.

H.R. 1744, to create a National Economic Conversion Commission and require major defense and space contractors to put a percentage of their profits into a conversion fund which will be drawn out as a particular contractor converts. This is one of several economic conversion bills we are trying to pass.

A forestry legislative package to increase the Federal appropriations of the Clarke-McNary Act from \$20 million to \$40 million to aid in fire protection; to increase the Cooperative Forest Management Account from \$5 million to \$15 million; and to inaugurate a new program for urban and environmental forestry. This is to help our ailing lumber industry.

H.R. 7414, to amend the State Technical Services Act of 1965 to include municipal governments, to increase the limits of Federal funding from 50 to 75 percent, and authorize appropriations of \$30 million the first year, \$40 million the second, and \$50 million the third. This will directly increase the ability of our local cities to meet the problems of our increasingly urban society.

#### IV. LONG-RANGE SOLUTIONS ARE NECESSARY

The first factor necessary to provide permanent employment in our area is to produce an upturn in the economy similar to that which occurred in 1962 after the 1958-60 recession. The major product of the Pacific Northwest consists of commercial airliners. Because of tight money, high interest rates, and depressed conditions in the airline industry, the sales of commercial airplanes in the United States have plummeted to almost zero. I have urged that the 7-percent investment credit which was part of the Kennedy economic package in 1962 be reinstated. I have also urged that the Nixon administration change its tight money and high interest rate policies and that the tools of direct credit controls, wage and price guidelines and a



careful use of Federal taxing and appropriating powers similar to those used in 1962-64 be instituted in order to restore a full employment economy.

A second factor is the need for diversification of our major business concerns. I have discussed this in detail with those in the private enterprise sector of our economy and they are fully prepared to move ahead with the use of their skilled people and systems analysis techniques to meet the problems of urban mass transportation, antipollution devices, and other new products for the decade of the 1970's. This will require, however, the development of new Federal Government purchasing techniques to supplement the dwindling budgets of NASA and the Department of Defense. I have suggested the creation of a national transportation policy with the appropriate agencies and quasi-public corporations being formed to contract directly with major private concerns for the use of systems analysis in solving our transportation snarls, and later the purchase of the vehicles to carry out these solutions.

#### V. CONCLUSION

The passage of the public works bill today is very vital to the people of my district and the other economically depressed areas of this Nation. We know this is no panacea but we need help while the long-term solutions I have mentioned are being implemented. Our area needs jobs now. Most of our unemployed people are trained, highly skilled individuals who have worked hard all of their lives and are now unable to obtain employment because of national economic conditions. I urge the national administration to change the economic policies that have been in effect during the last 2 years. This bill today, I hope, is the first step in an overall program to make jobs available to our people.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS).

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my words of strong support to those already voiced here today on behalf of the Public Works Acceleration Act, of which I am pleased to be a co-sponsor.

In this time of intolerably high unemployment and economy uncertainty, it seems to me that Congress has an immediate duty to take positive action to provide employment opportunities and boost the economy.

The House of Representatives has an opportunity to do so by approving the Public Works Acceleration Act this week. To fail to act at this period of crisis seems unconscionable.

The concept behind the Public Works Acceleration Act is a proven one. It was successfully implemented a decade ago to stimulate unemployment and the economy.

With millions of Americans out of work now there can be no doubt that such a program is needed again.

Mr. Chairman, I know there is no need for me to chronicle the appalling unem-

ployment situations which exist around the country.

However, as Representative in Congress from South Bend, Ind., I want to say that the problem is most acute in my home area. The current rate of unemployment in the South Bend labor market is a staggering 8 percent. There are more than 8,000 persons there who are out of work. The South Bend labor market, which includes St. Joseph and Marshall Counties, has been designated an "area of substantial unemployment" by the U.S. Department of Labor for the past 9 months.

There are similar problems in far too many areas throughout the country.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, the way to react to this pressing crisis is not to veto programs providing for employment opportunities and job training or to freeze funds which could be used to alleviate the situation or to vote down measures designed to put people back on payrolls, such as the Public Works Acceleration Act. Rather, we should move to help solve these problems through effective legislation.

Mr. Chairman, as a cosponsor of the original accelerated public works bill, I urge my colleagues to give their overwhelming support to this most needed legislation.

Surely we in Congress can do no less for the millions of American men and women who are anxious for jobs, but are not able to find employment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, ever since the concept of an Appalachian regional development program was first proposed, I have heard many questions: "Why is it necessary to place so much emphasis on the construction of a modern highway system?" Some, who have been opponents of the program do not put it so nicely, but more bluntly: "Carl, why do we need these millions of dollars to provide highways to a remote area where there is no industry?" To me, the simple statement of the question provides its own answer.

Eastern Kentucky has not enjoyed an expanded economy as has other parts of our Commonwealth of Kentucky, and as have other parts of our country because of its isolation.

Access to areas by rail and by water and by road have always been essential to economic development. But, in our day of mass production, of a new technology creating new products and new markets, modern means of transportation by which goods can flow rapidly and inexpensively are indispensable for any type of system's economic activity. Areas of Appalachia such as our eastern Kentucky area have been long neglected in Government support for construction of rails, roads, and the development of navigation. There are many reasons for this, but one of the chief ones has been a technical problem.

Until after World War II, we did not

have available the type of excavation equipment nor the engineering concepts or techniques which could literally build a modern four-lane highway through mountainous terrain at anywhere near a reasonable cost per mile. Road construction in mountainous terrain without such equipment resulted in sharp curves and steep inclines that impeded the free flow traffic of goods. The result has been isolation of eastern Kentucky from the mainstream of economic activity.

To me a first and fundamental step in attracting new industry, in stimulating new commerce and enterprise has been the opening up of our area and all of its vast natural resources by the construction of modern high-speed highways. Having the water, having the timber, having the mineral resources with access to outside markets, it would only be a matter of a short time that industry commerce would provide the jobs and the prosperity which have been denied us.

Thus as we who originally sponsored the Appalachian Regional Development Act conceived it, developmental highways in eastern Kentucky would:

First. Link key areas of the region to the Nation so that they could become logical locations for new economic developments and employees could get their goods produced in Appalachia to market.

Second. Promote commutation to new schools and health services and jobs which the Appalachian regional development program was designed to bring about.

Third. Serve as a giant framework on which these new services and jobs could be located.

Fourth. Open up new sites for development.

At the beginning of the program, 419 miles of the developmental highway system were to be constructed in our eastern Kentucky area. Only 110 miles of this construction has been completed—and only 37 miles of the uncompleted 309 miles is now under construction.

Here, let me pause a moment to emphasize what I mean by modern highways because I have the distinct impression that our highway engineers think too narrowly in traditional terms when they design highways for Appalachia. A developmental highway means to me that you do not place emphasis upon existing traffic counts with respect to the location, nor with respect to the design of the highway. To the contrary, you look to economic development potential. You look to modern highway design which would be competitive with modern limited four-lane highways that serve economic and industrial centers outside of Appalachia. That is why I have stressed before the House Public Works Committee and before my colleagues in the House of Representatives the importance of developmental highways each having at least a minimum of four lanes.

This is why I continue to stress the importance of the four laning of the entire length of U.S. 23 from Portsmouth

to the Virginia line near Jenkins and U.S. 15 and U.S. 119 from Williamson to Whitesburg. This is why I have stressed that there must be additional four-lane east-west connections.

There is already some evidence even though the system is not yet one-third completed that our economic isolation is ending as a result of improved modern highways. More people are finding it easier to commute to jobs on the edge of Appalachia. Control Data Corp. has located a plant at the junction of two Appalachian highways. American Standard Corp. has located a plant farther down the same highway that ultimately will employ almost 500 people.

Considering the entire Appalachian area, it is estimated that one-half million new jobs have been created since 1965 which have located along the alignments of these new highways.

As all of the links of the system become complete, I predict that peripheral development that we see taking place will merge into the heart and most isolated portions of the Appalachian area.

On Appalachian Highway B from Columbus, Ohio, to Asheville, N.C., for example, a new community is being built at Lucasville, Ohio; several new industrial sites are being developed in eastern Kentucky; a major model city project in which construction of this Appalachian highway plays a principal role is at Pikeville, Ky.; and an industrial complex serving three counties and an independent city is being built across the State line on this same highway in Virginia.

Allow me to describe what has been happening in Pikeville. Pikeville is a town of 5,000 people located along the banks of a horseshoe bend in the Levisa fork of the Big Sandy River in eastern Kentucky. In spite of its relatively small population, it serves as the medical center, the shopping center, the legal center, and the educational center for a rural population of over 145,000. Pikeville has not realized the full potential of its role, however, because of inadequate health services and facilities, substandard housing, poor recreational and cultural facilities, and inadequate transportation facilities of all types. Despite the magnitude of its problems, the city was determined to improve its situation. Through the cooperation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Commerce, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the Appalachian Regional Commission, substantial Federal assistance is being used to redirect a portion of the Big Sandy River in order to provide additional space for Pikeville to expand. Part of the C. & O. Railroad is being relocated out of town and a new arterial system is being developed to ease traffic congestion in the center of town. The Appalachian Commission has helped on each of these projects and in addition has provided money for a housing project, hospital renovation program, and educational TV transmitter, and a college improvement project. The Commission is serving as Federal coordinator for much of the project.

In all, supplemental aid from the Commission has facilitated over \$8 million in public improvements eligible for basic grants-in-aid, without counting the cost of the new highway and the cut through the mountain that will contain the new river location and railroad.

As more and more people are able to move more easily over greater distances, it will be possible for hospitals and schools to serve larger populations. This will make these institutions more economical and better in quality.

So far as I know, this is one of the few examples in the entire country of a highway system being used in a creative way to build a new life and shape the future development of an area.

We are getting our money's worth. That is why I urge that the recommendations of the Committee on Public Works for the additional funds needed to finish this highway system be approved.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN) such time as he may require.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5376. This legislation provides \$2 billion in Federal funds to assist areas that are hardest hit by unemployment.

There are approximately 5½ million Americans who are presently unemployed and these figures do not include the many who are working only part time, and those who, in despair, have given up the job hunt. In less than 2 years, the national unemployment rate has increased from 3.3 to 6 percent, with some areas having a figure nearly double this. The Department of Labor classifies 45 major labor markets as having "substantial unemployment." Last year, Rhode Island's unemployment rate matched the national average of 4.7 percent. Our rate is now at the 7.6 percent level. Rhode Island needs the Public Works Acceleration Act, just as the Nation needs it.

The Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962 was a success. I believe that H.R. 5376 will be just as successful. By providing funds for much-needed public works projects, we will be creating jobs as well as stimulating our stagnant economy. Local communities will also benefit by the implementation of these public works projects, many of which have been long delayed.

We must also consider the multiplier factor here. With the creation of each new job, there is a backup force of designers, architects, manufacturers, engineers and truckers who will be needed, thus creating additional demand.

Mr. Chairman, the unemployment figures and percentages fail to relate the misery and hardship which besets the unemployed. They are, like the Vietnam casualty figures, cold and insensitive. But millions of Americans are experiencing the humility and the sense of frustration

that accompanies unemployment. Their families are not being cared for adequately and their bills are mounting.

And so, the need is great. The President has not seen fit to use all of the moneys appropriated by the Congress last year for the public works programs. Unless we act now, our unemployment rolls will continue to grow and our economy will become even more sluggish. Where the President has failed, the Congress must act. I urge you to give the Public Works Acceleration Act your positive and swift approval.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) such time as he may require.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion to strike title I, the Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971, from the bill which we are considering today. These amendments, which I have cosponsored, are designed to alleviate unemployment through Federal funding of public works projects in areas of high unemployment.

The Public Works Acceleration Act amendment would authorize \$2 billion in Federal grants to State and local governments to build and repair public facilities which are needed by the American people. The bill would provide Federal funds for necessary projects such as waste-treatment plants, health-care facilities, street repairs, water supply, and sewer systems, and public buildings, and recreation facilities.

Even more important, this bill will provide relief to the many communities throughout the country which are presently suffering from unemployment and economic distress by creating desperately needed jobs. In addition to providing immediate "useful employment" for unemployed Americans, these amendments would also make it possible for local areas to build municipal buildings and other public facilities without overburdening their own local tax bases.

Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Acceleration Act was originally passed in 1962 to stimulate the construction of Federal and local public works projects at that time in areas that were "burdened by substantial unemployment and underemployment." The 1962 act noted that:

Action by the Federal Government is necessary, both to provide immediate useful work for the unemployed and underemployed in these communities and to help these communities, through improvement of their facilities, to become more conducive to industrial development and better places to live and work.

And, I might add, that the 1962 act was very successful and instrumental in helping this Nation recover from the effects of the recession which began during the late fifties and continued into the sixties.

The purpose of title I is simply to extend and modify the 1962 act to meet the economic conditions confronting our Nation today, in 1971. Just as the basic purpose of the original act was to create jobs, the basic purpose of the 1971



amendments is to create jobs—and the need for jobs has never been more urgent.

Presently, over one-third of the Nation's 150 major labor areas are suffering from "substantial unemployment"—which is defined by the Department of Labor as 6 percent or more. In fact, the entire Nation has reached the level of substantial unemployment according to this criterion. The national rate of unemployment has been 6 percent or more for 3 out of the last 4 months, and, as of last month, it remained at 6 percent.

The number of unemployed Americans is approaching the 5.5-million mark, and the average duration of unemployment recently rose to 10.8 weeks—the highest level in 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, the unemployment situation in this country has now reached a very critical stage, and the current trend cannot be reversed without prompt and affirmative action by the U.S. Congress.

The situation is even more severe in my own State of Michigan, especially in my own congressional district in the Detroit metropolitan area. The most recent figures indicate that, despite the Nixon administration's casual and optimistic attitude, during the past year unemployment in Michigan has been increasing at the rate of approximately 25 percent—from 6.7 percent in February 1970 to 8.4 percent in February 1971. The rate of increase has been even greater in the Detroit metropolitan area, where there is approximately 140,000 unemployed. During the past year the unemployment rate has increased by one-third—from 6.1 percent to a critical 8.1 percent.

Mr. Chairman, it is time for Congress to realize that, despite all the rosy predictions and casual assurances which we have been hearing constantly from the Nixon administration, things are not getting better. The total number of workers on payrolls in February 1971 was no greater than it was nearly 18 months before, in September 1969.

The Nixon administration's economic game plan has been a total failure, and it is now time for Congress to take the initiative. President Nixon has presided over a sinking economy characterized by rising inflation and unemployment ever since coming into office over 2 years ago.

Congress has promised the Nation that it can and will supply the leadership to provide realistic and meaningful remedies for the ills of this country while the Nixon administration provides speakers to tour the country talking about them. Today, Congress can assert this leadership by passing these amendments and by passing this entire bill.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI) such time as he may require.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very important and very essential public works bill. At a time when this country is trying to extricate itself from the throes of one of its worst recessions, it is essential that we

provide the means to spur the economy to greater real growth. Title I of this bill in particular will help accomplish the President's ambitious economic goals.

Title I will extend and modify the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 which successfully aided efforts to turn around the recession of the early sixties. Moreover it is concentrated in the areas of the greatest need. Mainly those areas with the most serious economic problems will be eligible.

These are defined as areas of chronic high unemployment or underemployment and low incomes, and those additional areas which will suffer an unemployment rate of 6 percent or more for at least the next 2 months.

Also projects in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as redevelopment areas or economic development centers would also be eligible.

With inflation hovering around 6 percent, it is vital that we provide new job opportunities. Additionally many veterans are returning from Vietnam after serving their country valiantly only to find there are no jobs for them to take.

It is natural then, that with a backlog in public works projects, we accelerate our efforts in this vital area and at the same time aid the unemployed.

This backlog of applications involves nearly \$6 billion of Federal funds. The money would go to help build over 6,000 waste treatment plants, water lines and sewers, hospitals, nursing homes, public health centers and many other projects of benefit to the public.

I strongly urge approval of this program and early appropriation of the funds authorized by this measure. The problem of a lagging economy and high unemployment is very serious. This act today would go a long way toward helping solve the problem this year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished member of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROE) such time as he may require.

Mr. ROE. Mr. Chairman, I strongly recommend the enactment of the Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971 as an important measure to aid us in our efforts to help reduce unemployment and provide for our domestic needs.

The most recent information available on unemployment shows that on March 31 we had over 5 million unemployed in the United States, or 6 percent of our civilian labor force. At the end of March the Labor Department added five large cities to its list of major labor markets undergoing substantial unemployment. This brought the total of cities with more than 6-percent unemployment to 50—the largest number in 9 years. The Department also added 27 smaller cities to its substantial unemployment list for a total in the category of 662.

In my State of New Jersey five cities are classified as having substantial unemployment and similar situations prevail in practically all States. Nor, as was recently brought out in the Joint Economic Committee report to the Congress,

is the outlook favorable for improved employment during 1971. Many of the witnesses before the Joint Economic Committee testified that they expected the unemployment rate to remain at 5½ to 6 percent throughout the year.

The bill before us today will reactivate the 1962 Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962, broaden its coverage, and liberalize the conditions under which assistance can be extended to meet the unemployment problem and related economic stagnation facing many areas of the country. A \$2-billion authorization will be available to provide for the construction and improvement of needed public facilities that have already been authorized by Congress and therefore eligible for financing.

Our experience under the 1962 act was favorable. Many States and communities benefited from the construction of water supply systems and sewers, hospitals, waste treatment plants and other vitally needed public facilities. Our need is even greater today, and, as was brought out in testimony before our committee, there is a large backlog of planned projects that are ready to go once financing is available.

I am aware that there are those who may label this legislation as inflationary spending. But what is more wasteful than unutilized resources—the unemployed worker and our unused industrial capacity. The 1971 Joint Economic Report, to which I just referred, estimates that for the fourth quarter of 1970 our economy was operating at a rate almost \$70 billion less than its potential with little prospect that this gap will be significantly reduced in 1970.

I also firmly believe that if we can spend over \$5 billion of public funds on unemployment compensation to those who are out of work through no fault of their own we can provide the means by which some of these funds can be used to provide useful work in upgrading our public facilities and in improving our quality of life. I believe the bill before us today will help provide that means.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my support for title II of H.R. 5376, the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971.

Section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, presently authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to designate as "redevelopment areas" eligible for financial assistance under the act, the so-called special impact areas.

Under the present act, special impact areas include areas designated by the Office of Economic Opportunity and areas determined by the Secretary of Commerce to meet the special impact program section of the Economic Opportunity Act. Under this legislation, special impact areas are communities or neighborhoods which are characterized by certain conditions of economic hardship and which have submitted an overall economic development program designed to alleviate such conditions. The re-

defined designation standards will relate designation of EDA special impact areas more closely to the purposes of this act. Additionally, the administrative requirements of the Economic Opportunity Act necessarily vary from those of the Public Works and Economic Development Act. The redefined standards should provide for greater flexibility and ease of administration.

I would stress at this point the statement on page 20 of the committee's report that the proposal for an overall economic development program required for the special impact areas are in lieu of the more detailed program required for the other criteria after designation of redevelopment areas. The new proposals should be narrower in their scope and acceptable in a shorter period of time than is the case for the programs under the present procedure.

One of the most difficult and frustrating aspects of the administration of this program has been the extreme difficulty in obtaining a precise administrative formula or methodology so as to readily permit the pinpointing of specific neighborhoods, sections of rural areas, towns, or communities which may be suffering from extraordinarily high unemployment, excessive low income, or extreme out-migration and therefore in need of assistance to stimulate or redirect their economy. This difficulty occurs because the official Federal and State unemployment income and migration statistics are either not available for short term periods or are not broken down to neighborhoods, parts of rural areas, or individual communities or cities.

A graphic example of this kind of problem occurs in my State. Paterson, the third largest city in the State of New Jersey, together with the city of Passaic with extraordinarily high levels of unemployment have been unable to participate in the EDA program because under the SMSA formula the counties of Passaic and Bergen are statistically bulked together.

The average rate of unemployment for 1970 for the SMSA District of Passaic and Bergen Counties is officially recorded at 5.3 percent. For the same period, the rate of unemployment on the census-to-census ratio method for the city of Paterson was 9.5 percent and the city of Passaic was 8.9 percent.

Further, and more specifically, during the month of December 1970 the reported statistics for unemployment for the SMSA District of Passaic and Bergen Counties was 5.5 percent while the unemployment rate in the city of Paterson was 9.9 percent and the city of Passaic was 9.5 percent.

During the month of January 1971 the reported unemployment statistics for the Bergen-Passaic Counties SMSA District was 6.8 percent with Paterson at 12.3 percent and Passaic at 11.5 percent.

The average for the month of February 1971 for this SMSA District was 6.8 percent with Paterson at 12.2 percent and Passaic at 11.6 percent.

At my request, the committee ex-

amined this problem and in its report stated as follows:

The committee wishes to clarify any confusion which might exist on this point. It is not our intent that the administration of the new provisions on special impact areas be hamstrung by arbitrary use of eligibility based on SMSA statistical figures. Designations should be made on the basis of all available information, including reasonable estimates prepared by the State, local bodies, or the Department of Labor or Commerce. For example, the types of information used to develop the unemployment rates for Paterson and Passaic should be eminently satisfactory. Furthermore, it is the intent of the committee that the Secretary exercise discretion and flexibility in determining the acceptability of statistics upon which to base a designation.

I wish to express my appreciation to Chairman BLATNIK and to the committee for this clarification. I am certain that not only Paterson and Passaic in my district will now be able to obtain the designation and avail themselves of assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act and the Public Works Acceleration Act—but so will hundreds of other depressed economic areas throughout the Nation.

Mr. JONES of Alabama, Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes personally, but I do want to say this, that the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 has been universally recognized as one of the most successful programs of our Government to meet the needs of areas that have high unemployment and depressed conditions. Its success has been established by indepth studies by our subcommittee and the studies are available for examination by anyone who wants to look at what has actually been accomplished in terms of long-term employment by this program.

The administration itself supports the extension of this program. There is a difference among some of us as to whether it should be for 2 years or 1 year. But the committee bill calls for a 2-year extension and that was overwhelmingly adopted in committee with strong support on both sides.

So I hope the Members of the House will go along with this extension as the committee has brought it out with the full funding authorized at \$1,945 million for the program over the next 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to answer any questions that anyone may have that I can comment upon with regard to the working and the operation of the program.

Mr. Chairman, basically title II of H.R. 5376 is a simple 2-year extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The purpose of the Public Works and Economic Development Act is to provide Federal help, in cooperation with the States, to assist communities, areas, and regions in the United States which are suffering from excessive unemployment or underemployment by providing financial and technical assistance needed for

the creation of new jobs. Unlike the Public Works Acceleration Act, its emphasis is on long-range planning and programming for economic development. Its objective is to enhance domestic prosperity by establishing stable and diversified local economies. This is accomplished by developing and expanding new and existing public works, providing loans for businesses, and technical assistance necessary to create directly or indirectly new opportunities for long-term employment and economic growth.

In an effort to help these lagging areas, title I of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 authorizes a grant program for public works and development facilities needed to create a climate conducive to the development and operation of private enterprise. This title provides for direct grants up to 50 percent and supplementary grants up to a maximum Federal participation of 80 percent for public works and development facility projects, except in the case of grants to Indian tribes where the Secretary may reduce or entirely waive the required non-Federal share. It authorizes the designation of areas as eligible for grants under this title if the Secretary of Labor finds that there have been areas of substantial unemployment for the preceding calendar year.

This title presently authorizes an appropriation of \$500 million annually until June 30, 1971. Section 202 of H.R. 5376 would extend this authorization for 2 additional years and increase the authorization for appropriation to \$550 million annually.

Title II of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 authorizes loans up to 100 percent of project cost to assist in financing public works and development facilities and authorizes business development loans up to 65 percent for the purchase or development of land and facilities within redevelopment areas. Working capital guarantees are authorized up to 90 percent of private working capital loans made in connection with direct loan projects. Assistance may be provided only where funds are not otherwise available and there must be a reasonable expectation of repayment. The projects must be consistent with the overall plans for the economic development of the area.

Title II presently authorizes an appropriation of \$170 million annually until June 30, 1971. Section 203 of H.R. 5376 would extend the authorization for 2 additional years.

Title III of the 1965 act authorized the Secretary of Commerce to provide technical assistance including operational assistance for both projects and areas. Repayment of assistance under this provision may be required at the discretion of the Secretary. The title also authorizes grants-in-aid of up to 75 percent of the cost of planning and administrative expenses to appropriate public and private nonprofit State, area, and local organizations. In addition, the research program enables the Department to formulate and evaluate its policies and to establish long-term goals and priorities.



The Secretary is authorized to make grants, enter into contracts, or otherwise provide funds for demonstration projects in redevelopment areas if such projects will foster the regional productivity, prevent outmigration and otherwise carry out the purposes of the act.

This title presently authorizes an appropriation of \$50 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. Section 204 of H.R. 5376 would extend this authorization for 2 additional years.

Title IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 establishes the standards for the designation of redevelopment areas and insures that every State will have at least one such designated area.

It also provides for the designation of multicounty economic development districts containing two or more redevelopment areas and at least one growth center and authorizes 10 percent additional funds for projects in redevelopment areas located within designated districts.

Public works and development facility grants and loans, business loans, and working capital guarantees are authorized in section 403 to be provided to economic development centers—which are growth centers.

Section 205 of H.R. 5376 would amend the criteria established in section 401 of the 1965 act 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. The criteria, under the amendments offered by the gentleman from Arkansas, (Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT), would be changed to:

Increase from 40 to 50 percent of the national median, the maximum median family income under which an area can qualify;

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 outmigration;

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.

Any such area must have submitted an acceptable proposal for an OEDP which will have an appreciable, beneficial impact upon such condition. No such area designated shall be eligible to fulfill the prerequisite of two redevelopment areas necessary for the creation of an economic development district; and

Add the new criterion of a significant decline over a 10-year period in per capita employment.

Section 206 of H.R. 5376 would amend the provision pertaining to the annual review of redevelopment areas to provide that designated areas may not be terminated in less than 3 years from date of designation. This amendment avoids problems resulting from year-to-year

shifts in unemployment rates, which although temporary, can now result in an area being dedesignated and shortly thereafter being redesignated. Such year-to-year shifts are partly the result of statistical vagaries in the unemployment rate data, and should clearly not influence an area's eligibility for economic development assistance. Guarantees of eligibility for 3 years should minimize the problems of annual eligibility reviews, and permit planning with a greater degree of confidence so that the expenditure of effort and funds will not be wasted.

This title presently authorizes an appropriation of \$50 million annually until June 30, 1971. Section 207 of H.R. 5376 would extend this authorization for 2 additional years.

Title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 authorizes the designation of appropriate economic development regions within the United States and the procedures for establishment of appropriate multistate regional commissions.

The form and responsibilities of these regional commissions were patterned after those of the Appalachian Regional Commission. Their purposes included the development of programs to stimulate economic growth in the affected areas and the making of recommendations to Congress of programs where legislation was needed.

Subsequent amendments to the original 1965 legislation provided for basic and supplemental grant authority, required the development of a comprehensive long-range economic development plan, and permitted the commissions to engage in demonstration projects.

Five title V commissions have been established: Ozarks Regional Commission, New England Regional Commission, Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission, Four Corners Regional Commission, and the Coastal Plains Regional Commission.

Each of the commissions had developed long-range comprehensive development plans and is in the process of improving them.

In my own area, the Ozarks Regional Commission has been developing a broad-based program which should provide long-range benefits to the people of the areas as well as the entire Nation.

Section 509 of title V presently authorizes an appropriation of \$255 million for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971.

Section 208 of H.R. 5376 would authorize an appropriation of \$305 million for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973.

Section 512 of title V presently authorizes \$500,000 for the 2-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971, for the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska for the purpose of planning economic development programs and projects in Alaska in cooperation with the government of the State of Alaska. Section 209 of H.R. 5376 would extend this authorization through June 30, 1973.

Section 2 of Public Law 91-304 provided that no area designated as a re-

development area would have its designation terminated or modified after May 1, 1970, and before June 1, 1971, unless the local governing body of the county qualified under existing criteria for dedesignation specifically requests dedesignation action.

Section 210 of H.R. 5376 would extend the June 1, 1971 date to June 1, 1972.

Section 211 of H.R. 5376 would add a new provision to the 1965 act providing that—

No person in the United States shall, on the ground of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Mr. Chairman, the total amount of the authorization for the extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 for fiscal years 1972 and 1973 is \$1,945,500,000. Without enactment into law of this bill, all of the authorizing provisions of the 1965 act will expire on June 30, 1971.

Mr. Chairman, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 has shown great promise for success. Although, admittedly burdened by insufficient appropriations to carry out the programs authorized, the Economic Development Administration and the regional Commissions have on the overall done a good job. As is natural, they have suffered growing pains. Now they are approaching a stage of maturity which could result in the realization of the objectives which the Congress originally envisioned.

It was the committee's judgment that a 1-year authorization as recommended by the administration is insufficient. The States and the local areas which have placed their confidence and reliance for future economic growth in this program must have this type of assurance in order to develop sound plans for individual projects and comprehensive programs.

Mr. Chairman, before yielding back the remainder of my time to the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, the gentleman from Minnesota, I wish to note my support for title I of H.R. 5376.

I commend the chairman for bringing the Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971 to the floor early in this session. This is a constructive measure and deserves the support of every Member.

As in 1962, we are faced with a serious unemployment problem in many regions of the country. At that time we had 4 million unemployed; today we have over 5 million. Unemployment benefits were also running at the multi-billion-dollar level.

We used public works to provide useful employment in 1962 and by so doing we benefited not only the unemployed but also the citizens of these communities by improving and providing badly needed public facilities.

I am impressed with the public facilities that were constructed under the 1962 act. Hospitals and health facilities, water supply and other public utilities, waste treatment and sanitation facili-

ties, as well as many others were constructed. We are still reaping their benefits. Certainly the construction of these facilities, representing the investment of the services of the people who were unemployed on these projects, was a better investment of public funds than unemployment compensation and welfare payments. No one can place a value on the human benefits received by the unemployed who were again used in the community on productive work.

Today, our need for public facilities in both urban and rural areas is greater than in 1962 because our population is large and the services required are more extensive. The demand for improving our environment alone has placed a heavier demand on States and communities than we had in 1962. I am also glad that the amendments reflect the experience with the 1962 act by increasing the Federal Government's participation in the financing of various community facilities. At that time, many communities were unable to participate because they could not comply with the financial requirements. By increasing the participation to 80 percent and making provision for up to 100 percent participation under special circumstances we can provide the means of giving greater assistance to many financially hard-pressed communities.

There is no question in my mind that the reactivation of Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 is needed. I strongly support this legislation.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I understand some public works grants programs now require final plans and specifications, detailed estimates, and other material before they will accept and consider an application for approval. Is it intended that this program require such detailed information before approval of a public works project?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, it is the intention of this bill as I understand it to require only the reasonable minimum data and plans and specifications necessary to judge a worthy project before its approval. It is the intention here to require preliminaries only and the architect/engineer work necessary to give fairly reliable estimates of cost. I understand that the Economic Development Administration and the Farmers Home Administration are presently operating their programs on this basis.

Mr. Chairman, I want to acknowledge the very fine and reasonable attitude that the Secretary of Commerce has on this subject and the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the entire bill which has been presented by the great Committee on Public Works.

Mr. Chairman, Chairman BLATNIK and the distinguished Public Works Committee are to be commended for their prompt and thoughtful consideration of the accelerated public works bill, which has been reported to the House as title I of H.R. 5376. This bill may well prove

to be one of the most significant measures produced by this Congress to remedy our ailing economy, and I wish to express my appreciation to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House leadership for giving it high priority and expeditious handling.

As cosponsor of the bill, which was introduced in the Senate by the Honorable JENNINGS RANDOLPH, I hasten to say that this is not a new idea whose time has come; rather, it is an old idea whose time has come again. It worked successfully in the 1960's, and there is every reason to believe that it can be applied with equal success in the 1970's.

It was this same Public Works Committee that produced the original public works acceleration bill in 1962, under a different administration but at a time of similar need, when the country was struggling to recover from a series of recessions and a heavy burden of unemployment. I had the honor to be a member of the committee that hammered out the public works acceleration bill, tailored to meet the gravest needs of the time by creating jobs in areas of high unemployment and by launching public works projects to provide needed facilities that State and local governments had been unable to finance on their own.

The act that was passed by the 87th Congress played a significant part in "getting the country moving again" into a period of economic growth and expansion that continued steadily until March 1969.

Now, in another decade and under another administration, we are again concerned with a sluggish economy, resulting in high unemployment. More than 5½ million Americans are seeking employment, without success. The unemployment rate remains at 6 percent of the labor force across the country, but in some areas it is as high as 11 percent, and among urban minorities, in particular, it exceeds the national average by far. There are now 50 major labor areas reporting "substantial unemployment," meaning over 6 percent. Last fall, by comparison, there were 35. So the unemployment problem has been spreading—touching more communities and more lives. The administration's economic game plan has not been adequate to alleviate the situation, and it is now incumbent upon this Congress to take the lead in initiating programs that will attack the roots of the problem, quickly and effectively.

I am happy to see this Congress accepting that responsibility, and I am pleased that nearly 150 Members of the House have joined in cosponsoring this measure to amend the Accelerated Public Works Act to make it applicable to our problems and our times. The passage of this bill may mark a turning point in our failing economy and in the lives and fortunes of thousands of Americans who have spent dreary months in enforced idleness.

Mr. Chairman, I know the problems of substantial and persistent unemployment firsthand from my own district, and I know how communities stagnate and deteriorate when plants are not operating at full capacity, tax revenues decline, and public services diminish. Those com-

munities could be revitalized by the initiation of public works projects that have been on the shelf for lack of adequate local financing. That is what we could accomplish with funds available under the accelerated public works bill.

As adopted by the Public Works Committee, H.R. 5376 will provide \$2 billion for public works grants to communities with high unemployment and with planned public works projects ready to go as soon as the grant is made. One of the stipulations for qualifying for a grant is that a major portion of the grant must be used on payroll—thus bringing money into the community and directly into the pockets of those who need it most.

This is not a make-work project nor a Federal handout. It is a mutual benefit arrangement. These workers need jobs, and the country needs their skills. The range of projects that can be advanced through this kind of effort is broad: water and sewer works, public buildings, recreation centers, street repairs, lighting improvements, and so on—projects that will improve the environment and the living conditions of people who live in these economically depressed areas. An example of the impact made by the original Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 can be found in the report of the Department of the Interior, which used a total of \$63.7 million under this program:

The program resulted in immediate as well as long-term benefits.

The immediate benefit was the creation of thousands of new jobs at the site of work and many other thousands in providing goods and services. The entire program created approximately 8750 man-years of employment in a wide range of improvements touching many phases of conservation and benefitting most States. The longer-range benefits now are being realized. Our rangelands, our national parks, our fish and wildlife refuges, our roads, our Indian Reservations have been improved. Fire hazards in timbered areas have been curbed, streams have been cleared, new trails have been built. Costly soil erosion has been lessened. Also, we now have many new campgrounds, more parking areas, additional boat-launching facilities, more swimming and picnicking areas.

Many of these projects normally would have been years in developing. Today they are completed and the public is using them.

This is the experience of only one of many Federal agencies using accelerated public works funds, but the statement describes more eloquently than any presentation of mine the positive effects of this legislation, not only in terms of creating jobs but in terms of improving the environment and protecting our natural resources.

The Public Works Committee has amended the accelerated public works proposal to include extension of the Economic Development Act and the Appalachian regional program—amendments which I heartily endorse.

It is my hope that the Congress will approve the bill as amended by the committee, after extensive hearings and careful consideration. Furthermore, I hope that we will have both the approval and the cooperation of the administration in this effort, and that the funds Congress sees fit to appropriate for this



purpose will be allocated promptly by the executive branch.

There are critics who say that such a program as this would not bring relief fast enough—that it would take too long to set the projects in motion. Some projects may require advance study and surveys, it is true. Then let us begin. Others can be undertaken immediately. I know of long-delayed projects in my district—and I am sure my colleagues can cite similar examples—that could be in operation within a few days after the allocation is made. For instance, Tracy, Calif., is faced with a \$16.5 million expenditure for sewage treatment plant expansion to meet the proposed requirement of the Water Quality Control Board. The city cannot finance such an expansion and is in desperate need for assistance, because the required amount is far in excess of the city's legal bonding limits. This is the kind of community, and the kind of project, that could qualify immediately for aid under the accelerated public works bill.

Other cities in my district that qualify as areas of substantial unemployment have lists of much-needed public works projects that could be initiated at once: storm drainage systems, sidewalk improvement, libraries, schools, police stations, community centers, street lights and traffic signals, airport facilities, city halls, and so on. These projects, which have been long planned and shelved for lack of local funds, would call for total expenditures amounting to almost \$177 million.

By providing funds for such projects, this legislation would create new jobs immediately—especially in the construction trades which have been hard hit by long-term unemployment and even today reach rates as high as 12 percent and higher in some areas. And with the creation of each new job, there is a multiplier factor involving all the backup forces of engineers, architects, designers, manufacturers, truckers, and so on, giving a boost to the economy, encouraging investors and developers, and making the area more attractive to industry as well as more habitable for our citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this body to vote favorably on this bill, which could mark a turning point in a difficult period.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from California should publicly be noted as one of the strongest and earliest champions of an accelerated public works section in this bill and one who did a great job in connection with its adoption in committee.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the very distinguished gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have before us today one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before the 92d Congress. H.R. 5376 is a bill that is designed to help human beings, while at the same time create very badly needed public facilities. There are three titles to this legislation, each of which serves a worthy purpose.

Title I, the Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971, updates the former act, passed in 1962. Just as the original bill did, this new proposal will offer an immediate and needed economic shot in the arm. With more than 5 million people unemployed something must be done and done now. Based on our experience during the years 1962 through 1964 we know that many people will once again be gainfully employed in the planning and construction of such vital public works as water and sewer systems, waste treatment plants, water supply systems, hospitals, nursing homes, and public health facilities. Thousands of jobs will be created in those areas which have become chronic pockets of depression. Federal funds can be granted at an 80-percent rate, while in those communities which are financially unable to raise any money 100 percent of Federal funds will be made available.

In January of this year unemployment compensation totaled \$560 million. Additionally many of the unemployed, having exhausted their benefits have gone on the relief rolls, adding to this nonproductive financial drain. A goodly portion of that drain will be eliminated when human beings are returned to the labor force. So while a short-ranged program, title I is still an essential feature of the bill and should receive your support.

Title II will extend for 2 years the Economic Development Act of 1965. That remarkable and farsighted legislation has been working economic miracles in many parts of the Nation. I know it has meant so much to the State of West Virginia. However, while doing so much good, more time is still needed if the objectives of the EDA are to be met. No program, particularly one which is contributing to the economic well-being of the country, should be permitted to die before accomplishing its purposes differing from title I in that it is a long-ranged planning and programing for economic development. EDA encourages the development and growth of private enterprise, as well as offering grants for public works. In extending the act, funding in the amount of \$550 million per year would be authorized, an increase of \$50 million a year. Also the criteria for eligibility for designation as a "redevelopment area" has been broadened. Experience has taught us that many areas, although obviously suffering economic distress, cannot qualify under the current provisions of the EDA Act of 1965.

Title III will extend the Appalachian Act for 4 years, and the highway provisions for 5 years. Total authorizations would amount to \$1.5 billion during this period. Since the passage of this great legislation 6 years ago the Appalachian region, most of which has suffered a depressed economy throughout this century, has started to emerge from its tragic situation. There are 13 States blanketed by the provisions of this bill, 12 partially, but only one State is covered in its entirety—West Virginia. So you can readily understand my strong and deep-felt support for the continuation of this most important act. The purpose of the Appalachian Act is to assist the region in meeting its problems, to pro-

mote its economic development and provide basic facilities essential to regional growth. This it is doing, but much, much more must be accomplished before we will have a self-sustaining economy throughout the area.

Now that you have heard from those who advocate passage of this legislation, keep in mind as you vote that this is a humanitarian act which will immeasurably help thousands of our less-fortunate citizens, people who want to be a part of the system in a productive and useful manner.

I cannot urge you too strongly to vote for H.R. 5376.

(Mr. STAGGERS, at the request of Mr. KEE, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, we will soon be voting on the Hill to extend the authority for the Appalachian regional development program for 4 years. It has proved to be a most effective approach to the economic and social advancement of a region where some 18 million people live. I intend to vote in favor of this renewed authorization because past success gives me confidence in the ability of the program to complete its vital mission in the next 4 years.

One of the most essential tasks of the program is to help improve the levels of education and health in the 13-State region. One way in which the Appalachian Regional Commission is undertaking this task is to provide small children with the kinds of health, social, and educational services which will enable them to develop into productive adults.

While we have heard a good deal about the much needed Appalachian highway system, the vocational and technical schools built with Appalachian program support and the health facilities constructed under the program, I want to discuss the child services activity in the light of these facts:

Less than 5 percent of the children under 6 in Appalachia have available comprehensive services such as those included in Headstart.

About 43 percent of all children under 6 in Appalachia are categorized as poor by OEO standards and are likely to require some special services. Headstart is available to only about 11 percent of these children.

In some Appalachian counties the infant mortality rate is as high as 45.2 per 1,000 live births—a rate which exceeds that in many of the underdeveloped countries of Africa and Asia.

Given this situation and the needs it represents, Congress in 1969 amended section 202 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act in 1969, to authorize a child development program. We expressed the intent that the program become "a national laboratory" for the creation of comprehensive and effective service delivery systems for children.

In responding to this new authority, the Appalachian Regional Commission acted from two important principles.

First, child development is not the "property" of any one State agency. Young children are served by State departments of health, mental health, wel-

fare, education, and others. An effective coordinated program requires that all these agencies work together. Thus, the Commission is requiring that planning for child development be the administrative responsibility of an interdepartmental State body which includes the relevant agencies.

To establish a new or separate child-care agency would have simply further fragmented an already discoordinate situation.

Second, because the major sources of service for children are State agencies, and because the bulk of Federal funds flow through State agencies, it would be unrealistic to plan for either part of a State, or to have primary planning done by agencies other than the ones directly responsible for providing service. Therefore, Appalachian planning grants provide the foundation for the statewide planning by the responsible agencies. They will invite participation of local and area organizations and citizens, and such local participation will be necessary in order to turn plans into action.

This planning is well underway and has already produced not only a diversity of patterns for service to children, but also in many States important movement toward the coordination of all human service programs.

The Commission, while supporting continued planning is now ready to assist in implementation of initial service projects in Appalachia. I am informed that these services are expected to include health and nutrition of mothers-to-be and infants, and day-care and preschool services.

Mr. Chairman, there are 2.2 million children under 6 in Appalachia, half of them in very low-income families. The statistics I cited at the beginning of my statement reflect the need. The anticipated service projects will reach at most a few thousand of these youngsters. But the Appalachian program is building the base on which other programs can pick up the burden of expanding services. The Appalachian funds are the seed money for this process.

I am a believer in the Appalachian development program. I have personally seen what has been accomplished in the last 6 years, and what must be completed in the next 4 years. I urge support of the renewed authorization.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. Does the distinguished member of the committee recall which economists and specialists testified regarding the economic impact which this legislation will have on the country at this time?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Do I recall which individual economists testified?

Mr. RONCALIO. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Leon Keyserling testified at some length.

Mr. RONCALIO. It is my understanding that many eminent economists testified before this subcommittee regarding the benefits and impact this legislation would have, particularly in the area of

moving ahead toward constructing worthy public works projects now, projects which could be put into fruition in the continuation of the 1965 program, and that is one of the economic aspects of this legislation; is that correct?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am sure the gentleman is correct. I do not recall any adverse testimony of this subject from any economist.

Mr. RONCALIO. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma. I am happy to give my support to the legislation, and I am pleased to be a member of the committee and the subcommittee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee.

(Mr. JAMES V. STANTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, the Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971 is a good bill. I ask that every Member seriously consider the conditions with which we are faced today. Two years ago unemployment was not a deep concern. Today, some of the statistical data from communities throughout the Nation are frightening. Areas report 25 to 33 percent unemployment or underemployment. The national average is running 6 percent. We, in the Congress must recognize the facts of life and do something about it.

In title I of H.R. 5376 we now have before us a proposal that not only gets at the heart of the employment problem, but produces programs which are sorely needed. Water and sewer plants, hospitals, nursing homes, public health services, all add to the welfare of the country and make available vital projects which will better the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans. Each day we delay building these already needed projects, the longer our people are to be denied them, and thousands of human beings are being denied the dignity of gainful employment.

You have heard from others how the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 was so successful. That legislation was needed then, and we passed it. Today the situation is as bad as that existing 9 years ago. If we considered that era one of need and one which called for immediate action, today the requirements are just as urgent.

We propose to authorize \$2 billion for public works. The previous law authorized \$900 million, and resulted in more than 7,700 projects. No one will ever know how many people directly benefited from these programs—benefited purely in a financial sense. Not only were people put back to work, but suppliers, community services and the like participated in the economic upswing which the act created. An estimated 170,000 individuals could be employed directly on projects already on the shelves, and ready to go. Certainly an educated guess that more than 250,000 other jobs could be created as a byproduct of such an active program

cannot be discounted. As I said this is a needed bill. I urge that every Member of this House support H.R. 5376.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I wish to bring to the attention of the House the fact that last year the five States of Montana, the Dakotas, Wyoming, and Nebraska, on a bipartisan basis, prepared an overall economic development program for our region and made application. Also last year Congress appropriated \$300,000 to get this five-State region off the ground with the Upper Missouri Regional Development Commission. But so far nothing has been done by the Secretary of Commerce. I want to be assured that the bill we are taking up today in its authorization covers and provides for the Upper Missouri Regional Development Commission when it is approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is my understanding, I will say to the gentleman, that the provision providing for regional commission authorization would not only make entirely in order the funding of the region which the gentleman so ably represents, but other regional commissions also which might subsequently be established as well.

Mr. MELCHER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, a regional approach to economic development is essential in areas of relatively sparse population, capital, and public revenues. In such areas, it takes the combined strength and numbers of the people of a river basin, or a geographic region with common problems, to provide the capital and other essentials for growth which a single State, or small political subdivision, does not have standing alone.

Energy is an excellent example. Low-cost energy is essential to industrial development. Small electric generating units are uneconomical. Only when an area with consumers sufficient to justify generating plants of at least 100,000-kilowatt capacity—and a million is better—has been linked into a single transmission grid can the economies of size be achieved which are necessary to be competitive in the field of electric energy supply.

The Upper Missouri Basin was one of this Nation's highest cost electrical energy areas until development of the main stem of the river required the development of a transmission grid to market the power. That grid now serves eight States and has now made possible the construction of generating units, to meet load growth, in multiples of 100,000 kilowatts.

We are increasingly confronted with the need for size—an adequate service or supporting area—to justify specialized educational programs, a medical college, for example; or adequately broad research programs, in plains grazing lands management as an example in that field; or on transportation problems, animal health, livestock breeding—many prob-



lems which one farmer or rancher, or even one State, cannot support alone.

In the Upper Missouri Basin we have common minerals development problems which need joint attention. I believe we are on the threshold of a breakthrough in use of giant beds of low-sulfur coal found in both of the Dakotas, eastern Montana, and Wyoming. Our coal is now moving east to generate power for the Twin Cities and Chicago in competition with oil, gas, and atoms. With the perfection of magnetohydrodynamics—MHD—which is a process for generating electricity directly from coal, which doubles its efficiency and provides nearly pollution-free generation, our area can become the powerhouse, or power source, of the northwestern quarter of the United States. But we need a united regional effort to speed the development of this process—and the Tennessee Valley Authority developed high concentrate fertilizers to the benefit not only of its own area but of the whole Nation.

And we will need a regional approach to regulatory problems in this same aspect—common requirements for strip-mined land restoration because we must have land conservation for the future rather than competition for coal resource development in terms of lax and inadequate strip-mined land restoration requirements.

We have a great opportunity to develop recreation—leisure industries—in the Upper Great Plains area. On the West are Glacier National Park, Yellowstone and the Grand Tetons. A plan for a vast recreational complex including the Great Lakes of the Missouri River—the reservoirs behind the great mainstem dams—a Lewis and Clark Trail tourway, a prairie wildlife refuge, Indian reservations, and historic sites, has already been blueprinted for us. A prairie tourway through the center of the regional commission's area, and a parkway linking our western mountain parks from Glacier to the Rocky Mountain National Park in Colorado, have all been proposed but still lay on the drawing boards for want of an agency, or a vehicle, which will unite the efforts of the States to bring about their completion and the expansion of tourist, or leisure industries, which our area and the citizens of the Nation, now being crowded into overflowing parks and campgrounds and other recreational facilities, very greatly need.

There is need for the development of industry of all kinds, including general industry, our agricultural industry, mining, and the so-called leisure industries. Our need for specialized educational facilities and research is extensive, and our need for the development of common policies in many fields, illustrated by the strip mining problem I have mentioned.

Our common problems are numerous, and so are our common opportunities.

All of the Governors of the five States, all of the Senators of the five States, and all of the Congressmen from the five State—men of both political parties—joined in petitioning for an Upper Mis-

souri Basin Regional Economic Development Commission in April and May 1970.

The Secretary of Commerce subsequently advised the Members of Congress that the administration was reviewing the Commission program and would consider the Upper Missouri Basin proposal in that connection.

Last year, at the insistence of the five-State delegations, the public works appropriations bill was amended to include an item of \$300,000 to launch the Upper Missouri Basin Commission. An equal amount was provided for a Midsouth Commission in Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

There was no action to establish the Commissions, so the Governors of the five States appeared, with Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, and me before the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Economic Development, urging them to extend the Economic Development Act, including title V, authorizing regional economic development commissions.

Subsequent to the hearing, the five Governors and the nine active Senators from the five States—Senator KARL MUNDT is recuperating from a heart attack—addressed a letter to the President, requesting him to release the funds appropriated for the Upper Missouri Basin Commission and activate it.

The President has since proposed that the funds of the Appalachia Commission and funds intended for the title V Commissions in New England, the upper Great Lakes, the Ozarks, the Four Corners, and the Southeast be included in his revenue-sharing "rural development" proposal.

In a response to the February 24 letter of the five Governors and nine Senators, John D. Ehrlichman, writing for the President, has stated that the President prefers his "revenue-sharing" proposal, contained in his "rural development" message, but that, if Congress sees fit to extend title V Commissions, the Upper Missouri Basin application will be reconsidered "in that light."

Mr. Chairman, I believe passage of this bill with title II clearly shows the intent of the House to encourage the creation of the Upper Missouri Regional Development Commission because the criteria specified under the act has been clearly met by our five-State area and we want to get moving.

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. DENHOLM. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding. I rise in support of H.R. 5376 and commend the gentleman from Oklahoma and the members of the committee for proposing legislation to get the economy of this country moving again.

I want to inquire of you and the committee of the legislative intent in relation to the scope of H.R. 5376 in getting the economy moving and getting full employment. I should like to ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if he has an opinion as to how the bill would affect the largest industry in the United States, the industry of agriculture and the farm

families of this country. I would like to remind you and the committee that the people in agriculture are receiving about 67 percent of parity. For the purpose of getting the economy moving again, and looking at the dollars-and-cents aspect of the total economy of this country the people in the industry of agriculture are presently receiving about one-third less of the dollar for produced food and fiber from the farms and ranches than they should and would be receiving to equal a fair and equitable share of the whole economy as an industry—the industry of agriculture. I submit the loss of one-third of the income to a major industry of our economy represents an impact on the total economy of rural America equal to 33 percent unemployment of nonagricultural occupations and that the resulting consequences are equally devastating. What does H.R. 5376 do to assist the farm families and people of rural America?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I share the concern of the gentleman about the problems of rural America. The bill would certainly facilitate funding for rural water districts and other public works and construction projects of a rural nature. I will concede that it is easier to get those projects going in a town or a city than it is in a rural area. But it would be our hope that a good portion of these funds could go to rural public works projects.

Mr. DENHOLM. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5376.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5376 is a brick and mortar bill. It will build schools, libraries, public buildings, water and sewer systems, industrial parks, highways and hospitals—which are the kind of projects that make significant and lasting contributions to economic growth. This bill will also provide jobs for 5 million unemployed Americans who are victims of the transition from a wartime economy to peacetime economy and the reordering of national priorities. One of the most important things we can do today during this difficult period is to provide the unemployed with a sense of hope that comes with a chance to work. This bill addresses itself to the problem of unemployment and economic deprivation existing in areas which have been isolated from the mainstream of economic growth. By building basic community facilities and services which generate employment opportunities, we can revitalize chronically depressed areas and attack excessive rates of unemployment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to confine my remarks at this point to title III of the bill which I feel is one of the most important and significant pieces of legislation which the Congress has passed. The Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 has been a unique experiment in Federal-State relationships and

stands as a shining example of "New Federalism." The program was created to revitalize a region which had stagnated from the lack of economic diversification by developing human resources, providing transportation accessibility, and building basic community facilities with which the region can achieve and maintain a viable economy.

The Appalachian program is the only successful working model I know of for a strategy for balanced urban and rural growth through the development of a Federal-State-local partnership. The Appalachian program is successful because it grows out of plans drawn by people at the grassroots. The local people have the advantage of preparing those plans in full awareness of how many dollars are available to implement them and within a broad framework of principles adopted by the States and the Federal representative on the Appalachian Regional Commission.

This means that the hard decisions about priorities used for scarce dollars available must be made by the local people and by the State, not by some bureaucrat in Washington. This is a plan under which national interests are also met through the participation of the Federal agencies and the vote of the Federal chairman.

For example, in Ohio's 10th Congressional District whose 12 of 13 counties are in Appalachia, we have formed three multicounty development districts responsible for preparing plans to develop their area. There is a local health council and educational organizations. These are the groups that prepare the local plans. But the State of Ohio also has its responsibilities for the preparation of an overall State plan which combines local hopes with State commitments.

Our experiences in Appalachia, Ohio, as well as my own observations on the Public Works Committee have persuaded me that under the Appalachia Act we have found a way to unite different levels of government into a new kind of partnership with which we can develop coordinated approaches to local problems. I believe the lessons we have learned from the Appalachia program can be applied to other parts of the Nation. Serving as a model, the Appalachia program can demonstrate the capability and commitment which is possible for all levels of government to work together in developing comprehensive approaches to many of the economic, social, and cultural problems which exist in this Nation today.

As a member of the House Public Works Committee, I have had the opportunity to help evaluate this legislation and I strongly believe that programs such as the Appalachia Regional Development Act should be allowed to continue to complete the great work it has begun.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MIZELL).

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, it is a great privilege for me to rise at this time to speak about the Appalachian Regional Commission and its companion programs in the economic development programs.

On many occasions, in this Chamber

and in other forums, I have expressed my strong support and admiration for the goals and operations of the Appalachian Commission, and it was my pleasure to have cosponsored legislation with the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) to extend the Appalachian program for another 4 years.

And so it is gratifying to see this extension incorporated in the bill being considered today.

In the Fifth District of North Carolina, which I am honored to represent, and throughout the western portion of the State, the Appalachian Commission has made its mark as a vital agent of progress.

Its well-planned strategy for economic development throughout the 13-State Appalachian region has been a blueprint for unparalleled achievement.

Its consistently capable, responsible, and energetic leadership has been an inspiration for all those who work within the program, and for all who are affected by it.

And its working partnership between the various levels of Government has been an excellent example of the effectiveness that can result from governmental cooperation and from the active participation of people on the local and State levels.

The success of this comprehensive campaign to revitalize the Appalachian region can be seen in the ever-growing network of Appalachian development highways, linking the region with the interstate highway system; it can be seen in the many primary and secondary access roads throughout the region, opening up new areas to development, helping to realize the Appalachian potential.

Success can be seen in the new hospitals, vocational schools, community colleges, regional health centers, water and sewage treatment plants, airports, manpower development programs, and other projects that have transformed the region from a place where despair and pessimism were widespread into an area where hope and opportunity and progress abound.

I see in this 4-year extension bill a chance for the Fifth District, North Carolina and the entire Appalachian region to continue to grow. And I believe that in the future, the example of this program can be well applied in an even greater effort to revitalize the whole of rural America.

This legislation we are considering today can represent an important step in that direction.

The proposed funding for this extension has been set at \$571 million for the 4-year facilities and services program, and \$925 million for the 5-year continuation of the 2,671-mile development highway construction program.

The people of the Fifth District of North Carolina expect me to keep a close watch on the expenditure of Government funds, and fiscal responsibility has always been one of my primary concerns throughout my career in public service.

I believe the funding proposed for this extension program represents the soundest possible investment of Government funds, because during the past 6 years

the Appalachian Regional Commission has proven over and over again that these investments pay great dividends when planning and foresight are applied.

In the same way, the Economic Development Administration and the title V regional commissions have proven to be effective instruments of progress within the borders of their legislative mandates.

The regional economic development approach has proven itself in all of these cases to be a truly effective and necessary response by the Government to the needs of the people these agencies serve.

For all of these reasons, I strongly urge my colleagues to join with me in voting for passage of this new lease on life for these excellent programs.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN).

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5376.

Mr. Chairman, when the original area redevelopment and the Appalachian programs were under discussion, I opposed them. I was for the economic development concept but my reservations were twofold. First, I was concerned that questionable projects might be approved. Second, the possibility of one area pirating jobs and industries from another was a matter of deep concern to me. Also the administration of the program left much to be desired, once implemented, that verified my concern.

But, I am happy to say that the Appalachian approach with improved administration has more than proven its worth. I can, therefore, wholeheartedly support extension of the Appalachian and EDA programs.

Mr. Chairman, the Appalachian region is far from my home district in California. But I have watched the development of the program with great interest because it deals with problems of deep concern to me. It seeks to revitalize both urban and rural areas. In my view, the Appalachian program contains within it the seeds for a sound approach to national growth and development. The lessons we have learned provide useful guidelines for solving social and economic development problems nationwide.

President Nixon, in his 1970 state of the Union address, drew attention to the need for a national growth policy. We desperately need such a policy.

The migration of millions of people out of rural areas and into a few great metropolitan areas has intensified economic and social congestion on the one hand and rural decline on the other. At a time when our national population is growing, it is strange indeed that half the counties of the Nation are experiencing population declines. This continuing migration of people to the cities poses severe fiscal strains for them. They will be hard pressed to provide an adequate level of services to new migrants or even to maintain them for their present population.

The rural areas experiencing out-migration over the past three decades have different, but no less serious, problems than those of the cities. In the past, it was possible for small, sparsely settled rural communities to provide



much the same kind of services and amenities as the cities provided for their populations. As technological, employment, and social patterns changed, however, new kinds of difficulties began to arise for such rural areas. More and more, they found that modern public services required a larger base for efficient financial support and operation.

Cities, with large, dense populations, were more capable of providing modern public services than were rural areas with their scattered populations. And so, the level of public services in rural areas began to lag farther and farther behind. This added to the problems already faced by rural communities which were increasingly less able to attract modern industrial, business, and job-creating activities. Because they were unable to find jobs, millions of rural citizens migrated to the urban areas. Unfortunately, most were ill-equipped to cope with city life.

The solution to the problems of both city and countryside clearly lies in the better management of the patterns of national development. This does not, of course, imply that individuals should be forced to live in either an urban or rural area. Rather it means that people should be provided with viable alternatives so that they can choose between overcrowded metropolitan areas and rural communities.

This is why the Appalachian experiment is important. It is an attempt to provide such alternatives by stimulating the development of or revitalizing small and medium-sized communities. They can then provide employment opportunities as well as a range of modern, urban-type public services for rural residents.

There are two principle goals in the Appalachian regional development program:

A social goal to provide the people of Appalachia with the skills and services necessary to compete successfully wherever they choose to live; and

An economic goal to develop in Appalachia a self-sustaining economy capable of providing its residents with rising incomes, improved levels of living, and increased job opportunities.

In order to move toward the achievement of these goals and to provide for more rational development patterns in the future, the efforts and resources of Federal, State, and local governments had to be linked with the private sector. The Commission provides such a linkage between the States and Washington. Local development districts which cover multicounty areas provide the linkage between State and local governments, and the private sector.

The second important feature of the Appalachian program is its urban thrust. The efforts of previous programs were not as effective as they should have been because they tried to do everything, everywhere. Recognizing this, the Congress directed that the Appalachian program concentrate its activities in areas where there was a significant potential for future economic growth. By pinpointing potential economic growth and development centers to serve as focal points for enterprise growth and expan-

sion, this has been done. Such centers are generating employment opportunities for rural citizens as well as providing urban services within reasonable proximity to their rural homes. Appalachian program investments have aimed at providing the kind of public facilities—highways, airports, and access roads—needed to accelerate the growth of such economic centers. They have also attempted to develop a network of health and education facilities to more effectively serve the population of the Appalachian region.

The Appalachian program has only been in existence for 5 years. It is too early to expect that social indicators such as the "U.S. Census of Population" to show a significant impact. But it is clear from the analysis of the communities involved that progress is being made and that the Appalachian program offers many lessons for revitalizing and developing rural areas of our Nation.

That is why I believe this experiment warrants our continued support.

At this point, I wish to comment on certain provisions of Appalachian legislation which we consider here today. Their enactment will, I believe, substantially improve the program in coming years.

In its consideration of the legislation this year, the Committee on Public Works saw fit to adopt a total figure authorization which, in effect, would amount to a consolidated grant to the region instead of a category-by-category approach. I believe that this will improve the flexibility and capabilities of those administering the program. It will encourage decisionmaking at the local level and promote the setting of priorities more consistent with local community objectives.

The committee also funded a solid waste clearance and disposal program. This pilot undertaking was suggested by Gov. Arch A. Moore, Jr., of West Virginia, in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Flood Control and Internal Development of which I am ranking minority member. A \$5 million authorization was provided for this regionwide effort. We are hopeful that through this program we will be able to clean up the junked automobiles and other contributors to solid waste pollution which scar the landscape of Appalachia. In the process, we look to gaining invaluable experience which will help us formulate an expanded solid waste disposal program, national in scope.

Finally, I wish to comment on the airport safety provisions of the bill which the committee approved. In recent months, a number of tragic air crashes have made the Nation acutely aware of the special flying hazards which exist in Appalachia. Airports in the region are frequently carved out of mountain tops. Many are surrounded by rugged terrain, which, as a professional pilot, I can personally attest, make landings and take-offs hazardous undertakings. The full potential of the Appalachian region simply cannot be developed without substantial improvement of safety facilities at existing airports.

Allocation of funds for this purpose

under the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970 are based upon population, land area, and passenger loadings. Under this formula, only \$8 million is apportioned to the Appalachian region—a sum totally inadequate to its needs.

The need for improving airport safety in Appalachia prompted the committee to provide a general authorization of \$20 million in each biennium to provide supplementary grants to States to accelerate the eradication of hazards to commercial aviation in the region.

In this connection, the committee provided \$50 million in supplementary funds for airport safety for EDA areas. Also, each region is allocated \$10 million for a supplementary grant program.

At this point, I should like to make a few observations about the Economic Development Administration and what it is doing to help promote growth in the First District of California.

The basic mission of EDA is to help communities with economic problems develop long-range growth programs which generate new jobs and higher personal incomes.

Because EDA projects are planned and implemented on the local level, they meet the specific needs of the people of the community.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of local involvement in economic and community development. I have found that EDA programs not only are responsive to this participation, but also help stimulate it.

Although EDA offers many forms of assistance, all are shaped to enable communities to diversify their economic bases and accelerate their development.

Several technical assistance projects also have been conducted with EDA funds in my district.

EDA has approved more than \$8 million for projects in the first district. They are good projects; they are necessary projects, and they are meeting their objectives because they are local projects.

All in all, I believe both the Appalachian and EDA programs have more than proven their worth. Their success is encouraging. Outmigration from these areas is going down. Jobs and opportunities for residents are going up. It is my judgment that if these programs are carried forward, by the end of this decade both Appalachia and the other areas of this country, which have lagged behind in economic growth, will have become self-sustaining.

For these reasons, I support approval of these measures.

In conclusion, our committee will be holding further hearings to, hopefully, advance the best of these proven economic growth programs plus recommendations the President and his administration will advance on rural revitalization, diversification, and economic development. I look forward to this effort with eager anticipation.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5376. The need for rapid enactment of amendments to the Public Works Acceleration Act which would

make its benefits available to certain areas of extra-high unemployment is readily apparent. The jobless situation in this country is critical. In every section of the United States, people are experiencing the frustration and humiliation of being without a means of earning a livelihood.

My own district in Massachusetts has not been spared from the devastating effects of high unemployment. Latest estimates from the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security indicates a jobless rate of 6.8 percent for the Pittsfield labor area, 10.1 percent for the Greenfield labor area, 12.6 percent for the North Adams labor area, and 8.7 percent for the Springfield labor area. So I know from first-hand experience that action must be taken—and taken soon.

The original 1962 legislation was a great boon to communities throughout the Nation that were plagued by high unemployment rates. It eased their financial burdens by providing needed public facilities that made these communities better places in which to live and work.

I was pleased to have cosponsored legislation with 150 of my colleagues in the House to continue this lifeline assistance. Title I of the bill we are considering today would stimulate a stagnant economy, put jobless people back to work, and enable local communities to proceed with long-delayed public works programs.

No one is saying that this legislation is a long-range answer to the long-range problems that affect our economy. But the millions of persons that have been thrown out of work and are struggling to survive and maintain their human dignity cannot afford to wait for long-range solutions. Congress must meet its responsibility now by implementing immediate relief while it searches for more complex solutions that will provide the long-range economic stability that this Nation so desperately needs.

For communities that are ready with a firm plan for a badly needed permanent public facility and that are willing to begin almost immediate construction, this bill would provide the necessary impetus of Federal assistance. The construction of such facilities such as municipal buildings and sewer facilities would make local areas more attractive to industry without overburdening the local tax rates.

I sincerely hope that this body will take swift effective action in approving this vital legislation.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I want to make this point again to my colleagues. There has been a discussion about the backlog of projects which will be available to be rushed through this public works program. This is the same point we had in 1962 when we had a rush of public works projects. It says right in the act that we have a backlog of projects, and under the most favorable conditions, when we had the House and when we had the Senate that both wanted to accelerate public works projects, we only got some effectiveness from that 2 or 3 years afterward and not immediately. It will not be effective now. It will not be effective tomorrow, and it will not be

effective next month, but only 2 or 3 years hence.

Here are some Bureau of the Budget figures on the outlays under the 1962 program where we had every conceivable favorable factor in existence. In fiscal year 1963, we had an outlay of \$62 million; in 1964 we had an outlay of \$332 million; in 1965, some 3 years from the date, we had an outlay of \$322 million; and in the next fiscal year we had an outlay of \$88 million. So I suggest that Members not be deluded by the effect they are going to get quickly or by the implementation they are going to get quickly, because even under the most favorable conditions we did not get that kind of response. Now with an administration that opposes the program, we cannot get quick action. So there are many hurdles for this legislation to overcome before there is any quick relief for the unemployed.

One final comment is in order. Even if the \$2 billion accelerated public works—APW—program called for in H.R. 5376 were to be enacted, and if the funds were subsequently employed for direct Federal and federally assisted construction in the same general proportions—approximately 16 percent and 83 percent, respectively—as were the funds under the APW program of the early 1960's, the outlays generated would be about \$200 million in fiscal year 1972, \$750 million in fiscal year 1973, \$700 million in fiscal year 1974, \$250 million in fiscal year 1975, and \$100 million in fiscal year 1976.

This outlay projection is based on the expenditure pattern experienced under the earlier APW program and on the following assumptions: \$1 billion of the authorized funds would be appropriated by July 1971, and would be fully obligated in the course of fiscal year 1972; and the remaining \$1 billion would be appropriated by July 1972, and would be fully obligated in the course of fiscal year 1973.

Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) such time as he may consume.

(Mr. BAKER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today is noble in purpose. It seeks to alleviate unemployment in depressed areas throughout the Nation. We have been changing from a wartime to a peacetime economy. This always presents problems, but we have been through this exercise before. We had to make this same kind of adjustment at the end of World War II and again at the end of the Korean war. We know it is usually slow and it is sometimes painful because of the dislocations built into any operation of this kind. We bring our veterans home to civilian life at the same time we cut back on defense expenditures. Until the peacetime economy is sufficiently geared up, people are out of work in larger numbers than we should have in this country.

But we have had evidence this month that the Nation's economy is looking better. The total output of the Nation is heading up. For the first time in the history of this country, the gross national product climbed past the trillion-dollar mark. Even when you adjust the percentage increase of growth in the first

quarter of this year to account for the degree of inflation, the jump is an impressive one. Prices are also leveling off and the increases are less rapid than in most of 1969 and 1970.

Even the doubting Thomases among the economists agree that 1971 looks a good deal better than 1970 and the prospects for continued improvement are good. We have reason to hope that the "quickenings of the pulsebeat of the economy" will translate itself into more employment and in stabilized prices. The inflationary rise can be curbed by continuing the administration's policy of restraint and by the exercise of prudence in the demand for wage increases.

On this optimistic note, we must face up to the question of whether all of the titles of this bill are necessary. My Republican colleagues and I who sat through the deliberations on this legislation do not feel that title I, which would resurrect and amend the 1962 Public Works Acceleration Act, is exactly what we need at this time. The additional funds under this title would be going into public works projects, but there would be little impact on the unemployment we have in the aerospace industry, defense-oriented fields and in other technical industries which have been adversely affected by winding down the war and in shifting priorities.

I feel the President is on the right track in the recommendations he has made to pump additional funds into the economy within the budget limitations he has set to keep inflationary pressures under control and at the same time reduce the rate of unemployment. I do not think he should be burdened with additional programs whose ability to effectively reduce unemployment where it is worst is questionable.

It is my recommendation that we strike title I of this bill and pass it with titles II and III intact. This will give a stronger bill, tailored to the needs of 1971 and the future. The extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 is dealing in known quantities of proven worth. Both programs have measured up to expectations in administering to the needs of selected areas throughout the country where persistent economic and social hardship have created special problems.

I have observed some of this economic therapy first hand. All of the counties of the Third Congressional District of Tennessee are in Appalachia. Three of them qualify for full EDA assistance. For the most part, these counties have suffered from a sharp decline in mining, agriculture and railroad employment. They have suffered from physical isolation because of terrain which limited the number of highways necessary for progress in an age of mobility and increased need for transportation facilities to develop commerce and sustain the economy.

Under these depressed conditions, the outmigration has been substantial while those who remained in Appalachia had to put up with poor health conditions, substandard housing, and inadequate education.



The implementation of the Appalachian Regional Development Act and the Economic Development Act is changing the outlook for the people of Appalachia. They are getting badly needed roads. New industries are moving in. Health and educational facilities are being built. The rate of migration has slowed and Appalachia is on the road back to economic self-sufficiency.

This progress cannot be measured in dollars alone, because human resources are always the most valuable, but as an example of what can happen, I want to report this: since the inception of the program, Tennessee's Third District has received \$5.5 million in Appalachian funds for public facilities, but total expenditures involving other Federal, State, and local funds amount to \$33.5 million, and this type of input is bound to have an impact on any economy.

Schools like the Athens State area vocational facility in McMinn County, the Bradley County area vocational education program, and the Orange Grove School in Chattanooga, Tenn., are helping the vocational and technical schools of the region meet more than 40 percent of the region's manpower needs.

The same type of contribution is being made in health facilities, such as the Meigs County Public Health Center and the Bledsoe County Hospital; improved housing, water and sewer improvements and many other aspects of an upgraded standard of living.

We cannot overlook the importance of the local development districts in promoting the various facets of this program. The counties of my district are included in two of the development and planning organizations—the East Tennessee Development District and the Southeast Tennessee. Through these building blocks, the local citizen of Appalachia—the man this program is all about—has a major voice in shaping the development of the region.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act, in tandem with the Public Works and Economic Development Act, is writing a success story of impressive proportions. Both acts merit extension to continue the vital work of upgrading depressed areas. Their continuation is authorized in titles II and III of the bill we are considering today. They are necessary, but the same convincing case cannot be made for title I. I shall vote to strike title I of this bill, and I trust enough of my colleagues will join me so that we can enact titles II and III into law and continue the important economic development we have underway in Appalachia and elsewhere.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington, (Mr. PELLY).

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I express my deep appreciation to the majority manager of this bill for yielding me this time, because I could not get any from my own side.

I might say that when I expressed myself as being in favor of title I, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) indicated he was going to ask me to name one person who might be taken off the un-

employment rolls if this bill went through. I said to the gentleman that I had one person particularly in mind, and that was myself. That was a facetious remark, of course but it is true that thousands in my congressional district who want and need jobs are looking to their Congressman to support legislation to provide jobs.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is not entirely correct when he says I refused him time. I expressed to the gentleman that it appeared as if my time had been consumed by Members of the committee.

Mr. PELLY. That does not diminish from my gratitude to the gentleman from Alabama for giving me time.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I did not ask the gentleman to name me one person who would be taken off the unemployment rolls. What I did ask the gentleman was for him to name me one scientist or one engineer who would be so employed.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am a political scientist, so I was right but again all my unemployed are not scientists. After all, too, engineers can take other jobs and besides 20 percent of our building trades are out of work.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 5376. In this connection, I wish to begin by stating that I represent an area of our land which in February had an unemployment of 12.7 percent. By mid-March it rose to 13.2 percent. Since that time, both the House and the Senate have turned down the supersonic transport program, and the new figures are not yet available, but it is projected at 16 percent at the end of this year.

In rising to support the Public Works Acceleration Act, I do so as a short-term stop to this rising unemployment. While much of our difficulty in the Pacific Northwest and in Washington State's First Congressional District is due to the loss of aerospace employment, many thousands of service jobs are affected, and it is here that we are trying to get people back to work in H.R. 100 and similar bills.

The impact on the loss of work in the aerospace industry cannot be overlooked. In the last year alone, the airplane business in the Seattle region dropped 41.7 percent. Building permits for residences were off 24.7 percent in the last year, and building permits for public construction dropped 70.3 percent in the last 12 months. The total construction industry in the Seattle area is off 20.2 percent since this time last year.

To help such a situation, of course, is the purpose of this legislation. While it is not the total answer to our problems, at least it would provide a speedy curb in the rate of increase in unemployment.

The Washington State Unemployment Department is saddled with a roll that is rising daily. The Boeing Co. alone had to discharge 7,000 employees because of the loss of the SST, in addition to a steady decline of about 2,000 a month.

With the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Seattle area, as well as other qualifying regions of our country, would receive 80 percent grants-in-aid to as-

sist local public projects and provide jobs in the process. Local areas could construct long-needed facilities such as sewer plants and municipal buildings without overburdening the local tax rate, and at the same time take the pressure off the unemployment rolls.

Mr. Chairman, we are not talking about training workers. We are talking about putting trained men back to work in other jobs.

Laborers, carpenters, bricklayers, and others in the building trades would receive immediate assistance from this legislation, and I strongly urge support for it.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEWEN), one of the distinguished members of our committee.

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio for yielding this time.

I want to say to the Members, when the bill is read for amendment I shall offer an amendment to include 18 counties in the State of New York in the Appalachian region.

I should like to briefly state to the House why this amendment will be offered. This is an area that was overlooked and not included when 14 other counties in New York State were originally included in the Appalachian region.

Let me say, ladies and gentlemen, I have no argument with the inclusion of any area in the Appalachian region, but I would point out that in New York State, of the 14 counties included, only one has ever been listed under the Public Works and Economic Development Act as an area of high unemployment.

The counties I am referring to, 18 in number, have 12 which have had critical and high unemployment and have had it persistently now since the 1965 Act for Public Works and Economic Development and the Appalachian Act.

Let me say, with respect to these counties, I have some most recent figures. I will not bother naming the individual counties, but I will give the unemployment rates: 10 percent, 10.4 percent, 15.8 percent, 16.7 percent, 13.1 percent, 11.4 percent, 26.7 percent.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, the only good news I have seen recently was given to me in a clipping from one of the newspapers, which had a story headed, "Employment in County Reported Up." Then I read the story, and I came upon the statement, "The report further indicates that unemployment in the county dropped to 15.8 percent."

I would say, Mr. Chairman, that is an improvement, but something less than what we should like to see.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McEWEN. I yield to the distinguished dean of the New York delegation.

Mr. CELLER. Am I correct in the statement that the Governor of our State has urged these counties be embraced in the Appalachian region?

Mr. McEWEN. I would say to my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee (Mr. CELLER), he is eminently correct. Our Governor has addressed himself to this and re-

quested that these counties be added to the Appalachian region.

His request, as the gentleman knows, is based upon a Presidential report that came to the Congress last year that said the socioeconomic factors of this area are such that they should be included in the Appalachian region.

Mr. CELLER. I join with the gentleman. I believe the amendment is worthy and should be adopted.

Mr. McEWEN. I thank the gentleman for his support and joining in this.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. TERRY), a member of the committee.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I express gratitude to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA) for giving me this opportunity to be heard in support of the amendment which the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEWEN) spoke about.

I refer specifically to the day of November 5, 1970, when the chairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission went on to state that we believe that the study made of the upper New York area is thorough and provides the relevant information required to determine the relationship which exists between the counties specifically set forth by the gentleman from New York (Mr. McEWEN), and the Appalachian region.

On the basis of its own analysis this Commission believes there is demonstrable evidence of such need in the northern and central counties of New York State, which would benefit from the kinds of approaches made possible through regional cooperation.

Governor Rockefeller's attitude has been explained. I merely quote in part a statement that he made, that 14 New York counties are now included in the Appalachian region under the act. He expresses the fact that alternative A of the President's upper New York study recommends 34 additional counties, and he urges this.

He went on to state in a later document addressed to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary (Mr. CELLER) that the study clearly showed the interdependence between the more sparsely populated rural counties and the metropolitan growth centers in upstate New York. There was clearly enough evidence of the Governor's feelings on this matter when he sums up in his statement on April 15, 1971, wishing to reiterate his support for the inclusion of these counties in the Appalachian regional development program.

Now, the question could be logically asked, why New York State? Under the circumstances I would have to answer that by saying while other areas perhaps could be and should be considered, few other additional areas could qualify for these funds from a geographical and economic viewpoint. It should also be pointed out that the areas we propose to add are characterized as high unemployment areas, with little or no population growth, and heavy outmigration as well as an economically large dependence on the agricultural and recreational facilities therein. Therefore the benefits to these counties would be high, and I am hopeful that we will have the opportunity

this afternoon successfully to present this amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. While I have not polled the membership of the so-called steering committee of the New York State delegation, which committee represents the entire New York State delegation, both Republicans and Democrats, from what I know of their views generally I am quite sure that the steering committee would approve the amendment that the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. TERRY. I think the distinguished gentleman for his statement that, while he has not polled them, he is certain that the delegation's representatives on both sides of the aisle would approve the addition of these counties in upper New York State.

Thank you very much, Mr. CELLER. (Mr. SHRIVER, at the request of Mr. HARSHA, was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot be present for consideration in the House of Representatives of H.R. 5376, the Public Works Acceleration Act. This week I will be attending an international conference of Labor Attachés in Rabat, Morocco, at the request of the Speaker.

I am cosponsor of this legislation and if I were present today I would vote for the bill as reported by the Committee on Public Works.

As adopted by the committee, H.R. 5376 will provide \$2 billion for public works grants to communities with high unemployment and with planned public works projects ready to go as soon as the grant is made.

The city of Wichita and the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans., already have submitted applications to the Economic Development Administration in anticipation of enactment of this needed legislation. Projects amounting to approximately \$72 million already are on the drawing boards in Wichita and Sedgwick County and officials have advised me that this legislation would be of great benefit to the community in stimulating the economy and assisting in creating much-needed jobs.

In a 1-year period from January 1970 to February 1971, the unemployment rate in Wichita and Sedgwick County soared from 4.3 percent to 10.6 percent. The discontinuance of the SST prototype program will undoubtedly further aggravate the unemployment problem in Wichita.

There are those who appropriately point out that "public works construction projects are no substitute for aerospace programs." However, during this period of economic adjustment and transition for areas such as Wichita and Seattle we must attack the unemployment problem on all fronts. Public works projects, as proposed by the city and county governments in Wichita and Sedgwick County, will enable the community to diversify its economy and attract new industries or expand existing ones in the necessary effort to create jobs.

Public works acceleration is not designed as a long-range cure for the un-

employment problem. It would be of limited duration. The administration is taking other actions and submitted other proposals which will be helpful in attacking other facets of the unemployment problem.

It is my hope the Congress will act favorably and quickly upon this bill.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, it is only fair for Members to ask what has been accomplished by the special Appalachian regional program after 6 years. There are many ways to answer the question. The committee has recited many of the physical accomplishments. But the achievements can be measured in statistical terms, too.

All of us who have watched this program recognize that there are still many needs in Appalachia that are unmet. No one pretends that everything has been accomplished. But there is no doubt that early signs of improvement are apparent.

Out-migration from Appalachia has been cut in half. Between 1950 and 1960, a net of 2.2 million people moved out of Appalachia into the large cities of the Midwest. That is more people than the total number of persons who moved into the entire United States during the same period. Between 1960 and 1970 that net out-migration had been reduced to about 1.1 million persons. My own home area of northern Georgia has changed from a center of out-migration in the 1950's to a center of in-migration in the 1960's. It will take another decade or so before we can expect net out-migration from Appalachia to stop, but at the moment it appears that the program is on target. The hope of the program is to make it unnecessary for people to crowd into the large cities to make a living, but if they do choose to move—which is their right as American citizens—it is the hope of the Governors on the Appalachian Regional Commission that they will go to their new homes with the health and skills which they require to compete for jobs and become productive citizens in their new homes. The best measure of improvement is increased income.

In 1962, Appalachia's average per capita income was about 76 percent of the United States. Today it is approximately 80 percent.

This means more translated into total dollar gains. Between 1965 and 1966, total regional income increased by \$1.5 billion over what it would have been had there been no gain relative to the rest of the United States.

Of course, within Appalachia there are substantial variations. Per capita income in eastern Kentucky today is only half that of the United States. But the poorest areas of Appalachia are making significant income gains now. Between 1965 and 1968 Kentucky increased from 42.9 percent of the United States to 50.1, Virginia increased from 50.5 to 60 percent, and Georgia from 57.4 to 60.2 percent.

But it is in employment that we find the most significant measures of improvement. Well over 500,000 new jobs have been added to the Appalachian economy since 1965—many of them in diversified manufacturing enterprises which have had no previous history of locating in Appalachia. Unemployment in Appalachia has declined rapidly relative to the United States, so that in 1969



the official unemployment rate in Appalachia was only 0.5 percent greater than that of the United States. Even under today's economic conditions, many Appalachian labor markets appear to be holding their own reasonably well relative to the rest of the country, except for some areas in the northern part of the region and some areas in Alabama which have been affected by recent reductions in defense and space expenditures.

Unfortunately, these official unemployment statistics do not count an estimated 500,000-600,000 persons who are not looking for work but who would work if they thought the jobs were available.

What makes these statistics remarkable is that in the past, Appalachia's rate of decline during times of economic downturn has always been greater than those of the Nation, while rates of employment, in relative terms, have exceeded those of the country in times of prosperity. It now appears that this high sensitivity of the Appalachian economy to the national economic cycle is evening out because of increasing diversification of economic activity in the region during the last 5 years.

It would be a serious mistake to stop the efforts at bringing about a self-sustaining economy in the Appalachian region before the job is finished.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, during the time I have been in Congress, I have watched my colleagues on frequent occasions come to the floor of this House proposing new and imaginative programs. I have watched many of them succeed and many of them fail. But if I were to be asked to select one program which has completely lived up to the expectancy surrounding it at its birth, I can think of no more appropriate program than the Appalachian regional development program.

The purpose of this program is a very basic one. It was designed to move a substantial quantity of Federal money into a specific area of this country to solve the many problems facing that section and to supplement the work which would be done under the Federal programs already in existence.

In my own congressional district, the Appalachian program has fulfilled its promise to an outstanding degree.

When this program was initiated, we were faced with the serious problem of mine fires throughout the anthracite region. We were faced also with the possibility of new mine fires; and in my own congressional district, this possibility became a reality, and a very frightening reality when a new mine fire was discovered in the Cedar Avenue section of the city of Scranton, and when another mine fire threatened the industrial park located in the Borough of Dunmore.

We did not have to wait for the often long and difficult process of passing Federal legislation to attack the mine fires. With the funding from the Appalachian program and with the outstanding and intelligent cooperation of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, both mine fires were extinguished and the threat to life and property removed.

We have used Appalachian money in my District in nine flushing programs to

stabilize the surface, to reduce the threat of subsidence.

When we needed to build access roads to two new industrial parks, again we turned to the Appalachian program to build them.

When Mercy Hospital in Scranton moved to a new development program, and when Robert Packer Hospital in Sayre was constructing a new Community mental Health Center and nursing school, we looked to the Appalachian Commission for help, and we obtained it.

We have a magnificent center for the treatment of the handicapped in the city of Scranton, called the Allied Services for the Handicapped. It is, I believe, one of the outstanding centers for such work in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The handicapped and their parents, and all of us who worry about the handicapped, will be eternally grateful to the Appalachian program for the help it gave in building the Allied Services.

The work we have been able to do in my congressional district through the cooperation of the Appalachian Regional Development Commission has demonstrated the vast area of challenges which can be met with sufficient funding and intelligent planning. Since the passage of the Appalachian Act, the people of Pennsylvania have approved a \$500 million Land and Water Conservation Fund to restore the environment of our State and a portion of this fund has been earmarked to supplement the Appalachian dollars in eliminating the scars of past mining in our coal areas.

The Appalachian program has been administered intelligently and vigorously in my own congressional district. I have every confidence that it has been administered with the same intelligence and vigor all across the region. I support the renewal of this program with enthusiasm. I trust my colleagues in the House will join me in giving this legislation an overwhelmingly affirmative vote.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, it gives me great pleasure today to voice my support of H.R. 5376, which would amend the 1962 Accelerated Public Works Act to make the benefits of this legislation available to areas currently suffering high rates of unemployment.

The purpose of H.R. 5376 is to reactivate Public Law 87-658, the 1962 Accelerated Public Works Act. The 1962 legislation was designed to provide jobs and income in areas of substantial and persistent unemployment through the construction of public works. The funds appropriated for Public Law 87-658 were used to build roads, bridges, hospitals, schools, and water and sewer projects.

According to the 1965 annual report of the Economic Development Administration, which for a time administered the accelerated public works program, the legislation at that time had helped start 7,711 projects and had created 200,000 man-years of direct and indirect employment. These jobs and projects had cost the Federal Government \$842.6 million, and State and local sources \$1.7 billion.

The Accelerated Public Works Act was passed in order to deal with a recession which was causing a great deal of unem-

ployment, throwing people out of jobs throughout the country. Today, the United States is again in a recession. Recent Labor Department figures show national unemployment at 6 percent in March of this year.

The number of unemployed people in the Nation in March was 5.2 million. This is a lot of people. January 1971 figures for the Chicago area, which includes the district I have the honor to represent, showed 134,000 unemployed. This was an increase of 44,000 over January a year ago. Optimistic administration predications about an improved economy are of little use to the man or woman without a job. People without work do not care that the rate of unemployment is going up or down or that experts predict an upturn in the economy this year. They need a job now.

I feel that H.R. 5376 will help those out of work by giving them useful employment now. Hopefully, when a man's work on a public works project, which would be financed under H.R. 5376 is ended, the experts' predictions will have come true and the economy will be back on the track and this man will be able to get another, more permanent job.

The construction of public works as a means to relieve unemployment, in my opinion, has many strong points. First and foremost, it provides jobs to the carpenter, bulldozer operator, laborer, and engineer who needs work. It provides additional jobs by pumping money into the local economy. The man working on the public works project needs clothes, food, and shelter. In order to provide these necessities new jobs will be created. Cement, bricks, and steel have to be made for the project, and delivered to the construction site; this creates more jobs.

In addition to employment, public works construction provides the community with needed public facilities. A new school or hospital will give service for years. It will help make the local community a better place to live and work. A man and his family may not have benefited directly by being employed to build the school or hospital, but his children who are educated in the school and loved ones who benefit from improved medical care will receive many noneconomic benefits.

I feel that H.R. 5376 will amend the Accelerated Public Works Act so that it will be able to help meet the severe unemployment problems facing many cities and towns throughout the Nation. It makes Public Law 87-658 able to meet today's economic conditions.

The \$950 million authorized under H.R. 5376 would provide many thousands of jobs, and would help construct many needed roads, sewers, schools, hospitals, and other public works in communities across the Nation. I commend all of the distinguished Members of the Public Works Committee for their prompt and cogent consideration of this urgently-needed legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join in support of H.R. 5376 in order to insure its enactment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, there is pleasure in strolling through a park, watching adults playing games with their youngsters—or just relaxing

on a park bench. It is a stimulating experience to move along the streets of our Nation's municipalities among the men and women who set a brisk pace from one store, office, and factory, to another.

Today, and for too many days in past months, the members of this legislative body can and could have found dozens and hundreds of men and women engaged in these activities. With depressing frequency, scrutiny of their faces would reveal that the deep-set lines around their eyes and mouths come not from the inroads of laughter. Those lines are the too-well-worn ravines of the worry, doubt, and frustrations of an unemployment given an especially vicious sting by an unrelenting economic recession.

This afternoon, Mr. Chairman, the Members of this powerful and wise governmental body have the opportunity to change the character of the expressions in the eyes of these people. That achievement will be simply accomplished. When the vote is called for on H.R. 5376, the Accelerated Public Works Act, says "yes" to the hopes, dreams and prayers of these jobless people.

Say "yes" to their pleas for jobs, a restoration of their dignity as contributing human beings, to their desires to provide—through money they have earned—for the material needs of their families.

Mr. Chairman, it would be incredible if a Member of this House of Representatives could be identified who is unaware, unconcerned, untouched, by the needs of this Nation's unemployed. We all are at least minimally knowledgeable about the spirit-destroying economic conditions which prevail in this Nation. In past months we have provided the President with the tools with which to take concrete steps toward turning the economy around.

I do not intend to question here the quality of the President's concern in this area. But, the fact is that, thus far, the steps which have been made have incontestably failed to bring an upsurge in the economy. Since November alone, the only thing which has prospered on the charts which outline our progress deeper and deeper into the grave of unemployment has been the jobless figure. The Council of Economic Advisers has told the Joint Economic Committee of Congress that in November 1970, 4,607,000 persons were unemployed.

In the monthly reports issued by the CEA since November, this statistic has moved inexorably upward. The March issue of "Economic Indicators" shows that 1,604,000 new faces have joined the ranks of the jobless. In that time the unemployment rate rose 1.1 percent—from an unacceptable 5.5 to an even more ominous 6.6 percent.

More alarming to me, as an individual Member, is that as early as March 1970, in six of the 15 counties in my district—the First Congressional District of Arkansas—6 percent or more of my constituents were without jobs.

In two counties the figure had gone above 9 percent.

I quote you statistics here, Mr. Chairman. But, on my frequent trips home to talk with my people and through the mail which comes to my office, I see the

ravaged faces and lives of these honorable, useful human beings who are struggling to renew their hold on the ladder of self-respect.

The bill which I would join my colleagues in persuading the sensitive, compassionate, and concerned Members of this powerful body to approve could very literally move many of the jobless in these counties out of the savings withdrawal lines and back into the bank deposit lines.

There are no less than five vitally needed public works projects in my district which could begin immediately if the essential Federal assistance were available. The total investment in these projects would be \$3,507,719. They would be eligible for a minimum of \$2.4 million under the bill which I have cosponsored and which we consider today.

The projects of which we speak are uniquely fitted for instilling new vigor in the faltering economy of my district and of the Nation. A major portion of the funds for these projects would be disbursed to pay for labor costs. Those labor costs are for paychecks of the men and women who live in, and contribute to the economy of communities all across the Nation. These are paychecks which will be used for groceries, clothing, taxes, gasoline, medicine, and a host of other items the production of which will involve the services of increasing numbers of people.

Close your eyes for a moment my honorable colleagues. Listen to the desperate and licit, but proud pleas of the men, women, and children of this Nation. Can there be any other valid course than a vote of "yes" on H.R. 5376—a bill to put hundreds of this Nation's jobless to work on legitimate works for the public good.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5376. Earlier this year I joined with my distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN J. McFALL in the introduction of the accelerated public works bill. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the members of the Public Works Committee for taking prompt action on the bill. There is an urgent need for the Congress to take immediate steps to reduce the unemployment rate in certain areas of the country. This comprehensive, antirecession public works legislation will provide assistance to many redevelopment areas, some major labor market areas, and small sections known as "pockets of poverty" located in existing labor markets. The bill will help many communities throughout the country make public facility improvements and will stimulate local industrial development.

More importantly, the enactment of this legislation will clearly demonstrate that the Congress is deeply concerned over the alarming rate of unemployment in this country and is eager to provide immediate and measurable relief to persons who are asking for a chance to earn an honest wage at a time when we are plagued with a stagnant economy.

There are approximately 5½ million jobless persons who cannot wait for new, long-range economic programs or concepts to come forth. Consequently, we need a kind of "crash program" to offer assistance to communities with an inordinately severe unemployment pro-

blem. This proposed legislation will meet that immediate economic need. It will be a first step in the direction of economic recovery. It will provide a vital tool to aid the hardest hit areas of our Nation.

Congressman McFALL's research findings reveal that there are hundreds of communities across the land with unemployment rates averaging 9 percent or more. A number of areas in my own State would qualify for special public works assistance under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I give my unqualified endorsement to this worthy piece of legislation which also extends the Economic Development Act and the Appalachian Regional Development Act, thus insuring continuance of economic assistance to those chronically depressed areas of the country covered by the previous law. I hope that my colleagues will support this bill.

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill before the House, H.R. 5376—the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1970, the continuation of EDA, and the Appalachian regional development program.

This bill, which has my unequivocal support, represents constructive legislative action to spur the economy. According to the most recent estimates, the productive capacity of the economy is working at only 75 percent of its potential. The unemployment figure hovers forbodingly at about 6 percent and over 5½ million Americans cannot find adequate employment. Underemployment is also rampant.

Many of our citizens have been in a state of economic depression for many years, never being able to secure adequate employment. It is for this reason that the Economic Development Act was originally passed—to insure that those areas which are economically deprived can receive Federal assistance to diversify their economic base and provide gainful employment. Our economic problems have not been resolved, indeed they seem to have worsened. We cannot afford to wait for the advent of new programs when those already established are on the ground and functioning. They must be more fully funded and utilized.

I, too, have heard those rumors that the President will veto this bill because these programs—accelerated public works, EDA, and Appalachian development—have no place in this proposed revenue-sharing plan. I cannot subscribe to this view and I am not intimidated by this threat. The needs of the economy are now and these programs represent a distinct contribution to alleviating the severe economic crisis facing this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I am an original sponsor of the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971. This bill authorized \$2 billion to provide immediate funding for necessary public works projects. As we are all aware, the unemployment problems are serious. This title of the bill would allow the Federal Government to provide between 80 and 100 percent of the funds for already approved projects. The condition for receipt of this assistance is that the project has a large manpower commitment and is a necessary project. Priority will be given to projects concerned with preventing environmental decay. This is



a constructive attack on our economic problems and it should be passed.

There is another point that should be raised. In my State of Connecticut I have been informed that over 20 percent of the current unemployment is in the construction industry. This bill will move quickly and, I submit, effectively in alleviating the unemployment crisis.

I will vote to support this bill and I intend to vote against all amendments which would cripple it.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, although I am 100 percent for the Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971, I feel even more should be done. This bill calls for the expenditure of \$2 billion during fiscal years beginning June 30, 1971, for much needed projects such as waste treatment plants, water and sewer systems, hospitals and health facilities, and similar programs, all of them needed now. The primary purpose of title I is to get people back to work, off the unemployment roles, and for those who no longer enjoy those limited benefits, the ultimate in despair, off the public charity. This bill should be passed. It should be passed overwhelmingly if we are to let the people know we are aware of their distress and mean to do something about it.

However, I am also concerned with the embargoed funds for public works which have been authorized and appropriated by the Congress of the United States. We have acted in concert because we have become convinced beyond all doubt that communities across the country need help in improving their facilities. Why then, should programs, fully planned, completely approved by those agencies concerned, be placed on the backburner, to be looked at later on? If they are needed now, let us get them going—and the country with them. Let us, too, move out this legislation so even more can be done to relieve the pathetic conditions facing 5 million employable—and desirous—Americans. Let us do what we can to assist rejuvenating our communities in every State and territory. With concern for the needs of villages, towns, cities, and States and with compassion for needy human beings this House must act today.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of similar legislation, I hope and urge that in the immediate, priority national interest the great majority in this House will promptly approve this pending bill, H.R. 5376, designed to extend the existing Public Works Acceleration, Economic Development and Appalachian Regional Development Acts.

The detailed provisions of this measure have already and precisely been explained to the House. In summary, this bill is designed to speedily provide productive work for the unemployed, stimulate consumer income and spending, healthfully enliven a stagnant economy, and enable financially overburdened communities and States to more quickly move ahead with urgent, but too-long-delayed, public works projects, such as the construction of water storage, waste treatment, and sewer plants, hospitals and other health centers, street, and road improvements, and other public buildings necessary to properly serve the

ever-rising requirements of our citizens. Beyond providing vitally needed employment in places of high unemployment, such as my own home area, this bill will also provide qualifying communities and regions experiencing serious underemployment with Federal and technical assistance to continue and expand long-range planning and programming for economic development.

Mr. Chairman, no one can question that unfortunately rising unemployment represents one of the gravest human and economic problems facing our people and our country today. The loss of human dignity and the suffering of thousands upon thousands of American families involved in this economic tragedy is immeasurable. When we review this unhappy situation in the light of the great backlog and demand for basic public facilities at all levels of Government that are essential in meeting the needs of an expanding population, we have a challenge that this Government cannot and should not attempt to overlook or avoid. Our humane and prudent legislative response should be to move as quickly as possible to provide useful and productive work as a wholesome replacement for unemployment compensation and welfare payments and that will also serve to bolster our people's morale, energize a pallid national economy, and enable communities and States to start the construction of public projects that are absolutely essential to the physical well-being of their citizens and progressive economic development of their areas.

Mr. Chairman, no one would pretend that this bill offers the perfect and complete solution to all the human divisions and economic hardships plaguing our country today, but this measure does represent a sound and solid step in an upward bound movement and I hope it is resoundingly approved in the immediate and future national interest.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege for me to record my enthusiastic support for H.R. 5376, the Accelerated Public Works Act.

This is indeed an important bill in the sense that its passage will bring benefit to thousands of Americans who are in greatest need, having been the unfortunate victims of long term and persistent unemployment.

H.R. 5376 has many virtues, not the least of which is its simplicity. It relies on no complex formulas, creates no new agencies, presents no major problems of administration. It provides, simply, for the Federal Government to pay up to 80 percent and in some cases, up to 100 percent of the cost of needed public works in areas where assistance is needed.

This bill has the virtue of providing direct relief where it is needed the most—of striking at the hard core of unemployment and aiding those areas that have suffered the most from economic recession.

It has the virtue of proven effectiveness. Experience with the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 indicated that it was a highly successful program for alleviating unemployment and encouraging public works projects and community development.

It has the virtue of timeliness, offering immediate relief to those areas that could

be considered economically distressed. In those areas where unemployment is the greatest, needs for public works programs are also great. Projects such as public buildings, water, and sewer facilities, have been delayed for lack of local financing. The money provided under this bill would enable these communities to make an immediate start on projects that have long been in the planning stage, but deferred through economic necessity.

The quick, short-term effects of this measure would be the creation of new jobs. I can think of nothing more vital to the well-being of our citizens than the offer of meaningful employment after the humiliation and despair of long-term joblessness. My own district is more fortunate than some, and has not endured the alarming rates of 8 percent, 10 percent, or 11 percent that have confronted some cities, but it has not been unscarred by the current recession that has left 5½ million Americans out of work and out of hope, and thousands of others who, in their hopelessness, have dropped out of the labor market and quit trying. The prospects of new jobs can produce immediate results in terms of restoring confidence and giving a psychological lift to an entire community. But in the long run, the side effects of such a program can be even more significant. By revitalizing the community and its economy, we can encourage industrial expansion and business enterprises, thereby increasing the flow of tax revenues into the local coffers, and establishing a firmer economic base for the future.

This is the kind of revenue sharing the people of this country want—the sharing of revenues to do a specific job, in a specific place, to meet a specific need, and concentrated where the need is greatest.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Commerce on April 14, 1971, advised me by letter that "it has been determined that the Detroit area—Macomb, Oakland and Wayne Counties—now statistically qualifies for title I benefits of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965—Public Law 89-136."

Earlier, the Michigan Employment Security Commission reported that unemployment in the State of Michigan had reached the excessive level of 8.4 percent in mid-February as compared to 6.7 percent a year earlier.

On March 25, 1971, Mayor Gribbs advised me that unemployment in the city of Detroit had averaged over 12 percent for the last 6 months.

This sad state of economic affairs exists throughout the country. Nationally, the unemployment level was at a 9-year high during the last 4 months. Other economic indicators are equally dismal.

The House, today, has an opportunity to take action aimed at lessening the impact of the Nixon recession.

Chairman BLATNIK and the Committee on Public Works are to be commended for reporting out an excellent bill, H.R. 5376, to extend the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. This legislation authorizes a total of \$5.5 billion through fiscal year 1978, includ-

ing \$2 billion for immediate use, to help relieve unemployment and to speed the development of certain areas with chronic economic problems.

As a cosponsor of legislation to amend the Public Works Acceleration Act, on March 17, 1971, I made the following comment to the Committee on Public Works:

The need for this legislation is great, and it is my hope that this Committee and the Congress will act quickly to insure its early passage and implementation. Unemployment, which began rising immediately after the Nixon Administration took office, remains at a near-6% level nationwide, with heavy concentrations of jobless in 45 major work areas in the country where the rate sometimes exceeds 11%. Meanwhile, city and state governments have cut down on vital public projects and services because of reduced revenue. Unemployed people and nonproductive businesses do not pay taxes. By channeling Federal funds into areas that are most deeply affected by economic recession, we can stimulate construction, revitalize local communities, and bring unemployed people back into the work force.

I am fully in accord with the provisions of H.R. 5376 and I sincerely hope that my friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle will give this legislation an overwhelming vote of approval. We can do no less if we are to fulfill our obligations to the unemployed and economically disadvantaged of this Nation.

Mr. NIX, Mr. Chairman, this House today has an opportunity to show 5 million human beings who are out of work, and their families, that we are concerned about their plight. We also have the opportunity not only to put people back to work, to get them off unemployment compensation and relief—demeaning ways of keeping families together, with no obvious lingering benefits to communities throughout the Nation—but we can also insure that badly needed public facilities will be constructed for the betterment of all. Even if our national unemployment average was not at a 6-percent level, these public works projects should be constructed. We are all aware of problems of pollution, a lack of suitable water supplies, poor or nonexistent sewage treatment plants, sewer systems which contaminate the very water supplies used by many communities. Who would benefit from these basic projects? Everyone. Therefore, using tax moneys contributed by everyone, we should authorize the \$2 billion called for in H.R. 5376 right now—today—and get these programs moving. Title I of this bill would do this.

How many communities are financially unable to construct such needed facilities as hospitals, public health installations, nursing homes, and all the other things which are necessary to the well-being of the old, and the young alike? Can we continue to ignore the suffering of so many persons on the grounds we cannot afford it or that the expenditure of funds might further inflame our inflationary problems? I do not feel such a modest amount of money spread over the country, to the many communities in need, would make a ripple in the latter problem. In fact, the reduction in unemployment assistance and relief payments would offset some of this outlay. And,

too, I feel people would regain hope, self-respect, self-confidence, and continue from this point on to make a meaningful contribution in the process. For every dollar also that goes into the pocket of a working man many others will benefit as these dollars are spent over and over again in the area concerned.

It was but 9 years ago this House authorized \$900 million for an accelerated public works program. You have heard over and over of the benefits we accrued from that wise legislation. This act should repeat that success. I will vote for this new proposal both from a sense of concern for people and the needs of the Nation.

Mr. VANIK, Mr. Chairman, as one of the original cosponsors of this legislation, I urge the immediate enactment of this bill designed to reduce the staggering level of unemployment which plagues so many of our communities, and to "get the economy moving."

The bill before us today has three main sections.

First, it provides for the Public Works Acceleration Act of 1971. This section authorizes \$2 billion immediately for public works projects in designated "redevelopment areas" and "economic development centers" or in areas with 6 percent unemployment. In the case of a grant-in-aid for local public works projects involving a local cost share, the emergency grant can be made to cover up to 80 percent of the cost of the project. In addition, a 100 percent grant can be made in those areas where the State or local government has completely exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing capacity and cannot, therefore, meet the local matching grant requirement. The bill directs that—

Priority is to be given by the President to projects for assistance in the construction of basic public works (including work for the storage, treatment, purification or distribution of water and sewage treatment and sewer facilities) for which there is an urgent and vital public need.

Emphasis will be given to projects which can be completed within 1 year with the use of local contractors employing substantial amounts of local labor.

That there is a need for such money is evident. There is a backlog of applications involving nearly \$6 billion worth of Federal funds for grants to communities to build some 6,000 waste treatment plants, water and sewer lines, hospitals, nursing homes, public health centers and many other public facilities. Many of these projects are all planned and ready to go. Work could start tomorrow; men could start to work on new jobs tomorrow.

Second, today's bill continues and expands the Economic Development Act which assists localities in upgrading their economies through public works, business loans, and technical assistance. This program has been in effect in Cleveland for some time, but it is desperately in need of the larger funding provided by these amendments.

Third, the bill continues the Appalachian Regional Development Act. This section deals largely with rural areas,

but is of importance to large parts of southeastern Ohio.

I had the opportunity of testifying before the House Public Works Committee in 1966 on behalf of amendments to permit Economic Development Assistance to particular neighborhoods within cities which were suffering particularly heavy unemployment. As a result, portions of the city of Cleveland, Ohio, have been designated as eligible for aid. Recently, on March 12, the Economic Development Administration made two grants to inner city neighborhoods. The first grant provided \$177,410 to help continue a job and business development program run by the City of Cleveland's Committee on Community Resources. The other grant was for \$194,000 to help revitalize an industrial area and stimulate growth in the near west side of Cleveland. The money, also granted to the city of Cleveland, involves the construction of off-street parking facilities and the rebuilding of streets to provide truck access from the Flats industrial section to the Interstate Highway System. Cleveland officials have stated that the project will help retain some 60 businesses which employ some 1,700 persons in the area. It will also encourage existing businesses to expand and new businesses to locate in the area.

Yet these projects are a mere drop in the bucket when compared to the need.

Although the new census and economic data is not yet out—which would enable me to describe, by census track, the poverty and unemployment in certain Cleveland neighborhoods—it is clear from what is happening to the Cleveland standard metropolitan statistical area that unemployment in these neighborhoods is spiraling. The Ohio Employment Service, in their February 1971 report on the Cleveland metropolitan area stated that—

Estimated unemployment in the Cleveland area jumped from 41,900 in December to 46,600 in February, raising the unemployment rate from 4.3 percent of the civilian labor force to 4.9 percent. Including persons involved in labor-management disputes, total employment dropped from 929,000 in December to a February level of 902,900.

In addition, the workweek dropped from 40.7 hours to 40.1 hours between December and February and the number of persons on unemployment compensation was nearly three times the level of January 1970.

This means that the unemployment level in inner city neighborhoods is really skyrocketing. As a January 24, 1971 report from the Labor Department indicates, unemployment in poor urban areas is way above the national average. The report said that the jobless rate in urban poverty sections average 7.6 percent during 1970, up from 5.5 percent in 1969. It was also significantly higher than either the 1968—6 percent—or the 1967—6.8 percent—rate. The rate for teenager residents of poor neighborhoods increased from 19.9 percent to 24 percent. The unemployment rate for black youth rose from 27.9 percent to 42.5 percent. There are, in addition,



probably thousands upon thousands who have withdrawn from the labor market in frustration and hopelessness. These people are unemployed, but they are no longer reflected in the unemployment figures.

I would like to add at this point that despite the general high level of unemployment and the especially staggering levels of unemployment among youth, the administration is completely failing to provide an adequate youth employment program to meet the needs of the coming summer when millions of college students and high school students will be seeking work. Currently some \$228 million is being programed for this summer's youth work programs. Yet the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors have documented the fact that there is a total need of at least 641,639 full-time job opportunities nationwide. But only 514,000 will be helped—many through workweeks as short as 26 hours per week. To meet the extra need, an additional \$180 million is needed for youth employment alone.

The crisis created by youth seeking summer employment is being acerbated by heavy discharges of military personnel. At the present time, the jobless rate among Vietnam veterans is running at about 7.9 percent.

And youth are not the only ones being hit by the current recession. The chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Aging, Senator WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, has stated that more than 1 million persons 45 and older have lost their jobs—a 71-percent increase in less than 2 years.

All aspects of this unemployment are frequently concentrated in particular areas. Unemployment in Waterbury, Conn., Wichita, Kans., Flint and Muskegon, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., all runs above 10 percent. In March 1971, five more major population areas were classified as having substantial unemployment in February, as compared to January, for a total of 50 out of 150 metropolitan areas. This is the largest number of cities so classified in 9 years.

And this unemployment is not likely to pass away quickly—even if the economy has bottomed out as some claim. That is why this accelerated public works legislation is useful—and needed immediately. An article in the February 17, 1971, Wall Street Journal stated:

Despite what some people are saying and most people are hoping, unemployment isn't getting set for a nice, long decline. In fact, the rate of joblessness may rise in the next few months. And it is likely to remain high for several months after the expected increases end.

That's the inescapable conclusion emerging from talks with scores of major employers ranging from aerospace firms to refrigerator manufacturers. To be sure, there will be fewer companies making massive layoffs during the 1971 first half than in the final months of last year. But many companies are still whittling away, bit by bit, at their payrolls, and almost none is ready to rebuild work forces.

I would like to add here that while a great deal of justifiable attention has been given to the need for conversion employment for specialty engineers such as aerospace and defense workers, there

is also the need to provide employment impetus to many other forms of professional workers. On Monday, I received a letter from a mechanical engineer in my district in which the gentleman stated:

All industry has been scarred by the Nixon austerity program. The Cleveland Plain Dealer reported in January that 600 engineers were unemployed in the Cleveland area. In the last month I sent applications in response to 30 advertised job openings which were a close fit to my 21 years of engineering experience. I received 3 replies, all negative.

It is not just aerospace engineers that need new jobs; the entire economy is in need of a "shot in the arm."

All this indicates a pressing need for job creation right now. This can be done in a variety of ways. It has been estimated that between 140,000 and 280,000 could be employed in public service jobs in the 130 American cities over 100,000 in population. Many of these public service jobs could already be underway if the President had not vetoed the Employment and Training Act of 1970.

Countless jobs could be created by the impetus given the economy by the bill before us today. Mass transit, urban renewal, water pollution control plants, new sewer and water lines—all these public works which we so desperately need could, if financed, begin to put men to work. In the Greater Cleveland community alone, we need to construct an additional \$217.9 million in primary and secondary waste treatment works as well as \$266.9 million for interceptor and storm sewers. Modernization of Cleveland area mass transit facilities will take \$46 million, while development of a rapid transit system in the county could cost \$235 million or more.

Mr. Chairman, thousands upon thousands of Americans have been out of work for so long that their unemployment compensation benefits are exhausted along with other forms of savings and income. Throughout the Nation, State unemployment compensation trust funds are developing serious trouble as the unemployed drain their resources. In fiscal year 1968, unemployment compensation benefits amounted to about \$2 billion. In this fiscal year, these payments will probably reach \$5.5 billion.

As a result, the funds of a number of States have slid below the safety level. This is the point where reserves are only one and half times what was paid out in the State's worst 12-month period of unemployment since 1958. This safety ratio of 1.5 is what the U.S. Labor Department regards as the minimum safe reserve.

In addition to Ohio, the States in trouble are Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania.

I would like to print at this point in the RECORD the figures supplied me by the U.S. Department of Labor accurate through last November. The States in trouble, and which need to reverse the trend of growing unemployment through legislation such as that before us today, are those with a safety ratio of less than 1.5.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE DOLLAR RESERVES

	As of Dec. 31—		Safety ratio
	1969	1970	
U.S. total...	12,637,529,864	11,889,902,800	1.60
Alabama.....	133,733,443	130,124,061	1.62
Alaska.....	28,652,156	34,540,893	1.39
Arizona.....	108,405,775	119,285,775	3.97
Arkansas.....	52,744,316	48,885,896	1.39
California.....	1,304,868,187	1,218,855,220	1.38
Colorado.....	80,820,362	90,875,888	2.19
Connecticut.....	304,676,964	252,339,022	1.22
Delaware.....	24,201,995	22,282,750	1.16
District of Columbia.....	75,842,911	73,929,756	4.40
Florida.....	256,340,896	268,101,799	2.45
Georgia.....	321,210,089	340,428,501	3.11
Hawaii.....	43,561,288	44,656,317	1.82
Idaho.....	44,812,011	46,396,289	2.50
Illinois.....	499,741,057	400,511,970	.95
Indiana.....	324,137,276	326,051,447	1.83
Iowa.....	133,909,059	124,667,945	3.48
Kansas.....	99,445,340	84,115,871	2.31
Kentucky.....	172,934,235	175,409,001	1.63
Louisiana.....	163,277,075	145,689,360	1.56
Maine.....	44,509,780	38,942,398	1.10
Maryland.....	229,528,327	212,897,271	1.59
Massachusetts.....	412,530,806	377,462,807	1.64
Michigan.....	630,253,223	490,863,514	.70
Minnesota.....	120,333,571	119,260,672	1.12
Mississippi.....	85,786,733	84,450,643	2.05
Missouri.....	289,736,126	263,566,205	2.53
Montana.....	25,657,402	25,903,342	1.18
Nebraska.....	55,851,541	55,395,719	3.10
Nevada.....	38,196,042	38,809,258	1.26
New Hampshire.....	53,810,784	54,776,890	2.61
New Jersey.....	482,697,709	477,696,715	1.16
New Mexico.....	42,413,890	39,716,590	2.23
New York.....	1,798,812,387	1,684,861,285	1.80
North Carolina.....	394,860,981	414,112,096	3.02
North Dakota.....	11,066,163	13,030,214	1.54
Ohio.....	702,598,541	692,729,384	1.26
Oklahoma.....	60,984,411	55,063,248	1.37
Oregon.....	136,635,671	121,680,236	1.25
Pennsylvania.....	683,846,202	852,058,448	1.18
Puerto Rico.....	85,984,024	85,089,253	2.63
Rhode Island.....	84,770,079	76,778,532	1.63
South Carolina.....	158,353,982	166,256,105	3.56
South Dakota.....	19,606,257	20,261,870	3.88
Tennessee.....	207,204,634	212,347,320	1.72
Texas.....	357,542,745	337,292,196	2.04
Utah.....	49,054,149	50,643,466	2.79
Vermont.....	26,432,660	25,459,505	1.84
Virginia.....	212,389,679	217,497,348	3.71
Washington.....	333,440,187	218,582,254	1.77
West Virginia.....	101,551,348	107,897,817	1.65
Wisconsin.....	332,811,438	321,754,823	2.36
Wyoming.....	17,963,957	19,418,099	1.86

Source: U.S. Manpower Administration.

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support H.R. 5376 which I believe is a meaningful step forward by the Committee on Public Works and the Congress in providing necessary economic relief to that vast group of our citizens who suffer economic hardship through no fault of their own. The bill as reported by the Committee on Public Works embodies three titles: title I, which is a renewal of the extremely successful Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962; title II is an extension of the Economic Development Act of 1965; and title III, an extension of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. All three of these programs have already proved their worth. During the period that the Accelerated Public Works program was in effect from 1962 through 1964, many thousands of our citizens were put to work in meaningful occupations developing and building needed capital improvements for our State and local areas. This was a short range program to relieve hard core unemployment. This problem exists today as one can see by a study of the latest unemployment statistics released by the Department of Labor and, once again, there is a need for this program to provide work for our citizens as rapidly as possible.

Title II is a further extension of a program that is intended to be a long

range one, and do away with persistent and chronic unemployment in many sections of our Nation. I refer specifically to the Economic Development Act of 1965. This is a program which combines public works grants, loans and technical assistance to our areas of unemployment, and creates as well regional commissions similar to those first developed in Appalachia.

I am particularly pleased to note that title II of the act contains further amendments to the definition of redevelopment areas so that communities or neighborhoods, such as my own district on the lower east side of New York, may become eligible for help under the program. I refer specifically to section 205 of title II of the EDA section which will now allow a community or a neighborhood, without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries, to be eligible as a redevelopment area.

Finally, we extend the Appalachian Regional program which proved to be one of our most successful programs. It is one that is successfully bringing back into the economic well-being of our Nation that long stretch covered by the Appalachian Mountain range in the eastern part of our country, and covering some 13 States.

During the consideration of this legislation by the Committee on Public Works, it was my privilege to offer amendments to all three titles of the bill which made it quite clear that no person in the United States shall, on the grounds of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any of these programs. This is a needed amendment to give women the same status under this legislation—the same right to jobs and employment—as our male counterparts are now able to receive. It is a needed amendment because it will give women, with respect to these three programs, the same protections that minority-group members now receive, with respect to all federally assisted programs, under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Between 1962 and 1964, when the first Public Works Acceleration Act was implemented, the Department of Commerce estimated that it had created approximately 210,000 man-years of onsite and offsite employment. The bill we are considering today, which authorizes a total first-year appropriation, for all three programs, of roughly five times the amount of the original accelerated public works program, should produce at least a million jobs. This is a rough estimate, of course, but the facts are clear—the program will produce many more jobs—women want and need a fair share of those jobs—and this amendment will help them get them.

In further reference to the amendment, I would note that the report on the legislation, House Report 92-92, specifically on page 11 spells out the following in explaining my amendment under title I.

With respect to the anti-sex discrimination provision of this bill, the Committee expects that enforcement of the provision will be through agency procedures and rules established by Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. However, this remedy is not ex-

clusive and will not prejudice or cut off any other legal remedies available to a discriminatee.

This language in the report clearly explains the purpose of my amendment.

However, when this amendment is again explained under title II dealing with the Economic Development Act of 1965, there is an error in the report. It appears on page 19. The same language that appears on page 11 of the report and clearly explains my amendment is also included under title II to once again explain the amendment as it relates to title II. There is one significant change.

The last part of the last sentence is changed from "to a discriminatee" to "one who discriminates." It is quite clear on the face of my amendment that I did not offer it or have it accepted to provide relief to a party who discriminates, but rather to one who is discriminated against. I therefore point this error out on the report to this body so that the legislative history may be perfectly clear that under all three titles of the act my amendment will prohibit discrimination on the grounds of sex, and that any relief to be given thereunder is to be given to one who is discriminated against.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I support the passage of H.R. 5376, which extends the authorization for the Economic Development Act, the Appalachia Regional Development Act, and the Public Works Acceleration Act.

To my mind, one of the key elements of this legislation is the extension of the Appalachia, as well as the Title V Regional Commissions.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Congress has wisely recognized that there are certain areas of the Nation which have fallen behind economically. Too many national economists have a strong tendency to look at the economy as a whole, as one great monolith which goes through periodic adjustments such as we experienced last year. The real truth is that the economy is made up of segments, industrial segments and geographic segments whose conditions vary tremendously. We have identified six areas of the Nation in which economic conditions lag behind the rest of the Nation to a considerable degree. The Appalachia region is perhaps the best known, but the other regions, among them the Upper Great Lakes region, are no less deserving of the attention which Congress is trying to focus on them.

Why do these areas deserve special attention? It is an economic fact that when the rest of the Nation catches a cold, the lagging regions get pneumonia. When the rest of the Nation basks in economic sunshine, these lagging regions are still having chills. In my own district, which is part of the Upper Great Lakes region, the unemployment rate is double the national average. The Regional Commission, even with its meager budget, has played a significant role in preventing even more serious economic difficulties within the region.

With this legislation, we have the opportunity not only to continue the Commissions but also to increase the funding levels for their operation. I strongly support enactment of this legislation.

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Chairman, unemployment continues to be one of the Nation's most grave problems. In the past 2 years the nationwide unemployment rate has almost doubled, increasing from 3.4 percent in January 1969 to an average of 6 percent over the past 3 months. These are not dry statistics, Mr. Speaker. They represent able, decent American men and women who through no fault of their own have had their livelihoods taken away by inadequate economic policies. These people must have more than promises and theories to economically survive. They need jobs.

For January 1971, Massachusetts had an unemployment rate of 7 percent compared with 4.4 percent in January 1970. Of the eight major labor areas in Massachusetts, five had December 1970 unemployment rates of 7.9 percent or higher. In my own district, the Department of Labor has classified the labor areas of Marlboro and Fitchburg-Leominster as areas of substantial unemployment. In December 1970, Fitchburg-Leominster had an unemployment rate of 8.2 percent with 3,400 unemployed men and women. This area had for 1970 an annual average unemployment rate of 6.9 percent compared to 5.4 percent in 1969. In December 1970, Marlboro had an unemployment rate of 6.9 percent with 1,700 unemployed. Marlboro had for 1970 an annual average unemployment rate of 6 percent compared to 3.8 in 1969. I would also point out that every time I go back to my district, and review with my constituents the problems which most concern them, the foregoing figures seem conservative. Certainly no mere statistics can adequately convey the human dimensions of being out of work—when every hour of the working day seems to the unemployed like punishment for a crime they did not commit. Each of these unemployed people needs and deserves the dignity that comes with productive work. It is for this reason that I support H.R. 5376, which extends and expands the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

The Public Works Acceleration Act would provide immediate relief, while the Public Works and Economic Development Act would handle longer range unemployment problems and would help establish a stable and diversified local economy.

H.R. 5376 would give my district a much needed economic boost. In addition to providing employment for many of our people, H.R. 5376 would place money in the local economy, help suppliers, result in additional jobs as a multiplier to the basic construction and construction-related jobs, and provide vital and needed public facilities. The construction of such public facilities—for example those which relate to waste disposal—is also essential in connection with the effort to reduce pollution and better the quality of our environment.

Lastly, I do not fear that H.R. 5376 will contribute to inflation, considering that factories are operating at only 75 percent capacity, high unemployment prevails, unemployment compensation



payments are correspondingly high, and many of the unemployed require public assistance. H.R. 5376 would put many of these people back to work, and it would tend to reduce the funds expended for unemployment compensation benefits.

With the present crisis in unemployment, programs proven to be effective in combating unemployment are a necessity. Consequently, I call for the immediate enactment of H.R. 5376.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Public Works Committee and its able chairman, JOHN BLATNIK, for the prompt action taken on the Public Works Acceleration Act, H.R. 5376.

The principal thesis behind this bill is not a new one. The Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962—landmark legislation I strongly supported—proved to be immensely successful in providing jobs in areas of high unemployment, and in getting public works programs, long delayed by lack of local financial resources, into operation.

We are now facing the same general economic plight we encountered in the early 1960's. Unemployment, already at a record high, is not abating. We have been slipping deeper and deeper into a recession ever since late 1969. The various economic policy tools tried by the administration have afforded little relief. It is now time—indeed, past the time—for the Congress to act. It is time for us to implement what measures we can to create jobs where there is rising unemployment, and to put public works programs into effect where local authorities are unable to finance them. The Public Works Acceleration Act passed in 1962 stimulated wide economic expansion until 1969. I feel that this bill, before us now, will yield the same heartening results: It promises to help reverse the downward trend in our economy at a critical time.

Right now more than 5½ million Americans are unemployed, and their numbers are increasing. Tax revenues at the local levels have been falling off, forcing many municipalities to decrease public services. Our cities are, indeed, facing a period of crisis.

The legislation being considered is not designed to create jobs. Rather, those skills that can find no outlet in time of recession will be channeled into meaningful jobs to benefit the entire community and the Nation. There is a pressing need for labor to improve public works. Streets, lighting, water, and sewage, and recreation centers are but a few of the programs that demand the skills of our labor force. Improvements in conservation projects and the maintenance of our ecology can be realized through the provisions of this bill. There will be an immediate, and long-term benefit from the new jobs and the production of goods and services arising from the programs of the Public Works Acceleration Act.

The Public Works Committee has amended this bill, incorporating within it the Economic Development and Appalachian Regional Development Acts. These programs, too, are most worthy of our immediate attention.

Many long-delayed projects may be promptly implemented under this legislation. Unemployment rates would decline, and we should realize a welcome increase in the lagging rate of investment.

I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on this bill.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as cosponsor of the Public Works Acceleration Act, I wish to emphasize its urgency. Immediate steps must be taken to meet the economic needs of today. Our Nation is still in the midst of an economic slump. The unemployment level for the last 4 years is at a 9-year high. Today, there are over 5 million unemployed nationwide as compared to 2.6 million in January 1969. Yet, there is a backlog of public works projects at all government levels.

In the 24th Illinois Congressional District, both economic and seasonal factors have forced employment down. Over the years, nonfarm employment recorded a loss of 4,950 as compared to the February 1970 level. The heaviest concentration of employment losses are in the manufacturing sector. As of mid-February, unemployment was 9.1 percent of the civilian work force. This represents an increase over the 8.9 percent of the previous month and the 7 percent of 1 year ago.

Although a slight upturn in employment was announced, this was primarily due to the rebound from the General Motors strike. A turn downward is expected with the inclusion of summer job seekers.

The above statistics, however, do not represent an accurate account of unemployment. These figures do not take into account either those persons underemployed or those persons who, although not looking for employment, do not have jobs. In addition, the predictions for even a mild upturn have not taken into account this year's college graduates. Both Washington University and St. Louis University have reported a 30- to 40-percent decrease in placement this year.

Obviously, our economy is not improving. The administration forecast for a strong pickup in the economy has not become a reality. Indicators show that the GNP has fallen short of its projected growth by about \$10 billion. During this administration, the gap in output has gone from zero to an annual rate of greater than \$60 billion.

By reactivating the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962 and by extending to June 30, 1973 the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, this legislation will help to stimulate the economy and thus provide additional employment opportunities.

Title I of this bill authorizes the immediate appropriation of an additional \$2 billion for public works grants and would enable the Federal Government to contribute up to 80 percent of the cost of the project, and in some cases, up to 100 percent. In addition, title I would liberalize the conditions under which assistance can be granted and would broaden the criteria for designating eligible areas.

Because its purpose is to provide for

the construction of projects that can be built quickly without extensive long-term planning, this act has the potential of sizably increasing employment opportunities at all levels of government.

Again, I wish to reiterate the necessity for restoring our economy.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I support in full the public works acceleration bill pending before the House today. I am one of the many cosponsors of this much needed program in this day of high unemployment across the Nation.

The need for action is great to provide employment in these communities which are suffering unusually high rates of economic decline. The number of areas having substantial unemployment has continued to rise steadily, and the unemployment figures now show a national total in excess of 5 million.

There are some 45 major areas—including my own metropolitan area of Buffalo, N.Y.—which are classed in the "substantial unemployment" category, which means unemployment of 6 percent or more.

As the committee knows, the original Public Works Acceleration Act is still on the books, but the entire authorization has been utilized. What we are seeking here is a new authorization plus criteria directing benefits to communities of the greatest need.

H.R. 5376, as adopted by the Committee on Public Works, would provide \$2 billion for public works grants to communities with high unemployment and with planned public works projects ready to go as soon as the grant is made.

One of the requirements under the bill for qualifying for a grant is that a major portion of the funds must be used for payroll, thus insuring that the bulk of the Federal assistance will find its way into the pockets of the working man.

It is a mistake to construe this program as "make work." Likewise, it is wrong to consider it a Federal handout. What this program involves is a mutual benefit arrangement, providing workers with jobs and building needed public works.

The Committee on Public Works amended the bill which I cosponsored to include extension of the Economic Development Act and the Appalachian regional program. I support these amendments.

The goal of this legislation is to make local areas more attractive to industry by building such vitally needed environmental-related facilities as sewer and water plants, and so forth, as well as municipal buildings without overburdening the local tax rate.

All of us are well aware of the financial plight of most every community in the Nation in these days of rising costs and unrelenting demands for public services.

In order to continue even the present services, let alone modernizing and improving them, the communities have been forced to increase their tax rates to the point of no return. In many cases, they have reached their legal—if not their practical—limits.

There is much discussion today of revenue sharing. The pending bill is the

kind of revenue sharing which, it seems to me, makes sense. Here the Federal Government can assist on specific projects which meet reasonable criteria.

Furthermore, the provisions of the bill require that the community itself do its full share in helping itself in these trying times.

The concept before us is not new. It has had successful experience in the original law during the past decade and has proven its worth.

I hope the committee and the House will approve the pending bill without change.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1971, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 5376 as reported by the Public Works Committee. Through the prompt enactment of this vital measure, the Congress can respond constructively to the present economic plight of the Nation.

Unemployment in the United States is now at a 7-year high. In my own State of New Jersey, the jobless rate, according to the latest figures, is 7.3 percent. The Newark labor market area is experiencing a 6.4-percent rate of unemployment; in the city of Newark itself almost 15 percent of the workforce is unemployed.

Mr. Chairman, a few years ago a friend of mine was complaining to me about the high price of pork chops which then sold for \$1.35 a pound. He said he could recall when pork chops went for 15 cents per pound. I told him I could remember those days also, but did not have the wherewithal at that time to purchase them even at the "bargain" rates.

I met this same gentleman a month ago. He had been laid off from his job and readily admitted he preferred a little inflation to unemployment.

The point of the story is that unemployment is the most serious economic problem confronting our Nation today. Its reduction should receive the highest priority from both the executive branch and the Congress.

Unfortunately, administration efforts to deal with the tragically high level of unemployment have failed. Contrary to periodic optimistic assurance issued by high administration officials, the employment picture has deteriorated significantly over the past 2 years. Clearly, only affirmative action by the Congress will bring relief to the 5½ million Americans now out of work.

The Accelerated Public Works Act, title I of the bill before us, is designed to substantially and immediately attack the Nation's unemployment problem in those areas where it has exacted its harshest toll. It would authorize \$2 billion in fiscal year 1971 for public works projects in designated areas including those with 6 percent unemployed or those in which unemployment is anticipated to reach 6 percent during the next 2 months. Eighty percent Federal matching would be available for local projects with up to 100 percent available in certain cases where local financial resources have been exhausted. The program will serve the commendable dual purpose of increasing employment and helping com-

munities to provide the basic facilities such as water and sewer works, hospitals, road improvements, and public buildings.

Title II of H.R. 5386 would extend the worthwhile Economic Development Act for an additional 2 years with an increased level of funding. The objective of this program is more long range in nature. It is designed to enhance domestic prosperity by establishing stable and diversified local economies through public works, loans for business, and technical assistance to create new job opportunities.

Just last week construction began on a new plant in Newark, N.J., made possible by an EDA loan of over \$4 million. When completed the plant will employ approximately 1,800 persons.

Mr. Chairman, it is not enough for us to criticize the President's economic policy. Justifiable as such criticism may be, the Congress also has the responsibility to act to meet the present crisis. The Accelerated Public Works Act provides us with the opportunity to affect an immediate and drastic reduction in the ranks of the unemployed. I urge its speedy passage.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, there are many parts to the bill before us today. Indeed, H.R. 5376 is really three bills which are lumped together under one name. I generally support the Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971, which is title II of this omnibus bill. This contains new authorizations for Economic Development Administration—EDA—programs, which have benefited Coos, Grafton, and Carroll Counties in New Hampshire, and the regional commissions, including the New England Regional Commission.

In the past, I have opposed the Appalachia program because it is excessively discriminatory in that a relatively small section of the country has been singled out to receive massive aid. This discrimination is continued in the proposed extension of the Appalachian regional development programs in title III of the bill before us today. Some of my objections of previous years have been met by title V of title II of this bill; namely, the provision for regional commissions like the New England Regional Commission. However, these other regional commissions have been grossly underfunded compared with the Appalachian Regional Commission, and it is proposed that this inequality continue. The bill now under consideration would authorize a total of \$305 million over 2 years for all five of the other regional commissions, but would authorize \$1,545 million over 5 years for Appalachian Regional Commission. This is unfair and discriminatory.

It is regrettable that the Public Works Committee has not been more vigorous in exercising oversight in the areas covered by the legislation now being considered. I might add, however, that I am heartened by the fact that a new subcommittee chaired by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WRIGHT) will in fact exercise oversight over the whole spectrum of our jurisdiction. In the future, when we consider legislation such as this,

I hope and expect that we can bring better proposals to the floor.

My principal objection to the accelerated public works proposal, which is title I of H.R. 5376, is that if EDA, Appalachia, and the regional commission programs along with other programs in this area were properly functioning, then an accelerated public works program should not be necessary. It is a continuing source of concern to me that when existing programs fail, Congress reacts by keeping that one going and cooking up another new program to deal with the problem. My point is simply that at this time our greatest need is to vigorously examine the operation of all the various programs we have going, and either redesign them so that they work, or else get rid of them. We now have well over 1,000 grant-in-aid programs to the States and local governments of the United States. Until we make them work and we should make them work, we should not rush to add another new one.

This bill is very difficult for me, because it contains not only two programs which I support, and which have helped New Hampshire, but also a \$1.5 billion, 5-year extension of the Appalachia program, and a \$2 billion, 1-year accelerated public works program. This is another example of the unsound and unfair practice of lumping a number of proposals into one bill and then forcing Congress to vote either for it or against it. As so often happens in omnibus bills like this, the result is that some bad programs ride through under the umbrella supplied by some good programs. This is bad government, and should not be allowed. Ending this practice is in my opinion a badly needed congressional reform.

Additional reasons for opposing title I of this bill, the Public Works Acceleration Act, are well set out in the minority views to H.R. 5376, which I insert at this point in the RECORD. Although I signed these views, I do not support the Appalachian Regional Development Act extensions for the reasons I have heretofore stated.

The material follows:

#### MINORITY VIEWS ON H.R. 5376

We favor the basic objective of title I of H.R. 5376, which is to alleviate the unemployment in depressed areas of the Nation, but we are opposed to enactment of this title as it is now written. We endorse the extension of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 under titles II and III of the bill. The programs under these two acts have proven to be effective for their purpose of offering long-range economic planning and development to the lagging areas of the country. Both programs are under sound management, and the original acts have been refined to deal with the complex problems they are designed to relieve.

Title I attempts to relieve today's unemployment problems by use of a 9-year-old law. The present funding of this emergency type legislation, which was enacted in response to specific problems existing in 1962, cannot possibly meet today's needs which are substantially different. Bare unemployment statistics are approximately the same today as they were in 1962, but the types of unemployment are different. Title I of H.R. 5376 is an attempt to find a simplistic solution to a complex question. Simplistic solutions just



don't solve complex problems. In our opinion, the objectives of title I, however commendable and worthwhile, cannot be obtained by this legislation. Good intentions are not an acceptable substitute for good legislation.

We are opposed to the enactment of title I, which would resurrect and amend the 1962 Public Works Acceleration Act, for the following reasons:

1. It will provide little help for those who have lost their jobs in aerospace, defense, and other technical industries, as a result of the transition from a war-time to a peace-time economy.
2. Implementing and statutory time delays will prevent any real acceleration of public works construction.
3. It will thwart efforts to curb inflation.
4. The President's budget for fiscal year 1972 already provides for a \$1.4 billion public works outlay increase over the previous fiscal year, which will produce accelerated public works spending for fiscal year 1972. The President has additionally requested \$2 billion waste treatment plant construction grant authorizations for each of the fiscal years 1972, 1973, and 1974, which annual authorizations are double the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1971.
5. It is feared that high hopes of the unemployed will later be dashed to disillusionment when the highly advertised job expectancy is not realized.

#### LITTLE HELP FOR UNEMPLOYED IN AEROSPACE, DEFENSE, AND TECHNICAL INDUSTRIES

Title I addresses itself to the national unemployment problems of today. This title takes an aggregate view of the problems, and the remedies it offers imply that the types of unemployment are the same throughout the country. But unemployment problems in rural areas are not the same as the unemployment problems in the urban areas; nor are the problems the same throughout the country. Indiscriminate Federal spending would be applied to the construction of public works projects in areas statistically lagging in employment, in the unsupported hope that such spending will solve short-range unemployment. We do not think this is sound reasoning. We cannot conceive of such a simple program employing at the same time unemployed unskilled laborers and unemployed aerospace engineers and other persons highly skilled in specific limited functions.

For example, at recent hearings on H.R. 5376, witnesses from the States of Kansas and Washington described the economic plights of people in these two States. These two witnesses insisted that accelerated public works was the answer to their respective problems. But what was omitted from their testimony was emphasis on unemployment in their areas' basic industry—aerospace. Wichita is the site of many aircraft companies, which employ 56 percent of the total work force in the area, and 25 percent of the total work force are employed on Government projects alone. With such a large portion of the work force employed by a single industry, it is little wonder that this town in Kansas would clamor for aid when fluctuations occur in this particular industry. Public works construction projects are no substitute for aerospace programs.

Washington, particularly Seattle, is plagued by the same problem. The city's economy is closely tied to the aerospace industry. And when that industry sneezes, Seattle gets pneumonia.

There are other areas in this country suffering from high unemployment which do need public works projects. Such projects, referred to by economists as social overhead capital, aid an area tremendously in maintaining and expanding their long-range economy. Street improvement, sewage lines, water systems, and the like are basic criteria for multilevel economic growth. Unemployment, however, follows a pattern independent of

the need for social overhead capital. Title I does not take into account these complexities. It assumes, erroneously, that existing short-range unemployment will be substantially alleviated by public works construction projects, and this assumption, as pointed out earlier, is largely based on the promise that substantial numbers of the unemployed are construction workers.

At best, it appears that only 1 percent to 2 percent of those unemployed would be employed by the proposed accelerated public works projects, because the skills of the unemployed labor force in many areas cannot be easily adapted to the construction trades. Additionally, since the construction industry is extremely mobile, construction laborers may be imported to take the jobs created by such accelerated public works construction projects.

If the efforts of this committee in favorably reporting this legislation are aimed at reaching the hard block of unemployed people, it will not succeed, because of the large group of new unemployed from the aerospace, defense-oriented, and other technical industries.

Many of these people are highly skilled; they are trained for more advanced work than unskilled and semiskilled employees on public works construction projects.

We believe that the great bulk of the new unemployed identified by most of the witnesses who testified before the subcommittee will not be helped by this particular legislation.

#### TIME DELAYS

A second, and equally important, point is that construction projects by title I will not, to any appreciable extent, provide new jobs immediately. Significant employment gains under the Public Works Acceleration Act, enacted in 1962, did not occur until 9 months after the Act was signed into law. The time lag resulted from administrative and planning delays that apparently could not be avoided in implementing the program. This obviously would not meet the objective of the committee or the sponsors of the legislation—to provide immediate short-range employment. Certainly, with a time lag of 9 months, or more, the Accelerated Public Works Act would not meet that objective.

We foresee, in fact, even greater delays in the commencement of construction of projects as a result of environmental legislation. For example, Section 102(1)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 requires that the applications for all major projects significantly affecting the quality of the human environment must be accompanied by an environmental impact statement, which includes:

- (1) the environmental impact of the proposed action;
- (2) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be implemented;
- (3) alternative to the proposed action;
- (4) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity; and
- (5) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed action should it be implemented.

These highly technical and detailed statements require careful preparation and often require voluminous supporting data, which may take months to develop by engineers, environmentalists, psychologists, and other specialists. The act further provides that prior to making a detailed statement, the responsible officials shall consult with and obtain the comments of any Federal agency which has jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any environmental impact involved. Copies of the statement and comments and views of the appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies, which

are authorized to develop and enforce environmental standards, are required to be made available to the President, the Council on Environmental Quality, and to the public, and all of these documents must accompany the project application through the agency review process. These statutory requirements, alone, can add many months to the time required for the processing and approval of project applications.

The immediate creation of public works construction jobs, to relieve short-range unemployment, appears impossible to achieve under title I of this bill.

#### INFLATIONARY PRESSURES

Title I would primarily stimulate activity in the construction industry. Average hourly earnings in the construction industry increased 8.4 percent from 1968 to 1969, and 9.2 percent from 1969 to 1970; whereas the average hourly earnings increases in the manufacturing industry for the same periods were 6.0 percent and 5.3 percent respectively. Thus, the construction industry not only experienced a much larger increase in average hourly earnings for the same period, but a growing increase as well. There are many inflationary pressures in the construction industry, and to add a \$2 billion 2-year construction program, as proposed by this title, would dampen efforts being taken by the administration to combat inflation.

Since public works construction projects to be financed by title I would take up to 3 years, after initiation of applications, to complete, substantial portions of the \$2 billion authorized to be appropriated for the 2-fiscal-year period 1972 and 1973 would enter the economy during fiscal years 1973 and 1974. This can overheat the economy at a time when there may be far less unemployment. In addition, the wages that will ultimately flow from these construction projects may go into areas that are depressed today, but which will have achieved greater economic strength at the time of actual construction. The President's full employment budget for fiscal year 1972, which includes an increase of \$3.2 billion over fiscal year 1970 for public works construction, and the President's efforts to stimulate the economy through fiscal and monetary policy, also will have their most significant impact on the economy during this period. The President's program is calculated to achieve full employment with price stability. The addition of the \$2 billion public works program authorized by title I of H.R. 5376 will add substantial fuel to the fires of inflation and thus counteract many of the beneficial long-range effects of the President's program.

#### PRESIDENT'S ACCELERATION OF PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION

We would further emphasize that the President's budget for fiscal year 1972, which has been submitted to the Congress and which will be implemented beginning July 1 of this year, provides its own acceleration of public works construction.

It contains a \$1.4 billion increase in outlays for public works projects in fiscal year 1972 over corresponding outlays for fiscal year 1971. This increased expenditure in 1972 will be reflective of action already taken by the President to combat unemployment.

Also, the President has submitted to Congress a request for authorizations for appropriation of \$2 billion for construction of waste treatment works for each of the fiscal years 1972, 1973, and 1974. Recognizing the importance of the environmental protection and enhancement that will result from the construction of these projects, he has further requested that the entire \$2 billion to be authorized for fiscal year 1972 be appropriated.

This is twice the amount ever appropriated for this program for any year heretofore, and, when coupled with the \$1.4 billion increased public works spending previously referred to, presents a far more adequate method of

funding an accelerated public works program than that contained in title I of this bill.

#### HIGH HOPES TO DISILLUSIONMENT

The Comptroller General of the United States reviewed 497 projects constructed under the Public Works Acceleration Act, which was passed in 1962. The review disclosed that drastic overstatements of expected employment had been made for these projects. Whereas 50,853 man-months of on-site employment had been estimated to be created by these projects, only 27,345 man-months were actually realized.

A report of this review, which was submitted to the Congress, shows, first, that the administration of the Public Works Acceleration Act did not produce the results hoped for and, second, that Congress cannot rely upon the validity of estimates of expected successes and accomplishments to be realized from this program.

Much propaganda accompanied the introduction of this legislation in an effort to convince the public that it will expeditiously meet the current unemployment problem. We are gravely concerned that many people will be disillusioned when their needs are not met by this legislation.

It would be most unfortunate, even cruel, if the hopes of the unemployed were raised by heralded announcements of bounteous jobs under title I only to be struck down later by the reality of unemployable specialized skills, statutory delays, and inflated expectations.

WILLIAM H. HARSHA.  
JAMES C. CLEVELAND.  
FRED SCHWENDEL.  
WILMER (VINEGAR BEND) MIZELL.  
JOHN H. TERRY.  
CHARLES THONE.  
LAMAR BAKER.

Mr. DORN, Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5376, the public works acceleration, economic development, and Appalachian regional development extensions. This \$5½ billion bill is a comprehensive approach to both the current short-range problem of economic recession and to the longer range goal of national economic development. This bill is a tribute to the leadership of our great Chairman JOHN BLATNIK, with whom it has been my pleasure to serve in drafting this bill. Our Committee on Public Works conducted extensive hearings and deliberations and we have reported to the House a bill which fully deserves the widespread public support it has already received.

Mr. Chairman, title III of H.R. 5376 would extend for 4 years the Appalachian Regional Development Act. Because of my service on the subcommittee which drafted this title, and because three of the counties I represent participate in the Appalachia program, the Appalachia extension is of special interest to me. The Appalachian Regional Commission and its programs have been one of the most popular and successful Federal aid programs in history. It has in fact become a model for the Nation in demonstrating the possibilities of successful cooperation and coordination among local, State, and Federal authorities. The controlling principle behind this program has been grassroots participation and planning, and this principle has been the most important reason for the Appalachia program's success. This has truly been a States rights program.

In 1965, when the Congress inaugurated this program, it was recognized

that the 13-State Appalachia region had special problems. The national postwar prosperity had in most cases passed Appalachia by. The Congress then provided a mechanism for meeting the problems of this area, both in terms of development of human resources and in providing badly needed public facilities. This work is by no means completed, but there has been progress in bringing Appalachia into the economic mainstream of America. It would be tragically short-sighted were we to terminate this program now when many of its programs are just getting underway.

Mr. Chairman, I will mention but a few of these programs. Basic to any program of economic development is a network of good roads, and work has been initiated on 93 percent of the nearly 2,600 miles of Appalachian development highways. About 500 miles of development highways have been completed, and about 367 miles are now under construction. In my own area, Appalachia assistance has been instrumental in the construction of South Carolina Highway 11, which will cross the Appalachia foothill region of northwest South Carolina and which will provide access to the fabulous nuclear power development by Duke Power Co. at Keowee-Toxaway in Pickens County. The Appalachia program has also met some of the pressing human needs through its assistance in the field of health facilities and services.

Mr. Chairman, an economic gap still separates the Appalachia region from the rest of the Nation, and for that reason this imaginative approach must be continued. But as a measure of the success to date of the Appalachia program, we can point to the shrinking size of this gap as measured in terms of per capita income and in the outmigration of population.

Title II of H.R. 5376 would extend for 2 more years the Economic Development Act and authorize a 2-year total of \$1.945 billion. The EDA programs, like the Appalachia programs, have been aimed at long-term economic development. In cooperation with the State governments, the EDA programs have aided regions which have suffered from excessive unemployment. This assistance has led to construction of public facilities needed to attract industry and has helped finance programs of vocational and technical education that make areas more attractive to private investors. Several counties in my district have benefited from EDA programs, and I know from experience how EDA participation has laid the foundation for an expanded private-sector economy in these areas. Title II of this bill also calls for an extension of the so-called title V commissions, which are multistate planning commissions patterned after the Appalachian Regional Commission.

Title I of this bill would provide short-term relief to areas of excessive unemployment and would also reduce a long backlog of needed public facilities, such as water and sewer facilities, highways and medical facilities. Title I would authorize the appropriation of \$2 billion to be made available immediately to the administration for allocation.

Taken together, Mr. Chairman, the

three parts of H.R. 5376 constitute a broad attack on both the current national problem of economic slowdown and the more long-range problem of areas where economic development has not kept pace with that of the Nation as a whole.

As one who has consistently supported a sound Federal fiscal policy over the years I can recommend this legislation as fiscally sound and in the national interest. This legislation is a good investment of Federal funds. It will promote more jobs, better education and tax revenue. This bill is insurance against depression, unemployment and falling revenue at local, State, and Federal level. I recommend this legislation to my colleagues without any hesitation or reservation.

Mr. BERGLAND, Mr. Chairman, as a representative of an economically distressed rural district suffering from low farm prices, chronic unemployment, and underemployment, and a district lacking job opportunities, I am wholeheartedly behind H.R. 5376. As a freshman Congressman, I have lent my name to any number of pieces of legislation which would benefit residents of the Seventh District in northwest Minnesota. Of all these measures I am confident that H.R. 5376—extending three public works bills enacted during the 1960's—could have the most immediate impact on the well-being of my constituents.

For 80 years there has been a drift of families and individuals from our farms and small towns into our crowded cities. These individuals have been in search of jobs and driven against their will. This drift has imposed a hardship on the city in the long run and city problems will get worse if this drift continues.

H.R. 5376 would provide some relief for our cities by creating opportunities in the countryside. I urge support for this bill to give rural residents jobs at home. It would benefit all people no matter where they live.

I noted in the Sunday New York Times of March 15 a front-page story on "Some Areas Seek To Halt Growth." This article could not have been more timely. In general, this article discusses the desire of various States and cities to discourage growth:

Across the country, budgets are being slashed for agencies that entice new people and industries to various states and cities.

What a far cry this is from chambers of commerce in our rural areas who only wish to maintain their population and not see it dwindle away any more than it already has over the past decade and more. Again many of our rural areas are crying for some chance to grow or at the very least not to diminish in size. H.R. 5376 would enable those most disadvantaged areas to have a part of the economic pie and a chance to maintain the wholesome life afforded in our rural communities.

As long as I serve in Congress I am committed to devoting the majority of my time and energy to putting a stop to outmigration and lending my every effort to seeing our rural areas revitalized and developed. I am, of course, particularly concerned with those areas for which this bill would provide some relief,



and which are suffering from inordinately high rates of unemployment.

Authorizing a total of \$5.5 billion through 1978, including \$2 billion in fiscal year 1971 in accelerated public works funds, the enactment of this bill into law would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, under the rule, the Clerk will now read by title the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5376

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**TITLE I—PUBLIC WORKS  
ACCELERATION ACT**

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Public Works Acceleration Act Amendments of 1971".

SEC. 102. The Public Works Acceleration Act (42 U.S.C. 2641 et seq.) is amended as follows:

(1) Clause (1) of section 2(a) is amended to read as follows: "(1) certain communities and areas in the Nation are presently burdened by substantial unemployment and underemployment resulting from the economic decline of 1970, and"

(2) Subsection (b) of section 2 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Congress further finds that Federal assistance to stimulate public works investment in order to increase employment opportunities is most urgently needed in those areas, both urban and rural, suffering persistent or substantial unemployment or underemployment."

(3) Subsection (a) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) For the purposes of this section, the term 'eligible area' means—

"(1) those areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as 'redevelopment areas' or as 'economic development centers' for the purpose of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and those areas designated by such Secretary under section 102 of such Act.

"(2) those areas which the Secretary of Labor designates each month as having been areas of substantial unemployment for at least six of the preceding twelve months."

(4) The last sentence of subsection (c) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding any provision of such law requiring the Federal contribution to the State or local government involved to be less than a fixed portion of the cost of a project, grants-in-aid may be made under authority of this section which bring the total of all Federal contributions to such project up to 80 per centum of the cost of such project, or up to 100 per centum of the cost of such project if the State or local government has exhausted its effective taxing and borrowing capacity for such purposes and therefore does not have economic and financial capability to assume all of the additional financial obligations required."

(5) Subsection (d) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1970, not to exceed \$2,000,000,000, to be allocated by the President in accordance with subsection (b) of this section."

(6) Subsection (e) of section 3 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In prescribing such rules, regulations, and

procedures, the President shall require that priority be given to projects for assistance in the construction of basic public works (including works for the storage, treatment, purification, or distribution of water; and sewage, sewage treatment, and sewer facilities) for which there is an urgent and vital public need."

(7) Subsection (h) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"(h) The criteria to be used by the Secretary of Labor in determining areas of substantial unemployment for the purposes of paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section shall be the criteria established in section 8.3(a) of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations as in effect March 2, 1971."

(8) Subsection (a) of section 4 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) No part of any allocation made by the President under this Act shall be made available during any fiscal year to any State or local government for any public works project if the proposed or planned total expenditure (exclusive of Federal funds) of such State or local government during such fiscal year for all its capital improvement projects is decreased."

(9) By adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 7. An eligible area under this Act shall retain such designation for only so long as it continues to meet the unemployment criteria applicable to it but in no event shall such designation be terminated prior to one year after the date of designation.

"SEC. 8. Federal financial assistance made from allocations made by the President under this Act may be used for all or any portion of the basic Federal contribution to projects and for the purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to such projects."

SEC. 103. (a) Clause (ii) of the last sentence of paragraph (4) of subsection (b) of section 202 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "section 9" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3".

(b) Section 202(e) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended by striking out "section 9" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 3," and by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "80 per centum."

SEC. 104. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance under the Public Works Acceleration Act.

Mr. JONES (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HARSHA

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARSHA: On page 8, strike out line 5 and all that follows down through line 3 on page 12.

Renumber succeeding titles and references thereto accordingly.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple enough. I do not think the language itself needs any explaining; it is simply a motion to strike title I from the bill, but I would like to explain to the Committee my reasons for it.

In the first place, today we are dealing just with the authorization legislation. If this is finally approved by both bodies

of the Congress and then signed into law, and administered by the President, then the task of having it funded, or the appropriation process, comes in. This is another process that will take some time.

Then under the legislation the President delegates his authority to administer this program to the various agencies throughout the United States. This again will be a time-consuming matter by the administration delegating that authority. Then we must draft and implement new rules, regulations, and procedures, because in this legislation we have made significant changes from that which existed in the old 1962 act.

There are several changes, Mr. Chairman, which preclude the usage of previous rules and regulations. This, again, will be time consuming.

Then, Mr. Chairman, we have the environmental impact requirements which will take anywhere from 90 days to 4 months or even 6 months to bring into being, because they are very involved. They require highly technical preparation and statements and observations by highly trained people, technical people. They must be reviewed by every agency that is affected. The States must be permitted to express their views on them and so forth. This all takes time. Even when there is a most resourceful urging, this particular hurdle for any administration to overcome cannot be quickly accomplished.

Now, what that means is that at the most optimistic level no appreciable contracts under the accelerated public work amendments of 1971 could conceivably be awarded before January or February of 1972.

So, what we have, in effect, is the fact that there will be no new jobs until the spring of next year. Therefore, we are talking for all practical purposes of jobs that will not be available until this time next year, and then not in any appreciable amount because even under the most favorable conditions, which do not exist insofar as this legislation is concerned, it was 2 years before any appreciable impact was realized under the 1962 act.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, to label this act an accelerated public works program is a misnomer. Let me show you, based upon the statistics of the proponents themselves, how ineffective this title really is.

First, by their own figures as contained in the report the real impact on employment did not come until June 1964, 22 months after the enactment of the bill, and even then involved the on-site employment of some 45,000 people at its peak. It was not at that level for any appreciable period of time—it was not for a year or 6 months, but probably was for a very considerably shorter period of time.

Even this was achieved only after an enormous expenditure of both Federal and State dollars, as they say in the report \$1.7 billion.

Furthermore, under this bill you are probably not going to have any more total expenditures than you experienced in 1962, because we have eliminated the maintenance of effort qualifications or requirement provision that was in the old 1962 act. There the States were re-

quired to increase their expenditures for public works projects by the amount of new non-Federal money that went into those projects.

Here, we have taken that requirement out.

What do you get for this \$1.7 billion? Let us look at the record.

In September 1962, the time of the passage of the 1962 APW act, unemployment was at the 5.6-percent level, with a total unemployment of 3,961,000.

In June 1964, when the program peaked and you had the highest level of employment under the program, overall unemployment was at a 5.2 percentage level with 3,812,000 people unemployed, an actual reduction of some 150,000 persons. Now, at that point they only claim—and this appears in their report—they only claim 45,000 people employed as a result of the passage of the act. Therefore, one can only attribute to the Accelerated Public Works Act about one-fourth of the reduction in unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HARSHA was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. HARSHA. You cannot, therefore, attribute to the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962 but about one-fourth of the reduction in the unemployment or one-tenth of 1 percent. That is all you got for a total expenditure of \$1.7 billion, a reduction in unemployment of one-tenth of 1 percent.

Obviously the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962 was not effective, and this Accelerated Public Works Act cannot be any more so. Furthermore, it admittedly does not reach the skilled technicians, the scientists, the engineers, and so forth. I think the implications of this legislation are obvious. Pumping money into the economy 2 or 3 years from now in efforts to cope with current conditions is a risky undertaking. Such an action could well overheat the economy dangerously at a time when our rate of unemployment may be far lower than it is today, at a time when the economy will be in full gear and the effects of the administration's actions will be in full swing.

But the real threat implicit in title I is that we are holding out to the Nation a package of false promises of rapid 80-percent funding of a program that cannot achieve the results desired, because of the very nature of the act, in the construction industry and the statutory delays, the false hopes and great expectations that will be struck down by the reality of unemployable specialized skills and inflated promises.

Let me caution you that if this bill passed with title I in it we are in grave danger of losing any extension of the Economic Development Act, and the Appalachian Act.

Title I interferes so directly with the major economic plans of the administration that it must inevitably cause the President to veto any bill containing it. Do not sacrifice the proven benefits of two good programs for the uncertain and

unproved, and certainly overestimated benefits of a bad one.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

(On request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HARSHA was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, first let me compliment the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA), on his objective analysis of this particular portion in this overall legislation.

Title I, in my judgment, should be stricken, and I strongly support the amendment.

When you consider that inevitable delays, as illustrated from the experience of the 1962 act, that will occur, I think we must come to the conclusion that this legislation, if it becomes law, if it is funded, will not have an immediate impact on resolving any unemployment in any of the areas that would qualify.

Second, Mr. Chairman, the illustration used by the gentleman from Ohio of the minimum impact experienced under the 1962 act of solving any of the serious unemployment problems likewise justifies support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the EDA legislation and the Appalachian legislation are worth while, and ought to be extended, and properly authorized and funded. It would be tragic, indeed, if we had any serious interruptions in those two necessary pieces of legislation because they were encumbered by a part of the proposed legislation that is somewhat suspect for the reasons that have been given.

Mr. Chairman, I hope and trust that we can pass titles II and III, and that we can eliminate title I, and that we can send this bill to conference and, hopefully, to the desk of the President so it can be received with welcome. If we encumber it I suspect that we could have some trouble. I hope we can avoid difficulty by approving the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minority leader would give his opinion of title III, as to whether or not it should be passed in its entirety or with amendments that will be specifically proposed?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the gentleman from Alabama give me the benefit of explaining the amendments that he is talking of?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I understand that an amendment will be offered to add additional counties in the State of New York.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand it, on the basis of the information I have, those counties after a study made

at the request of the Congress were recommended for inclusion and were considered to be desirable counties for the purpose of this legislation. If my information is accurate that there was a commission study and it did recommend the inclusion of those additional counties in New York State, I would support such an amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. And if that did not so officially appear in the report, what would be the response of the gentleman from Michigan? If the report did not make that recommendation, what would the gentleman's response be?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think in all honesty, my response would be that I would not vote for the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. If the gentleman will refer to page 29, section 5, recommendation 1, and read it the recommendation does not say that these counties be included in Appalachia. The report really makes no specific recommendation.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARSHA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, at this point in the RECORD I think it should be made clear, and I think the gentleman from Alabama should be aware of this as well as the minority leader—it is my understanding that an amendment which may be offered will be patterned on the amendment offered by Senator Robert Kennedy several years ago. At that time, when the lower tier of New York was brought into the Appalachia program, it was, I believe, subject to a reservation. The Governors which are the ruling board of the Appalachian Regional Commission had the final say. Because of that, I think the questions the gentleman from Alabama has just asked the minority leader were not entirely relevant.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA). The gentleman from Ohio makes two points in defense of his amendment which would eliminate title I from the bill.

First, he suggests that title I should not be adopted as a part of the bill because he says it is already too late. In effect, he says there is not any way to speed up the public works that it authorizes, and, that, therefore, it should not be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, let me address myself briefly to that. While I acknowledge that the gentleman does have a point in saying that the processing time of typical applications on public works projects under the EDA has risen and taken more time than Congress would prefer, I think history demonstrates we are able within reasonable bounds to get projects moving. In 1962, we adopted the accelerated public works program and by 1964, after just 2 years, 7,769 projects already had been put into being. That accounted for \$861 million of Federal funds which stimulated enough matching local and private funds to make a total of \$1.7 billion.

Now, if there is a question as to whether we could possibly move ahead



immediately with projects today, let me call the attention of the committee to the fact that there presently exists a \$6 billion backlog of projects on which applications have been filed and which are awaiting action.

Of that backlog, \$3 billion in projects already have completed sufficient processing that they would be ready to start virtually right now.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. BLATNIK. I wish to congratulate the gentleman in the well for underscoring a very important aspect of this problem. Never in the history of the country, and certainly not in the past third of a century, since the last great depression, have we had such a bona fide, reliable backlog of projects ready to go immediately. They are in the files downtown, not many blocks from this very chamber. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We will have \$6 billion, of which \$3 billion are ready to go almost immediately. I congratulate the gentleman again for underscoring that very important fact.

Mr. WRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his important contribution.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman will get me a little more time when my present time runs out, I would be happy to yield to him.

Mr. HARSHA. I will be happy to do so.

Mr. WRIGHT. I would like to address myself for a moment to the second suggestion which the gentleman has advanced as a reason for not approving title I. It is that he says it really will not do much to help the highly skilled and technical people who have been put out of work by the loss of defense contracts. Perhaps it will not directly do that. This bill is not a panacea. I do not think its purpose necessarily is to help engineers and other highly skilled people get jobs. Undoubtedly, we shall have to do something about that problem. I do not think that it is an essential goal of this particular bill, however.

This bill does, on the other hand, address itself to doing something to help those areas that have been hit by the loss of employment. On page 13 of the bill at line 6, the following language appears:

\* \* \* the Secretary may designate as redevelopment areas those communities or neighborhoods \* \* \* in which—

the Secretary determines there is \* \* \* an actual or threatened abrupt rise of unemployment due to the closing or curtailment of a major source of employment;

Beyond that I think it might well be pointed out that these public works projects are essential and needed. Quite frequently they result in the creation of a private-sector investment in a local plant or a local industry which perhaps would not have been able to come into the area if this type of money had not developed the necessary infrastructure.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. I represent the district that has the highest unemployment rate in the United States. We have skilled people out of work. But we are fully in support of this legislation because in 1962 we used this in order to develop facilities so our people could go to work. What is more, we have at the present time, which the mayor of Seattle has listed, \$37 million of projects that could start tomorrow. The local bonds support them, and if this legislation is passed, they will start tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

(On request of Mr. HARSHA, and by unanimous consent, Mr. WRIGHT was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WRIGHT. I promised to yield to my friend from Ohio. So I yield to him at this time.

Mr. HARSHA. I want to refer to the gentleman's remark about a backlog. We had a backlog in 1962 of large proportions. In 1962 we had a backlog of unexpended funds or unappropriated funds of 6.1 percent. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota said that there is the greatest backlog of public works projects which is available now than there has ever been in the history of the country. I point out again, Mr. Chairman, that there has been a backlog and the withholding of Federal moneys by every administration, and this administration has not withheld any more percentagewise than any other Presidential administration. So this is not unique with this administration. This is a point the Congress has been confronted with for a number of years.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the gentleman's point. I am not saying that this administration or any other administration alone is responsible. Unemployment should not be a partisan issue. It strikes Republicans, Democrats, and independents, alike. I am talking about an American program to help get people back to work. There is a backlog of needed public works. Many of them will facilitate and make possible private investment for industries that will require the skills of highly technical people.

For us to say it is too late and it takes too long, and therefore it should not be started now, it seems to me is a bit like a man who has not had breakfast or lunch and says, "I shall not order supper because it will take entirely too long to bring it to the table."

If it is going to take a while to get that supper to the table, then for heaven's sake, let us order it now—not wait another hour, not wait another day, not wait another week, not wait another month. This is the time for action. As fast as we can get these projects going, the American Nation and the American economy are going to get moving again.

I recommend we vote "no" and in such a majority that we demonstrate to our well-intentioned President, who wants to

strengthen the economy, that this is desired and wanted by a strong majority of the Congress of the United States and the people of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in 1962 when the accelerated Public Works Act was first enacted, \$400 million was appropriated in October.

By January 1963, \$394 million had been programed, and over 22 percent of these projects were underway. If the administration wishes to cooperate in carrying out this program, we can act quickly. If the administration wishes to take advantage of this legislation, it can help solve our unemployment problems throughout the country. Today, we have the experience of the early 1960's to guide us, and we have the Economic Development Administration already in place and functioning to get these programs underway quickly.

The position of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, it seems to me, is that we should not start this program because there may be a delay beyond our hopes. Well, gentlemen, I ask the Members: When will we start to do something? Shall we stand here now and do nothing, because it may take too long?

Mr. Chairman, during our Easter recess I conducted a day-long conference in my congressional district in southeast Washington concerning the possible impact in my area of the implementation of H.R. 5376, the Public Works Acceleration Act.

We were concerned primarily with title I, which the amendment before us would remove from this bill.

Testifying at this conference were mayors, city managers, city councilmen, port district managers, park district managers, committee chairmen from county and regional overall development planning committees, and individual citizens.

We received testimony from approximately 20 communities from eight of the counties in my congressional district. This is a district in which there are many scientific and technically skilled persons who are unemployed.

Insured unemployment runs from 8 to 15 percent and higher, and in several communities it will definitely increase during the coming months. Total unemployment clearly exceeds 20 percent of the total labor force in many communities in my district.

Mr. Chairman, during this conference we received a message which was clear and unmistakable and overwhelming. There are literally dozens of worthy public works projects which are eligible for Federal support under one existing program or another, but which have not been initiated because adequate financing has not been available from any source. Many of these are projects where the engineering is complete. Some of them have been submitted to the Economic Development Administration and are on long waiting lists.

Some of these projects have been or-

dered to be completed by other entities of the Government. In one instance, adequate sewage disposal and waste treatment facilities have been ordered to meet the standards of the Washington State Department of Ecology, but there is no legal way for the community to finance the project within the deadline set for compliance by the State government.

We were repeatedly presented detailed plans with engineering and cost estimates complete for needed water supply and purification facilities, sewage disposal facilities, neighborhood facilities, and roads and bridges. In one case, a community inside an Indian reservation virtually without a tax base with a high percentage of senior citizens must install sewage disposal facilities. In another case, a rural community must provide a water supply to keep chemical fertilizers from adjacent irrigation projects out of the drinking water.

The bill—H.R. 5376—with title I included, can accomplish three important things. It can provide an immediate shot in the arm for the economy of our Nation—one that will be significant, particularly in areas of high unemployment. Second, it can help stabilize the economy in hundreds of large and small communities throughout the country by providing meaningful and realistic employment. Mayor Wes Uhlman, of Seattle, estimates that 1,500 new jobs can be created in the Seattle area by eligible projects waiting to be financed.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I might point out they have passed local bond issues for this, and in one area the employment dropped from 105,000 in 1968 to 29,000 projected at the end of the year.

We will take any kind of jobs we can get at this point.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the distinguished gentleman, who comes from Seattle.

Finally, this legislation can provide all sorts of needed public facilities to help increase the standard of living in areas where that will be most valuable.

Mr. Chairman, this bill was criticized in that it does not provide relief in the scientific and technical communities. I believe we should face the fact that this bill was not intended to carry out that particular mission. I have joined in sponsoring legislation to retrain and replace scientists and technical personnel in this country. I hope this legislation will also be enacted when it comes before the Congress, but the legislation before us today will provide for a broad spectrum of employment not limited to the scientific and technical communities, and that is exactly what is intended.

As a scientist from an area where there is high unemployment in the technical community as well as outside of it, I recommend the defeat of the amendment before us.

I recommend the passage of the Public Works Administration Act with title

I included, not only because of the realistic magnitude of the authorization it includes, and not only because it will aid our economy and our unemployed, but because there are dozens of small- and medium-sized communities dotting the map of almost every congressional district in this country which do not have the tax base or even the knowledge of how to obtain financial or Federal support for the projects which they so desperately need.

Without adding any new bureaucracy, this bill with title I included will help solve these problems. It will pump money directly into these communities under existing Economic Development Administration procedures and supervision. The executives of small towns—many of whom do not even know how to ask for help today—can be helped because EDA will be fully funded to provide counsel and technical assistance to them.

In my opinion, there are few pieces of legislation which we could enact during this session of Congress which would have a greater impact for good where it is needed, with less overhead or less criticism for Government waste. I urge you to join me in rejecting the proposed amendment—in retaining title I in the bill—and passing the Accelerated Public Works Act overwhelmingly today.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is one point I do not believe has been covered in the debate, and I want to make it.

This is called an accelerated public works amendment. I believe it would be more accurate, more pragmatic, and more realistic to designate this as a decelerated public works amendment.

Under the terms of this amendment there will be a greater Federal share to go into the projects which will be covered. This means, as a practical matter, that, if the bill passes and is signed into law, all the States and local communities will stop their ongoing programs and will consider ways and means of getting in under the rather limited umbrella of this particular program.

I believe Members will find that in the 1962 period when the Accelerated Public Works Act was enacted, there was just this sort of temporary delay in the ongoing programs while there was a race of the diligent to see if they could get more generous Federal participation.

So if Members want to be realistic and pragmatic I believe they have to recognize the fact that this is not an accelerated public works amendment. It is a concept which is going to give a greater share of money to those areas where there is greater unemployment. Perhaps one can support that objective, but as a practical matter this will result in an obvious delay for countless ongoing projects in any area where more Federal money is even remotely possible.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVELAND. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5376, among other things, would provide

authorization for a 4-year extension of the Appalachian Regional Commission and the regional development program covering 13 States. I strongly favor this extension. I do so, of course, because I have seen the real benefits the program has produced. The Appalachian program is reaching people.

Twenty-two of the 24 counties in the Fifth District of Kentucky, which I represent, are included in Appalachia and have benefited from Appalachian Regional Commission programs in education, in highway development, and in health.

A system of vocational education provides training for those who are unskilled and thereby gives them the opportunity to earn a living.

In the last 6 years, the Appalachian Regional Commission has provided approximately \$4,967,000 for vocational education in the Fifth District. These funds have been used not only to construct 21 new facilities, but also to provide equipment for facilities in 14 counties.

The system of vocational education in my district has been established in such a way that the vocational schools and the extension centers serve students from all areas. They also serve a wide variety of purposes. High school students are taught during the day, extension classes are held in the evening, MDTA programs use the facilities, and the local community colleges also train students in these schools.

The construction and expansion of vocational school facilities has also encouraged major industry to establish plants in these areas, thereby providing more jobs for the people of this region.

Closely related to ARC funding for improving the educational system are programs to encourage the construction of new libraries. The \$100,000 has been provided for the construction of three new libraries: \$20,701 for a library in Clinton County, \$39,198 for Laurel County, and \$45,923 for Pulaski County. An application for ARC funds has been submitted for Bell County as well.

Economic development throughout Appalachia is largely dependent upon the development of a good highway system. The Appalachian Regional Commission has provided funds for this purpose.

Since the beginning of the ARC highway program, 132.9 miles of developmental highway have been constructed or are under construction. The major portion of the work done has been in two areas.

The first is Corridor "J," 94 miles long, which in the Fifth District extends from London to the Tennessee State line. A total of \$6.8 million in ARC funds has been obligated for this corridor. The second is Corridor "F," which, in the Fifth District, runs from the Letcher County line to Cumberland Gap, for a total of 38.9 miles. Appalachian Regional Commission funding for this corridor is \$19.1 million.

In addition, four access roads have



been constructed with a total of \$1.3 million in ARC funds. One access road has been built in Pulaski County, two are located in Harlan County and one in Leslie County. These roads serve a vital purpose by providing access to hospitals, industrial sites, airports, schools, et cetera.

The rough terrain and low tax base in most communities of Appalachia have meant that efficient transportation was difficult and costly to provide. The Appalachian highway system being developed with ARC assistance is providing the people of Appalachia with a means for reaching services, schools, and developing employment opportunities by attracting industry to the area.

The entire Nation is faced with acute problems in the health care field. Appalachia, in particular, is characterized by a critical shortage of health manpower as well as health care services. Through the Commission's programs, efforts are being made to develop a better health system to serve the people of this region.

The Appalachian health program includes numerous means for improving the health care system in Appalachia. In the Fifth District alone, construction grants have been made by the ARC for hospitals, nursing homes, or extended care centers in 10 counties. This, of course, has meant that health care services could be offered on a more widespread basis to the people of the region.

In addition to construction grants, ARC funds have been provided for the planning and operation of a wide variety of health projects. Mental health-mental retardation projects have been funded in four locations, a day-care center for the handicapped and mentally retarded has been established in Whitley County, environmental health programs have been begun, and planning is being carried out for an infant and early childhood program in southeastern Kentucky. In addition, health education projects have been funded which will not only provide an education for its participants, but will also furnish needed health care to the people of this region. Ambulance services have been funded, as well as emergency radio networks for numerous hospitals. Finally, funds have been provided for home health service programs in seven counties.

One of the most recent results of Appalachian Regional Commission assistance in the Fifth District is the completion of a new Marymount hospital in London, Ky. In 1968, an initial ARC grant of \$175,000 was made to assist in its construction. Further funds were granted in 1969 in the amount of \$300,000.

I have with me today a comprehensive analysis of the Appalachian Regional Commission's health programs throughout Appalachia and in eastern Kentucky in particular. I submit them for inclusion in the RECORD at this time. A healthy population is essential to successful regional development, and I believe this analysis demonstrates the progress made in the health care field as a result of Ap-

palachian Regional Commission assistance:

#### ANALYSIS OF THE APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Since funds for the health program were limited, the Appalachian Regional Commission decided to concentrate support in a limited number of demonstration areas. These areas vary in size from 3 to 16 counties.

Prior to designation by the Commission, each proposed demonstration area was required to submit a comprehensive plan covering all aspects of health care in the area. These health development plans, which have been updated annually, represent the best judgment of local public and private leaders as to how present facilities and resources are to be used in the overall health system. Since each demonstration area faced different problems and had different resources, each represents a variation in the way those problems are being relieved.

Commission grants have been authorized for a wide variety of projects, ranging from new hospitals to systems of communication and transportation needed to reach patients in outlying areas and specialized equipment required to perform complex surgery in a regional hospital.

The Appalachian health program enlists the Appalachian Regional Commission, the U.S. Health Services and Mental Health Administration, the states and the local health councils.

Too often in the past there has been insufficient coordination between the public and private organizations furnishing health services. Public medical services have traditionally been organized to fill gaps in the private system, but liaison between the two sectors has frequently been sporadic or nonexistent. As a result, in many communities overlaps or new gaps have appeared without being recognized. In the Appalachian demonstration health areas an effort is being made to end this inefficient use of scarce resources through the operations of the local health councils. These councils are composed of public officials, interested citizens, physicians, dentists, hospital administrators and specialists in the field of public and private health care.

The very existence of demonstration health programs in Appalachia improves the health manpower situation to some degree in that these demonstration programs attract health professionals to the region by offering them a professionally stimulating environment, one where new medical approaches are being tried. In addition, the Commission—through Section 211 and Section 214 of the Appalachian Act—has alleviated the health manpower problem by sharing in the costs of building and equipping higher education facilities offering advanced training in health fields and by helping to build vocational and technical schools which are used to train laboratory technicians, medical secretaries and other auxiliary health workers. In the hospitals constructed with Appalachian assistance physicians, nurses and other health workers will not only practice medicine but will also receive training.

In many demonstration areas Section 202 funds have been used to expand the programs of public health agencies. New clinics have been added, and existing ones expanded. Screening programs have been undertaken to detect disease and refer those detected as ill for treatment. Staffs are recruited, hired and trained for health education. Programs in maternal and child care, family planning and nutrition are being offered.

In a time of rapidly rising hospital costs, it is essential to find sound alternatives to putting patients in expensive acute care beds if the alternatives are medically ad-

visable. One sound alternative is care by competent nurses and other health personnel delivered to the patient in his home. This may be offered to the convalescent, who then does not need to remain in the hospital once he is past the necessity for intensive care. Home services are being provided in the demonstration program.

In some areas of Appalachia, dentists are in shorter supply than physicians, and dental care is virtually unknown. Severe dental disorders are the rule among children; they often become manifest in later life as the cause for rejection for military service. Commission grants for traditional dental services tend to focus on school-age children. Fluoridation has also been undertaken with Appalachian grants. Training of dental technicians is another frequent type of program.

Demonstration health areas have undertaken environmental health programs as part of the development of comprehensive health services. There have been inspections and analyses to determine the most effective way to provide sanitary water supplies and sewage treatment in relatively rural areas with large, but dispersed, populations. Solid waste disposal projects have been undertaken in connection with the adoption of local ordinances to control waste collection and sanitary land fills. Land fills are a major means of eliminating breeding grounds for rats, flies and other disease carriers, as well as of ending a physical blemish that impedes regional development. Grants for sanitary land fill projects have generally provided that user fees or general taxes will cover an increasing share of the operating costs of disposal in order to prevent dependence on Commission funds.

As a physician, I have kept a close and continuing watch on the Appalachian health program's demonstration in Eastern Kentucky. I want to share with you a progress report on that particular activity.

Kentucky's 16-county demonstration health area provides an interesting example of how comprehensive planning to meet specific goals and objectives can be carried into effect. Health planning in eastern Kentucky had a headstart over that in most of the region, due to a \$684,000 grant awarded to the Kentucky Program Development Office for that purpose from the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in 1965. The OEO grant initiated intensive planning efforts throughout eastern Kentucky, and particularly in the Kentucky River Development District and the Cumberland Valley Development District, two regions subsequently designated as the Southeastern Kentucky Health Demonstration area under Section 202 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act.

The broad goal of the Kentucky program, as stated in the most recent health development plan, is "to make the basic health services system in a hard core problem area of Appalachia into one that is viable and dynamic in bringing comprehensive health care to the area, improving the health and vitality of its people, and in these and other ways . . . advancing the overall development and progress of the area."

The means of implementing this general goal are categorized under six major program areas, within each of which specific objectives are indicated.

The six program areas are: a coordinated system of emergency services; a coordinated system of supportive services for patients not in institutions (home health care); a coordinated system of levels of care (facilities), a coordinated system of community services for promotion and improvement of health; a regional system for improving environmental health conditions; and health manpower development.

The first step toward achieving each of the

objectives has been to gather and analyze information on existing problems and services provided, and to examine current capabilities in relation to the total population and its health needs.

The rugged terrain of the Kentucky demonstration area, its underdeveloped road system, its climate (high rainfall, snow, ice) and its dependence on extractive industry—all combined to make the need for emergency services in the demonstration region acute. A regionwide emergency services system therefore became the top priority of the Southeastern Kentucky Health Demonstration Corporation. It was the glue which would bind together a total health system.

As a first step, an emergency radio communications network was developed among twelve area hospitals, providing immediate and constant regionwide communication and coordination in emergency situations. Then two separate emergency transportation projects were designed—one in the Kentucky River Development District and one for a portion of the Cumberland Valley Development District. These projects now provide an integrated system of ambulance service in the area. The communications system and the ambulance service could determine where to take the patient and provide transportation to get him there, but appropriate facilities to care for the emergency patient also had to be developed. To meet this need, emergency care facilities were renovated and modernized at the Hazard Appalachian Regional Hospital, and new facilities were established to deal with emergency and ambulant care at Pineville, Harlan and Corbin.

The Kentucky planning councils chose development of supportive services to noninstitutionalized patients as their second priority. These supportive services would particularly benefit the chronically ill, disabled or convalescent, would lift from them the heavy financial burden of hospital care and would free needed beds and facilities in the area's general hospitals, mental hospitals and other institutions. A coordinated system of 16 home health agencies functioning within a single organizational framework has been operating in the demonstration area since 1968. In an area with only 944 hospital beds, the home health service's organization has provided health services to a caseload of 1,246, and has made 88,006 visits to the chronically ill, 11,812 pediatric visits and 789 "family support" visits while a mother was in the hospital.

A regionalized and coordinated system of facilities—acute care, extended care, long-term care and ambulant care—was developed to avoid fragmentation, duplication and overlaps in services by various facilities. The objective was to make each level of care "reasonably available" to the population of the region, on a "transportation time" and "statistical need" basis, and to prevent, for example, the construction of two 50-bed hospitals within 15 miles of each other rather than a 100-bed hospital which could more efficiently serve the two combined areas.

The first step in this design was to determine the need for the various levels of institutional care within the general area. The next step was to superimpose these determinations over specific localities—a task requiring education, patience and tact! The result was an investment plan that would plug the gaps in the multilevel framework of care available to the citizens of the demonstration area.

Priorities for new facilities were then established on the basis of the investment plan. Projects which have received funding include a new \$2 million general hospital at Manchester, Kentucky, a 40-bed acute care wing at the Hazard Appalachian Regional Hospital, a \$4 million extended care addition

at the Pineville Community Hospital, a new \$700,000 extended care facility in Harlan and a 15-bed psychiatric addition to Southeastern Kentucky Baptist Hospital. Facilities being developed include a 50-bed addition to general hospital facilities in Corbin and small ambulant care centers in Hindman, in Knott County and in the Cloverfork section of Harlan County. Also being proposed is a large service and training facility for the Frontier Nursing Service in Hyden, a project which is also related to Kentucky's manpower development objective and which would provide master's level training in nursing services.

Kentucky planners anticipated that improved availability of adequate supportive services would result in increased demands on southeastern Kentucky's community health system. To backstop the demand, the councils developed several projects to expand available services, particularly in mental health and health education. A system of mental health services was developed to provide complete psychiatric services to the area, including sheltered workshops, day care centers and periodic consultations with mental health personnel. In addition to mental health programs, funding was secured from the Appalachian Regional Commission for continuing programs operated by the Kentucky Department of Health, such as dental health (fluoridation units were established on a pilot basis in three communities), health education and multiphasic screening for detection of chronic diseases.

The latter program has doubtless already saved many lives. In its first six months of operation, 3,150 people were screened, and 360 previously undetected cases of chronic illness, including tuberculosis, cancer and communicable diseases, were discovered. A German measles vaccination project carried out in the demonstration area has protected 76,000, primarily children and women of childbearing age, from that disease.

The environmental conditions which jeopardize health in Kentucky's demonstration area are principally an insufficient supply of water and inadequate sewage and waste disposal systems, all of which require major capital investments. In addition, food, milk and housing inspection, and diseases associated with coal mining have to be contended with.

The demonstration health program developed a new strategy to attack these problems. Technical assistance teams were organized to scout out environmental problems and to assist local communities in survey work, research and the design of solutions to these problems. The teams also aid local communities, counties and regions by investigating possible sources of funding for projects designed to cope with the problems. The demonstration area has been working toward development of solid waste disposal systems (sanitary landfills) to serve the total 16-county area.

Kentucky's demonstration area continues to face a serious shortage of doctors, dentists, nurses and supportive health personnel. The demonstration area is sponsoring the development of a family medicine residency in the Department of Community Medicine at the University of Kentucky Medical School and is continuing to sponsor field professorships in community medicine. Under the latter program, professors are attached to the University of Kentucky College of Medicine and reside in the demonstration area, promoting and activating demonstration projects, increasing allied health manpower training and introducing medical interns and residents into the area. A training facility being developed in cooperation with the Frontier Nursing Service is an additional

attempt to raise professional capabilities in the area.

In addition to the emphasis on training more people in conventional health manpower programs, Kentucky is exploring ways to develop new types of manpower, such as paraprofessionals, who would fill existing gaps or extend the productivity of existing health manpower.

The Commission approved a development grant to the University of Kentucky Research Foundation on behalf of the Hazard Community and Southeast Community Colleges. The purposes of the project are to investigate how allied health programs can be established at the community college level, determine priorities for allied health programs, develop staff requirements and curriculum and establish appropriate internship programs and recruitment methods.

As in other health-related fields, environmental sanitation is faced with a manpower crisis. In an effort to provide adequately trained personnel and interest them in remaining in eastern Kentucky, the demonstration area has developed an in-service training program in cooperation with Eastern Kentucky University. Three students in the sanitation field have been assigned to the project for 15 weeks' field training.

Mr. Chairman, I regard this Appalachian health program as a model for the nation. Its accomplishments are reflective of the overall Appalachian development program and a major reason for my intention to vote for extension of the Appalachian effort.

H.R. 5376 also provides for an extension of the programs carried out by the Economic Development Administration.

Economic progress has bypassed certain areas of our Nation, including Kentucky's Fifth District. In these areas the declining economic base has resulted in local inability to finance the public improvements necessary to attract new industry. The young people, who are unable to find employment, are forced to migrate in search of better opportunities. Prospective new employers find such areas distinguished not only by inadequate public facilities but also by an untrained or inadequate labor force and thus turn their attention to more attractive locations.

The underlying philosophy of EDA's programs has been that long-term employment, which would encourage the development of stable and diversified local economies, could best be effected by attracting new business enterprises and by encouraging the expansion of existing businesses. In order to make depressed areas more attractive to businesses, a system of grants and loans for public works and development facilities has been established.

EDA grants and loans have been numerous and varied in Kentucky's Fifth District. The major thrust has been in the funding of water and sewer projects.

In the past 6 years, EDA funds have been provided for 27 water projects in 15 counties. In addition, the Economic Development Administration has funded programs for construction and expansion of 24 sewer facilities in seven counties. Such projects have improved the attractiveness of the Fifth District to in-



dustry and have begun to encourage businesses to locate in this area.

Funds have also been provided for management assistance in several counties: two in Harlan County, one in Bell County, and one in Pulaski County.

EDA funds have been of particular value in establishing industrial sites to encourage industrial development in the fifth district. Since 1965, six grants or loans were made for this purpose.

Additional assistance has been provided by the Economic Development Administration for tourism, an important industry in my area. In 1965 a project was established in Green County, in 1967 three more projects were funded in Bell, Harlan, and Russell Counties.

It is my feeling that the projects carried out thus far by the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Economic Development Administration have demonstrated that they can improve conditions for those living in economically depressed areas. Much more remains to be done, however. It is for this reason that I support an extension of these programs.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take much time, but I am very interested in this legislation and particularly in opposition to this amendment. I believe we have missed one very important point that was brought out by the gentleman from Ohio; that is, that this phase of the bill will not help people who have been unemployed who are in the highly skilled areas. But he is grossly mistaken and has missed the point entirely, because of the fact that the hospitals, the water programs, the sewerage treatment plants all are planned by highly skilled engineers and draftsmen and by electrical engineers, by the people who have been laid off in the aerospace industry.

The laboring people who will be helped in my area will be helped, but this has a dual purpose. The laboring people do not make the plans. They do not do the drafting. They do not do the highly skilled work.

So when we are building a rural water supply three-fourths of the work will be done by highly skilled engineers, by draftsmen, and by consulting engineers. When you build a hospital three-fourths of the work done in the construction of it is done by highly skilled craftsmen, engineers, electrical engineers, draftsmen, and so on.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I have a very brief time but I would be happy to yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am very happy that you made this point because the inference would be, from what the gentleman from Ohio said, that it was only the scientists who needed work. We have 20 percent of all the building trades employees who are unemployed today. So, I feel that you have made a very important point here.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio briefly.

Mr. HARSHA. I thank the gentleman for yielding. He makes a very valid point that it takes a lot of timing, designing, and engineering. This was one of the points that I was trying to bring out, that it creates delay in implementing this program. It takes 22 months to get this thing going, and you will not get it immediately as the proponents expect.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. I thank the gentleman. Let me get to the other phase about delay. The farm area is never in high gear. We have chronic unemployment in the farming areas. The gentleman says that this will take 1 or 2 years to implement. I do not care if it takes 1 year or 5 years. I have the bodies to fill the jobs. The migrants are getting in worse straits year after year. So if this takes 1, 2, or 3 years, I would like to have it at any time of course the sooner, the better, but this will help my area in the lower echelons at any time.

I would like to tell the gentleman something to close my discussion. In my area we have great unemployment. There are not many jobs, period. There is very little private enterprise coming in there, although we are trying daily to attract it. So I think Government has a responsibility to provide jobs if private industry cannot. This is one way to do it. The main reason that I support this legislation is this: We were having a committee hearing in the Committee on Agriculture and there were some migrants who came from the State of Michigan to testify. One of the migrants testified how a migrant worker in my area came all the way to Michigan to earn \$45 a week. A member of the committee asked the person who made this statement, "Why do you think he would do it?" His answer was very simple. He said, "He was too proud to beg; he would rather work for \$45 a week and earn a little to support his family working than to beg a lot from the Government."

Mr. Chairman, this helps the migrant workers, it helps the highly skilled workers. I believe it is a basic responsibility of Government when private resources cannot give the employment to the people to give them the jobs before they put them on welfare. Our people need jobs, they want to work, this is one way of helping.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. Mr. Chairman, I am cognizant that the amendment offered by the distinguished ranking minority member (Mr. HARSHA) refers to title I of this bill. However, in an exchange moments ago between the minority leader GERALD FORD and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) reference was made to the Appalachian region and in particular to amendments that have been under discussion both at the committee and here today among the gentlemen who are present.

I would like to ask the distinguished

gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) with regard to his reading of the recommendations on page 29 of the so-called Upper New York study which was given to the Congress last October by the President of the United States. It is my recollection that he concluded that the study was in effect saying another region. I would like to go back first to page 25 of the report wherein it states:

Although geography suggests that one would be equally able to place the Upper New York area in either the New England or the Appalachia region, the socio-economic indicators reveal that the local counties have more in common with Appalachia.

And, it goes on to state in prior years that the Department of Commerce conducted studies and so forth.

I would, then, like to refer my colleague from Alabama to page 28 wherein because of the substantial variation among upper New York counties, two alternative solutions appear reasonable. Each based their economic findings and other questions relating—and I emphasize this—to the inclusion of upper New York State or parts thereof in an economic development region.

It goes on to state that all of the counties as defined are recommended for inclusion in an expanded Appalachian economic development region.

Now, with respect to the section that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. JONES) referred to, at page 29 thereof there is stated that there is sufficient economic justification to warrant the inclusion of portions of Upstate New York in an economic development region.

Further, the socio-economic orientation of the area favor inclusion within the Appalachian region.

Then it goes on to state that if we are considering other regions in post-1971 legislation by this Congress, this Appalachian regional program could also be considered as title III under this bill. Therefore, in my opinion, unequivocally, they are talking about the inclusion of Upper New York State counties in two alternatives under the provisions of this report and recommend their inclusion in the Appalachian region.

I ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama whether he differs with that or not?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I listened to the statements which have been made by the gentleman from New York and have read those statements which were presented by the President in his report. That was a request made by the committee in the act of 1969. This report was submitted on July 15, 1970.

Mr. TERRY. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Now, if the gentleman will yield further—and the gentleman just referred to page 29 of the report—I called to the minority leader's attention what recommendation No. 1 was.

Mr. TERRY. The gentleman covered only a part of it.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Subsequent to the submission of this report the President of the United States sent a re-

quest to the Congress for an extension of 1 year of the Appalachian program and he did not ask for additional counties to be included. Now the gentleman is trying to read into that other utterances, something he did not say.

Mr. TERRY. May I comment, first with respect to that particular statement which the gentleman just made?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman has yielded to me and I want to pursue the whole matter at this time.

On page 52 of the same report you have a letter from Mr. John B. Waters, Jr., Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, and here is what he says:

For these reasons, it would appear to be premature to incorporate New York's northern counties into the New England or Appalachian regional programs until assessment of present policies is completed and appropriate recommendations on the overall questions involved can be made to Congress.

Now, how can you have this administration saying that it does want these counties included?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HARSHA).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARSHA) there were—ayes 87, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIERNAN

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TIERNAN: Page 9, line 10, strike out the quotation marks. Page 9, after line 10 insert the following:

"(3) those areas which the Secretary of Labor designates each month as areas having an average rate of unemployment of veterans who served on active duty during the Vietnam era as defined in section 101 (29) of Title 38, United States Code, and who were discharged or released from active duty in the military, naval, or air service of the United States under conditions other than dishonorable, at least 25 per centum above the national average rate of all unemployment for three consecutive months or more during the preceding 12 month period."

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer the following amendment to title I of H.R. 5376:

(3) those areas which the Secretary of Labor designates each month as areas having an average rate of unemployment of veterans who served on active duty during the Vietnam era as defined in section 101 (29) of Title 38, United States Code, and who were discharged or released from active duty in the military, naval, or air service of the United States under conditions other than dishonorable, at least 25 per centum above the national average rate of all unemployment for three consecutive months or more during the preceding 12 month period.

The purpose of this amendment is to include areas with substantial unemployment of Vietnam veterans with those areas eligible to receive "Federal assistance to stimulate public works investment."

By mid-1970, nearly 4 million men who served in the Armed Forces during the

Vietnam era were back in civilian life. They made up one-fourth of the 13 million men in the 20 to 29 age group in the civilian population.

Until late 1969, these men who left the military service entered an economy in which employment was expanding and unemployment was approaching the lowest levels of the decade. By mid-1970, we witnessed a slowdown in economic activity. The national unemployment rate, which was 3.5 percent throughout most of 1969, rose to about 4.5 percent in the first half of 1970.

During this same period the unemployment rate for veterans between the ages of 20 to 29 also rose. It moved from 4.5 percent in the first half of 1969 to 6.5 percent in the first half of 1970. I have now obtained the figures for the first quarter of 1971. With the national unemployment rate at 5.9 percent, the rate for veterans 20 to 29 years old is 10.8 percent. I might add here that I use the ages between 20 and 29 because over 85 percent of our Vietnam veterans fall within this category.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment does not mean that veterans are to be granted a preference over nonveterans in every job created, for under H.R. 5376 there are two other definitions of an "eligible area." What it says is that these Vietnam veterans must not be left out in the cold. Let me quote from an editorial in yesterday's Washington Post:

It is true that unemployment and deficient medical and/or hospital care are widespread problems in this country at the moment—not just the particular affliction of servicemen returning from Vietnam; and it is also true that in the past, veterans of other wars have found the compensations offered upon their return to civilian life to be far short of the rhetorical gratitude with which they are accompanied. But short money, reduced veteran's benefits, a tight job market and savagely inadequate medical care would be burdensome enough. When you add to them the problem of readjusting to life in a national community that is anything but unanimous on the question of the actual value and moral worth of the cause for which these men have risked so much, it adds up to a unique—and uniquely distressing—environment to which to return.

It is estimated that H.R. 5376 will create approximately 170,000 badly needed jobs within the next year, with a multiplying factor providing an additional job increase of 250,000. Certainly somewhere in this whole program we cannot forget our veterans. Their unemployment is as high as some areas of the country with "substantial unemployment" far above the national average.

I ask for your support for my amendment.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIERNAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with the membership of the committee on this side of the aisle, and we have agreed that it does have logic and deserves support, and we will certainly accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Mr. TIERNAN.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to title 1, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the "Public Works and Economic Development Act Amendments of 1971".

SEC. 202. Section 105 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3135) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and not to exceed \$550,000,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973."

SEC. 203. Subsection (c) of section 201 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

SEC. 204. Section 302 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3152) is amended by striking out "and June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1971, June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973".

SEC. 205. Section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3161) is amended as follows:

(1) Paragraph (2) of subsection (a) is amended by striking out "40 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "50 per centum".

(2) Paragraph (6) of subsection (a) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) the Secretary may designate as redevelopment areas those communities for neighborhoods (defined without regard to political or other subdivisions or boundaries) which—

"(A) the Secretary determines have one of the following conditions:

"(i) a large concentration of low-income persons;

"(ii) rural areas having substantial out-migration;

"(iii) substantial unemployment;

"(iv) an actual or threatened abrupt rise of unemployment due to the closing or curtailment of a major source of employment; or

"(v) severe economic distress due to the occurrence of a natural disaster; and

"(B) have submitted an acceptable proposal for an overall economic development program which will have an appreciable beneficial impact upon such condition.

No redevelopment area established under this paragraph shall be eligible to meet the requirements of section 403(a)(1)(B) of this Act;

"(7) those areas where per capita employment has declined significantly during the next preceding ten-year period for which appropriate statistics are available."

SEC. 206. The first sentence of section 402 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3162) is amended by striking out "thereof" and all that follows down through and including the period at the end of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "of such reviews shall terminate or modify such designation whenever such an area no longer satisfies the designation requirements of section 401, but in no event shall such a designation of an area be terminated prior to the expiration of the third year after the date such area was so designated."

SEC. 207. Subsection (g) of section 403 of the Public Works and Economic Development



Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3171) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1973".

Sec. 208. Subsection (d) of section 509 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3188a) is amended by striking out the period at the end of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973, to be available until expended, not to exceed \$305,000,000."

Sec. 209. Section 512 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3191) is amended by inserting immediately after "1971," the following: "and \$500,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1973,".

Sec. 210. Section 2 of the Act of July 6, 1970 (Public Law 91-304) is amended by striking out "1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "1972".

Sec. 211. No person in the United States shall, on the ground of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Mr. BLATNIK (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SLACK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5376) to extend the Public Works Acceleration Act, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 5376.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 398) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 398

Resolved, That Walter E. Fauntroy, Delegate from the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, elected to the standing committee of the House of Representatives on the District of Columbia.

The resolution was agreed to.  
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### A PRESIDENTIAL POSSIBILITY

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

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the first contingents have begun to arrive for the massive demonstration which will surround this building on Saturday. This is a protest of the continued involvement of our country in the war in Indochina, a cause which touches deeply a great part of the American people. But it is also a particular manifestation of a broad and varied pattern of protest which is characteristic of our times.

We are living in a time of protest unprecedented in the history of America and I wish to draw my colleagues' attention to what seem to me to be some of the implications of the rising incidence of open and urgent protest on the part of groups all across the country.

First, I think no one of intelligence can wholly deplore or deprecate these protests because to do so would be to disapprove of progress, of all change, and of the exercise of the constitutional prerogatives of the American people. And looking at our society honestly, at the contrasts of affluence and poverty which are still widespread, at some of the rigidities and failures of many of our existing institutions, there must be recognition of the validity of the protesters' claims in many cases.

Nevertheless, there must be a balance in any successful society between acceptance of certain standards and institutions and challenges to and protests against these established standards and institutions. There have been societies, in the past, which have failed because they were too rigid and, as well, societies which have been destroyed because they became too tolerant of protest, too indiscriminating to distinguish between the voice of necessary change and the seeds of anarchy.

Our trend in the last half century has been toward greater and greater acceptance of protest. This has been manifested in the national upwelling of sentiment against racial discrimination and the grossest economic disadvantage of millions of Americans. It has also been manifested in the decision of a President of the United States not to run for reelection because of nationwide protests of one of his policies, an event unprecedented in our history.

There is fickleness about some of the waves of protests. Even the protests against the war have taken many forms—focusing at one time on the college ROTC program, at another on napalm, at another time and place on defense-oriented research at a university. But underlying the moral issue there has been the revulsion of the American people against spending so much money for an inconclusive military operation when there are so many urgent and critical needs here at home.

The money issue runs through the whole range of protests—through the marches of welfare mothers, the picketing of senior citizens, the ecology campaigns, the demand for powerplants that burn more costly, sulfur-free fuels, the opposition to the SST, the demand for billions to clean up our rivers and streams. The issue is not only one of priorities, it is primarily one of providing the money to meet urgently felt needs.

All of this suggests two further things to me, which I think are especially pertinent when we consider the kind of leadership this country will need in the turbulent years of protest that appear to lie ahead.

We must have, I am convinced, a President who has the capacity to take up all of these threads of protest and direct this strongly felt concern into constructive programs of change. We had such a President in Franklin Roosevelt when the country faced the great economic crisis of the 1930's.

We also need a President who has complete confidence in himself, who can stand firm when firmness is needed and who can move decisively when the time for action has come. And we need a man who has demonstrated this capacity to the people. They must have confidence in his character, in his judgment, in his knowledge of the economic facts of life—which mean the difference between having the money, the resources to meet the real needs of the people.

I think there is such a man among us, and I would like to cite him by name as an invitation to thought, in this body, and among the American people, as we look ahead to 1972. The selection process for presidential nominees is a long one and I hope the American people will give a great deal of thought to the problems and choices that face us and affect the future of our society.

The record of WILBUR MILLS, the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, has demonstrated, I think, all of those qualities that are needed in these times. He has won a place of the highest regard in the House and in the Congress for his extraordinary competency in handling the most basic of legislation—the legislation which forms the tax environment for our economic growth, the legislation which raised the means, the money to do all of the things the people expect of their Federal Government, the legislation which sustains the life and the health of the aged, the blind and disabled, and the young and dependent in our society.

He has won this regard through the care with which he has prepared his case, the logic with which he has presented it to the House, the generosity with which he has given time and consideration to the opponents of his legislation, and his insistence that logic, reason, and fact form the basis for overwhelming that opposition in the debate.

It might be suggested that a man from Arkansas would be disqualified from national leadership. But I have found that when persons ascend to offices of great

influence affecting all of the people, sectionalism is not a part of their decisions. I recall with shame my opposition to Roosevelt's appointment of Hugo Black to the Supreme Court. And I learned from that incident that one cannot be obsessed with prejudice; one must be obsessed with justice and decency.

It is human nature which causes national leaders to rise above sectionalism. I know of no instance when a man reached our highest office that he did not try to rise to the ranks of the great men of history. Some have had the capacity to ascend to those heights and I think such men are available to the American people today.

#### VETERANS ORDERED TO LEAVE MALL

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

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not assume to speak for the leadership of the House although I can indicate that they are sympathetic to the position I am about to express.

We all know that the Chief Justice has ordered the Vietnam veterans to leave the Mall by 4:30 p.m. today. We do not seek in any way to intrude upon that judicial process or in any way to infringe upon that process. Counsel for the veterans' group, I understand, will be appearing before the Court seeking to overthrow or overcome the Federal injunction. However, we know it has long been the custom for the Federal Government to assist in finding suitable areas for groups of Americans located in the Capitol area for legitimate purposes.

I have written a letter to the Secretary of the Interior calling upon him to confer with such officials of the District of Columbia government or others to secure suitable accommodations.

The letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1971.

HONORABLE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
Department of the Interior,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We have no wish to intrude upon the judicial process under which Chief Justice Burger has ordered the VietNam Veterans to leave the Mall by 4:30 P.M. As the counsel submits review before the full court, it would be inappropriate for us to infringe upon that process.

Nevertheless, it is our feeling that these men who have served our country and now wish to extend that service by utilizing our constitutional and traditional means of public expression should not be deterred from doing so by any force or exercises of police power as long as such expression is orderly and non-violent.

Further, as it has long been a custom for the Federal government to assist in finding suitable areas for groups of Americans to locate in the Capitol area for legitimate purposes, we call upon the Secretary of the Interior to meet with the leadership of the VietNam Veterans in order that suitable accommodations can be found for the group at some nearby place.

We note that the Vice-President has ex-

tended the use of the West Capitol grounds for peaceful demonstrations in a decision last week. In that spirit, we believe it would be appropriate for the Secretary of the Interior to make the necessary arrangements we refer to above.

Sincerely,

HUGH L. CAREY, SAM GIBBONS, GLENN M. ANDERSON, WILLIAM F. RYAN, DONALD FRASER, DON EDWARDS, JAMES HARVEY, LES ASPIN, BERTRAM L. PODELL, EDWARD I. KOCH.

SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, MIKE MCCORMACK, NICK BEGICH, FRANK THOMPSON, MARTHA GRIFFITHS, DOMINICK DANIELS, JAMES H. SCHEUER, JOHN G. DOW, THADDEUS J. DULSKI.

MARIO BIAGGI, ABNER J. MIKVA, PAUL S. SARBANES, TORBERT H. MACDONALD, ROBERT A. ROE, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, WM. J. GREEN, FRANK E. EVANS.

JOSHUA EILBERG, ELLA GRASSO, ROBERT N. C. NIX, DICK BOLLING, MORRIS UDALL, TENO RONCALIO, ROBERT F. DRINAN, EMANUEL CELLER, Members of Congress.

#### SALUTE TO SECRETARIES

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

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Secretaries Week, sponsored by The National Secretaries Association—International—is being observed from April 18 through the 24th. Today, April 21, has been designated as Secretaries Day.

"Better Secretaries Mean Better Business" is the theme of the 20th consecutive annual Secretaries Week. Governors and mayors throughout the United States have officially proclaimed Secretaries Week, and their counterparts in Canada have done the same. For the seventh straight year, the Outdoor Advertising Association has undertaken Secretaries Week as a public service project, and billboards have been made available throughout the country.

The purpose of Secretaries Week is to bring recognition to secretaries for the vital role they play in business, industry, education, government, and the professions. Secretaries Week was originated in 1952 by the National Secretaries Association—International—in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce to draw attention to the secretaries contribution to the educational, professional, and civic growth of the community. It also serves to remind secretaries of their responsibilities to their employers and to their profession. Many secretaries also will participate in secretarial seminars.

The activities of Secretaries Week in the Nation's Capital started with attending mass at St. Matthews Cathedral on Sunday, April 18, at 12:30 p.m. The 20th Annual Secretaries Day dinner is being held this evening at Blackie's House of Beef and the climax of the activities for the week will be on Saturday, April 24, at the Kenwood Country Club with a luncheon and presentation of "Fashions for the Secretary" by Rose Williams.

I am familiar with the National Secretaries Association—International—

and the many civic activities which they so willingly participate in since Margaret Morrison, a member of my staff, has been an active member for several years and is a past vice president of this organization. It gives me great pleasure to pay tribute and salute our secretaries at this time.

#### DOUBLE STANDARD JUSTICE

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

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, as the so-called High Court of this land continues to deplore school segregation in the South contending that such is discriminatory, the same black-robed Justices also continue to wink at school segregation in the North.

To confirm this, one need only examine the Court's opinions of yesterday which were masterpieces in gobbledygook. While again kicking southern schools in the teeth, these master interpreters—and often misinterpreters—of the law made positively certain that the last southern school, without exception, be sacrificed on the altar of the Court's double standard of political justice—one standard for Yankee schools and another for Dixie schools.

There should now be no question in the minds of anyone that there is no more justice or equality of treatment for southern schools in President Nixon's High Court, headed by his Chief Justice Burger, than there was in President Eisenhower's High Court, headed by his former Chief Justice Warren. On reviewing the numerous utterances heard in the last year or so about the Court being moved toward a conservative point of view, the Court's decisions of yesterday, as written and read by Chief Justice Burger, confirm the sad fact that this has been no more than just a lot of talk. The hope that had built up within us, like the walls of Jericho, has been shattered to its foundation.

Mr. Speaker, it is reasonable to assume that the administration's front man, SPIRO AGNEW, will continue to flit across the South attempting to draw reverberating applause with his utterances against school busing. At the same time, the administration's hatchetman and head of the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice will no doubt continue his surveillance of southern schools, bringing actions whenever and wherever he can find the slightest imbalance in black and white mixing.

The position of those who advocate and support the double standard, that is, one for the South and another for the North, was strongly endorsed and further fortified yesterday by the Burger opinions. Undoubtedly, this hypocrisy will go on and on. The High Court will no doubt continue to dodge that which would require the integration of northern schools comparable to that which it has forced upon the South. The same double standard will be pursued in the



Congress, the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and also in the White House.

When Spiro Agnew next cuts a swath across the South and attempts to hearten our people with his familiar and oft repeated utterances, "We are against school busing," it might be well that his listeners reply, "Oh yeah? And what is the position of this administration on busing north of the Potomac? What is it doing to see that upcountry citizens and schools are forced to swallow the same bitter dose that has been administered to southern schools?"

We anxiously await the answers.

#### CONGRESS SHALL MAKE NO LAW ABRIDGING THE FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

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

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Special Committee on Investigations, House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, has issued a subpoena for all used and unused material relating to their program, "The Selling of the Pentagon." I regret this action by the committee.

How CBS put its program together is simply none of our business.

We have a free press in this country, and I say, thank God for it. If it were not for obstreperous and uncooperative reporters such as Malcolm Browne, David Halberstam, and R. W. Apple, we would still be thinking everything in Vietnam was hunky-dory. Certainly we would never have heard the truth from the State or Defense Departments, or from the White House.

We all wish the news media would trumpet our virtues and help us sweep our faults under the rug. But we have no right to order the media to do so. The Constitution explicitly forbids it, and our national interest demands that we not do it. If we ever reach the stage in which the only truth is that proclaimed by the Government, one of the most important differences between us and the Soviet Union will have disappeared, and with it much of the reason for our national existence.

The media can certainly stand improvement. In my opinion, "The Selling of the Pentagon" was regrettably superficial, and in one case it distorted by quoting out of context. But it dramatized a basic point which its critics have not even attempted to refute: The Pentagon spends millions of the taxpayers' dollars to con the same taxpayers into shelling out more billions for bigger military appropriations.

Just as we politicians must submit ourselves to the electorate, so the media must submit themselves to the citizenry. If they do sloppy or prejudiced work, the people will look elsewhere for information. This mechanism, not Soviet-style government interference, is what we must rely on to keep the media honest and competent.

As I said a minute ago, I regret the issuance of the subpoena. I hope it will be dropped.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG VIETNAM VETERANS

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

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are no victory parades for the brave young Americans who served their country in Vietnam.

There are no bands, no flags, no bunting.

But there is unemployment, drug addiction, alienation.

This week I have been meeting with Vietnam veterans who are in Washington to lobby for an earlier end to the war. I have met at length with these young men, and we have had productive give-and-take sessions in which we talked and listened to one another.

Transcending the concern of these veterans for peace in Southeast Asia is their need to find a meaningful place for themselves in the America they return to from their service overseas.

They are concerned about the significantly higher rate of unemployment among Vietnam veterans compared to other groups of Americans.

Fifteen percent of all Vietnam veterans are unemployed. They must ignominiously apply for unemployment and welfare checks because there are no bonuses or 52-20 clubs in 1971 as there were in 1945.

They are concerned about their educational opportunities, especially the poor veterans. Thirty percent of our 5 million GI's are using the GI bill—but only 10 percent of the 1 million who are poor can afford to take advantage of school or job training because the bill does not cover the basic cost of tuition, room, board, and books at most private colleges in the country.

They are concerned about drug abuse which they all admitted was rampant among servicemen. One veteran, being treated on an ambulatory basis at a VA hospital in New York said drugs are sold openly by pushers to patients in the hospital. They told me of the depression, fear, and frustration in the war that leads to drug use. And once they are addicted, rather than receiving humane treatment from the Government, they are treated as criminal offenders and given dishonorable discharges.

They are concerned about the thousands of veterans who are injured and require care in VA hospitals. They are sent to these overcrowded hospitals where they often wait for months for artificial limbs and other long-range care.

These are the things these veterans are really worried about—no jobs, no education, no treatment for mental and physical handicaps which are their dividends from the war. They have returned home like no other veterans in our long

history—tantamount to a release into limbo.

This is a far cry from the days when returning veterans received noisy welcomes from a grateful Nation.

Mr. Speaker. It is time for America to face its responsibility to her sons who have served in this war. For whatever one may think of the American effort in Vietnam, we must recognize that veterans of this war are entitled to every bit as much gratitude, assistance, and compensation as veterans of past wars.

And they are not getting it.

I call on my colleagues to look beyond the encampment on the mall and into the hearts and minds of these abandoned Americans. They have served well—many say they are the finest fighting men America has ever produced, and they have served in a difficult and frustrating war.

They need our help.

They need our help in the speedy passage of a comprehensive military drug bill to provide for medical discharges for addicts, followed by civil commitment to a program of meaningful rehabilitation, treatment, and aftercare.

They need our help in the passage of an across-the-board increase in the educational benefits available to GI's.

They need our help in the adequate expansion of VA hospital facilities to treat each and every veteran in the most comprehensive and up-to-date manner possible.

And they need our help in expanding the Federal effort to provide the one thing they want and need the most—meaningful jobs which afford them a decent standard of living with dignity and pride.

This is why these veterans are in Washington and I intend to do all I can to help them.

And I ask Members to join me in giving these GI's, not a handout, but the rewards they deserve for having honorably served their country.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S "LEGACY OF PARKS" PROGRAM

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

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on March 24, 1971, in a speech on the House floor, I voiced my concern with the "fragmented Federal approach" to the funding of our cities' summer park and recreation programs. I would today like to discuss an even more basic problem in this most important area.

With the exception of the model cities program, every Federal recreation program is facility oriented. There are no dollars available in these programs for leadership and operation. I think it is safe to say that indications are not bright that such funds will be available in future plans. I make specific reference to the President's "legacy of parks" program. It is no secret that America's cities are finding it extremely difficult to get the necessary dollars to accommodate

the 50-50 matching fund requirement of the present facility-oriented programs. I believe that documentation for this can be found in the fact that perennially there are unexpended funds at the Federal level at the end of the fiscal year. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, park and recreation department budgets are usually among the first to be considered for a decrease when cities are in a financial bind. However, they are often the first services to be called upon to assist local authorities to ease the pain of civil disorders.

I have always supported and will continue to support and encourage the Federal park effort; but if parks are to make people more effective citizens, then funds will have to be made available to provide the leadership to conduct programs in those parks and in other recreation areas that meet the needs and preferences of the local citizens. In order to do this, local departments will have to have supplementary funds on an on-going basis to provide the programs. With this in mind, I am currently in the process of drafting various amendments to several existing laws which will hopefully go far to remedy this situation.

Mr. Speaker, responsiveness to total urban recreation needs will not be accomplished through the President's "legacy of parks" approach alone, but only through the massive infusion of programs and services geared to meet the needs and preferences of the disadvantaged. Facilities alone are not the answer—facilities together with meaningful programs are.

#### PUTTING AN END TO HUNGER IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, on May 6, 1969, President Nixon publicly committed his administration and the Nation to "putting an end to hunger in America for all time." Today, less than 2 years later, incredible progress has been made in pursuit of this objective.

At the time of the President's message, there were 440 counties in this country without a family food assistance program—today there are only nine. Those participating in the commodity distribution or the food stamp programs now number 13.6 million—an increase of almost 6 million over last year and an even larger increase over the year before. Similarly, 2 million more youngsters now receive free or reduced price school lunches than did in the previous year.

Certainly, the President and those members of his administration responsible for this great achievement deserve our wholehearted commendation. I am including in the RECORD today an article by Jeffrey Hart which appeared in the Indianapolis Star on February 17, 1971. Mr. Hart's analysis goes to the heart of the hunger issue and demonstrates the

ever-present dichotomy between the men of action and the men of words.

The article follows:

#### MEN OF CONCERN? HUNGER IN AMERICA— AND POLITICS (By Jeffrey Hart)

Flash. The Nixon administration, it appears, is well on the way to solving what by anyone's definition constitutes the problem of hunger in America. You may not remember it, but only about a year and a half ago hunger was Awfully Big. There was even a major White House Conference on the subject, which made headlines by vociferously declaring that hunger was widespread in America. Whereas FDR, in the depths of the Depression, had claimed that only one-third of the nation was "ill-fed," by 1970 we were hearing that one-third or even one-half of the nation was "hungry." The drum began to beat. Starvation in the midst of affluence. One more instance of America's depravity and the bankruptcy of the System.

Senator George McGovern led the wave of enlistments in the Hungerian cause, becoming a sort of Mr. Hunger for the first quarter of 1970. Paperbacks on hunger poured from the presses. You will not believe it, but I vouch for the fact: one New York travel agency actually advertised an Appalachian Vacation. Those who were bored with Acapulco and the south of France could now spend 10 days on the hunger scene, maybe eating grits and deer meat. In this way, they might accumulate enough anecdotes to get through an entire cocktail party season.

But now it develops that the Nixon administration, without much fanfare at all, has, in fact, moved massively to pass out a lot of food. In New York City the number of people receiving food stamps, subsidized school lunches, and other forms of Federal nutritional aid has increased fourfold since President Nixon took office. In Pennsylvania, the number of Federally subsidized lunches has jumped from 25,000 per month two years ago to 2.8 million per month today. And these figures are not atypical.

Let us set aside the question of whether the Federal approach is the best one here. On the surface, at least, it would seem to be what the hunger chorus actually desired. But are they celebrating this Nixonian achievement? They are not. Of course, I know that the erstwhile Mr. Hunger has now become Mr. Lose the War, having very big things in mind. But what about all the others? Aren't they even interested in something like a solution?

The answer is no. And here I think we touch on something profound. For a certain kind of person, problems are much more interesting than solutions. And the reason is that the McGovern and all the other hunger warriors are not primarily concerned about hunger, really, and not about something so pedestrian as food. Rather, they desire to dramatize their capacity for concern itself. It is the dramatization that is all important. Therefore the hunger politician of 1969 can suddenly become the pollution politician of 1970. The whole idea is to set up the correct vibrations with a particular constituency. From this perspective, solutions, which usually involve tedious administrative measures and lots of boring routine, are of no interest whatsoever.

When you have watched this process go on for some time, you discern that it even has a quasi-religious dimension. Dramatizing concern, setting up the correct vibrations, establishes a politician as a Man of Good Will, one of the saved, a member of the moral elect—in contrast to the Others, the mere politicians and administrators. And no one needs to be told that Mr. Nixon hardly sets

up the correct vibrations. He merely seems to have solved the problem. And the Men of Concern, having gone on to other things, do not even care enough to notice it.

#### DISCHARGE PETITION FOR VIET- NAM DISENGAGEMENT

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

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that I have placed on the Clerk's desk a discharge petition on the Vietnam Disengagement Act of 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope my colleagues in the House will join me in an effort to bring this resolution to the floor of the House for debate and action at the earliest practicable date.

#### THE DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

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

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am delivering to you now a letter in which I protest and I express my great concern about the failure to hold a Democratic caucus this morning in the House of Representatives. As you know, this was to be one of the regularly scheduled monthly caucuses. At least nine resolutions were on the agenda. Some have been carried over from caucuses as far back as February. The resolutions deal with vital issues: The war in Vietnam, the President's freeze on appropriations enacted by Congress, procedures for considering appropriation bills, and others.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I called at 9 o'clock and was told that the hearing of my subcommittee had been canceled because of the caucus. At 9:45 I got a call back to my office from the staff of the Democratic caucus saying that there would be no votes in the caucus and that the committee hearings were going on. This meant that there would be no quorum because the Members would be attending hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest it is time that the Democratic leadership saw to it that the caucuses are held regularly. It is the duty of the leadership to see that committee business does not conflict with the caucus and to assure that Members' resolutions are brought up for full and fair consideration. If this is not done, there is not going to be any Democratic Party in this country.

I present for inclusion in the RECORD the text of my letter to the Speaker of the House.

APRIL 21, 1971.

HON. CARL ALBERT,  
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I want you to know of my very grave concern over what I consider to be the deliberate and malicious sabotage of today's Democratic caucus in the House of Representatives.

As you know, this was to be one of the regularly scheduled monthly caucuses. At least nine resolutions were on the agenda,



and some had been carried over from caucuses as far back as February. These resolutions dealt with vital issues—the war in Vietnam, the President's freeze on appropriations enacted by the Congress, procedures for considering appropriations bills, and others.

Early this morning we received indications that efforts were being made to prevent a quorum at the caucus. My staff and I made some calls and determined that representatives of the Democratic leadership were advising the committees to hold hearings because there would be no votes at the caucus. Inevitably, enough Members went to the committee hearings, there was no quorum at the caucus, and the caucus was cancelled.

Words really are insufficient to express my outrage over this. I have felt for some time that the lack of strong Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives was responsible for the absence of a Democratic legislative program and for the fact that our party seems always to be in the position of reacting to Republican initiatives, instead of being on the initiative ourselves. The lack of coordination has become apparent to the press and the public through such fiascos as the hurried scheduling of the social security legislation and the failure of either the Speaker, the Majority Leader or the Majority Whip to take any role in the recent efforts to increase appropriations for education.

Today marked the second time a Democratic caucus had to be canceled for lack of a quorum and the second time the caucus was deliberately sabotaged by the leadership. I don't feel the members will tolerate this any longer. I, for one, did not seek election to the House of Representatives to merely ratify whatever may be put in front of me by the party leadership. My constituents sent me to Washington to take an active role in shaping this nation's policies and programs and helping to move the Democratic Party in a direction truly responsive to national needs.

Unless the Democratic leadership accepts this and enables all members to take an active role in developing a party program, it should be replaced by Members who can spell democratic with a small "d".

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN BADILLO,  
Member of Congress.

#### WE MUST CURB TEXTILE IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, early in the 1960's we saw that many foreign countries began doubling, then tripling, then expanding even further their exports of cotton goods to the United States. Taking cognizance of their needs for dollars to pay for their imports from us, as well as the needs of domestic producers for protection from runaway import levels, after protracted negotiations we reached a long-term cotton agreement with the major exporters in which the total of all cotton textile imports was limited and limits to each of the categories of cotton manufactures set. We applied this LTA fairly to all cotton exporters, giving the foreign nations a fair percentage of our consumer market and even allowing a decent percentage increase over the years. We believed that we had achieved a fair competitive market for foreigners and one in which our domestic producers could meet the competition by reorganizing themselves, by adopting innovative procedures, by installing new machinery, and, generally,

by producing more per manhour so as to meet the low-cost foreign imports.

The system worked well for a couple of years, till suddenly we found that we had been outwitted and outmaneuvered in our domestic textile market.

We have extended the life of the LTA. Other nations abided by the terms for cotton textiles. But what they also did was to shift their attention to other textiles, such as wool and artificial fibers, and apparel made of these two types of fibers and swamp our markets in these fields. The American Textile Manufacturers Association saw the new trend, started warnings against this new takeover of an ever-increasing percentage of our total textile market and asked not only that discussions be initiated on a private basis but also on governmental account, and that adjustment assistance be granted those domestic firms seriously injured by excessive imports of like or competitive textile products.

Discussions with private exporters overseas failed dismally. The argument was made that there was no agreement on textile goods other than on cotton, that there were no prohibitions in our tariff laws and customs procedures against imports of wool and artificial fiber textiles or on apparel made of these two types of fibers, and, lastly, that any prohibition against such imports might be a contravention of the principles of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT. This latter implication might lead to a trade war, or retaliation against our exports, or also appeals for damages against our curtailment of specific exports to us.

On a government-to-government basis our Secretary of Commerce went personally to various continental countries with a face-to-face confrontation with governmental leaders about the excessive amount of textiles exported by their countries to the United States. A personal visit to Japan, Taiwan, and South Korea resulted in an equally frustrating refusal to compromise or even consider any type of governmental influence to discourage their excessive exports. The Japanese went even further by claiming that their textile exports were not really injuring our total domestic textile industry and that our manufacturers were merely trying to safeguard an excessive percentage of our domestic market for their own benefit. However, as a face-saving device they did send a textile mission to discuss textiles with our State Department. No substantive result as to curbing textile exports to the United States came about as a result of their talks.

As we all know the whole textile import problem rapidly worsened. So large was the amount coming in during late 1969 and all during 1970 that many of our textile mills simply had to shut down and tens of thousands of textile workers joined the ranks of the unemployed. This is the situation as it obtains today with continued stories of mills closing or curtailing production and workers being laid off.

As a result of the injurious effect of excessive textile imports and in accordance with the relief procedures of the 1962 Trade Expansion Act many textile unions asked for adjustment assistance. Finally,

toward the end of 1970 the Tariff Commission has at last certified to the President that certain groups of workers are entitled to assistance from the Department of Labor and some mills to help from the Department of Commerce. But this is not the whole story, since too many mills have closed their doors and too many workers have been laid off.

What is of concern to me is the fact that we in the House were so concerned about this unequal import competition in respect of textiles, shoes, electronics, and a few other strategic commodities that we passed a fair import quota bill last year under which imports would be restricted to a specific percentage of our yearly consumption. As you know, the President and his administration supported this bill, but it was not passed in the Senate.

On January 22 of this year the bill was introduced again with the same provisions for import quotas on all textiles and shoes and any other commodity injuriously affected by excessive imports. I subscribe heartily to these provisions.

But what has happened during the last few weeks?

The President has striven hard to get some kind of voluntary contraction of textile exports from Japan. He felt that if such negotiations could not succeed then the only recourse to cutting imports would be an import quota bill. As you know the Japanese as the largest exporters were obdurate in their denials of voluntary agreements for their own people. Just how far the Japanese Ministry of Imports and the Japanese textile manufacturers have an interrelated agreement I do not know, but it seems that at last they have agreed to curb their total textile exports in 1971 to the 1970 total plus 5 percent, the 1972 exports to the 1970 total plus 6 percent and the 1973 exports to the 1970 total plus 6 percent. This is their latest offer made to Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee.

The President and the administration have announced that this so-called concession is unacceptable. The whole textile industry has denounced this accommodation. The AFL-CIO has come out for a quota bill. And I am certain that all Members with textile plants in their districts will disavow approval of such an offer.

I am against this kind of an offer. It does not meet the problem of injurious imports at all. It merely continues the injury. It does not have any offsetting feature since the American taxpayer must still foot the bill for adjustment assistance while the Japanese increase their exports. Nor does it tackle the problem of imports from South Korea, Hong Kong, and Taiwan; nor imports from Europe.

No, the problem is still with us.

In 1970 we imported 4 billion square yards of all types of textiles with a value of \$2.4 billion. This was 11 percent more than in 1969 which already was a banner year. In 1970 we exported less than \$800 million worth of textiles leaving us with a textile trade deficit of \$1.6 billions. Unless something definite is done soon, the same deficit will obtain in 1971.

The textile industry is concentrated here in our Southeast in Tennessee, the

Carolinas, Alabama, and Georgia with around 550,000 people employed in the industry apart from apparel production. Yet, in our region 57 plants have gone out of business in North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, we have been told lately that we might not have a 1971 trade bill unless the Japanese so-called voluntary agreement is made part of that bill. The facts show that their offer is unacceptable to us. They are staying in business and expanding their exports to us by 5 percent at our expense. The time has come to look after our own. Foreign textile exporting countries have full employment and are getting rich at the expense of our own textile workers. Our textile industry insists that an import quota by category in cotton, wool, and artificial fibers is the only solution toward fair and reasonable competition. To this end I shall keep on raising my voice because it is the only fair remedy open to us. I trust that this question will remain open and that such an import bill will be passed soon.

#### TAKE PRIDE IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDWARDS of California). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today we should take note of America's great accomplishments and in so doing renew our faith and confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation.

The 1960's was the decade when illiteracy in this country was halved. Only 1 in 100 persons 14 years and older was unable to read and write. The Census Bureau, which is authority for these statements, says that in the years from 1959 to 1969 the total of persons unable to read or write declined from 2.6 million to 1.4 million.

Illiteracy declined among all ethnic groups. In 1969, the illiterate rate for whites 14 and over was seven-tenths of 1 percent, for blacks 3.6 percent. At the start of the decade, the rates were 1.6 percent for whites and 7.5 percent for minority groups, including blacks. About 45 percent of all illiterates in 1969 were 65 or over.

Literacy is a key that opens the doors to opportunity, as everyone knows. That fact has probably done more than any other to reduce the rate of illiteracy in this country.

#### "THE SECOND FRONT OF THE VIETNAM WAR": COMMUNIST SUBVERSION IN THE PEACE MOVEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHMITZ) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, this April and May, the American people are once again being subjected to the spectacle of mass demonstrations against our involvement in Southeast Asia as two ma-

jo Communist-led coalitions try to manipulate and exploit the legitimate concerns of sincere peace advocates, subverting them to the perhaps unwitting service of the propaganda requirements of Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow.

These two coalitions are the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice—PCPJ—led primarily by Communist activists, and the National Peace Action Coalition—NPAC—tightly controlled by the Trotskyist Communist Socialist Workers Party.

The Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice is a direct successor to the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, which was the subject of intensive investigation by the House Committee on Internal Security during 1969 and 1970; as a result of this investigation, the HCIS concluded in its annual report for 1970 that New Mobe was under Communist domination.

The National Peace Action Coalition is also a successor to New Mobe, representing the Trotskyist-led faction which formed its own organization in June 1970 because of disagreement with New Mobe's increasing emphasis on multi-issue protests rather than on the single-issue mass mobilizations centered around a demand for withdrawal from Vietnam, the strategy traditionally favored by the Trotskyists.

Though split as to strategy, the PCPJ and NPAC managed to achieve unity on the April 24 Washington and San Francisco marches, a unity which was a direct result of an urgent appeal from Xuan Thuy, chief North Vietnamese Communist representative at the Paris peace talks.

Furthermore, despite their tactical differences, both coalitions are as one in their determination to see the immediate and total withdrawal of American forces from Southeast Asia. The leadership of both the PCPJ and NPAC, as shown by their public statements of belief and purpose, is determinedly pro-Hanoi and pro-Vietcong—and militantly anti-American.

Mr. Speaker, today it is my purpose, with the aid of my distinguished colleagues Mr. ZION from Indiana and Mr. THOMPSON from Georgia, to try to put before this House such information as we have been able to assemble on the Communist background of these demonstrations. We will present a detailed history of the anti-Vietnam war movement, especially from September 1966 to the present time, so that our colleagues in the House, as well as the entire American people, may be informed as to the identities of those who operate behind the scenes to organize and control the direction of major antiwar protest in this country.

It is our fervent hope that all who read and assimilate this information will be made aware that this is not simply innocent protest, that this is instead part and parcel of a well-organized and viciously conceived international Communist-led campaign to hamstring the United States and destroy our will to

resist Communist aggression, not only in Vietnam but around the world.

We do not say that all who endorse or otherwise participate in these demonstrations are Communists. That would be manifestly unfair, obviously. But we do say that the evidence is overwhelming that those who operate, often behind the scenes, to set the policies are all too often Communists and others whose interests and sympathies are quite obviously inimical to our country's security. The guiding geniuses, if you will, are not simply home-grown pacifists. Rather, they are partisans of Hanoi, people who believe that they must act in concert to promote a communist victory in Vietnam to humiliate the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now proceed to set before this House information on the historical background of Communist activity in the peace movement so that we may set the stage for the detailed accumulation of evidence that will be presented by my colleagues and myself as we progress:

#### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE UNITED FRONT AGAINST THE WAR A. GENERAL

The use of "peace" as a propaganda weapon and peace groups as organizational instruments to promote that theme has been one of the most successful ingredients in the communist propaganda assault on the West. However, as the phenomenon of light cannot be understood without an appreciation of darkness, so also the so-called "peace program" of the communists must be viewed within the whole context of their policies on revolution and the circumstances of war in which communist nations are or may be faced.

Historically—and skillfully—the communists have whipped up a clever mix of peace-and-war propaganda which invariably finds the communist and the "Capitalists" four-square in the "peace-loving" and "war-mongering" camps, respectively. Until the day that the "dictatorship of the proletariat" has won the world, communists and capitalists, when scrambled and tossed, will inevitably plop back within the camp of peace and the camp of war. Since Marxism-Leninism has preordained that history says it is so, communists from 1917 to date have worked feverishly to make it so.

Firm in the belief that they can fool all the people all the time, the communists have adroitly masqueraded their military offensives behind a defensive posture of "peace." In so doing "peace" became a weapon of war because its object was to disarm the opposition materially and psychologically. On other occasions it has been used to gain time to preserve or to strengthen an achievement. The record speaks for itself, and the record of communist achievements has not been unsuccessful.

What do communists really mean by the term "peace"? Although Lenin developed the Aesopian language of communism, in times of intense political or military stress he dropped all pretense at



double-talk. For example, in April 1916, Lenin had written that "every peace programme" was a deception of the people and a "piece of hypocrisy" unless its principal object was to explain to the masses the need for a revolution and to support, aid, and develop the revolutionary struggle of the masses. From that time until his successful palace coup of November 1917, Lenin tirelessly promoted revolution against both antagonists in World War I, including Russia, Germany, France, etc. Friend or foe, all were "capitalist" nations.

Lenin's peace program was immediately resurrected after his revolutionary takeover in Russia for the purpose of salvaging the first nation to fall under communism. He did this by signing a peace treaty with Germany which, according to the Seventh Congress of his party, was necessary in order to withdraw before a stronger enemy, to gain the necessary reprieve to put the economy in order, and to create a new worker-peasant army capable of defending the country against the onslaught of imperialism. Instead, he subsequently used the new Red Army to conquer nonimperialist territories which now comprise huge portions of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.). The army also attempted to invade neighboring countries, e.g., Poland, Finland, The Baltic Nations, etc., but there the Red Army failed.

Josef Stalin extended Lenin's peace-to-buy-time program, following the U.S.S.R.'s civil war and famine, and incurred the wrath of Leon Trotsky, who had opted for "permanent revolution" beginning in 1917 against the noncommunist world. The sores resulting from World War I, the revolution, mass liquidations, civil war, and famine still smarted when Stalin promoted the theme of "peaceful co-existence" at the 15th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). It was the task of communists to delay war by "buying off" the capitalists and to take all measures to maintain peaceful relations.

The next year, 1928, the first 5-year plan was adopted and the nation concentrated its whole being on building its heavy industry sector as a supportive base for the development of a modern military machine by which it hoped to achieve major nation status. But while the U.S.S.R. was restoring its agricultural base in the 1920's and its industry in the 1930's, its international activities had not remained idle in selling Russia's "peace-keeping" mission.

The Sixth World Congress of the Communist Third International (Comintern), held in 1928, resolved that the peace policy of the U.S.S.R. did not imply that the Soviet Union had become reconciled with capitalism. It was, the Comintern stated, merely another and—under present conditions—a more advantageous form of fighting capitalism—a form, the resolution declared, which the U.S.S.R. has constantly employed since the revolution of 1917. Candidly, it concluded, the revolutionary war of the proletariat—that is, the party—dictatorship

was but a continuation of the revolutionary peace policy by other means.

At the Seventh World Congress of the Comintern of 1935, held but a short time after the U.S.A. rendered diplomatic recognition to the U.S.S.R. in exchange for a Soviet promise to cease its subversive hanky-panky, Otto Kuusinen, executive committee member of the Comintern, and central committee member of the CPSU, addressed the group on the subject of "Youth and Fascism." In calling for a broad international revolutionary youth front, he cited the successful achievements of the young "comrades" in America and France as examples to be emulated.

After urging his international audience to "invite pacifist youth organizations to join the united front," Kuusinen, at his dialectical best, said that youth should be reminded of Lenin's instructions:

You will be given a gun. Take it and learn well the art of war. This is necessary for the proletarians \* \* \* in order to fight against the bourgeoisie of your own country, in order to put an end to \* \* \* war, not by good intentions, but by a victory over the bourgeoisie and by disarming them.

If our parties' youth carry on the fight against war in this spirit, there can be no doubt that in a number of countries the counter-revolutionary imperialist war will lead to revolution \* \* \*.

What the Comintern-CPSU official had in mind, when he urged youth and pacifists to fight in this fashion against war, would soon be realized the following year when civil war broke out in Spain. The Comintern organized, trained, and armed thousands of young "peace-loving" combatants from all over the world, including 3,000 from the U.S. alone, of whom at least two-thirds were communists. The usual complement of Soviet "advisers"—sans troops—were also in evidence.

The most noteworthy use of "peace" as a ruse was the classroom classic use to which it was put by the U.S.S.R. prior to and shortly after the outbreak of World War II when the Kremlin's frequent zig-zag tactics tested even the most devout communist.

In early 1939, the Kremlin and the CPUSA switched from their united-front peace line to a prowar theme. They attacked American isolationism and called for the most active participation by the U.S. in a world struggle against Nazi Germany. But the same year, in August 1939, following the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pacts, the CPUSA quickly resurrected its peace line in order to "keep America out of the imperialist's war"—and thereby permit the CPSU-Nazi duet to share, uncontested, the war spoils in Poland and other areas of Northern Europe.

It is instructive to note here that while the Communist Party of the Soviet Union made war in Europe it directed its puppet, the CPUSA, to "make peace" in America, which took the form of strikes against defense facilities, demonstrations, etc.

Following Germany's attack on the U.S.S.R. in June 1941, the CPUSA's former peace-war-peace line abruptly

switched for the third time during which it called upon the U.S. to declare war on Germany immediately and to send military aid to the U.S.S.R. Soon thereafter strikes against defense plants were considered treasonable in the eyes of the party.

Khrushchev, whom some considered more peacelike than Stalin, promoted the peace-peaceful coexistence theme more than had his predecessor. However, in 1955 he reportedly stated in a speech in Warsaw:

We must realize that we cannot coexist eternally, or for a long time. One of us must go to the grave. We do not want to go to the grave. They do not want to go to the grave either. So what can be done? We must push them to their grave.

Kommunist, official publication of the CPSU, stated in 1960 on the related questions of peace and peaceful coexistence, "there can be no doubt that the strengthening of peace and peaceful coexistence is a factor which favors the expansion of the liberation movement [i.e., wars of national liberation] and the activation of the class war [i.e., revolutionary civil war] in the capitalist countries.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover wrote that with the communist weapon of peaceful coexistence, the communists hoped to lull the free world, especially the United States, into a false sense of security. It means of buying time, he said, to consolidate past gains while probing for soft spots in the free world which present opportunities for future expansion.

#### B. INTERNATIONAL "PEACE" MACHINERY

The Kremlin's major international communist fronts created to market its peace product are the World Peace Council (WPC) and the World Peace Congresses. The WPC was conceived in Paris in 1949 at a meeting of the First World Peace Congress. It was formalized at the Second World Peace Congress in Warsaw in 1950. WPC claimed a membership from 120 countries and territories. Expelled by the French Government for "fifth column" activities, the Council moved to Prague and finally to Vienna in 1954. It was banned in 1957 by the Austrian Government on the grounds that its activities were "directed against" the interests of the state of Austria.

The World Peace congresses were cited in 1951 by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as having been "organized under Communist initiative" in various countries throughout the world as part of a campaign against NATO. However, its greatest moment was realized when it organized the World Peace Appeal (known as the Stockholm Peace Petition against the Korean War) launched 3 months before communism's armed aggression against an ill-prepared South Korea. HCUA stated that the peace appeal, which was a worldwide drive for signatures and the most extensive campaign of psychological warfare even conducted on a world scale, was obviously intended to smokescreen that aggression.

The Kremlin-controlled Cominform,

through the WPC, exercised direct global supervision of this communist "peace" campaign while the CPUSA directed the program in the United States.

#### C. DOMESTIC COMMUNIST "PEACE" MOVEMENTS

1. The American League Against War and Fascism, organized in the U.S. in 1933, was a domestic offshoot of the World Congress Against War held in Amsterdam in August 1932 under the chairmanship of the well-known French communist, Henri Barbusse. The league was characterized by Attorney General Francis Biddle as an organization established "to create public sentiment in behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union." Its stated objectives were (a) to stop the manufacture and transport of munitions and all other materials essential to the conduct of war; (b) to support the peace policies of the Soviet Union; (c) and to win the Armed Forces to the support of this program.

2. The American League for Peace and Democracy, cited as the (then) largest communist "front" movement in the U.S. by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, was created in 1937 as a successor to the above-mentioned group. Earl Browder was its vice-president. It succeeded the League Against War and Fascism following a change in the international line adopted at the Seventh Comintern Congress, which had called for a united front of "peace-loving" nations. It was itself replaced following another switch in the international line which was called for by the signing of the Stalin-Hitler (Molotov-Ribbentrop) Pact in August 1939.

3. The American Peace Mobilization, cited as "one of the most seditious organizations" ever to operate in the U.S. by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, was formed in 1940 under the auspices of the Communist Party, U.S.A. Its function was to protest lend-lease, conscription, and the national defense program. Its main objective was to mold public opinion against participation in the war against Nazi Germany—then bedfellowed with the U.S.S.R. Shortly after Germany invaded the Soviet Union, but only long enough to regroup under a new title, the group was terminated.

4. The American People's Mobilization, organized in the summer of 1941, reversed all the policies of its predecessor and came forth with a program favoring complete support for the U.S.S.R., China, and Great Britain. When, following V-J Day in August 1945, the U.S.S.R. no longer needed the United States of America, the party line again became anti-U.S.A. and the name of the group changed as well.

5. The Win the Peace Conference (Congress) was organized in 1946 to conduct peace activities during the period of the cold war. Its major purpose was to crystallize support behind the presidential candidacy of Henry A. Wallace, the Progressive Citizens of America, which later absorbed the group, and the Progressive Party. The National Committee To Win the Peace was cited as a com-

munist subversive group by Attorney General Tom Clark.

6. In addition to the above general or mass appeal peace groups, the CPUSA assigned "peace" functions on occasion to its specialized organizations including:

(a) The Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, organized in March 1949, which was a "supermobilization" of the inveterate supporters of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and its auxiliary organizations. Cited as a communist front by the HCUA, its function was characterized as mobilizing American intellectuals in the field of arts, sciences, and letters to provide a propaganda forum for Soviet foreign policy and Soviet "culture" and to prepare the way for the World Peace Congress to be held, as previously noted, in Paris. Additionally, it would also attack the Marshall Plan, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, U.S. foreign policy, and American culture.

(b) The National Labor Conference for Peace was organized in Chicago in October 1949. Communist-controlled unions and communist labor figures played an important role in this peace activity by waging an incessant propaganda campaign on behalf of the Soviet Union, including activities against the Atlantic Pact nations, and the U.S. foreign aid program. Meanwhile it promoted Soviet plans for settling the Korean war and for seating Red China in the United Nations.

(c) The American Youth for a Free World, a U.S. affiliate of the communist international front—the World Federation of Democratic Youth—and so characterized by the HCUA, was also swept into the communist "peace" program.

7. The Committee for United States Participation in the American Continental Congress for Peace was formed as a section of the American Continental Congress for Peace, a group organized in Mexico City in September 1949. Its purpose was to consolidate anti-American forces throughout the Western Hemisphere. Two American vice presidents in the parent body were Linus Pauling and W. E. B. DuBois, both of whom were identified in 1952 by Louis Budenz, former CPUSA leader, as secret members of the Communist Party. The parent body was characterized by the HCUA as "another phase in the communist 'peace' campaign."

8. The American Peace Crusade was organized in February 1951, as a communist-front organization according to the subversive Activities Control Board. The Board found that the APC was operated primarily under the management and direction of members of the CPUSA. Under the guise of promoting peace, it actually promoted the program of the Communist Party U.S.A.

The communists' massive expenditure of energy and resources on "peace" and "peace-front" activities especially observed after the November revolution of 1917, during the united-front period of the thirties, during the Stalin-Hitler Pact period, following Germany's defeat in World War II, and just before and during

the Korean war, would not be seen again—at least on this scale—until the decision was made in Washington to assist South Vietnam against the military aggressions of communist North Vietnam.

During the mid-1960's there was a serious resurgence of communist "peace" activity as opposition to the Vietnam war mounted and a wide variety of pacifist and communist organizations staged demonstrations throughout the United States; but a true national emphasis was not achieved until the April 17, 1965, SDS-sponsored march on Washington, a demonstration that encompassed nearly every significant pacifist and subversive group in the country. This was the first real attempt to gather all opposition to the war into a single united-front type of activity, although a certain amount of opposition to the participation of communists was attempted by some of the more traditional peace-oriented groups.

The first national coordinating agency for the developing anti-Vietnam war movement, however, was the National Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam, founded in August 1965 as a result of discussions held during the Assembly of Unrepresented People in Washington, D.C. The NCCEWV included in its ranks a number of organizations, both communist and non-communist, on the basis of the united front strategy. The NCCEWV steering committee included representatives of various committees to end the war in Vietnam, many of which had been formed largely under the aegis of the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance, as well as such prominent movement leaders as Dave Dellinger, a self-professed non-Soviet communist; Arnold Johnson, the Communist Party, U.S.A.'s official representative in the peace movement; Irving Berlin, an employee of the independent communist newsweekly Guardian and representative of New York's Lower East Side Mobilization for Peace Action; and Jerry Rubin, representative of the Vietnam Day Committee in California.

Trotskyist participation in the NCCEWV was significant, as it has been throughout the anti-Vietnam war movement. The Minnesota Committee to End the War in Vietnam, for example, was represented by YSA member Larry Seigle, while the Philadelphia Area Committee to End the War in Vietnam was officially represented by Robin Maisel, also a member of the YSA.

The NCCEWV was directed by Frank Emspak, son of deceased Communist Party, U.S.A., member Julius Emspak. Frank Emspak, who indicated interest in trying to unite the peace movement with civil rights groups, was himself no stranger to CPUSA-oriented activity. For example, during the 1964-1965 academic year, Emspak was president of the Wisconsin Socialist Club, a group organized in 1957 by two members of the Labor Youth League, a now-defunct Communist Party youth organization. Emspak also attended meetings of the CPUSA-organized W.E.B. DeBois Clubs of America during this period.



One of the NCCCEWV's major activities was the organizing of the International Days of Protest on March 25-26, 1966, with demonstrations held in cities throughout the United States. These demonstrations were characterized by major Communist involvement.

The most significant of the demonstrations was held on March 26 in New York City under the auspices of the Communist-dominated Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, a broad-based united front group whose steering committee at that time included members of such organizations as the Communist Party, Socialist Workers Party, and Progressive Labor Party. Along the more than 20,000 demonstrators were more than 50 members of the CPUSA, along with numerous members of the SWP, PLP, Workers World Party, and Youth Against War and Fascism, youth arm of the WWP.

In Chicago, an estimated 2,600 demonstrators were led by a contingent of members of Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, an organization formed by Communist Party member LeRoy Wolins. At the University of Wisconsin, CPUSA national committee member Herbert Aptheker was among the speakers, while Dorothy Healey, at that time chairman of the Communist Party's Southern California District, was the featured speaker at a Los Angeles teach-in on March 25, attended by an estimated 3,000 people.

Toward the end of 1966, the NCCCEWV declined as a direct result of a struggle between the adherents of the Communist Party, advocating multi-issue demonstrations, and those of the SWP, who advocated a single-issue mass mobilization approach geared solely to demands for withdrawal from Vietnam. This struggle proved a portent of things to come.

The on-again, off-again "peace offensive"; by communist powers and their foreign affiliates from 1917 to date has been carefully calculated to correspond to those periods of military emergency when the U.S.S.R. or a "fraternal" member of the communist bloc had the most to gain—or lose—as a result of the outcome of that armed confrontation. As a "balanced" athletic team is evaluated by the skill with which it correlates its defensive and offensive capabilities, so might it be said of the communist movement, which synchronizes the defensive weapon of "peace" to disarm its opponent, with a full complement of offensive moves in the political, economic, cultural, and military sectors designed to ultimately overwhelm it.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague from Indiana, Mr. ZION, who will place into this RECORD data on the development of the November 8 Mobilization Committee, Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, three of the direct predecessors of the present-day Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice and National Peace Action Coalition.

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

Mr. Speaker, as the National Coordi-

nating Committee To End the War in Vietnam (NCC) was declining, certain key activists in the anti-Vietnam war movement were busy setting up the November 8 Mobilization Committee, a united front which proved far more durable than the NCC.

The November 8 Mobilization Committee was established as an ad hoc coalition at the National Leadership Conference of anti-war activists in Cleveland, Ohio, on September 10-11, 1966. This conference was of pivotal importance for two reasons: (1) it represented a resurgence of the united-front coalition strategy within the "peace" movement and (2) it established the basic pattern of communist participation that has remained characteristic of the Mobe throughout its evolution.

The official proceedings of the conference reflect that the idea for the gathering originated with the University Circle Teach-In Committee, a Cleveland antiwar group, and its chairman, Professor Sidney Morris Peck. Peck, who played a key role during and after conference, is a former member of the Wisconsin State Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and has a sustained record of affiliation with communist and communist-front organizations that leaves no doubt he has remained actively procommunist in his sympathies. Peck remains one of the most influential and prominent leaders in the activist portion of the peace movement and is one of the guiding influences in the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice.

The conference was attended by approximately 150 delegates and observers from around the country, including the following:

(1) Stewart Meacham, a representative of the American Friends Service Committee;

(2) Ron Young, a representative of the pacifist Fellowship of Reconciliation;

(3) Sholem Lemovitz, representative of Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, a group founded in Chicago in 1966 by veteran Communist Party member LeRoy Wolins;

(4) Eric Reinthaler, member of the University Circle Teach-In Committee, former member of the CPUSA and more recently an active member of the Socialist Workers Party;

(5) Irving Beinlin, representative of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee and staff employee of the communist news weekly *Guardian*;

(6) Sidney Lens, leader in the Chicago Peace Council and onetime leader of the Revolutionary Workers League, cited as "subversive and Communist" by Attorney General Tom Clark in 1947 and 1948;

(7) James West, an Illinois member of the CPUSA;

(8) Jack Spiegel, an identified member of the CPUSA dominant leaders of the Chicago Peace Council;

(9) A. J. Muste, prominent pacifist and communist sympathizer who was described by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as a man "who has long fronted for Communists";

(10) Danny Luce, member of Youth

Against War and Fascism (YAWF), youth arm of the dissident Trotskyist Workers World Party;

(11) Anthony Seederly, member of YAWF;

(12) Otto Nathan, representative of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee and an identified Communist;

(13) Joel Myers, member of YAWF;

(14) Robert Greenblatt, an avowed supporter of the communist Viet Cong in South Vietnam;

(15) Rev. Richard Fernandez, director of Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, a group which has aided American deserters in Sweden;

(16) Hugh Fowler, leader in the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America, the official youth front for the CPUSA;

(17) Mike Stein, a New York member of the CPUSA;

(18) Edward Keating, publisher of the pro-Hanoi magazine *Ramparts*;

(19) Barbara Bick, a representative of Women Strike for Peace who was identified as a member of the CPUSA by two witnesses in sworn testimony before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1951 and 1953;

(20) Syd Stapleton, member of the SWP;

(21) Fred Halstead, staff employee of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee and prominent member of the SWP;

(22) Gus Horowitz, well-known member of the SWP;

(23) Larry Seigle, representative of the Minnesota Committee to End the War in Vietnam and prominent member of the Young Socialist Alliance, youth and training section of the SWP;

(24) Danny Rosenshine, a representative of the Cleveland Committee to End the War in Vietnam, which was largely controlled by the Socialist Workers Party, and a member of the YSA;

(25) Peter Buch, member of the SWP;

(26) Richard Lesnick, member of both the SWP and YSA;

(27) Robin Maisel, representative of the Philadelphia Committee to End the War in Vietnam and member of the YSA?

(28) David Wulp, a representative of the Chicago Peace Council and member of the SWP and YSA;

(29) Lynn Henderson, representative of the Chicago Peace Council and member of the SWP;

(30) Marcia Sweetenham, representative of the Cleveland Committee to End the War in Vietnam and member of the SWP and YSA;

(31) Linda Sheppard, representative of the Greater Boston Coordinating Committee to End the War in Vietnam and member of the SWP and YSA;

(32) Rachel Towne, a representative of the Cleveland Committee to End the War in Vietnam, member of the SWP, and writer for the SWP's official newspaper, *The Militant*;

(33) Douglas Jenness, member of both the SWP and YSA;

(34) Jack Barnes, member of the SWP;

(35) Lew Jones, member of the SWP and YSA;

(36) Frank Emspak, representative of

the National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Vietnam;

(37) David Frankel, Queens College SDS, member of the YSA;

(38) Charlie Bolduc, representative of the Minnesota Committee to End the War in Vietnam and member of the YSA;

(39) Harry Ring, prominent SWP leader;

(40) Joe Henry, representative of the Wayne State Committee to End the War in Vietnam and member of the YSA;

(41) Mareen Jasin, member of the YSA;

(42) Thomas Dennis, CPUSA member from Detroit;

(43) Evelyn Kirsch, member of the SWP and YSA;

(44) Barbara Gregorich, representative of the Cleveland Committee to End the War in Vietnam and writer for *The Militant*;

(45) John McCann, representative of the Cleveland Committee to End the War in Vietnam and member of the YSA;

(46) Ellen Robinson, representative of the Wayne State Committee to End the War in Vietnam and member of the SWP;

(47) Tom Bell, member of SOS from Ithaca, N.Y.;

(48) Jim Benton, SDS member from Michigan;

(49) Pete Brownlie, SDS member from MacAlistair College;

(50) Sidney Peck, representative of the University Circle Teach-In Committee and former member of the Wisconsin State Committee of the CPUSA;

(51) Louise Peck, representative of the University Circle Teach-In Committee and wife of Sidney Peck;

(52) Walter Kos, representative of the Detroit Committee to End the War in Vietnam and member of the YSA;

(53) Richard Hill, representative of the Chicago Committee to End the War in Vietnam and an organizer for the SWP;

(54) Eloise Nesecky, a YSA member from Boston;

(55) Jeff Powers, a YSA member from Ann Arbor, Mich.;

(56) Edward Heisler, representative of the Hyde Park [Chicago] Committee to End the War in Vietnam and member of the YSA;

(57) Eva Friedlander, representative of Chicago Women for Peace and member of the Communist Party;

(58) Ben Friedlander, representative of Chicago Voters for Peace, husband of Eva Friedlander, and member of the Communist Party;

(59) Sylvia Kushner, key leader in the Chicago Peace Council and member of the Communist Party.

Thus, of those registered for the conference to establish the coalition that eventually evolved into the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice and the National Peace Action Coalition, at least 10 have been identified as members of the Communist Party, U.S.A., or its former youth front, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, while no fewer than 30 have been identified as members of the

Socialist Workers Party or its youth front, the Young Socialist Alliance.

Other key groups represented, as shown by the above listing, were Students for a Democratic Society, which in 1965 had reversed its stated, but long-ignored, policy of excluding communists from membership; Youth Against War and Fascism, militant youth arm of the Workers World Party; the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, a key New York area coalition formed in 1965 and dominated by communists; and the Chicago Peace Council, a major area peace coalition which is controlled by members of the CPUSA.

Two people in the list stand out as particularly important in the subsequent evolution of the November 8 Mobe: Fred Halstead and Sylvia Kushner.

Halstead, SWP candidate for President in 1968, has long been one of the key members of the staff and administrative committee of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, which has functioned as the New York office for the Mobe and its successors, and has served as one of the chief organizers of the Parade Committee's major demonstrations. He has also held numerous key positions in the November 8, Spring, National, and New Mobilization Committees and serves today as a member of the steering committee of the Trotskyist-controlled, National Peace Action Coalition.

Mrs. Kushner, a member of the Illinois State Committee of the CPUSA, is the executive secretary of the Chicago Peace Council and controls the day-to-day operations of the CPC by virtue of her position as the CPC's office manager and chief spokesman. She is also one of the five CPUSA members—Kushner, Spiegel, Dorothy Hayes, and Ben and Eva Friedlander—who, in collaboration with Sidney Lens, control the executive committee of the Chicago Peace Council. These are positions of great significance because the Chicago Peace Council, like the Parade Committee in New York, is one of the most potent area peace coalitions in the country and because, again like the Parade Committee, its leadership causes it to function as a key vehicle for communist activity within the peace movement. Just as Halstead has been a primary leader of the Trotskyist faction in the Mobe and its successors, Kushner has been one of the predominant leaders of the anti-Trotskyist group, helping to guide the organization increasingly in the direction favored by the CPUSA. She is currently playing a major role in organizing the April and May activities of the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice.

Promotional literature circulated by the November 8 Mobilization Committee identified 34 people as members of the committee, including the following:

- (1) Barbara Bick;
- (2) Robert Greenblatt;
- (3) Sidney Peck;
- (4) Edward Keating;
- (5) Otto Nathan;
- (6) Carl Oglesby, former president of SDS;
- (7) Jack Spiegel;

(8) Herbert Aptheker, CPUSA theoretician and director of the American Institute for Marxist Studies, a front for the CPUSA;

(9) Sidney Lens;

(10) Franklin Alexander, chairman of the CPUSA's W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America and a member of the CPUSA;

(11) Fred Halstead;

(12) Lew Jones;

(13) Gus Horowitz;

(14) Father Philip Berrigan, S.S.J. convicted and jailed for destroying U.S. Government draft files.

(15) Staughton Lynd, a professor at Yale University; former member of the defunct CPUSA youth group, American Youth for Democracy; member of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America; and participant in an unauthorized trip to Hanoi with SDS founder Tom Hayden and CPUSA national committee member Herbert Aptheker;

(16) Deirdre Griswold, a key leader of YAWF who currently serves as a member of the national committee of YAWF's parent organization, the Workers World Party.

Most of the remaining committee members were people with records of support for communist fronts and causes.

The November 8 Mobilization Committee was created to organize mass mobilizations against the Vietnam war throughout the United States on November 5-8, 1966. It is significant that the national board of the Communist Party, U.S.A., gave full cooperation to the November 8 Mobe in this project.

One of the largest of the demonstrations was a November 5 rally in New York City. Among the participants—estimated to be as many as 20,000—were numerous members of the CPUSA, the Socialist Workers Party, and the Workers World Party. Signs carried during the rally included some that declared: "Defeat the U.S. Imperialists—Victory for NLF."

SWP member Judy White and CPUSA leader Herbert Aptheker were introduced to the crowd, and David Dellinger sent greetings from communist North Vietnam. Speakers included Sue Eanet of SDS; Grace Mora Newman, a member of the CPUSA; Leon J. Davis, a New York labor leader who has been a consistent supporter of CPUSA causes and who refused to tell a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor in 1948 whether he was in fact a member of the CPUSA; Alexander Evanoff, another prominent New York labor figure and supporter of CPUSA fronts and causes; and Pauline Rosen, a New York leader in Women Strike for Peace who attended a closed national convention of the CPUSA in New York in June 1966.

On November 26-27, 1966, the November 8 Mobilization Committee met again in Cleveland for its final conference. Of the 117 persons registered for this gathering, 75—approximately 65 percent—were members of the SWP or its youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance, including SWP national committee member Fred Halstead and SWP/YSA member Kipp



Dawson. The National Coordinating Committee To End the War in Vietnam was represented by Frank Emspak. National committee members Arnold Johnson and James West represented the CPUSA, and the DuBois Clubs were represented by their executive secretary, Hugh Sterling Fowler.

Speakers at the conference included A. J. Muste, prominent peace activist Dr. Benjamin Spock, and David Dellinger. According to The Militant for December 5, 1966. "The conference was deeply moved when Dave Dellinger reported on his visit to North Vietnam and described the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people to U.S. aggression and the need for the American antiwar movement to emulate their inspiring example."

RECONSTITUTING THE UNITED FRONT: THE SPRING MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The primary result of the November 26-27 conference was a resolution by the November 8 Mobilization Committee to reconstitute itself as the Spring Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam and to concentrate on organizing mass protests against the Vietnam war on April 15, 1967:

In view of the opposing need for new initiatives and *nation-wide coordination* of activity to achieve peace, the November 5-8 Mobilization Committee hereby [sic] constitutes itself on a more formal basis as the Spring Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam.

The Mobilization Committee shall consist of those members and officers who are currently sponsors of the November 5-8 Mobilization Committee and those who designate their willingness to continue in that role, as well as such others as the Committee itself shall add to its ranks under procedures established in September. In addition to the present leadership there shall be designated by this meeting four Vice-Chairmen (Dave Dellinger, Sidney Peck, Robert Greenblatt, and Ed Keating), to assist in guidance and leadership, under the direction of the current Chairman, A. J. Muste. \* \* \*

The Mobilization Committee shall be charged with organizing a national action April 15, 1967 in San Francisco and New York, with the details to be worked out by the committee at its executive meetings.

The Mobilization Committee shall be charged with suggesting, stimulating and/or organizing such actions of a more limited and more localized nature as may be feasible, *with the aim of broadening the influence of the peace movement as much as possible, as long as these actions clearly fall within the consensus reached by the diverse viewpoints of this conference.* \* \* \*

The Mobilization Committee will seek to make the April 15 action an international one.

The Mobilization Committee shall also seek to *widen the movement* into such localities and professional milieux, including, but not limited to, labor, literary, military, civil rights, traditional peace groups, religious, electoral, as are not presently organized or which need our organizational assistance. [Emphasis added.]

This resolution was clearly an expression of the desire of Mobe's leadership to maintain the coalition on as broad a basis as possible, to make more nearly permanent the united front against the war by supplying nationwide coordination under continuing leadership, as well as by attempting to involve a wider range of groups in the movement by achieving agreement on fundamental issues around

which all competing tendencies could unite and organize.

It should further be noted that this continuing leadership was of a distinctly pro-Hanoi cast: Edward Keating, publisher of Ramparts magazine; Dave Dellinger, a self-professed communist who has traveled to Hanoi and who has maintained close contact with the Vietnamese communist leadership; Sidney M. Peck, who has traveled to North Vietnam and who has declared himself to be in favor of a communist victory in Vietnam; and Robert Greenblatt, who traveled to Hanoi and has also maintained extremely close contacts with international communist elements.

Among the 40 people who were listed as sponsors on the text of the resolution to reconstitute the November 8 Mobe at the November 26-27 conference were the following key movement activists: Bick, Peck, Spiegel, Nathan and Arnold Johnson, all of whom have been identified at various times as members of the CPUSA; Muste; Keating and Greenblatt; Paul Booth and Carl Oglesby, both associated with SDS; Frank Emspak of the National Coordinating Committee; Hugh Fowler and Prof. Staughton Lynd, both members of the DuBois Clubs; Sid Lens; Horowitz, Dawson, Halstead, and Lew Jones, all members of the SWP; Deirdre Griswold of YAWF; and Stokely Carmichael, chairman of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC). Carmichael was one of the principal architects of the alliance between SNCC and the Movement for Puerto Rican Independence (MPI). MPI was described by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as one of "the three leading pro-Communist organizations of Puerto Rico."

On November 27, 1966, the temporary steering committee for the Spring Mobilization met in Cleveland. The official minutes list 19 people as present. Of this number, six were members of the SWP or YSA: Peter Buch, Kipp Dawson, Fred Halstead, Gus Horowitz, Lew Jones, and Robin Maisel. Also present were Jack Spiegel, Otto Nathan, DuBois Clubs leader Hugh Fowler, Sidney Peck, and Arnold Johnson, in addition to Joan Levinson, a New Yorker who has served as an official of the Freedom and Peace Party of New York State, a front for the CPUSA.

The above rosters of active participants in Mobe affairs point to one of the cardinal precepts observed from the first by the Mobe leadership: the principle of nonexclusion. Among the Mobe leadership group, A. J. Muste, who served as chairman and chief unifying force until his death in February 1967, was perhaps most forceful in arguing for nonexclusion, which meant simply that Communists were to be welcomed into the coalition on an equal basis with non-Communists. Muste emphasized repeatedly that anticommunism should never in any sense become a part of Mobe doctrine or practice. In an article in the December 19, 1966, issue of Mobilizer, Spring Mobe's official voice, Muste made the following revealing observation:

In practice a non-Communist coalition is in danger of becoming an anti-Communist one \* \* \* [emphasis added.]

In the same article, Muste made another observation which is most instructive, indicating as it does that organized Communist participation is vital to the anti-Vietnam war movement:

What no doubt clinches the matter is that if we were to abandon the "nonexclusion" principle we would quickly disintegrate.

There can be no doubting the essential truth of Muste's statement. As the House Committee on Un-American Activities observed in its March 31, 1967, report on the Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week:

Generally speaking, however, genuine pacifist elements and organizations in this country are relatively small and weak. Alone, they have never succeeded in staging a major demonstration. While the sincerity of these groups in agitating for peace in Vietnam and elsewhere is not to be questioned, it is clear that they have played, and are playing, a minor role in Vietnam Week and in other anti-Vietnam-war demonstrations that have taken place in this country in recent years.

Every major, large-scale demonstration against the war in Vietnam which has taken place in this country has had all-out Communist support. They have, in fact, achieved the status of "large-scale" and "major" mainly because of the effort put into them by Communist elements.

On the basis of the House Committee on Internal Security investigation in this area, covering nearly 2 years, HCIS members are convinced that this assessment has even greater validity today than in 1967.

The united-front character of the coalition remained evident in the roster of officers chosen for the Spring Mobilization Committee. Muste, as already shown, was named chairman. Vicechairmen, in addition to Dellinger, Greenblatt, Peck, and Keating, included Cleveland Robinson, a New York labor leader and inveterate supporter of CPUSA fronts and causes, and Dagmar Wilson, founder of Women Strike for Peace and an avowed advocate of the North Vietnam communist cause who has traveled to Hanoi.

Communist leadership in Spring Mobe's regional preparations for the April 15, 1967, demonstrations was considerable. West coast executive director for Spring Mobe was SWP/YSA member Kipp Dawson, while the SWP provided the principal support for the Mobe's west coast office and its operations.

In California, Asher Harer, an SWP leader, was active in staff work, while his daughter Kathie, a member of the YSA, was in charge of organizing Bay area high school support, Robert Himmel, an SWP organizer, was in charge of the arrangements for the San Francisco activities in Kezar Stadium. Another active participant in west coast preparations for April 15 was CPUSA functionary Donald Hamerquist.

In Ohio, regional coordinator was former Wisconsin CPUSA leader Sidney Peck. In Chicago, CPUSA member and Chicago Peace Council leader Mrs. Sylvia Kushner was in charge of train arrangements. In New York City, one of the full-time staff workers was Mike Jarvis, a self-professed member of the DuBois Clubs.

In New York, black participation in the April 15 march was organized partly

by two groups: the Black United Action Front, one of whose officers was well-known SWP member Paul Boutelle, and Blacks Against Negative Dying (BAND), founded and led by YAFW activist Edward Oquendo. Boutelle was prominent in New York organizing for the march among members of the black community.

Organizations which formerly endorsed and/or actually participated in Spring Mobe's activities included the following:

(1) Communist Party, U.S.A., which had its own public contingent in New York led by top party leaders Gus Hall and Arnold Johnson;

(2) W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America, official CPUSA youth front;

(3) Socialist Workers Party;

(4) Young Socialist Alliance, SWP youth front;

(5) Youth Against War and Fascism, youth arm of the Workers World Party;

(6) Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, founded and led by identified CPUSA member LeRoy Wolins, who later served as a member of New Mobe's Washington Action Committee;

(7) National Lawyers Guild, CPUSA legal front organization;

(8) International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, which has long been controlled by identified members of the CPUSA;

(9) Women Strike for Peace, an organization infiltrated by members of the CPUSA and characterized by the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a group "which, since it was first formed in the fall of 1961, has enjoyed the complete support of the Communist Party";

(10) Los Angeles Committee for Defense of the Bill of Rights, a CPUSA front organization;

(11) Peace Action Council of Southern California, a major regional peace coalition that, like the Chicago Peace Council, is firmly controlled by members of the Communist Party;

(12) Los Angeles Committee to End the War in Vietnam, a group under heavy SWP influence;

(13) Revolutionary Contingent, a New York group which supports victory for the Vietcong;

(14) Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, key New York Mobe arm led by non-Soviet communist Dave Dellinger;

(15) Fort Hood Three Defense Committee, a Communist Party front group whose national secretary was Dave Dellinger and whose national chairman in 1969 was CPUSA member Grace Mora Newman;

(16) Americans for NLF victory, a California group;

(17) SDS National Council;

(18) SDS Midwestern Region Conference;

(19) John Hopkins SDS, Baltimore, Maryland;

(20) Baltimore Spartacist League, a dissident Trotskyist group;

(21) Progressive Labor Party, the major pro-Chinese communist group in the United States;

(22) Freedom Socialist Party, a Washington State group allied with the dissident communist Spartacist League;

(23) Trade Unionists for Peace, an organization set up by the CPUSA.

With the exception of the Spring Mobe itself, the key group in organizing the April 1967 anti-Vietnam war activities was the Student Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam.

Formed at a conference in Chicago during December 1966, Student Mobe has from its inception been dominated by communists, a fact thoroughly documented by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in its March 31, 1967, report on "Communist Origin" and Manipulation of Vietnam Week. The committee also detailed the communist domination of Spring Mobe and found formally that communists were playing "dominant roles" in both organizations.

The idea for the December 1966 conference had first been proposed by self-professed CPUSA member Bettina Aptheker, but members of the SWP and YSA quickly became active in Student Mobe affairs. In 1968, after a bitter factional dispute between the YSA and forces led by the CPUSA, the Student Mobilization Committee fell—and has remained—under the complete control of the YSA.

Besides playing a key role in the organization and execution of the April 1967 actions, Student Mobe has collaborated closely with the Spring, National, and New Mobilization Committees in every mass anti-Vietnam war demonstration down to the present time. The Student Mobilization Committee remains today one of the most active and potent communist organizations in the "peace" movement.

Support for the Spring Mobilization came also from a wide variety of individuals, both communist and noncommunist including the following:

(1) Bettina Aptheker, CPUSA;

(2) Beverly Axelrod, National Lawyers Guild;

(3) Peter Camejo, SWP and YSA;

(4) Mr. and Mrs. Robert Cugini, DuBois Clubs;

(5) Robert Davis, YSA;

(6) Kipp Dawson, SWP, YSA, and Student Mobe;

(7) Benjamin Dreyfus, CPUSA and National Lawyers Guild;

(8) Martin Hall, onetime active member of the German Communist Party and prominent supporter of communist fronts, including especially the Peace Action Council of Southern California;

(9) Terence Hallinan, active DuBois Clubs leader and member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;

(10) Ralph Johansen, San Francisco Lawyers Guild;

(11) Professor Donald Kalish, self-admittedly "far to the left" of the CPUSA;

(12) Michael Kelley, NLG Student Division;

(13) Albert J. Lima, chairman, Northern California District, CPUSA;

(14) James R. "Bob" Lindsay, CPUSA;

(15) Wayne Mercer, San Jose DuBois Club;

(16) Ben Dobbs, Southern California District, CPUSA;

(17) Arnold Johnson, public relations director, CPUSA;

(18) Robert Treuhart, identified member, CPUSA;

(19) Don Rothenberg, identified member, CPUSA;

(20) Malvina Reynolds, identified member, CPUSA;

(21) Al Richmond, executive editor of the People's World, official CPUSA west coast newspaper;

(22) Eldridge Cleaver, who has served as one of the primary leaders of the Black Panther Party;

(23) Jack Spiegel, identified member, CPUSA;

(24) Fred Halstead, SWP;

(25) Irving Sarnoff, identified member, CPUSA, and leader of the Peace Action Council of Southern California;

(26) Jerry Rubin, a founder of the Vietnam Day Committee;

(27) Prof. Eli Katz, identified member, CPUSA;

(28) Prof. Leon Wofsy, identified member, CPUSA;

(29) Jesse Gray, identified member, CPUSA;

(30) Prof. Linus Pauling, identified member, CPUSA;

(31) Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, official in the Southern Conference Educational Fund, a group led by persons who have been identified as members of the CPUSA;

(32) Dr. Carleton Goodlett, a leading member of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council;

(33) Jessica Mitford, identified member, CPUSA;

(34) Deirdre Griswold, YAWF;

(35) Sidney Lens, former leader, Revolutionary Workers League;

(36) Rev. Stephen Fritchman, who in two appearances before the House Committee on Un-American Activities refused to answer all questions pertaining to membership in the Communist Party;

(37) Aubrey Grossman, identified member, CPUSA;

(38) Lester Cole, identified member, CPUSA;

(39) Morris Watson, identified member, CPUSA;

(40) Rev. William Howard Melish, identified member, CPUSA;

(41) J. H. O'Dell (also known as Hunter Pitts O'Dell), member Communist Party National Committee;

(42) Mae Mallory, associate of Robert F. Williams and prominent in activities of the Workers World Party and YAWF;

(43) Irving Beining, *Guardian* staff;

(44) Rev. Lee H. Ball, prominent supporter of CPUSA fronts and causes and executive secretary of the Methodist Federation for Social Action, officially cited as a front for the Communist Party, U.S.A.;

(45) Nelson Blackstock, YSA;

(46) Anne and Carl Braden, identified members, CPUSA;

(47) Al Evanoff, prominent supporter of communist causes;

(48) Sue Eanet, SDS;

(49) Nick Egleson, president of SDS;

(50) Paul Booth, SDS, leader in the National Conference for New Politics;

(51) Hugh Fowler, DuBois Clubs;

(52) Gus Horowitz, SWP;

(53) Lew Jones, SWP and YSA;

(54) Dr. Corliss Lamont, identified member, CPUSA;

(55) Dan Rosenshine, YSA;



(56) Abe Weisburd, Trade Unionists for Peace;

(57) Jaimey Allen, SWP;

(58) Ove Osposy, SWP;

(59) Brian Shannon, SWP;

(60) Carl Oglesby, SDS;

(61) Marian Gordon, DuBois Clubs;

(62) Rev. John W. Darr, head of the Greenwich Village Peace Center in New York City and an identified member of the CPUSA.

The People's World, CPUSA's official west coast newspaper, thus was able to state in its issue for January 21, 1967: "National sponsors of the action indicate possibilities of unprecedented breadth."

An estimated 100,000 to 125,000 people participated in the New York march and rally on April 15, 1967. Speakers included Stokely Carmichael, Nick Egleson, William F. Pepper of the NCNP, and Pedro Juan Roa of the Movement for Puerto Rican Independence. Chairmen of the rally were non-Soviet communist Dave Dellinger and Dr. Benjamin Spock, prominent anti-Vietnam war activist and supported of the communist-controlled National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and the Freedom and Peace Party. Singers who appeared in New York included identified CPUSA member Pete Seeger.

Dignitaries listed as attending included identified communist Otto Nathan, identified CPUSA member Linus Pauling, identified CPUSA member David Livingston, former CPUSA Wisconsin State Committee member Sidney M. Peck, and North Vietnamese supported and WSP founder Dagmar Wilson.

The San Francisco rally, attended by an estimated 40,000 to 50,000 people, was entertained by, among others, identified CPUSA member Malvina Reynolds. Speakers included Eldridge Cleaver, who accused the United States of murder and genocide in Vietnam; SWP activist Kipp Dawson; and Grace Mora Newman, sister of DuBois Clubs member Dennis Mora of the Fort Hood Three. Mrs. Newman has traveled to North Vietnam and is an open supporter of the North Vietnamese communist cause.

Groups participating in San Francisco included the Progressive Labor Party, Socialist Workers Party, and Freedom Socialist Party of Seattle, while the New York parade included a public contingent of the Communist Party, U.S.A., led by top party leader Gus Hall and Arnold Johnson.

Financial support for the Mobilization came from a variety of sources. A west coast financial report for the period January 13 through February 2, 1967, acknowledged a loan of \$400 from the San Francisco State College Vietnam Day Committee; and a west coast progress report dated February 4, 1967, made special mention of contributions from identified Communist Party member Benjamin Dreyfus (\$25) and from California Communist Party leader Albert J. Lima (\$100).

The consistently anti-United States and pro-Hanoi stance of the Mobe and its key leadership was a prime cause of difficulty within some sections of the anti-Vietnam war movement. On March 16, 1967, the National Action Committee of the Young People's Socialist League,

youth group of the Socialist Party, declared in a resolution:

We do not support the "Spring Mobilization to End the War in Vietnam," since this effort is a continuation of the kind of united-frontism that clouds the real issues and confuses the American people about what the peace movement stands for. Political differences are smothered under amorphous slogan, with the result that supporters of a Vietcong military victory are lumped in with some who sincerely hope to make a contribution to peace.

The last "Call" of the Spring Mobilization Committee \* \* \* makes no demands on the Communists, as well as the United States, to de-escalate and end the war. Such one-sided demands \* \* \* can only alienate Americans and cause them to wonder if the peace movement is against the war, or merely against the American side in the war. Anti-Americanism alone may appeal to simple minds, but will only discredit the legitimate peace movement. \* \* \*

Another statement announcing a refusal to participate in the April 15 Mobilization, again because of the Mobe's one-sided emphasis on alleged American responsibility for the Vietnam war, was issued on April 12, 1967, by the executive board of the Northern California region of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

Foreign communist endorsements for the Mobilization came from the Vietnam Peace Committee, a North Vietnamese group, and from North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong, who hailed the movement "to demand United States Government stop war of aggression in Vietnam and bring American troops home." A February 19, 1967, article in the official North Vietnamese Government newspaper Nhan Dan also "hailed the mounting struggle of the entire people of the United States of America against Johnson's aggressive war in Vietnam."

During the weekend of May 20-21, 1967, the Spring Mobilization Committee held a National Anti-War Conference in Washington, D.C. Of the more than 700 people who registered for the conference, over 300 were members of the Communist Party, W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America, Socialist Workers Party, Young Socialist Alliance, or Youth Against War and Fascism. CPUSA and SWP officials participated in a series of workshops, one of which was devoted to fundraising and conducted by inactive CPUSA National Committee member Hunter Pitts O'Dell.

The conference ended by calling for a massive march on Washington on October 21, 1967. This project had also been proposed and endorsed by a Chicago conference of the Student Mobilization Committee the previous weekend, May 13-14. The Student Mobe session had been attended by some 500 delegates, many of them members of the CPUSA, DuBois Clubs, SWP, YSA, and Students for a Democratic Society.

THE UNITED FRONT TURNS TO VIOLENCE: THE NATIONAL MOBILIZATION COMMITTEE TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

The leadership of the Mobilization, known subsequent to the May meeting as the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, remained as a united front, Communist-oriented in

character. Non-Soviet Communist Dave Dellinger continued as chairman. Co-chairmen included Greenblatt, Peck, Kalish, Evanoff, Lens, and Dagmar Wilson. Also listed as cochairmen were John Wilson, a member of the SNCC central committee and leader in the National Black Anti-War, Anti-Draft Union, an offshoot of the Student Mobilization Committee, and Lincoln Lynch, an official in the Congress of Racial Equality, sponsor of a testimonial dinner in behalf of CPUSA leader William L. Patterson, and supporter of the CPUSA front Freedom and Peace Party.

National coordinator was Robert Greenblatt, with Jerry Rubin and NBAWADU leader John Wilson serving as project directors. SWP member Peter Buch was listed as part of the staff of Mobilizer, the Mobe's official voice. CPUSA functionaries active in planning for October included LeRoy Wolins, founder of Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, and Sylvia Kushner, guiding influence in the Chicago Peace Council.

Medical arrangements for the projected demonstrations were to be handled by the Medical Committee for Human Rights, one of the top leaders of which, Dr. Quentin Young of Chicago, appeared in October 1968 before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and refused to answer all questions pertaining to Communist Party membership.

Legal arrangements were partly to be handled by the Communist-controlled Emergency Civil Liberties Committee and by the Law Center for Constitutional Rights, presented by such attorneys as William M. Kunstler and Arthur Kinoy, both active in the ECLC and National Lawyers Guild, and Morton Stavis, a National Lawyers Guild attorney an identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Again, a crucially important role in organizing for the October protests was played by the communist-dominated Student Mobilization Committee, which actively promoted participation by groups and individuals across the United States. In Chicago, Student Mobe organized and sponsored participation by Chicagoans in collaboration with the Chicago Peace Council, whose most influential figures are identified members of the Communist Party.

Other organizations which contributed actively in organizing support for and participation in the Washington action included:

- (1) the Communist Party, U.S.A., which marched under its own banner under the leadership of such top party officials as Arnold Johnson, chairman of the Peace Commission, Michael Zagarell, chairman of the National Youth Commission, and James Jackson, chairman of the International Affairs Commission;
- (2) the Socialist Workers Party;
- (3) The Young Socialist Alliance;
- (4) the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America;
- (5) Youth Against War and Facism;
- (6) Students for a Democratic Society;
- (7) the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee;
- (8) the Black Panther Party;

(9) Women Strike for Peace, founded by Dagmar Wilson, Mobe leader and open supporter of the North Vietnamese communists;

(10) the Progressive Labor Party;

(11) the Chicago Area Draft Resisters (CADRE), an organization which has recently emerged as a supporter of the Black Panther Party;

(12) the U.S. Committee to Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam;

(13) the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;

(14) Veterans for Peace in Vietnam;

(15) the National Conference for New Politics;

(16) the Spartacist League;

(17) Trade Unionists for Peace;

(18) the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, a CPUSA front.

The demonstrations on October 21, 1967, included a rally at the Lincoln Memorial and civil disobedience at the Pentagon, an attempt to gain entrance to the building in order to "confront the warmakers" and "disrupt the war machine."

Speakers at the Lincoln Memorial rally, which drew an estimated 55,000 demonstrators, included:

(1) David Dellinger, Mobe chairman;

(2) Dr. Benjamin Spock;

(3) Dagmar Wilson, Mobe cochairman;

(4) Ossie Davis, supporter of numerous Communist Party fronts and causes;

(5) John Wilson;

(6) Linda Morse, head of the Student Mobilization Committee;

(7) Fred Davis, SDS representative;

(8) Lincoln Lynch.

During the demonstration activity, Negro participants were exhorted to break off from the main line of march and proceed to a separate area to hold their own rally. Some 300 did so and listened to speeches by leaders of SNCC; the Mau Maus, a black nationalist group; and the Revolutionary Action Movement (RAM), a pro-Chinese Marxist-Leninist organization then being led from self-imposed exile in communist China by black revolutionary Robert F. Williams.

At about 2 in the afternoon, the demonstrators began to march across the Memorial Bridge to the Pentagon, where they demonstrated until the following morning. The Mobe had announced that there would be civil disobedience at the Pentagon in an attempt to gain entrance to the building to "confront the warmakers" and "disrupt the war machine."

The number of people who took part in this demonstration was estimated at from 30,000 to 60,000. Figures compiled by the U.S. marshal's office and the Department of Defense, which handled arrests during the Pentagon demonstration, reflected a total of 683 arrests at the Pentagon from the afternoon of October 21 through the early morning of October 23. There were 24 demonstrators, 13 marshals, and 10 soldiers treated for injuries. Afterwards Dellinger hailed the demonstrations and arrests as a great victory which signaled the birth of a new, more militant movement.

International communist support for

the October 21 Mobilization project was substantial. The Hungarian Peace Council in Budapest announced a Vietnam Week for October 15-21, 1967. Demonstrations of support were held in various cities around the world, including Moscow, Tokyo, Stockholm, Paris, and Munich, in addition to at least five major cities in Canada.

James Bevel, national director of the Mobilization and a supporter of many communist fronts and causes, including a fund appeal and court action in behalf of the CPUSA's DuBois Clubs, attended the Stockholm World Conference on Vietnam, July 6-9, 1967, and reported strong support for representatives of the American peace movement at the conference. One of the resolutions passed by the conference, which was organized primarily by the World Peace Council, Soviet-controlled international communist "peace" front, stated: "The organizations and groups working for peace in Vietnam should mark October 21 \* \* \* by demonstrations in many countries and towns."

In Vietnam, the National Liberation Front on October 16, 1967, established the South Vietnam People's Committee for Solidarity-with the American People. One of the new group's messages as broadcast from Hanoi urged the American people "to step up the struggle to demand an end to the U.S. aggression in South Vietnam." Another message from the Solidarity Committee, also broadcast from Hanoi, declared:

\* \* \* We highly value the American people's movement against the U.S. war in Vietnam and regard this movement as a just and valiant action.

May the Oct. 21 struggle mark a new development in the American people's movement for an end of the U.S. war in Vietnam. We wish you brilliant success.

North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong declared in a message to the Mobilization Committee: "The Vietnamese people thank their friends in America and wish them great success in their mounting movement."

On November 12, 1967, the administrative committee of the National Mobilization Committee met at the George Washington University in Washington, D.C., to assess the October demonstrations. Among those present, according to the official minutes, were:

(1) Charlotte Weeks, who has traveled to North Vietnam and who later served as a coordinator for the New Mobe;

(2) Eric Weinberger, Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;

(3) Gus Horowitz, SWP;

(4) Lew Jones, YSA;

(5) Robert Greenblatt, National Mobe;

(6) Sidney Peck, National Mobe;

(7) Barbara Bick, Women Strike for Peace;

(8) Leon Kuhl, New York Veterans for Peace in Vietnam;

(9) Abigail Grafton, National Mobe;

(10) Harvey Kasden, National Mobe;

(11) Abraham Bloom, Washington Mobe;

(12) Irving Beinin, *National Guardian*;

(13) Nancy Strebe, Washington Mobe, SWP;

(14) Peter Buch, SWP;

(15) Robert Heisler, DuBois Clubs, member of the CPUSA;

(16) Beverly Sterner Greenblatt, National Mobe;

(17) Linda Wetter, Washington Mobe YSA;

(18) Michael Kramer, George Washington University Student Mobe;

(19) Warren Herland, George Washington University Student Mobe;

(20) Sue Bonner, George Washington University Student Mobe;

(21) Lincoln Lynch, CORE;

(22) Sue Orrin, National Mobe;

(23) Jill Boskey, National Mobe;

(24) Linda Morse, Student Mobe;

(25) Syd Stapleton, Student Mobe, SWP;

(26) Arnold Johnson, CPUSA;

Peck acted as chairman for the meeting, which heard a report from Sue Orrin, who stated that certain people at the Institute for Policy Studies, a New Left-oriented study center or "think tank" in Washington, were prepared to make analyses of the various options open to demonstrators arrested in October. Orrin also indicated that the Medical Committee for Human Rights had been basically dissatisfied with Mobe's handling of the march, particularly the "terms of permit signed on Thursday, Oct. 19."

Bloom reported "there was a real feeling of participation in Washington" and that Washington Mobe's membership was from 1,800 to 2,000.

Though SDS was not formally represented at this meeting, the minutes reflected that they did send a telegram to the effect that they "couldn't come but wanted to express continuing support for Mobe."

Boskey and Morse both reported increased activity on campuses as a result of the October project. Morse in particular stated that the Mobe's October demonstrations were "very important" for the student movement, that demonstrators came from over 600 campuses as a result of Student Mobe's efforts, and that there was now an increase in "student militancy."

The financial report in the minutes reflects that the Mobe made "about \$32,000" exclusive of checks from the sale of buttons and from donations made by demonstrators. Linda Morse, however, reported that Student Mobe was \$5,200 in debt and proposed that National Mobe advance the money from its \$6,000 bail fund. It was indicative of the close relationship between the two organizations that a special committee was then formed to deal with Student Mobe's needs, the committee to consist of Beverly Greenblatt, Eric Weinberger, Abe Bloom, Irving Beinin, Bob Greenblatt, Sidney Peck, and Linda Morse.

During 1968 the major project of the National Mobilization Committee was the organizing of massive and disruptive demonstrations in Chicago during the August 1968 Democratic National Convention. These demonstrations, with their resultant violence, were examined in detail during hearings by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in October and December 1968. In the



course of these hearings evidence was introduced which revealed extensive participation by communists in the planning and execution of the demonstrations. Evidence introduced also documented the extensive contact maintained by Mobe leaders with foreign communist leaders and powers.

Organizations which participated in the planning and execution of the demonstrations during the Democratic National Convention in collaboration with the National Mobilization Committee included:

- (1) the Student Mobilization Committee;
- (2) the Black Panther Party;
- (3) the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, a major Mobe regional affiliate;
- (4) the Chicago Area Draft Resisters;
- (5) the Chicago Peace Council, which functioned as one of the primary forces in organizing the protests;
- (6) the Coalition for an Anti-Imperialist Movement (COAIM), a cooperative effort of Youth Against War and Fascism and the U.S. Committee to Aid the NLF;
- (7) the Communist Party, U.S.A.;
- (8) the Dow Action Committee, a California united-front group dominated by communists;
- (9) the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, a key Mobe affiliate in New York City;
- (10) the Guardian;
- (11) the Medical Committee for Human Rights, which served as the primary organizer of medical teams in anticipation of violence during the demonstrations;
- (12) the Movement for a Democratic Society, an affiliate of SDS;
- (13) the National Black Anti-War, Anti-Draft Union, an offshoot of the Student Mobilization Committee;
- (14) the National Conference for New Politics;
- (15) the New University Conference, an SDS-oriented academic group;
- (16) the Progressive Labor Party;
- (17) the Radical Organizing Committee, formed by Communist Party and other non-Trotskyist members of the Student Mobilization Committee after the June 1968 takeover of the SMC by members of the Young Socialist Alliance and Socialist Workers Party;
- (18) Ramparts, the pro-Hanoi, pro-Castro west coast magazine which published a daily newspaper during the demonstrations, which newspaper was published with gratefully acknowledged assistance from identified Communist Party member David Canter;
- (19) the Socialist Workers Party;
- (20) the Southern Conference Educational Fund, led by Carl and Anne Braden, identified members of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;
- (21) Students for a Democratic Society;
- (22) Summer of Support, a project of the National Mobe;
- (23) Veterans for Peace in Vietnam;
- (24) the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America;
- (25) Women Strike for Peace;
- (26) the Young Socialist Alliance;
- (27) the Workers World Party, a disident Trotskyist group.

When an office was established in Chicago to serve as a center for the organizing effort, the Communist Party, U.S.A., indicated its willingness to supply funds for this effort. The party further offered to defray the expenses of Negro representatives so that they might travel to Chicago to attend planning sessions.

One of the earliest major planning sessions was held on January 26, 1968, in the New York City offices of the National Lawyers Guild, a Communist Party legal front organization. Present at this session, which was called to "discuss the establishment of a nationwide legal defense apparatus [sic] to deal with the projected legal problems arising" from the convention protest, were such activists as Bernardine Dohrn, at that time associated with the NLG; Lee Webb, currently associated with the Guardian; Ken Cloke, a top Lawyer Guild functionary; Tom Hayden, a founder of SDS, frequent traveler to communist countries, and open supporter of the Vietcong; and Jonathan Lubell, National Lawyers Guild attorney and identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Information recently made available, however, proves conclusively that the National Mobe was active in planning the disruption of the convention as early as December of 1967.

On December 27, 1967, the Mobe's administrative committee met at the Academy Hall at 853 Broadway in New York City. According to the official minutes, the following people were among those present.

- (1) A. Cronick, U.S. Committee to Aid the NLF;
- (2) Jill Boskey;
- (3) Deborah Weisburd, Teachers Committee for Peace in Vietnam;
- (4) Art Farrier, Veterans and Reservists for Peace in Vietnam;
- (5) Myron Shapiro, Veterans and Reservists for Peace in Vietnam;
- (6) Peter Buch, SWP;
- (7) Vincent Copeland, Workers World Party;
- (8) Abe Weisburd, Trade Unionists for Peace;
- (9) Peter Antonson, YAWF;
- (10) Douglas Gordon, Ad Hoc Committee on the Middle East (now known as Committee to Support Middle East Liberation), a YAWF front group;
- (11) Gus Horowitz, SWP;
- (12) George Simmons, USCANLF;
- (13) Paul Friedman, CPUSA;
- (14) Mike Stein, CPUSA;
- (15) Syd Stapleton, Student Mobe, SWP;
- (16) Eugene Tournour, DuBois Clubs, member of the CPUSA;
- (17) Sue Orrin, National Mobe;
- (18) Bob Greenblatt, National Mobe;
- (19) Dave Axel, YAWF;
- (20) Howard Macthinger, SDS;
- (21) Steve Halliwell, SDS;
- (22) Harriet Tanzman, Fort Hood Three Defense Committee;
- (23) Fred Halstead, SWP;
- (24) Lew Jones, YSA;
- (25) Kipp Dawson, Student Mobe, SWP, YSA;
- (26) Tom Hayden, a project director for the convention protest.

Rennie Davis, also a project director

for the convention protests, reported that it was "the general feeling of groups in the Chicago area that any demonstration at the convention should show an 'escalation in militancy' by the peace movement" and that people in Chicago, with a "full time staff of 15" working on logistics, "have already begun to prepare for the convention" demonstrations.

Linda Morse stated that "the movement should not seek to 'petition' but to disrupt and demand." She further said that "People like Dick Gregory will be there to disrupt the democratic convention not the democratic process."

Doug Gordon, on the other hand, advocated an even more militant position: "action at the republican convention also which would disrupt and destroy both conventions and the 'parties of imperialism.'"

On February 11, 1968, another planning meeting was held, this time in Chicago. At this session, there were 34 people in attendance, among them:

- (1) Kendra Alexander, a member of the Communist Party, active member of the CPUSA's W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, and wife of DuBois Club leader and Communist Party member Franklin Alexander;
- (2) Carolyn Black, DuBois Clubs, member of the Communist Party;
- (3) Greg Calvert, SDS;
- (4) Rennie Davis, supporter of the Vietcong and project director, with Tom Hayden, for the convention protests;
- (5) David Dellinger, Mobe chairman;
- (6) Earl Durham, member, CPUSA National Committee;
- (7) Robert Greenblatt, Mobe coordinator;
- (8) Fred Halstead;
- (9) Don Hamerquist;
- (10) Tom Hayden, Mobe project director;
- (11) Sid Lens;
- (12) Lincoln Lynch, CORE leader;
- (13) Charlene Mitchell, member, CPUSA National Committee;
- (14) Sue Munaker, Mobe employee who was a participant in a Stockholm meeting of American peace activists with NLF, North Vietnamese, and South Vietnamese representatives under the auspices of the World Federation of Democratic Youth, an international Soviet-controlled Communist Front group;
- (15) Sidney Peck;
- (16) James Rollins, a leader in the National Conference for New Politics and supporter of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs;
- (17) Jack Spiegel;
- (18) Dagmar Wilson.

The meeting was chaired by Rennie Davis and Carlos Russell. Russell is a prominent activist within the NCFP Black Caucus, member of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, and identified member of the Communist Party.

During the meeting, Lynch asked: "How are we going to discredit [Chicago Mayor Richard J.] Daley and show him to be a liar? How will we present challenges to the Convention?" Halstead advocated demonstrations even without official permission from the authorities: "We should have a demonstration in

Chicago whether or not it is allowed by the city. We should definitely go ahead with an action." And Hammerquist stated:

\*\*\* What we must do is make concrete demands on the Convention which the Convention cannot respond to. Our confrontation must be political in the sense of winning people away from the Democratic Party. The organization that develops around this activity should emphasize local organizing and political education. It should develop an alternative ideology and real leadership for the left in the country.

Identified CPUSA member and Chicago Peace Council representative Jack Spiegel foresaw clearly that violence would develop:

We can't call 200,000 people to Chicago and then disassociate ourselves from violence. Disruption and violence will occur. It's going to happen and we'll have to deal with that fact.

On March 22-24, 1968, a planning conference was held at Camp Ravenswood outside Chicago. Sponsors included several people who served later as leaders in New Mobe: Sidney Peck, Al Evanoff, Sid Lens, and Cora Weiss, a New York Women Strike for Peace leader who has traveled to North Vietnam. Others sponsors included Carl Davidson, one time leader in SDS and currently a writer for the Guardian; Vernon Grizzard, a former vice president of SDS; Linda Morse of the Student Mobilization Committee; William Pepper of the NCNP; Dagmar Wilson; and identified CPUSA member Dr. Quentin Young of the Medical Committee for Human Rights.

The temporary administrative committee for the conference consisted of the following: Rennie Davis, Dave Dellinger, Tom Hayden, Bob Greenblatt, and Sue Munaker. A press release dated March 25 and issued by Rennie Davis from the Chicago office claimed that around 250 people attended the meeting.

A separate meeting was held nearby at the same time, attended by black activists who had determined to assist in "creating a parallel organizational structure in which black and white people operate from a basis of separate and equal strength." The letter promoting attendance at this session was signed by six activists, among them Kendra Alexander, Lincoln Lynch, John Wilson, and Carlos Russell.

The conference "affirmed its intention to hold demonstrations at the time of the Democratic National Convention." The program and purpose of the effort was stated as follows:

\*\*\* The strategy developed by the Conference will be to underscore through action organization the real issues this country must face. Those issues are the immediate withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam, the right of the Vietnamese people to national independence and self-determination, the end of American attempts to control and direct the future of the underdeveloped areas of the world for its own economic and political interests, and immediate end to the draft and the virtual military occupation of Black Communities and the recognition of the right of Black People to control their own lives and determine their own future in this country [Emphasis added]

The conference also selected a three-

man interim committee to serve until such time as various national and regional student and antiwar organizations could choose their own representatives to serve on a national committee to organize the demonstrations. This interim committee consisted of Rennie Davis, active in SDS community organizing projects and the head of National Mobe's 1968 Summer of Support program, an operation aimed at servicemen disaffected with the war in Vietnam; Dave Dellinger; and Vernon Grizzard, who, in addition to having been active in SDS, have traveled to Budapest, Hungary, to consult with representatives of the National Liberation Front and the North Vietnamese forces. Grizzard also traveled to Hanoi in 1968 as part of a three-man National Mobe group invited by the North Vietnamese to participate in the release of three captured American pilots.

The program announced after the Chicago conference of March 22-24 was reiterated in an August mailing from the Mobe's New York national office, following a July 20 Cleveland meeting of the Mobilization's administrative committee:

Our activities will be issue oriented and will on focus on candidates. We will call for an end to the bombing (so that negotiations can take place) and for American military withdrawal—from Vietnam and the black communities. We will call for self determination in Vietnam and in the black and other poor communities.

This letter announced that there was already a staff of 25 persons in Chicago preparing for the projected massive demonstrations. This staff was led by project directors Rennie Davis and Tom Hayden "and is greatly aided by the Chicago Peace Council which is actively committed to the program." The letter was signed by Dave Dellinger, chairman of the National Mobilization Committee, and Robert Greenblatt, Mobe's national coordinator, about whom the following document, written to a North Vietnamese official, is of interest:

DEAR COL. LAO: This note is to introduce you to Mr. Robert Greenblatt, the coordinator of the National Mobilization to End the War in Vietnam. He works closely with myself and Dave Dellinger, and has just returned from Hanoi.

If there are any pressing questions you wish to discuss, Mr. Greenblatt will be in Paris for a few days.

We hope that the current Paris discussions go well for you. The news from South Vietnam seems very good indeed.

We hope to see you this summer in Paris or at a later time.

Good fortune!  
Victory!

/s/ Tom Hayden  
TOM HAYDEN.

On August 4, 1968, another meeting of the National Mobe administrative committee was held in Chicago. Chairman of the session was David Dellinger. Others present at the meeting included:

- (1) Tom Bickler, Radical Organizing Committee;
- (2) Irving Beinin, *Guardian*;
- (3) Richard D. Conrad, Radical Organizing Committee;
- (4) Rennie Davis, National Mobe;

- (5) Dave Dellinger, National Mobe;
- (6) Ted Dostal, Workers World Party;
- (7) Helen Gurewitz, Washington Mobilization for Peace representative and identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;
- (8) Richard Hill, Student Mobilization Committee, SWP;
- (9) Bob Greenblatt, National Mobe;
- (10) Tom Hayden, National Mobe;
- (11) Betty Heilman, National Mobe;
- (12) Wayne Heimbach, SDS;
- (13) Donald Kalish, National Mobe;
- (14) Michael Klonsky, representative of SDS and self-described revolutionary Communist;
- (15) Sylvia Kushner, Chicago Peace Council, CPUSA;
- (16) Otto Liljenstople, Chicago Peace Council;
- (17) Rose McKiernan, SDS;
- (18) Sidney Peck, representative, Ohio Peace Action Council, and former member, Wisconsin State Committee, CPUSA;
- (19) Maxwell Primack, Chicago Peace Council;
- (20) Ruth Samuels, Radical Organizing Committee;
- (21) Jay Schaffner, W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, member of the Illinois State Committee of the CPUSA;
- (22) Hamish Sinclair, SDS;
- (23) Jack Spiegel, Chicago Peace Council, CPUSA;
- (24) Syd Stapleton, Student Mobe, SWP;
- (25) Albert Sterger, Workers World Party.

Concerning violence, the official minutes of the meeting reflect the following:

When the nonviolent line was questioned, Dave [Dellinger] explained that MOB included groups whose beliefs ranged from pacifism to militant self defense. While our aim is not to physically disrupt the convention nor to advocate violence, Mob has never repudiated the actions of its constituents. It will be stressed, in addition, that it is well known that Chicago police are responsible for violence. (Emphasis added.)

There was much discussion of the possibility that the march might have to be held despite the denial of a permit of the imposition of a curfew by the Chicago authorities. Greenblatt opined that a curfew "would be clearly an oppressive measure to be disobeyed." Liljenstople urged that, if a curfew were imposed, "volunteers be urged to disobey in order to force the city into the predicament of mass arrests."

Rennie Davis proposed five "project area directors," including Vernon Grizzard for marshals and National Lawyers Guild attorney Gene Cerutti for legal and medical concerns. It was also announced that a loan of \$1,000 had been pledged by the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, a key Mobe regional affiliate led by Jerry Gordon, who has been identified as a former member of the Labor Youth League, a CPUSA youth group, and as having attended closed meetings of the Communist Party itself.

The medical presence for the demonstrations was organized by the Medical Committee for Human Rights, in which Dr. Quentin Young has played a key role, and an allied group, the Student Health Organization. MCHR spokesman Irene



Turner later estimated that there were some 300 people who participated in the medical operations during the demonstration activity, including more than 50 physicians actually in the streets. It was further estimated that there were more than 400 injuries requiring further treatment and therefore classed as serious.

The convention and accompanying demonstrations were held during the week of August 25, 1968. It has been officially estimated that some 10,000 people took part in these demonstrations. Mass violence was met with mass arrests—653 adults and 28 juveniles. There was more than \$12,000 damage to police equipment, and 161 policemen were injured, some of them seriously. Of the demonstrators arrested, 253 were from Chicago, 292 were from out of State, and 10 were from outside the United States. Charges included disorderly conduct, criminal trespass, unlawful use of weapons, criminal damage, public indecency, theft, burglary, assault, and battery. Weapons seized by police from demonstrators included chunks of concrete, spears, swords, rocks, nails, and clubs.

On September 14, 1968, an administrative committee meeting was held in Washington, D.C. This session was attended by, among others, the following:

- (1) Irving Beinin, Guardian;
- (2) Karl Baker, SDS.
- (3) Tom Hayden, National Mobe;
- (4) Alan Gross, Radical Organizing Committee;
- (5) Dave Dellinger, National Mobe;
- (6) Rennie Davis, National Mobe;
- (7) Betty Hellman, National Mobe;
- (8) Harry Ring, SWP.
- (9) Lew Jones, YSA;
- (10) Susan LaMont, New York Student Mobilization Committee and YSA;
- (11) Mike Maggi, Student Mobe national staff and YSA;
- (12) Larry Seigle, YSA;
- (13) Pat Grogan, YSA;
- (14) John Tillman, NBAWADU;
- (15) Walter Reeves, NBAWADU;
- (16) John Wilson, SNCC and NBAWADU;
- (17) Willy Louvallen, SNCC;
- (18) Irwin Gladstone, National Radical Organizing Committee;
- (19) Josh Brown, New York Radical Organizing Committee;
- (20) Abe Bloom, Washington Mobilization Committee;
- (21) John Benson, Philadelphia Mobilization;
- (22) Leland Summers, Washington Mobilization;
- (23) Tim McCarthy, Washington, D.C., SDS;
- (24) Judith Simmons, Washington Mobilization;
- (25) Walter Schneir, author of a book defending executed atom spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg;
- (26) Arnold Johnson, CPUSA;
- (27) Richie Lesnick, SWP and YSA;
- (28) Eric Weinberger, Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;
- (29) Bill Ayers, Ohio-Michigan SDS;
- (30) Terry Robbins, Ohio-Michigan SDS;
- (31) Joan Campbell, CAPAC;
- (32) Sidney Lens, Chicago Peace Council;
- (33) Sandy Lutz, National Mobe;

(34) Donna Gripe, National Mobe and a sponsor of the December 28, 1968, Student Mobe-sponsored National GI-Civilian Anti-War Action Conference;

(35) Lee Webb, Ramparts;

(36) Tibi Texler, SCEF;

(37) Barbara Bick, a member of Women Strike for Peace who has traveled to East Germany to attend a communist-sponsored World Peace Assembly;

(38) Helen Gurewitz, a member of the Washington Mobilization and an identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;

(39) Greg Sandow, New England Resistance.

At this meeting a program was adopted which emphasized local actions and local initiatives rather than massive, concentrated activity such as that in Chicago or the earlier New York and San Francisco marches. The meeting decided to sponsor a National GI Week, including leafleting of USO centers and visits by movement people to soldiers at bases around the Nation. Other aspects of the program included confrontation of political candidates, antiwar rallies around the country on the eve of the election "an active campaign to raise the relevant political issues in the streets" on election day a student strike in colleges and high schools as part of the election-day strategy and activities in Washington, D.C., on January 20, 1969, Inauguration Day.

Reports were received from two absent Mobe coordinators, Prof. Donald Kalish and Prof. Sidney Peck. Kalish endorsed the GI Week idea and urged continuing pressure on draft boards and such companies as Dow Chemical "in an effort to apply the diversity of the movement and enunciate specific political content." Peck wrote "that he was willing to focus on the illegitimacy of the Presidential candidates, but didn't want to rule out support of local candidates, or other Presidential candidates like Halstead and Cleaver." (Fred Halstead was presidential candidate for the SWP, while Eldridge Cleaver, violent black revolutionary, had been nominated by the ultraleftist Peace and Freedom Party.)

Tim McCarthy said "that no candidate should speak unencumbered by demonstrations and suggested the Guardian publish the schedules of the candidates to facilitate organization." Such schedules were approved, to be printed weekly and distributed through the Mobe office.

Guardian staff employees Irving Beinin "called for militant demonstrations to challenge the rigged elections by recreating Chicagos all over the country."

With regard to the structure of the Mobe, Davis proposed with support from Dellinger, that the steering committee be abolished and reformed with a regional emphasis rather than group representation that the staff be more aggressive and better organized to develop long-range projects, and that regional staffs "with strong communication ties with the national staff" be formed.

This precipitated a disagreement between the Socialist Workers Party and its allied groups and others in the coalition. Harry Ring argued that a system such as Davis advanced would be the

end for numerous groups who, deprived of representation, would simply become inactive and useless to the movement. The end result would be that the Mobe would become, rather than a coalition of organizations, an organization itself. This marked the first known major clash between the Trotskyists and others in the Mobe coalition.

Another cause for dispute between the SWP and other elements lay in the emphasis on the elections. The SWP representatives, notably Harry Ring argued that this represented a diminution of the coalition's concern with the war itself as the overriding issue. Always a strong supporter of the single-issue was mobilization approach, the Trotskyists became increasingly disaffected with the course the Mobe was taking.

Despite this, however, Ring agreed to serve on a committee to discuss the various proposals advanced at the conference. Others named to this committee included Rennie Davis; Dave Dellinger; Irving Beinin; Barbara Bick; John Wilson; Greg Sandow, an employee of the Boston underground paper Old Mole and member of Cambridge Iron and Steel, a dummy corporation which has channeled funds into such enterprises as Liberation News Service, New York Regional SDS, and the Guardian; and Steve Halliwell, an active member of SDS and contributor to the Guardian.

On September 14 Hanoi announced that the South Vietnamese People's Committee for Solidarity with the American People had sent a letter to the National Mobe "thanking the progressive American people of all strata for their seething, resolute, and courageous struggle conducted last month when the convention of the Democratic Party was meeting \* \* \*". The message continued:

Despite the huge, barbarous repression machinery unleashed by Johnson, Humphrey, and their ilk, you have come down into the streets for demonstrations and shouted slogans demanding an end to the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam, cessation of the bombing on the whole territory of the DRV [Democratic Republic of Vietnam], and withdrawal of troops of the United States and of its allied countries in the Vietnam war. By your activities you have raised the just voice of the United States, a country with a traditional love for freedom and justice.

We express to you our deep sympathy and ask you to convey to the American people our heartfelt thanks for their participation in or support of the recent action in Chicago. \* \* \*

You have shed your blood for the honor of the United States and \* \* \* in defense of the Vietnamese people's right to self-determination, which is being flouted by the American aggressors, and of the peace in Southeast Asia and in the world now being trampled underfoot by the U.S. warmongers.

The Solidarity Committee also specifically expressed its appreciation for the encouragement provided the Vietnamese communists by Mobe activities:

In this South Vietnam \* \* \* we are daily and hourly following with great enthusiasm your persistent and valiant struggle.

Your recent actions in Chicago, as well as throughout the United States, against the U.S. policy of aggression in Vietnam have strongly stimulated our people in South Vietnam who are conducting the powerful general offensive \* \* \*.

We wish you to convey our best wishes to

our American friends who were wounded or arrested during the recent demonstrations.

On September 21, 1968, it was announced that a 28-member delegation of American antiwar activists had traveled to Budapest, Hungary for a September 5-9 meeting with representatives of North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front. The participation of United States delegates had been organized by National Mobe chairman David Delinger, and nine of the 28 delegates were veterans of the Chicago convention riots.

Former SDS vice president Vernon Grizzard, a member of the delegation, stated that the North Vietnamese were "pleased and interested in our plans." Grizzard said also that participants in the conference had "talked about methods of organizing and mobilizing students in universities" as well as plans to encourage draft resistance and to agitate among servicemen. The Americans told the North Vietnamese about plans for GI Week and about contemplated efforts at propagandizing servicemen through coffeehouses near Army bases.

On October 13, 1968, the National Mobe's administrative committee met again in Cambridge, Mass., to discuss various issues, including the House Committee on Un-American Activities hearings on the involvement of Mobe in the Democratic National Convention disruptions, the projected election and GI Week actions, and the proposed activities in Washington during the Inauguration.

This session was chaired by Dave Delinger, with the following people among those officially listed as present:

- (1) Marilyn Slotkin, National Mobe;
- (2) Bob Belluscio, National Mobe;
- (3) Sandy Lutz, National Mobe;
- (4) Greg Sandow, New England Resistance;
- (5) Linda Sheppard, YSA;
- (6) Larry Seigle, YSA;
- (7) Leland Summers, Washington Mobilization;
- (8) Eric Weinberger, Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;
- (9) Ruth Gallo, National Mobe;
- (10) Paula Bernstein, National Mobe;
- (11) Marlene Bluestein, National Mobe;
- (12) Abe Weisburd, Trade Unionists for Peace;
- (13) Irving Beinin, Guardian staff;
- (14) Rick Conrad, Radical Organizing Committee;
- (15) David Finkelstein, Radical Organizing Committee;
- (16) Irwin Gladstone, Radical Organizing Committee;
- (17) Josh Brown, Radical Organizing Committee;
- (18) Ted Yanow, Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;
- (19) Harry Ring, SWP;
- (20) Martin Kenner, National Mobe;
- (21) Bill Freeland, representing Liberation News Service, a New Left pro-Castro, pro-Hanoi news dissemination service;
- (22) Michael Myerson, secretary of the Peace Commission of the New York State CPUSA;
- (23) Peter Orris, SDS, an identified member of the Communist Party;
- (24) Rennie Davis, National Mobe;
- (25) Sid Peck, National Mobe;
- (26) Arnold Johnson, CPUSA.

The meeting resulted in an agreement that a four-man committee would draft a report, in conjunction with the Mobe staff, on the President's Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, "HUAC," and the anticipated Federal indictments of Mobe leaders as a result of the Chicago riots. This committee would consist of Abe Weisburd of the CPUSA-founded Trade Unionists for Peace, John McCauliff of the Committee of Returned Volunteers, and Vietcong supporters Rennie Davis and Robert Greenblatt.

As part of the overall planning for GI Week and activity among servicemen, it was decided to send a delegation to Paris and Stockholm to confer with American deserters. This delegation would then return and reveal their findings in speeches during GI Week. It was also agreed that the Mobe would join "in welcoming home and working with the Fort Hood Three."

The official minutes of the meeting disclose that, as part of the election strike activity—

It was announced that in New York on November 2 the Parade Committee is sponsoring a giant picketing in a 20 block area encompassing the Humphrey and Nixon headquarters; on November 6 Clergy and Laymen [Concerned About Vietnam], Parade Committee, and SDSers leading a delegation to Fort Dix; on November 4 and 5, SDS and the High School Union are opening movement centers across the city to engage in conversation and to plan actions, in addition to the High School Union's plan for a walkout to protest fraudulently [sic] elections; and on November 5, actions are planned where Nixon votes and then waits for election results.

Inauguration activities were discussed, but the minutes fail to reflect any definite decisions:

When ideas were solicited for Inauguration Activities, they ranged from movement centers, mass marches, rallies, guerrilla theatre to notions of the holding of a Second Continental Congress and a counter-inauguration ball. It was suggested that the Mobilization organize and action that would not physically disrupt the establishment inauguration, but attract masses of people of divergent views.

A significant endorsement for the Mobe's November protests came from Students for a Democratic Society, which had tended in the past to be critical of mass mobilizations on the grounds that they are harmful to long-term local organizing efforts. Meeting in Boulder, Colo., October 11-13, 1968, the SDS national council passed a resolution calling for a national strike of high school and university students on November 5. At colleges and universities around the country, SDS was active in attempting to promote GI Week and election strike activity.

Plans for GI Week, November 1-5, 1968, included activities at some 25 Army bases around the country, with major actions at Fort Hood, Tex.; Fort Dix, N.J.; Fort Devens, Mass.; Fort Jackson, S.C.; and the Presidio in San Francisco, Calif. Organizers at Fort Hood operated from the Oleo Strut, an antiwar coffeehouse established during the summer of 1968 as part of National Mobe's serviceman-oriented Summer of Support program, headed by Rennie Davis.

The demonstrations proved less potent than expected, although activities were

conducted at numerous locations across the United States. Student strikes, often with far less participation than organizers had expected, were held in such cities as Chicago, Ill.; Ann Arbor, Mich.; Denton, Tex.; Detroit, Mich.; Atlanta, Ga.; and New York, N.Y. Those strikes which did occur reflected major involvement by SDS.

GI-oriented activities were also numerous but less effective than anticipated. On November 2 Washington Mobe held a small rally in Lafayette Park, while Mobe teams leafleted at Fort Belvoir, Fort Meyer, Bolling Air Force Base, and the Marine Barracks. At Pratt Institute on November 5, members of Brooklyn College SDS and some Pratt students tried to force their way into the student center to disrupt Army and Navy recruiters who were attempting to conduct interviews.

On November 2 a reported 250 people attended an antiwar teach-in at Rosewood Park in Austin, Tex. A correspondent for the Guardian claimed that at least one-third of those who attended were GIs. It was reported that some 50 GIs from Fort Hood participated, along with servicemen from Fort Sam Houston and from Bergstrom and Laredo Air Force Bases. The attempted antiwar activity at Fort Dix proved largely abortive.

GI Week activities in New York City included a rally on November 2. This rally, reportedly attended by approximately 2,000 people, was sponsored by the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, Mobe's New York arm, with major participation by Veterans for Peace in Vietnam. Speakers included James Johnson and DuBois Clubs member Dennis Mora of the original Fort Hood Three, Youth Against War and Fascism leader Joel Myers, and several representatives from the American Servicemen's Union, founded by YAWF member Andrew Stapp.

At an administrative committee session in Washington, D.C., on November 17, 1968, further plans were laid for the Mobe-sponsored action during the inauguration in January 1969. According to Harry Ring in an article appearing in the November 29, 1968, issue of The Militant, official organ of the SWP, there were about 100 people present, 17 of them members of the committee and the rest "Washington-Baltimore-area SDSers who had been brought to the meeting." According to Ring, the SDS members "proceeded to set policy for the antiwar coalition which the Mobe is supposed to represent."

At a meeting near Kalamazoo, Mich., on November 15-17, however, the national interim committee of SDS specifically rejected Mobe proposals that SDS co-sponsor the inauguration demonstrations. One of the reasons for this rejection was reportedly SDS fear that the Mobe would, as the Guardian put it, "again dominate the public political posture of the action while SDS members took it on the head from the cops."

The Counter-Inaugural demonstrations were held in Washington on January 18-20, 1969. Coordinator for the project was Rennie Davis, and the following people were among the sponsors:

- (1) Stewart Meacham, peace educa-



tion secretary for the American Friends Service Committee and participant in a November 1968 meeting in Moscow, U.S.S.R., at the invitation of the Soviet Peace Committee;

(2) Rev. Richard Fernandez, director of Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, a Mobe-affiliated group which aids American deserters in Sweden;

(3) Tom Hayden, a founder of SDS;

(4) Dr. Robert B. Rutman, chairman of the Philadelphia Area Council of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and an identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;

(5) Paul Potter, former president of SDS;

(6) Prof. Harry Lustig, member of the Committee of the Professions and a sponsor of the original Spring Mobilization;

(7) Barbara Bick, WSP;

(8) Dennis Mora, Fort Hood Three and DuBois Clubs;

(9) Linda Morse, Radical Organizing Committee;

(10) Norma Becker, Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;

(11) Jodie Palmour, a member of the Southern Student Organizing Committee, a group associated with SDS;

(12) Al Evanoff, Mobe cochairman;

(13) John Wilson, Mobe cochairman;

(14) Rennie Davis, Mobe national coordinator;

(15) Dave Dellinger, editor, Liberation, and Mobe chairman;

(16) Howard Petrick, activist in the Student Mobilization Committee and member of both the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance.

Organizations which endorsed and participated in the Counter-Inauguration included:

(1) the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;

(2) the Southern Student Organizing Committee;

(3) the Communist Party, U.S.A.;

(4) the Socialist Workers Party;

(5) the Young Socialist Alliance;

(6) Youth Against War and Fascism;

(7) Women Strike for Peace;

(8) local and regional SDS groups;

(9) Veterans for Peace in Vietnam;

(10) the U.S. Committee to Aid the NLF;

(11) the Coalition for an Anti-Imperialist Movement, a combined project of YAWF and the USCANLFSV;

(12) the Committee for GI Rights, a YAWF front;

(13) the Committee to Support Middle East Liberation, another YAWF front group;

(14) the Freedom and Peace Party, a Communist Party political front organization based in New York City.

In addition, endorsement for the action was received from the National GI-Civilian Anti-War Action Conference, held in Chicago on December 27-28, 1968, and initiated by the Student Mobilization Committee, by that time under firm YSA control.

It was claimed by the Mobilization that active-duty GIs from at least 15 military bases were scheduled to participate; and a contingent of veterans and GI's did lead the line of march in a parade down Pennsylvania Avenue on Sunday, Jan-

uary 19. In this contingent were David Samas and James Johnson, original members of the Fort Hood Three who had recently been released from prison.

Medical aid for demonstrators was organized once again by the Medical Committee for Human Rights, particularly the MCHR's Washington, D.C., chapter. Staff persons in charge of street organizers included Rennie Davis and Maryann Weissman, national coordinator of Youth Against War and Fascism.

On January 18 there was a "Teach-In on the Movement" at the Riverside Church. This session, billed as a supplement to the "Conference on the Movement" being held the same day at the Hawthorne School, heard a varied group of radical activists, including:

(1) Dagmar Wilson, Women Strike for Peace;

(2) Al McSurley, Southern Conference Educational Fund;

(3) Lee Webb, Ramparts;

(4) John McAuliff, Committee of Returned [Peace Corps] Volunteers;

(5) Laurie Sandow, New York High School Students Union;

(6) Marcus Raskin, New Party;

(7) David Dellinger, National Mobe;

(8) Stewart Meacham, American Friends Service Committee;

(9) Andrew Stapp, American Servicemen's Union;

(10) Fred Halstead, Socialist Workers Party.

Stapp spoke on "The Antiwar Movement in the Army." Some other topics discussed were the high school student movement (Laurie Sandow); "North VietNam [sic] and the American Movement" (Stewart Meacham); "Sedition in Appalachia" (Al McSurley); and "Prospects for the anti-war movement" (Dagmar Wilson).

The Hawthorne School conference consisted of some 50 separate workshops, held all through the day and into the evening until around 10. A great number of subjects were discussed by the participants, who numbered in the hundreds. Some of the topics considered were GI organizing, antidraft activity, underground media, campus rebellion, black liberation, newsreel films, racism, relations with the National Liberation Front, tax resistance, and nonviolence.

The conference placed heavy emphasis on GI organizing and support for antiwar GIs. At a press conference on the morning of Saturday, January 18, Dave Dellinger stressed particularly the need to support antiwar GIs and claimed that there would be a fast development of GI demonstration activity not unlike that at the end of World War II. Participants in the GI panel at the conference included:

(1) David Samas, one of the Fort Hood Three;

(2) Andy Stapp, editor of The Bond, ASU newspaper;

(3) Sherman Sitrin, an antiwar GI from Fort Belvoir, Va., and participant in activities of the Student Mobilization Committee;

(4) Lew Jones, a leader in the Socialist Workers Party;

(5) Howard Petrick, an ex-GI, employee of the Student Mobe, and member of the SWP and YSA;

(6) Allen Myers, ex-GI, leader in Stu-

dent Mobe, and member of both the SWP and YSA.

On January 19 approximately 4,000 people staged marches and demonstrations, including a demonstration at the Smithsonian Institution during a reception for the Vice President and wife. Various objects were thrown before police broke up the demonstration. During January 19 speakers at a rally held in the Mobe's tent near the Washington Monument included James Johnson of the NBAWADU, Dave Dellinger, Rennie Davis, and Marilyn Webb, a Guardian writer and representative of the women's liberation movement. Scheduled speaker Kathleen Cleaver, wife of Black Panther leader Eldridge Cleaver, did not show up.

There was also a poorly attended and very disorganized "Counter-Inaugural Ball" on the evening of January 19. After this affair many of the demonstrators simply went home and ignored the planned demonstrations along the route of the inaugural parade the next day.

On January 20 some 600 to 800 demonstrators appeared along the parade route on Pennsylvania Avenue, primarily near 15th Street. Police were reinforced by members of the National Guard and Armed Forces. Many of the demonstrators, particularly member of YAWF, CO AIM, and the U.S. Committee to Aid the NLF, threw such objects as rocks and smoke bombs at the parade in an attempt to halt and disrupt it.

Testifying before the House Committee on Internal Security on June 9, 1970, Metropolitan D.C. Police Chief Jerry Wilson indicated that this activity was "technically separate from the counter-inaugural parade inasmuch as it was not directly sponsored by anyone insofar as formal sponsorship is concerned."

After the parade had passed some of the demonstrators spread out in the direction of Lafayette Park in an effort to enter the 1600 block of Pennsylvania Avenue. Bands of demonstrators blocked intersections, disrupted traffic, and smashed windows. Chief Wilson stated that 85 arrests were made between 12 noon and 9 p.m. on January 20. He estimated the total number of participants during the 3-day action as being in the area of 15,000; and he further testified that the demonstrations cost the police a total of \$265,000 and that the cost to the military was \$35,000.

According to Chief Wilson, most of the arrests made during the three days of demonstrations were made "during the street skirmishes which occurred in the Lafayette Park area." He said that there were "relatively few injuries reported for demonstrators or police" and that property damage was fairly light.

During the 3-day period, according to official FBI figures, there were 119 people arrested. Of these, 10 were juveniles. Six of those arrested were charged with mutilation, burning, or desecration of the American flag.

A message received by the Mobilization from the Central Committee to Campaign for Democracy and Disarmament in Germany indicated that the Mobe's activities had once again occasioned international communist approval:

We declare our solidarity with your demonstration against the War in Vietnam during Nixon's Inauguration. We demand the immediate start of negotiations with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the NLF about the departure of US troops and for national freedom and self-determination of the Vietnam peoples.

The Campaign for Democracy and Disarmament in Germany is a West German organization which has participated in affairs of the International Liaison Committee of the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam, an operation of the World Peace Council, international Communist "peace" front.

After the Counter-Inaugural actions, the National Mobilization Committee became relatively dormant, although Mobe leaders and affiliated organizations participated actively in organizing and executing a series of anti-Vietnam war demonstrations across the United States on April 5 and 6, 1969. This campaign had been announced at a March 24 press conference in New York City. Participating in the press conference were Mobe cochairman Dave Dellinger, one of the eight movement activists indicted for conspiracy to foment mob violence in Chicago during the August 1968 Democratic National Convention; Eric Weinberger, administrator of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee; identified communist Otto Nathan; pro-Hanoi ex-GI and Fort Hood Three member James Johnson, by then the new chairman of the NBAWADU; and Cora Weiss, Women Strike for Peace Leader who has participated in talks with Vietcong representatives in Paris.

The April 5 demonstration in Chicago was organized by the Chicago Peace Council, communist-controlled Mobe affiliate. In Chicago, as well as the other cities where demonstrations occurred, there was strong emphasis on GIs, continuing the program established during the November 1968 protests. Speakers in Chicago included:

- (1) Sidney Peck of the National Mobe;
- (2) Stewart Meacham of the American Friends Service Committee and frequent participant in Mobe administrative committee sessions;
- (3) Nathaniel Junior of the Black Panther Party, who expressed disapproval of the march and called for "victory for brother Ho";
- (4) Cha Cha Jimenez of the Young Lords Organization, a militant Puerto Rican group allied with the Black Panther Party;
- (5) Joe Miles, a black GI from Fort Bragg, N.C., and admitted member of the Trotskyist communist YSA.

Rennie Davis was scheduled to speak, but did not appear.

The New York demonstration was organized by the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, communist-dominated New York Mobe affiliate. Chief marshal for the parade, which included a major veterans' and GIs' contingent, was SWP leader Fred Halstead, a leading Parade Committee staff member. Scheduled speakers included Mobe cochairman Dave Dellinger and Black Panther Kathleen Cleaver; rally chair-

man was prominent Communist Party supporter Ossie Davis. There were speeches of support for the Black Panther Party and the "Conspiracy," the latter being the movement's name for the eight leaders indicted in Chicago for their activities in connection with the disruption of the 1968 Democratic Convention. The crowd also heard a tape recording of Mrs. Nguyen Thi Binh, a deputy leader of the NLF delegation in Paris.

In Seattle a public forum on Vietnam was held on April 5 under the sponsorship of the GI-Civilian Alliance for Peace, a Mobe affiliate. Speakers included Aaron Dixon, captain of the Seattle branch of the Black Panther Party, and attorney Terence Hallinan, a leader in the Communist Party's DuBois Clubs and identified member of the CPUSA.

In San Francisco a large crowd marched on April 6 to the Presidio Army base. One of the scheduled speakers for this GI-oriented demonstration was, again, Terence Hallinan. Groups which participated in the demonstration included SDS, the Peace and Freedom Party, GIs for Peace, Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, National Mobe, and the Young Socialist Alliance.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. THOMPSON), who will present detailed information on the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, one of the most recent direct predecessors of the PCPJ and NPAC—and one of the most ambitious communist-dominated united front efforts ever mounted in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in the late spring of 1969 a group of 27 antiwar leaders, most of them Mobe-connected, endorsed a call to a National Anti-War Conference in Cleveland, Ohio, on July 4-5, 1969, "to broaden and unify the anti-war forces in this country and to plan co-ordinated national anti-war actions for the fall." This call was circulated throughout the antiwar movement by means of the mailing list of the National Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam.

Primary organizer of this conference was Case-Western Reserve University professor Sidney M. Peck, a leading Mobe official and former member of the Wisconsin State Committee of the CPUSA. The host for the conference was the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, a major Mobe affiliate once led by Peck, in cooperation with the University Circle Teach-In Committee, a constituent group in the CAPAC coalition and one of the original sponsors of the conference in 1966 which established Mobe's first predecessor, the November 8 Mobilization Committee.

Among the initial endorsers of the National Anti-War Conference were the following:

- (1) Norma Becker, a leader of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade

Committee, key New York Mobe affiliate, and frequent speaker at meetings of the CPUSA-controlled Dubois Clubs;

- (2) Professor Charles Cairns, head of the Texas Coalition Against the War, endorser of the 1968 presidential ticket of the Socialist Workers Party, and University of Texas faculty adviser for the YSA;

(3) Stephanie Coontz, leader in the Seattle GI-Civilian Alliance for Peace and member of the Young Socialist Alliance;

(4) Dave Dellinger, a primary force in National Mobe, self-identified non-Soviet communist, and supporter of front organizations of the Communist Party, Socialist Workers Party, Young Socialist Alliance, and Youth Against War and Fascism;

(5) Professor Douglas Dowd, leading Mobe official, member of the executive committee of the communist-controlled National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and participant in the March 1969 legislative conference of the CPUSA-front National Committee to Abolish HUAC/HISC;

(6) Al Evanoff, New York labor leader, Mobe supporter speaker for the DuBois Clubs, and sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, a Communist Party front;

(7) Jerry Gordon, leader of the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, onetime identified leader in the Labor Youth League in Ohio, speaker at a June 1969 SWP election rally, and participant in activities of the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee;

(8) Robert Greenblatt, long-time Mobe activist and open supporter of the North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front;

(9) Professor Donald Kalish, supporter of numerous communist causes who has identified himself as being far to the left of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;

(10) Sidney Lens, leader in the Chicago Peace Council and onetime leader of the subversive Revolutionary Workers League;

(11) Carol Lipman, leading activist in the Student Mobilization Committee and prominent member of the Young Socialist Alliance and Socialist Workers Party;

(12) Arthur Kinoy, a vice president of the Communist Party-controlled National Lawyers Guild and national committee member of the National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee;

(13) Stewart Meacham, a leading official of the American Friends Service Committee, who traveled to Moscow to participate in a November 1968 meeting at the invitation of the Soviet Peace Committee and who has supported projects of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, and Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, all of which are fronts for the CPUSA;

(14) Professor Sidney Peck, who, in addition to his former CPUSA affiliation, is a supporter of the Student Mobilization Committee, a member of the national committee of the NECLC, and a sponsor of the GI Civil Liberties Defense Committee, and operation of the SWP and YSA;



(15) Max Primack, a leading member of the Chicago Peace Council, a key Mobe affiliate, and speaker for the SWP's Friday Night Socialist Forum in Chicago in 1967;

(16) Andrew Pulley, a member of the YSA;

(17) Irving Sarnoff, chairman of the communist-controlled Peace Action Council of Southern California, a major Mobe affiliate, and identified leader in the Southern California District of the CPUSA;

(18) Ken Shilman, a leader in the San Francisco GI-Civilian Alliance for Peace and member of the Socialist Workers Party;

(19) Dr. Benjamin Spock, recipient of an award from the Communist-controlled National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, sponsor of the National Committee to Abolish HUAC, sponsor of a dinner of the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, and supporter of the Freedom and Peace Party;

(20) Cora Weiss, a New York leader of Women Strike for Peace, who has traveled to North Vietnam and who has participated in 4 days of talks in Paris with representatives of North Vietnam and the Vietcong;

(21) Dagmar Wilson, founder of Women Strike for Peace, participant in activities of the Communist National Guardian, sponsor of the NCAHUAC, sender of greetings to a session of the international communist-front World Peace Council, and open supporter of the North Vietnamese cause.

The official "Invitational List of Delegates" to the National Anti-War Conference reflects participation by the following regional coalitions affiliated with the national Mobe office:

(1) Cleveland Area Peace Action Council,

(2) Chicago Peace Council,

(3) Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee,

(4) Minnesota Mobilization Committee,

(5) San Francisco GI-Civilian Alliance for Peace,

(6) Seattle GI-Civilian Alliance for Peace,

(7) Southern California Peace Action Council,

(8) Texas Coalition Against the War,

(9) Washington Mobilization Committee.

The following groups were also listed as being among those national organizations participating:

(1) Black Panther Party;

(2) Communist Party, U.S.A.;

(3) Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam;

(4) W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America;

(5) Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam, an organization with several leaders who have close ties to the CPUSA-front National Lawyers Guild;

(6) National Black Anti-War, Anti-Draft Union, an offshoot of the Student Mobilization Committee's Black Caucus;

(7) National Lawyers Guild;

(8) National Mobilization Committee;

(9) Progressive Labor Party;

(10) Socialist Workers Party;

(11) Southern Conference Educational Fund, led by identified Communist Party members Carl and Anne Braden;

(12) Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee;

(13) Southern Student Organizing Committee, a group associated with Students for a Democratic Society;

(14) Students for a Democratic Society;

(15) Student Mobilization Committee;

(16) Veterans for Peace in Vietnam;

(17) Women Strike for Peace;

(18) Workers World Party;

(19) Youth Against War and Fascism,

WWP youth front;

(20) Young Socialist Alliance, SWP youth and training section.

Illustrative of the emphasis on GI organizing and antiwar propaganda among servicemen was the fact that 20 "active duty GI groups, papers and coffee houses" were scheduled to participate. Among those listed were the American Servicemen's Union and its newspaper, *the Bond*; *the GI Organizer*, published in Killeen, Tex.; and GIs United Against the War in Vietnam, Fort Bragg, North Carolina. Another, more complete delegate roster shows that the GI Civil Liberties Defense Committee also participated in the conference.

The American Servicemen's Union was founded and is dominated by Andrew Stapp, a member of the Workers World Party's youth front, Youth Against War and Fascism; Stapp also serves as editor of *the Bond*. Representing the GI Organizer at the conference was Walter M. Kos, a self-proclaimed member of the SWP's youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance. GIs United Against the War in Vietnam is an organization made up of anti-Vietnam war servicemen and led by members of the Young Socialist Alliance and/or Socialist Workers Party; the GI Civil Liberties Defense Committee is an SWP/YSA operation designed to provide legal and other aid for these antiwar activist servicemen. The GICLDC has also cooperated closely with attorneys from the Communist-controlled National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee.

Among the several hundred individual delegates were:

(1) Fred Halstead, SWP;

(2) Don Gurewitz, CAPAC, and SMC, member of both the SWP and YSA;

(3) Allan Bhdka, CAPAC and SWP;

(4) Sylvia Kushner, Chicago Peace Council and CPUSA;

(5) Jay Schaffner, CPC, DuBois Clubs; and CPUSA;

(6) Norma Becker, Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;

(7) Al Evanoff, FAVPPC;

(8) Abe Weisburd, FAVPPC and Trade Unionists for Peace;

(9) Marjorie Colvin, San Francisco GI-CAP, member of the SWP;

(10) Mike Maggi, YSA;

(11) Helen Gurewitz, Washington Mobilization Committee, CPUSA;

(12) Abe Bloom, Washington Mobe, sponsor of the Washington Area Committee for the Abolition of HUAC; an affiliate of the Communist Party-controlled NCAHUAC;

(13) Evelyn Kirsch, YSA;

(14) Arnold Johnson, CPUSA;

(15) Phil Bart, CPUSA;

(16) Eugene Tournour, DuBois Clubs, member of the CPUSA;

(17) James Johnson, NBAWADU;

(18) Paul Zilsel, Friends of the Panthers, participant in activities of both the Workers World Party and Youth Against War and Fascism;

(19) David Hawk, Vietnam Moratorium Committee;

(20) Gus Horowitz, SWP;

(21) Joana Misnik, SMC and YSA;

(22) Allen Myers, SMC, SWP, and YSA;

(23) LeRoy Wolins, Veterans for Peace, CPUSA;

(24) Dorothy Hayes, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, identified member CPUSA;

(25) Sam Marcy, Workers World Party;

(26) Theodore Dostal, WWP;

(27) Andrew Pulley, YSA;

(28) Larry Seigle, YSA;

(29) Peter Gellert, YSA;

(30) Margaret Driggs, American Committee for Solidarity with the Vietnamese People, a pro-Hanoi communist front;

(31) William Okain, YSA;

(32) Peggy Swingle, YSA;

(33) Fred Brode, YSA;

(34) Dr. Robert Rutman, Philadelphia SANE, and identified member of the CPUSA;

(35) Abe Feinglass, Chicago labor leader and identified member of the Communist Party;

(36) Otto Nathan, identified Communist;

(37) Jack Spiegel, identified member of the CPUSA and leader in the Chicago Peace Council;

(38) Dave Dellinger, self-professed Communist and Mobe leader;

(39) Jerry Gordon, one-time Ohio leader in the Labor Youth League;

(40) Rennie Davis, militantly pro-Hanoi Mobe activist;

(41) Sidney Lens, Chicago Peace Council;

(42) Carol Lipman, SMC, YSA, and SWP;

(43) Sidney Peck, Mobe official and former Wisconsin CPUSA leader;

(44) Irving Sarnoff, identified CPUSA member;

(45) Cora Weiss, WSP;

(46) Irving Beinin, *Guardian*.

The conference steering committee, as shown on an official list dated July 5, 1969, reflected the basically communist complexion of the gathering. Included were such movement personalities as:

(1) Norma Becker, Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;

(2) Barbara Bick, leader in Women Strike for Peace and participant in the communist World Peace Assembly, held in East Berlin in June 1969 under the auspices of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council;

(3) Rennie Davis, one of the primary organizers of the violent disruptions in Chicago during the August 1968 Democratic National Convention and a public supporter of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong;

(4) Dave Dellinger, Mobe, *Liberation* magazine;

- (5) Jerry Gordon, CAPAC;
- (6) Fred Halstead, SWP;
- (7) Arnold Johnson, CPUSA;
- (8) Donald Kalish, Peace Action Council of Southern California;
- (9) Sidney Lens, Chicago Peace Council, Mobe;
- (10) Carol Lipman, SMC, member of the SWP and YSA;
- (11) Sidney Peck, Mobe;
- (12) Irving Sarnoff, Peace Action Council of Southern California;
- (13) Cora Weiss, WSP;
- (14) Dorothy Hayes, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;
- (15) Allen Myers, Veterans for Peace, *GI Press Service* (an operation of the SMC); SWP, and YSA;
- (16) Terry Robins, SDS observer;
- (17) Kathy Boudin, SDS observer;
- (18) John Wilson, SNCC and Mobe.

Another member of the conference steering committee was Pvt. Joe Miles, who was nominated from the floor by identified Communist Party member and Veterans for Peace founder LeRoy Wolins. Miles, a professed member of the Trotskyist communist Young Socialist Alliance, has been identified in *The Militant* as the initial organizer of GIs United Against the War in Vietnam at Fort Jackson, South Carolina, and Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Decisions on delegate status were handled by the steering committee's credentials committee, which included Irving Bein of the *Guardian*; Halstead; Peck; Rev. Richard Fernandez, director of Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam; and John McAuliff of the Committee of Returned Volunteers, a pro-Hanoi organization that also supports the National Liberation Front and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, an NLF creation.

The conference was called because of widespread dissatisfaction in the antiwar movement. There were three main bones of contention. First, many were divided on the single-issue as against the multi-issue approach; this meant that either the movement should concentrate on mass mobilization solely against the war and for American withdrawal, or it should base its actions on the war and other related issues such as poverty, racism, and repression. Second was the issue of nonviolence as against civil disobedience and possible violent confrontations. And third was the lack of any large-scale actions by National Mobe.

Chicago Vets for Peace, for example, had withheld its participation in several Mobe projects because it was felt that Mobe demonstrations tended to arouse violence, which was damaging to VFP's image. Also, LeRoy Wolins, the real power in VFP, felt that the Mobe had slighted his group by not taking seriously enough VFP's GI-oriented program.

The Chicago Peace Council was generally in agreement with National Mobe, but certain organizations within the CPC—notably the Socialist Workers Party, Young Socialist Alliance, and Student Mobilization Committee—were pressing for changes.

The SWP, YSA, SMC, and Chicago

Vets for Peace all felt that a single-issue organization would be best and would be used most effectively by the movement to mobilize public participation and support. These groups felt that National Mobe was becoming too multi-issue in its strategy and orientation and that it was too prone to arouse violence in connection with its demonstrations. Nationally, the SWP, YSA, and SMC played major roles in mobilizing support for the National Anti-War Conference.

The conference sessions began on the afternoon of July 4 and were open to the public. Speakers included Jerry Gordon, Sidney Peck, Irving Sarnoff, Stewart Meacham, Mark Rudd, Leo Fenster, Douglas Dowd, and Dave Dellinger.

Fenster, a United Auto Workers union leader who has been identified as a member of the Communist Party, spoke of the need for physical struggle, saying that the "peace" movement should be mindful of the physical struggle involved in building the labor movement. According to eyewitness Irwin Bock, who testified before HCIS in April 1970, Fenster "said that no change would take place if there was no blood being shed. . . ."

Peck said that antiwar actions to be planned by the conference should be massive and should consist of many different sorts of actions in many different places.

The next scheduled speaker was interrupted by identified CPUSA member LeRoy Wolins, who objected to the lack of any black representation on the conference steering committee. Wolins, as previously noted, proposed Pvt. Joe Miles, a member of the Young Socialist Alliance, and this proposal was adopted.

Next was identified CPUSA member Irving Sarnoff, who proposed that the Mobe sponsor demonstrations near the summer White House in San Clemente, Calif., in the early fall.

The next speaker was Stewart Meacham, who proposed a "reading of the war dead" in which people from across the Nation would converge on Washington, D.C., each person wearing the name of a dead American soldier around his neck. This project was initiated by Meacham's group, the American Friends Service Committee.

Next came Mark Rudd of SDS. Rudd more or less took over the platform and announced that SDS was planning a national action on September 27 in Chicago, Ill. The slogans were to include "Bring the Troops Home," "Show Support for the National Liberation Front," "Support the Black and Brown Struggle," "Free All Political Prisoners," "Abolish the Surtax," "Independence for Puerto Rico," "GI Rights," and "Support the Conspiracy." The big emphasis was to be on anti-imperialism. This proposal, for which Rudd solicited the conference's endorsement, caused controversy and some apprehension among the delegates, and no official action was taken at that time.

The majority report of the conference steering committee was given by Douglas Dowd and David Dellinger. This report advocated mass demonstrations with varying tactics, including civil disobedience, all of which would be sanc-

tioned by New Mobe. Further, demonstrations would be multi-issue in order to attract as wide a variety of groups as possible.

The basic policy proposal for mass actions against the war in Vietnam was presented to the conference by the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council delegation which included CAPAC chairman Jerry Gordon, SWP member Al Budka, and SMC activist Don Gurewitz, who is also a member of the SWP and YSA.

What was initially a minority report was delivered by Jerry Gordon. It differed with the majority report in several respects. It rejected civil disobedience, which was seen as too risky in terms of possible alienation of groups which might otherwise participate. Though also desiring a massive turnout for demonstrations, the minority pushed strongly for a single-issue approach centered around ending the war in Vietnam and bringing the troops home.

These conflicting reports caused a split among the delegates, with competing factions noisily vying for the floor. The chairman lost control of the meeting. Discussion lasted until late in the evening of July 4, the only result being that the whole matter was put over to the next day for further debate.

On the morning of July 5 workshops were held on such subjects as the "Early Fall November Action," "The Chicago Action, 27 September," "Action Called by Stewart Meacham," "Summer White House Action," "October Moratorium," and "GI and Civilian Alliances." The workshop on the Chicago action was conducted by CPUSA member Jack Spiegel of the Chicago Peace Council.

The workshop reports were submitted to the conference chairman. It was stated that they would go to the steering committee for action and evaluation and ultimately to the executive committee (not yet formed at that point) for final decision.

On the afternoon of July 5 SWP leader Fred Halstead read to the delegates the steering committee's proposal for a compromise resolution incorporating both majority and minority proposals.

This compromise proposal endorsed the August 17 San Clemente demonstration; a "reading of the war dead" on the first Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday in September; and the October 15 Vietnam Moratorium. These were three national actions that were "being organized by associated groups." The proposal also endorsed and proposed to provide Mobe administrative and organizing personnel for the September 27 Chicago action related to the so-called "Conspiracy" trial and for a "broad mass legal November 15th demonstration" in Washington, D.C., with "an associated demonstration" on the same day in San Francisco, Calif.

The "reading of the war dead" scheduled for September later became a part of the November demonstrations organized by New Mobe, and the Chicago action scheduled for September 27 never materialized. Instead, SDS held violent demonstrations in Chicago on October 8-11. SDS and New Mobe never achieved a working agreement on these demonstrations, primarily because SDS wanted sole control. As a result, New Mobe's sup-



port for the SDS October action was merely nominal.

The compromise proposal, which was finally adopted by the conference, caused considerable controversy with some shouting that it represented a "sellout." There had been no announcement the previous evening that the steering committee was engaged in such tactics; most of the delegates had anticipated that on July 5 there would be further discussion until a resolution satisfactory to all would be achieved by the entire conference after free and open debate.

The compromise meant that those who favored mass legal actions would have their day on November 15 in Washington, while those who favored militant confrontationist tactics would be converging on Chicago. As Bock stated, "what commonly started going around the meeting was that the good guys would be going to Washington and the bad guys would be going to Chicago.

According to Irwin Bock, the workshop reports "did not fit in at all." First, the compromise proposal was read, placed as a resolution for adoption, and passed. Then "the chairman said, 'We will now hear from the workshops on the proposals for fall actions.'" This caused people to laugh because "they had just completed adopting a program for the fall offensive. Now they are going to listen to the people who worked all morning on resolutions and proposals for specific actions to be implemented in the fall offensive which in reality were never going to be held."

In assuring that the conference adopted a program of mass action against the war, activists from the SWP, YSA, SMC, and GIs United played crucial roles. According to *The Militant* for July 18, 1969:

*Representatives of the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance sought to demonstrate that revolutionaries who regarded themselves as partisans of the Vietnamese liberation struggle had the obligation to build a broad mass movement in opposition to the war from the viewpoint of aiding the Vietnamese revolution as well as from the standpoint of accelerating the radicalizing process in this country.*

The discussion made apparent that the stand favoring central emphasis on mass action had the support of the great majority of the participants and, even though they were divided on other issues, among the majority of the conference steering committee. This made it possible for what began as a sharply divided conference to work out agreement on a program of action that in all its main features reflected the majority view and yet made it possible for the entire coalition to remain united. [Emphasis added.]

*The Militant* for October 10, 1969, candidly observed:

Here again, the SWP and YSA played a central role in insuring that the anti-war movement would take the next necessary steps forward. It took a political struggle to win the conference, and it took a political struggle at the conference to win the call to the demonstration [on November 15, 1969].

The key again was the SMC. The SMC took the call to the conference and publicized it far and wide. The SMC pushed and prodded others to come along (and more than a few came, somewhat reluctantly at

first.) The SMC made the conference a representative gathering of the antiwar movement with the authority to call the march on Washington [on November 15]. After a thorough political debate, there was a highly favorable response to the idea of Nov. 15, and a new national coalition [New Mobe] was set up to organize it. The next day (July 6), an SMC conference called for a student strike on Nov. 14, which can involve hundreds of thousands and build support for the march on Washington. [Emphasis added.]

The role played by members of GIs United Against the War in Vietnam at the conference was described thusly in the July 18 *Militant*.

Additional powerful arguments in favor of mass action as opposed to adventurist pseudoconfrontations by a few were advanced by members of GIs United Against the War in Vietnam who participated in the conference. Pvt. Joe Miles and ex-Pvt. Andrew Pulley explained how GIs United had developed and why their care in avoiding any adventurist trap had made it possible to win the confidence and support of many GIs as well as significant support from the civilian population.

Both Miles and Pulley are publicly known, self-professed activists in the SWP's Young Socialist Alliance.

The primary result of the conference was the organization of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam to carry on the work of the now-defunct National Mobe in organizing what a late July 1969 Mobe mailing called "the most intense anti-war campaign ever undertaken in the United States—the Fall Offensive." The program was to include several activities at various times and in various locations around the country; but the key elements in the scheduled program were the October 15, 1969, nationwide Vietnam Moratorium being organized by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee and a massive march on Washington on November 15, with a simultaneous demonstration on the west coast.

The original call for the October 15 action had been issued late in June 1969, prior to the convening of the National Anti-War Conference, but VMC coordinator David Hawk played an active role at the conference as a member of its steering committee and was one of those chosen for membership on the New Mobe steering committee at the conclusion of the conference. The VMC's program for October 15 wound up as one of three projects "being organized by associated groups" which the National Anti-War Conference formally endorsed and incorporated into the overall Fall Offensive.

Subsequent New Mobe and VMC literature reflected this pattern of mutual cooperation and endorsement. In literature mailed to editors of GI newspapers, the VMC referred to "its part in the 'Fall Offensive' against the war in Vietnam. . . ." And New Mobe Fall Offensive literature spoke of those numerous groups, including the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, which would provide the "principal resources" that would assure the success of the planned November actions.

An official New Mobe press release dated October 21, 1969, announced:

Co-chairmen of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam announced today their endorsement of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee and the activities it sponsors. The announcement was preceded [sic] at an earlier news conference by an endorsement of the New Mobilization Committee and its demonstrations for November 13-15 in Washington by the four coordinators of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee.

According to the October 22 issue of the Communist Party's official newspaper, the *Daily World*:

Sam Brown, Moratorium coordinator, declared here, "On November 15 the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam in sponsoring a peaceful and legal mass march and rally in Washington, D.C. Coordinators of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, as well as Moratorium supporters from around the country, plan to march. We will provide support for local Moratorium groups who will be coming to Washington and we encourage others to join us in the March on Washington."

Along with the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, the second major group in organizing the New Mobe's Fall Offensive was the Student Mobilization Committee. The SMC held its own conference in Cleveland on July 6, 1969, immediately following the National Anti-War Conference, in which SMC activists had played such a significant role. The SMC conference formally endorsed both the VNC's October 15 Vietnam Moratorium and the New Mobe's November 15 March on Washington. The Student Mobilization Committee played a vital role in organizing and mobilizing support for the entire Fall Offensive program.

The July 18 *Militant*, in discussing the July 6 SMC conference in Cleveland, included this item which reflects that the SMC insisted on mass actions against the war at least partially because of the approval for such tactics from the communists in Vietnam:

Julie Miller, a high school student in New York Front, noted that the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam had sent messages of support to the U.S. antiwar movement, urging us to keep up our massive demonstrations; thus, she concluded, the NLF apparently regards mass antiwar actions as more decisive in supporting them than would be an ultimatic slogan, 'Support the NLF,' raised by a small number of 'anti-imperialists.'

Subsequently, the New Mobe's program for November 1969 was to include a "March Against Death" on November 13-14, at which time demonstrators were to file past the White House, each demonstrator to carry the name of one American soldier killed in Vietnam. The VMC's schedule included an expanded moratorium, also for November 13-14. Both events, of course, coincided perfectly with the SMC's own projected November 14 student strike.

On October 20, 1969, SMC executive secretary and YSA member Carol Lipman announced that the SMC was backing "all anti-war activities," including the expanded moratorium on November 13-14 and the New Mobe's Washington march on November 15; and an official SMC Fall Offensive promotional leaflet urged people to "Join the fall antiwar offensive" and stated that the "SMC has

endorsed and is actively building the November 15 demonstration."

An official New Mobe press handout entitled "A Note on the Relationship of Antiwar Organizations," issued prior to November 15, explained the Mobe's approach to its main collaborators, the SMC and VMC, "both of which have major programs of their own this fall," Mobe declared:

The leadership of the three groups [New Mobe, Student Mobe, and Vietnam Moratorium Committee] sees the activities of the others as complimentary [sic] to its own. In other words, the activities of one organization is [sic] in no way seen as contradictory to the others, neither are the activities 'competitive.' Clearly, there is a need for viable anti-war activity moving forward on various levels and under various operating procedures. Thus, the Vietnam Moratorium Committee organizes on the local level for strictly local activity [an alteration in VMC strategy adopted after the nationwide October 15 action]; the New Mobilization Committee organizes to bring people to Washington on specific days; and the Student Mobilization Committee organizes students on campuses for activities there and for the Washington March.

To organize the Fall Offensive as originally scheduled, the conference designated so-called action chairmen and project directors. Sid Lens and pro-Hanoi activist Professor Douglas Dowd of Cornell University were placed in charge of organizing a projected October 11 demonstration in Chicago related to the "Conspiracy 8" trial. Project directors for this demonstration were to be Rennie Davis, coordinator of the Democratic Convention and counterinaugural protests, and Sylvia Kushner, secretary of the Chicago Peace Council and member of the Communist Party.

The November 15 Washington March was to be handled by AFSC leader Stewart Meacham and Sidney Peck, with Ron Young of the Fellowship of Reconciliation and Abe Bloom, chairman of the Washington Mobilization Committee, acting as project directors. Overall coordinator for the Fall Offensive was self-professed communist David Dellinger.

These nine individuals became the executive committee, with the authority to form a steering committee to implement the various proposals endorsed by the conference and, in the words of Irwin Bock, "to broaden the base of that steering committee to get as many different organizations participating as possible."

The membership of the New Mobe steering committee blatantly reflected the organization's communist domination. Members included Dave Dellinger, a self-professed communist and partisan of Hanoi; Sidney Lens, onetime leader of the dissident communist Revolutionary Workers League; Marc Beallor and Terrence Hallinan, members of the Communist Party and W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America; Jerry Gordon, a former Ohio leader in the CPUSA's Labor Youth League; Sidney Peck, Arnold Johnson, Sylvia Kushner, and Irving Sarnoff, all present or past members of the CPUSA; Marjorie Colvin, Fred Halstead, Gus Horowitz, Allen Myers, and Carol Lipman, members of the Socialist Workers Party; and Lipman, Myers, Joe Miles, Larry Seigle, Larry Swingle, and Peer

Vinther, all of whom are members of the Young Socialist Alliance.

The Washington Action Committee, which was the official New Mobe group in charge of planning the November demonstrations in Washington, was also heavily communist in its makeup. Some of its members—in addition to Peck, Halstead, Horowitz, Johnson, Lipman, Myers, and Vinther—included Don Gurewitz, a member of the Socialist Workers Party, Young Socialist Alliance, and Student Mobilization Committee; Helen Gurewitz, who has been identified as a member of the CPUSA; Dorothy Hayes, an identified member of the CPUSA; Otto Nathan, an identified communist; Harry Ring, a member of the SWP; Jose Rudder, a member of the YSA; and LeRoy Wolins, an identified member of the CPUSA.

As will be readily seen, the New Mobe was trying to maintain the policy of nonexclusion in building the united front. The New Mobe coalition embraced a very wide variety of groups, ranging from church-affiliated bodies to traditional pacifist groups to such avowedly Communist organizations as the CPUSA and SWP. Superficially at least, the presence of representatives from respectable church and pacifist groups lends an aura of legitimacy to such a coalition, especially since these are the groups usually emphasized in statements designed for public consumption.

But the hard fact is that these groups play a distinctly secondary role. They are, whether or not they fully realize it, used as a convenient facade behind which the communists operate to subvert the policies of government. The primary impetus always comes, sooner or later, from the communist elements which are, whatever their sectarian differences may be, united in their sense of purpose, especially in their disciplined determination to undermine the United States and its policies in the service of the world communist movement.

As former Progressive Labor Party member Philip Abbott Luce expressed it, "United fronts—especially on the Left—united fronts between communists and non-communists inevitably end up totally controlled by the communists to their own ends." Luce explained his argument thusly:

Once you allow the communists into an organization they ultimately take it over. And the reason for that is because most people who are interested in a movement, be it a peace movement or a union movement or a movement for civil rights or anything else, are basically good people. They're for liberal concerns. They're there because they don't like what's going on in the world. And then you confront them with power politics and communists are in all circumstances power politicians. So you get a person who's utopian, who's interested in the good life and the concerns of people, up against within an organization, the power politicians. And we all know the story lately what's happened: the power politicians always win.

This constitutes in effect a capsule analysis of precisely the situation that has existed in the Mobe from its inception in 1966. The sincere peace advocates have been cynically manipulated and exploited by communist power politicians behind the scenes who have managed to

set the Mobe's policies and who have also served as the primary organizing force by virtue of their considerable expertise in just such matters.

Fortunately there are organizations, including groups that are admittedly on the left, who have recognized the truth about such communist-run united front movements as the Mobe. A particularly cogent example is found in the following statement by Josh Muravchic, national chairman of the Socialist Party's official youth group, the Young People's Socialist League, as quoted in our hearings:

We wouldn't participate [in the New Mobe coalition] for two reasons. One is that we simply do not believe in coalescing and united fronting with communists and totalitarians—these people whose goals are the exact opposite of ours. And secondly we don't want to I think confer upon them the [kind] of legitimacy which we would confer by participating. [Emphasis added.]

Prior to the convening of the National Anti-War Conference, several people associated with New Mobe had attended two significant "peace" conferences organized by the international communist front World Peace Council. The first was the Emergency Action Conference of the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam, held in Stockholm, Sweden, on May 16-18, 1969; and the second was the World Peace Assembly, held in East Berlin in communist East Germany on June 21-24, 1969.

"Information Letter No. 2," issued by the International Liaison Committee of the Stockholm Conference on April 26, 1969, stated:

Apart from a top level Vietnamese delegation, we are especially assured of a representative US participation, reflecting different shades of the American opposition against Nixon's Vietnam policy.

The document proceeded to emphasize the need for an *international* perspective for the anti-Vietnam war movement:

That is why it is so imperative to come together, to make a thorough analysis of the situation and to find ways and means of action which perhaps could be used *all over the world*. Action co-ordinated and supported on this scale has a much bigger change to lead to results than separate action, different methods and different dates or doing nothing while feeling exhausted. [Emphasis added.]

One basic purpose of the Stockholm Conference was identified as bringing about the end of the war in Vietnam:

The basic idea of the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam is from the beginning that the Vietnam question is the first one to be solved if we want a liveable world. As long as the US war machine is maiming Vietnamese children with napalm and destroying crops by herbicides, none of the other big problems of the world will be solved. This was the reason why we called the first Conference in July 1967 and invited everybody to unite to help ending the war in Vietnam, without consideration of differences of opinion in other questions. [Emphasis added.]

It is instructive to note the similarity between this advocacy of the submerging of differences in a larger concern with the single, overriding issue of the war in Vietnam, and the July 18 *Militant* article, quoted earlier, which spoke of the ability of the National Anti-War



Conference, even though divided on some issues, "to work out agreement on a program of action that in all its main features reflected the majority view and yet made it possible for the entire coalition to remain united [around the single issue of bringing about an end to the war in Vietnam]."

The organizers of the Stockholm meeting placed great importance on the participation of the Vietnamese delegates.

In order to be able to evaluate the new situation, it is important to listen to what our Vietnamese friends will have to tell us about their experiences of the new US administration, to get informed about the different aspects of the new situation and to discuss, in common, what has to be done.

And we hope that responsible leaders of the different movements will attend the conference and participate in the discussions and afterwards see to it that the decisions and recommendations are really implemented. We hope very much of their talks with the members of the Vietnamese delegations. It is the wish of our Vietnamese friends that these contacts will develop into permanent ones.

This expressed desire for closer consultation with representatives of the Vietnamese points up the second basic purpose for which the May conference was called: "to achieve what we are aiming at with this conference—to realize that 'international mobilization' to end the war in Vietnam proclaimed at the December meeting in 1968."

The May 16-18 conference attracted representatives of a number of well-known international communist organizations, among them the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Union of Students, Women's International Democratic Federation, World Federation of Trade Unions, World Federation of Democratic Youth, and the World Peace Council.

The official "List of Participants" shows the following among the United States delegates to this conference:

- (1) Dr. Joseph Crown, Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam;
- (2) Professor William C. Davidson, member of New Mobe's steering committee;
- (3) Professor Richard Falk, Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam;
- (4) Dr. Carleton Goodlett, a leading American official in the World Peace Council and top Mobe official on the west coast;
- (5) Rev. Thomas Lee Hayes, a moving force in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, a group that aids American deserters in Sweden, and a participant in a New Mobe steering committee meeting in Washington, D.C., on February 7, 1970;
- (6) Mr. George Carrano, American Deserters Committee;
- (7) Mr. Donald McDonough, ADC;
- (8) Mrs. Doris Brin Walker Roberson, vice president, National Lawyers Guild;
- (9) Mrs. Beulah Sanders, chairman of the Citywide Coordinating Committee of Welfare Groups in New York City and an endorser of the New Mobe's November march;
- (10) Mrs. Amy Swerdlow, Women Strike for Peace;

(11) Mr. Standley Swerdlow, Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam;

(12) Mr. John Wilson, representative of SNCC and member of the New Mobe steering committee.

A Stockholm Conference mailing sent from Stockholm on May 23, 1969, stated that the conference had been attended by about 300 participants from 60 countries, including official representatives from 25 international organizations. According to this document,

The Vietnamese and US delegations were numerous and took a leading part in the deliberations of the conference. Madame Nguyen Thi Binh headed an NLF delegation of 7 and Mr. Nguyen Minh Vy was the leader of the DRV [North Vietnamese] delegation, also of 7. There were 33 U.S. delegates, representing different shades of the opposition to the U.S. war in Vietnam.

One of the primary accomplishments of the conference was the adoption of an "Appeal" which states that the "one indispensable action" that will restore peace in Vietnam is: "The complete withdrawal of all U.S. and allied troops without any conditions whatsoever to allow the people of South Vietnam to settle their own affairs, without any foreign interference."

A later version entitled "Vietnam Appeal" and adopted at a meeting of the International Liaison Committee of the Stockholm Conference on October 11-12, 1969, also demands "the total, immediate, unconditional withdrawal of U.S. and allied troops from South Vietnam."

This policy is similar in content to the officially stated policy of the New Mobe as contained in the "Position Paper of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam—October 21, 1969." This document declares that the United States must announce its "unilateral decision for withdrawal" from Vietnam and states:

The New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam will not be deflected from its aims by the deceptive 'peace' plans of the Nixon administration. We do not regard them as steps toward peace but as a means for beguiling the American people into acceptance of a longer and possibly more costly war. We will not rest until all troops and equipment are withdrawn from Vietnam and the United States renounces all military pacts to defend corrupt and dictatorial governments.

A like statement also appears in the New Mobe's basic fact sheet, which has been distributed as part of the organization's press kit:

The New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam is a broad coalition of organizations and individuals whose purpose is to gain an immediate end to the war in Vietnam through *immediate and total withdrawal of American men and materiel.* [Emphasis added.]

A significant item included in the May 23, 1969, mailing of the Stockholm Conference reflects that conference's concern with the creation and exploitation of antiwar sentiment among America's servicemen:

#### Resistance

Increased international support for resistance in America and by Americans abroad in refusing the draft, in defecting from the US armed forces, for carrying on propaganda

within the army and for militant action against the Selective Service Systems.

All these points were adopted to one or another degree by New Mobe itself or by several of its constituent organizations. The Resistance, for example, encourages draft refusal. Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam provides active assistance to American deserters in Sweden. Both GIs United Against the War in Vietnam, led by YSA members, and the American Servicemen's Union, founded by YAWF member Andy Stapp, openly agitate and propagandize among servicemen. The GI Civil Liberties Defense Committee serves as a vehicle for the SWP and YSA in aiding antiwar GIs, while the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee distributes its GI Press Service, edited by YSA and SWP member Allen Myers, free to servicemen. And an important part of New Mobe's official Spring Offensive program for 1970 was militant activities during March at draft offices around the country, involving civil disobedience and attempts to force the resignation of Selective Service workers.

The final item in the Stockholm Conference's program of action stated:

The issues of the war in Vietnam and in particular of the unconditional withdrawal of US troops and the ten-point programme of the NLF should be raised as widely as possible in all conferences, national and international, during this summer, including the *World Assembly for Peace in June*, and other meetings. [Emphasis added.]

The World Peace Assembly was held in East Berlin in communist East Germany on June 21-24, 1969. Organizations scheduled to participate, according to an official "Provisional List of Participants," included the American Friends Service Committee, World Peace Council, World Federation of Democratic Youth, and World Gathering for the Final Victory of the Vietnam People. American delegates included:

- (1) Dick Gregory, presidential candidate in 1968 for the CPUSA-front Freedom and Peace Party;
- (2) Stanley Faulkner, New York attorney and supporter of numerous Communist Party Fronts, including the National Lawyers Guild, Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties, and American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born;
- (3) Valeri Mitchell, Peace Action Council, Los Angeles;
- (4) Irving Sarnoff, chairman of the Peace Action Council of Southern California, identified member of the CPUSA, and New Mobe steering committee member.
- (5) Susan Borenstein, W. E. B. DuBois Club, Philadelphia;
- (6) Karen Ackerman, W. E. B. DuBois Club, Philadelphia;
- (7) Sonia Kaross, American-Russian Institute and Women for Peace, California (the American-Russian Institute is a San Francisco group officially cited as a CPUSA-front organization);
- (8) Estelle Cypher, Women Strike for Peace, Washington;
- (9) Dr. Herbert Aptheker, CPUSA leader, director of the CPUSA-front American Institute for Marxist Studies, and member of the presidium of the World Peace Council;

(10) Dr. Carleton Goodlett, member of the New Mobe steering committee and member of the presidium of the World Peace Council;

(11) Jarvis Tyner, national chairman of the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America and member of the Communist Party;

(12) Eleanor Ohman, secretary of the Committee for International Peace Action in San Francisco and participant in an August 5, 1969, New Mobe planning session in San Francisco;

(13) Rev. Richard Morford, member of the organizing committee for the World Peace Assembly and an identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;

(14) May Clarke, a Los Angeles coordinator for Women Strike for Peace;

(15) Barbara Bick, leading member of WSP and member of the New Mobe steering committee;

(16) Martin Hall, onetime active member of the German Communist Party, active participant in a number of communist causes, and member of the Peace Action Council of Southern California;

(17) Augie Dickerson, member of the organizing committee for the World Peace Assembly and identified member of the CPUSA;

(18) Pauline Rosen, member of Women Strike for Peace and participant in the affairs of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, major New York Mobe affiliate.

The Peace Assembly heard a speech by the head of the Soviet delegation, E. K. Federov, and received formal greetings from Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and Alexei Kosygin, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R.

Federov, in addition to a ritual denunciation of the United States and its policies, stressed the need for international coordination in the peace movement:

We Soviet followers of the peace movement consider that a lasting peace is completely possible. The basis of this conviction is [that] the powerful social and political force which confronts imperialism at the moment is against war and favours broad, international co-operation. \* \* \*

*Joint actions of the peace-loving forces is a very important factor.*

The Soviet followers of the peace movement consider it absolutely necessary to explore all avenues to find a road to common, co-ordinated action of all movements and organizations without exception, whose aims and activities serve the cause of peace.

One excellent example is the results of the Stockholm Vietnam conferences from 1967 to 1969. [Emphasis added.]

In summing up his presentation, as shown in the official printed text of his remarks to the assembly, Federov hailed the World Peace Assembly for "creating particularly favourable conditions for further improving the forms of cooperation among the peace forces."

These sentiments were echoed in the printed text of Brezhnev's and Kosygin's greetings hailing the assembly:

In our times the solution to the problems of war and peace depends to a great extent on the peoples and their active, joint struggle. The mass actions of peace supporters and participants of various anti-war movements, have achieved concrete and significant results in the struggle to thwart the aggressive plans of the imperialist circles.

It is instructive to note here two points raised by the Soviets in their presentations to the World Peace Assembly: mass action and international cooperation and coordination. The Mobe leadership, as shown by our investigation and research has maintained a significant degree of contact with representatives of international communist organizations and movements. And the emphasis on mass action was echoed specifically in the program adopted by the National Anti-War Conference in founding the New Mobilization Committee and setting up the Fall Offensive.

The official printed text of the American delegation's statement to the World Peace Assembly reflected adherence to the doctrines of the Stockholm Conference and foreshadowed the policies enunciated in the Mobe's October 21, 1969, position paper in demanding that "the American government begin the unconditional and total withdrawal of U.S. military forces from Vietnam \* \* \*." The statement further alleged that the "U.S. has demonstrated since its founding days a systematic policy of exploitation, imperialism and genocide." Continuing:

We are constantly threatened by increasing repression of the voices of dissent. Since foreign policy is the mirrored image of domestic policy, a nation which employs racism, violence and repression on the domestic scene will resort in kind to racism, violence and repression in its international affairs. The war in Vietnam, above all else, is a racist war. The horrible crimes committed against the Vietnamese people reflect the arrogance, yet deadly sickness of a racist society which has not yet dared to inflict such inhumanity on a white nation.

The American delegation's official statement also declared that "the forces for peace in the U.S. must mobilize and exert pressure" to end the war in Vietnam and "make new initiatives involving power confrontations against both the political and military-industrial establishments of the nation."

Concluding, the statement said:

We cannot close without paying deep tribute to the courage and remarkable heroism of our Vietnamese friends who in this day, through incalculable sacrifices, are manning humanity's front line in the defense, first, of their own country and, second, of the cause of human freedom. Vietnam's example should lead us all to make, in this hall, a covenant that no sacrifice is too great—even the threat to life itself—to deter man in his quest to be free. \* \* \* The peace forces of the U.S. and the world, through our sacrifices, can become a beacon light \* \* \*.

Irving Sarnoff, member of the New Mobe steering committee and an identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., addressed the assembly at length, denouncing the United States, supporting the Vietnamese, urging the need to "broaden and unify the anti-war movement in America," and discussing in detail the American peace movement, including antiwar activities among servicemen. Because Sarnoff's remarks are of great significance, both because they demonstrate his anti-American sentiments and because they foreshadow later Mobe positions, they are here recited in full, taken from the official printed text [emphasis added]:

It is with both shame and honour that I speak as a member of the American delegation. *Shame because it is my country that is responsible for so much of the evil being perpetrated in the world today.* I speak with the knowledge of the reality that for years the people of my country have permitted the warmakers to use the most modern, horrendous weapons of war to kill and repress the peoples of Vietnam as they struggle to determine their own destiny. I speak with a broken heart—as a father and a worker—when I think of the thousands of lives of children and workers we have destroyed so that the rich in America can rob and plunder the lands belonging to other peoples in Vietnam and throughout the world.

This policy is rooted in our history as a racist society, whose system places profit and material wealth as the major national priority, above the respect for the lives and dignity of people. Our history is that of a nation that has destroyed the lives and dignity of millions of Indians and blacks, and today keeps millions in economic and political slavery throughout the world. I need not repeat here the role of American economic and military forces in Asia, Latin America and Africa.

These policies are in essence the same ones that oppress and brutalize our own people.

As the rich get richer in America, 33 million of our people live in grinding poverty, the Blacks, Browns, Indians, youth and old people among the worst of the oppressed and exploited. To make profit, the air, soil, and water are being polluted. A thousand people are killed every week in cars. Eight million fathers have deserted their families, and we have 6 million alcoholics. *The violence of Vietnam has its counterpart in the violence of American cities.* In no major city can one walk the streets at night. Thousands of murders each year, 44,000 suicides per year, 40,000 children beaten and tortured each year by parents. Is there any wonder that such a society would produce 20 million mentally ill persons, drug addiction, and a plague of juvenile delinquency. As if this were not enough, *the rulers of America have used all the modern means of psychological warfare to destroy the conscience and humanity of our people, to condition our people to be insensitive to the needs of other people, and through racism to justify the robbing and killing in our own country and throughout the world.*

But I speak here today also with pride for that section of America that is now involved in a life and death struggle to change the policies and system of our country. Our new Nixon administration's answer to the crying needs of the people has been to propose a new missile system that will cost billions. The answer of the Nixons has been to use the experience of Vietnam to spread tear gas from helicopters on our youth, as they demonstrate for a better America. From one end of America to the other *Black Panthers, fighting against white supremacy at home and in Vietnam, are being killed, jailed and harassed.* New forms of repression are now being prepared to investigate and jail those that would oppose the policies of war, racism and poverty. The struggle against these policies is involving ever larger numbers—students on almost every campus protesting the war in Vietnam and militarism—even high school and junior high school youth. Black and Brown students and ghetto dwellers are in constant struggle against the oppression and racism that is intensified because of the war.

*On Army bases across America, G.I.'s are organizing and speaking out against the war—the stockades are full, but this historic movement continues to grow. There are over 25 underground anti-war newspapers being published by soldiers in the Armed Forces.*

There are literally thousands of young people also who are resisting the draft, refusing to allow themselves to be used by the govern-



ment to kill and plunder. And, as their ancestors did many years ago, *thousands of our youth are going into exile to escape from a violent, racist society that is daily finding new ways to repress the people.*

There are people involved in sacrificing themselves for human dignity from almost every section of the clergy—destroying draft files and the property of Dow chemical, producers of napalm. There is even the beginnings of motion against the war and militarism in some important areas of our labour movement as they oppose the Nixon administration's ABM proposals and the extra-taxation for war.

But, in spite of all of this movement, important sections of our people have fallen into a lull, a result of the end of the bombing of the north, the Paris talks, and the announced withdrawal of a token 25,000 troops. We realize that this is no accident, that it is a planned part of the psychological warfare of the new Administration to silence the voice of the American people while the war is intensified and the slaughter of Vietnamese and U.S. G.I.'s is increased.

We know that the heroic Vietnamese people, who have defeated the use of over one-half million American troops, will not be fooled as the neo-colonialists now try to force Vietnamese to fight Vietnamese for the sake of the United States and the Ky-Theu dictatorship.

The new Administration has done much to create frustration and apathy amongst the American people by trickery and lies designed to silence the anti-war movement while, in fact, intensifying the war.

It appears, however, that the honeymoon is over and the struggle to end the war and bring all the G.I.'s home will now again be renewed. Eisenhower's, Kennedy's and Johnson's war is now Nixon's war and he will have to face not only the valiant Vietnamese but also the wrath and opposition of the American people.

*Our task, more evident than ever before, is to broaden and unify the anti-war movement in America so that it becomes impossible for Nixon to continue his neo-colonialist, aggressive aims.*

*Our task is to broaden the base and understanding of our movement to include the many organized groups who are in motion around specific issues—wages, welfare, prices, taxes, racism, repression, housing, and to make them understand that there can be no improvement until the war in Vietnam is ended and the national priorities are re-ordered.*

*Our task is to bring to our people an understanding that the nature of the neo-colonialist policy is not only to exploit and oppress the rest of the world, but to exploit and oppress the American people.*

That is why our country is moving toward repression and violence and the increased exploitation of the American people. The increased role of the military and the billions spent to satisfy their appetites and those of the industrialists are what is oppressing the people world-wide as well as our people.

It is our responsibility to show that Vietnam is not just a mistake made by a previous administration, but part of the nature of a system that requires a cheap source of raw materials and a market to drop its surplus goods and capital.

We have already begun to move on the difficult tasks before us. Last week, in Southern California, hundreds of activists from all areas of the movement vowed to make August a month of organizing and struggle to end the war. On August 17, we will organize to bring thousands to the Summer White House in San Clemente to demonstrate their opposition to the Nixon Administration policies. We ask that in that month, while Nixon vacations in his secluded mansion on the beach at San Clemente, Cali-

fornia, that people all over the world demonstrate and send him letters to remind him of the agony and brutality of the United States policies.

We have initiated a petition drive—to be presented at his summer home—to end the surtax which is used to finance the war and bring our troops home so the Vietnamese can solve their own problems.

Students, the poor, Black and Brown, workers and professionals, will be urged to converge on Nixon's vacation hideaway to petition for a redress of grievances . . . First and foremost to end the racist war in Vietnam and to make the needs of our people the national priority.

*On July 4-5, as some Americans celebrate our own day of independence, anti-war and peoples' leaders from throughout America will gather in Cleveland to unify and broaden the movement, and to plan new and larger anti-war actions in the fall.*

We know full well the immensity of the struggle that faces us, but we also know the responsibility that lies on our shoulders for the killing and destruction that we have caused in Vietnam and throughout the world.

We will continue to organize, to go to jail, and, if necessary, die so that mankind can be freed from a system that robs and kills to keep a few rich.

*Long live the heroic Vietnamese people as they struggle for their national independence and sovereignty.*

*Long live the unity of the exploited and oppressed in America and throughout the world as we struggle against a common enemy.*

*Power to the People!*

It is noted here, although more detailed coverage is provided later, that all the areas of emphasis urged by Sarnoff in his remarks were in later months incorporated formally into New Mobe's program, a fact which was a prime cause of bitter dissent by the Trotskyist members of the coalition.

Planning for the Fall Offensive, as documented by the New Mobe's own official minutes of the sessions, was characterized by a regular pattern of active participation by members of communist parties, communist youth groups, and communist-front organizations.

The minutes of a July 24, 1969, meeting of the Washington Action Committee, official agency for planning the November actions in Washington, reflect participation by some 27 people, some of the more active participants being:

(1) Rev. Richard Fernandez, leader in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, a group which aids American deserters and which has been consistently active in Mobe projects;

(2) Katherine Camp, who attended a meeting in Montreal on January 30-31, 1970, with a number of representatives of communist and peace groups, as well as representatives of North Vietnam;

(3) Dave Dellinger, self-described non-Soviet communist;

(4) Don Gurewitz, leading activist in Student Mobe, member of the New Mobe staff, and member of the SWP and YSA;

(5) Carol Lipman, SMC leader and active YSA member;

(6) Allen Myers, SMC leader and member of both the SWP and YSA;

(7) Otto Nathan, identified communist;

(8) Sidney Peck, former member of the Wisconsin State Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;

(9) Harry Ring, SWP leader;

(10) Cora Weiss, Women Strike for Peace leader active in the Committee of Liaison With Families of Servicemen Detained in Vietnam, a Hanoi-oriented group made up primarily of Mobe-connected activists who are in close contact with the North Vietnamese.

At this session, there was much discussion of finances, with Fernandez, Abe Bloom, Otto Nathan, and Cora Weiss designated to serve as a short-term finance committee to raise \$10,000. Pledges were received from Sidney Peck (\$1,000 by August 31), Harry Ring (\$100), Carol Lipman, and Otto Nathan, among others. Lipman promised names "of large fund people," and Nathan promised an unspecified "personal contribution."

On July 29 a meeting of the chairmen and project directors of the New Mobe Fall Offensive was held with the following persons attending:

(1) Sidney Peck, New Mobe steering committee;

(2) Douglas Dowd, steering committee;

(3) Donald Kalish, steering committee;

(4) Sylvia Kushner, steering committee;

(5) Stewart Meacham, a leading Mobe official who attended the communist Hemispheric Conference to End the Vietnam War in Montreal, Canada, in 1968 and who also attended the meeting in Montreal in January 1970;

(6) Sidney Lens, steering committee;

(7) Abe Bloom, steering committee;

(8) Ron Young, a key Mobe staff member and steering committee member who attended a meeting of the International Liaison Committee of the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam in Stockholm on October 11-12, 1969;

(9) Steve Wilcox, a member of the Washington Action Committee.

At this meeting, as shown by the official minutes, it was "agreed to incorporate the March of the Dead into the program for the day of the Washington action." This aspect of the offensive eventually emerged as the November 13-14 March Against Death, in which movement people filed past the White House, each participant carrying the name of one American killed in action in Vietnam.

A steering committee meeting was held July 30-31 in Chicago with the following people among the 32 people present:

(1) Abe Bloom, Washington, D.C., Mobe;

(2) Dave Dellinger, Mobe east coast cochairman;

(3) Lou Diskin, a prominent member of the CPUSA;

(4) Douglas Dowd, Mobe east coast cochairman;

(5) David Hawk, leading member of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee;

(6) Ishmael Florey, an identified member of the CPUSA;

(7) Jerry Gordon, Mobe steering committee, CAPAC;

(8) Don Gurewitz, Mobe staff, SMC, SWP, and SYA;

(9) Dorothy Hayes, an identified member of the CPUSA;

(10) Donald Kalish, Mobe west coast cochairman;

(11) Sylvia Kushner, Chicago Peace Council, CPUSA;

(12) Professor David Herreshoff, leader in the Detroit Coalition to End the War Now, a major Mobe regional affiliate, and a prominent supporter of SWP fronts and causes;

(13) Gus Horowitz, SWP leader;

(14) Sid Lens, Chicago Peace Council;

(15) Carol Lipman, Mobe steering committee, SMC, YSA, and SWP;

(16) Stewart Meacham, Mobe east coast cochairman;

(17) John McAuliff, New Mobe steering committee member and leader of the pro-Hanoi Committee of Returned Volunteers;

(18) Allen Myers, Mobe steering committee, SMC, SWP, and YSA;

(19) Cora Weiss, Mobe steering committee, WSP;

(20) Sidney Peck, Mobe east coast cochairman.

The minutes of this session show that Donald Kalish proposed a demonstration in San Francisco to be held on November 15. The discussion was favorable, with Dellinger stating that he had discussed the importance of building west coast support with Karen Talbot, who is an employee of the Communist Party's official west coast newspaper, the *People's World*. It was moved and passed that Wilcox and Peck be sent "immediately" to the west coast.

David Hawk spoke on the plans of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee significantly stating that the VMC "had purposefully declined to make an issue of or disavow tactics of other more radical student groups."

Regarding Student Mobe's plans:

Carol Lipman gave a report on the Nov. 14 National *Student Strike Against the War in Vietnam* called by the SMCEWV. She reported on the decision to endorse and build the actions called at the Cleveland Antiwar Conference by an SMC conference of over 500 student antiwar activists on July 6. The SMC has also called a nationwide student strike which will focus on the war in Vietnam and immediate and unconditional withdrawal and campus complicity with the Vietnam war and free speech for high school students for the expressed purpose of building the D.C. action. Already she reported that a significant response has been galvanized from around the country, especially from high school students. The SMC will be working with the VMC [Vietnam Moratorium Committee] on the fall projects.

The meeting also discussed finances, and the minutes list the following pledges and contributions:

(1) \$500 from the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council;

(2) \$500 from the Chicago Peace Council;

(3) \$100 from Women Strike for Peace, with an additional \$200 to come at a later date;

(4) \$1,000 as a loan from Sidney Peck;

(5) \$500 from Douglas Dowd;

(6) \$200 from Donald Kalish, with \$1,000 to be loaned immediately and another \$1,000 to be loaned two weeks later;

(7) \$500 from the Student Mobilization Committee.

One particularly significant result of this meeting was an official expression

of support by New Mobe for the violently revolutionary Black Panther Party. As recounted in the August 9, 1969, issue of the *Daily World* by CPUSA member Jay Schaffner:

The NMC Steering Committee went on record expressing their solidarity and support for the Black Panther Party. \* \* \*

A joint press conference held by the Conspiracy, the Chicago Peace Council and the NMC further expressed this solidarity with the Panthers.

The immediate cause for this demonstration of support was a raid on the Illinois headquarters of the BPP, conducted by the Chicago police in the early morning of July 31. The *Daily World* account continued.

The joint statement [of the Conspiracy, New Mobe, and CPC] charged that this latest "police attack on the Black Panther Party is part of a systematic nationwide attempt to destroy the Black Panther Party." \* \* \*

[New Mobe co-chairman Dave] Dellinger said that in his opinion, "the unprovoked invasion and destruction of the office is part of a white racist effort to crush dissent in the ghetto."

[Chicago Peace Council co-chairman Maxwell] Primack, speaking for both the Peace Council and the Conspiracy said the purpose was to harass and terrify Black Panther Party members, to destroy the group's public image, and to divert the organization's funds and energies.

On August 5 there was a meeting of the New Mobe San Francisco Action Project. A memorandum to the executive committee and steering committee of New Mobe from Sidney Peck, an east coast cochairman of New Mobe and former State committeeman in the Wisconsin CPUSA, reveals the composition of the session. Included in the list of the 40 people invited to attend were:

(1) Alex Forman, Joe Hill Caucus of SDS at San Francisco State College;

(2) Art Goldberg, west coast bureau of the *Guardian*;

(3) Karen Talbot, employed by the official west coast newspaper of the Communist Party, the *People's World*;

(4) Andrew Pulley, a member of the Young Socialist Alliance;

(5) Phil Shapiro, a member of the Medical Committee for Human Rights and supporter of the Black Panther Party-sponsored United Front Against Fascism;

(6) Donald Kalish, member of the Southern California Peace Action Council, west coast cochairman of New Mobe, member of New Mobe steering committee, and, by his own admission, far to the left of the CPUSA;

(7) Terry Halliman, west coast co-chairman of New Mobe, member of the CPUSA-front National Lawyers Guild and W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America; and member of the CPUSA;

(8) Eleanor Ohman, delegate to the World Peace Assembly, held in East Berlin in June of 1969 under the auspices of the World Peace Council, international communist "peace" front;

(9) Dr. Carleton Goodlett, west coast treasurer of New Mobe and also a delegate to the World Peace Assembly;

(10) Irving Sarnoff, an identified member of the Communist Party, leader of the Southern California Peace Action

Council, and member of the New Mobe steering committee;

(11) David Hilliard, chief of staff for the Black Panther Party;

(12) Harold Supriano, a founding member of the Communist Party's former official youth front, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America;

(13) Barry David, Student Mobilization Committee and YSA;

(14) Lew Jones, longtime functionary in the SWP and YSA;

(15) Marjorie Colvin, secretary of the GI-Civilian Alliance for Peace, an organization under SWP leadership, and member of the SWP.

The minutes of a Washington Action Committee meeting held in Philadelphia on August 7, 1969, reflect that, as reported by Sidney Peck, there "was general agreement among the West Coast people that an action take place in SF on Nov. 15. Peck recommended that we continue to work closely with the West Coast."

On August 17-18 a New Mobe steering committee meeting to plan the "FALL OFFENSIVE—1969" was held at the Central YMCA in Philadelphia, Pa. Among those invited to this meeting were the following:

(1) Allen Young of Liberation News Service, the New Left's pro-Castro, pro-Vietcong news dissemination service;

(2) Anne Braden, identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and executive director of the Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF);

(3) David Herreshoff, member of the New Mobe steering committee and prominent supporter of fronts and causes of the Socialist Workers Party;

(4) Norma Becker, coordinator with Dave Dellinger of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, New York affiliate of the New Mobe, and member of New Mobe steering committee;

(5) Rennie Davis, New Mobe steering committee member and Vietcong supporter, recently on trial in Chicago for conspiring to foment violence during the August 1968 Democratic National Convention;

(6) Dave Dellinger, east coast Mobe cochairman and self-styled non-Soviet communist;

(7) Jerry Gordon, New Mobe steering committee member and head of the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, a Mobe affiliate;

(8) Fred Halstead, New Mobe steering committee member and long-time leader in the Socialist Workers Party;

(9) Arnold Johnson, New Mobe steering committee member and national legislative director for the CPUSA;

(10) Irving Beinin, New Mobe steering committee member and an employee of the *Guardian*;

(11) Sid Lens, east coast cochairman of Mobe and former official in the Revolutionary Workers League, designated subversive by the Attorney General under Executive Order 10450;

(12) Carol Lipman, national executive secretary of the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee, member of New Mobe steering committee, and formerly on the editorial staff of the YSA's official magazine, the *Young Socialist*;



(13) Sidney Peck, east coast cochairman of Mobe, leader in the Ohio Peace Action Council, and former Wisconsin State Committeeman, CPUSA;

(14) Irving Sarnoff, former member, District Council, Southern California CPUSA;

(15) Sylvia Kushner, member of New Mobe steering committee and the Chicago Peace Council, a Mobe affiliate, and an admitted member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;

(16) Donald Kalish, Mobe cochairman;

(17) David Hawk, member of New Mobe steering committee and coordinator of the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, which was closely allied with the New Mobe;

(18) John Froines, recently tried and acquitted in Chicago for conspiracy to foment violence during the August 1968 Democratic National Convention;

(19) Terry Halliman, Mobe cochairman and CPUSA member;

(20) Unnamed representatives of the YSA, W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, and Veterans for Peace (founded in January 1966 by Communist Party member LeRoy Wolins);

(21) Otto Nathan, communist and member of New Mobe steering committee;

(22) Dagmar Wilson, leader in Women Strike for Peace who has proclaimed publicly her advocacy of the North Vietnamese cause;

(23) Dr. Benjamin Spock, sponsor of the New Mobe's November demonstrations, member of the national council of the communist-run National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and supporter of the Freedom and Peace Party;

(24) Carleton Goodlett, Mobe west coast treasurer;

(25) Louis Goldblatt, identified member of the Communist Party U.S.A.;

(26) John Wilson, formerly of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee and leader of the National Black Anti-War, Anti-Draft Union, and offshoot of the Student Mobilization Committee, and a member of the New Mobe steering committee;

(27) Pvt. Joe Miles, member of the New Mobe steering committee and Young Socialist Alliance;

(28) Allen Myers, member of New Mobe steering committee and editor of SMC's GI Press Service;

(29) Majorie Colvin, secretary, GI-Civilian Alliance for Peace, and member of the Socialist Workers Party.

The official minutes of a Chicago steering committee meeting on September 12 reveal active participation by the following persons with communist connections:

(1) Sidney Lens, former leader, Revolutionary Workers League;

(2) Richard Hill, SWP;

(3) Jay Schaffner, DuBois Clubs, member of the CPUSA;

(4) Tony DeLeon, Student Mobilization Committee;

(5) Carl Finamore, YSA;

(6) Ben Friedlander, identified member, CPUSA;

(7) Rennie Davis, supporter of the Vietcong;

(8) Sylvia Kushner, CPUSA;

(9) Jack Spiegel, CPUSA;

Both Kushner and Spiegel are two of the dominant members of the Chicago Peace Council, a major New Mobe regional coalition affiliate.

Topics discussed at this meeting included the October 15 Moratorium and the November student strike. Among the organizations scheduled to participate in activities looking forward to these demonstrations were Veterans for Peace, the Chicago Peace Council, and the Du Bois Clubs, all under communist leadership.

On September 13 there was a meeting of the New Mobe's Washington Action Committee in Washington, D.C. The official minutes of the session reflect the presence of, among others, the following people:

(1) Irving Beinlin, *Guardian* staff;

(2) Barbara Bick, member of Women Strike for Peace and among the American delegates to the communist World Peace Assembly in East Berlin, June 21-24, 1969;

(3) Don Gurewitz, New Mobe staff employee and prominent activist in the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee;

(4) Helen Gurewitz, identified member of the CPUSA and New Mobe staff employee;

(5) Fred Halstead, SWP leader;

(6) Gus Horowitz, member of the New Mobe steering committee and a "leading SWP activist in the antiwar movement," according to *The Militant* for September 19, 1969;

(7) Carol Lipman, SMC, YSA, and SWP;

(8) Allen Myers, SMC, SWP, and YSA;

(9) Otto Nathan, identified communist;

(10) Sidney Peck, former Wisconsin CPUSA leader;

(11) Cora Weiss, Women Strike for Peace;

(12) Ron Wolin, leader of Veterans for Peace in New York and self-professed Trotskyist;

(13) Peer Vinther, New Mobe steering committee member and member of the Young Socialist Alliance.

Regarding the relationship between the New Mobe and Vietnam Moratorium Committee, New Mobe staff member Susan Miller reported, according to the minutes, "that the Moratorium Committee will lend major support to the" March Against Death, the Mobe's action scheduled for November 12-14, prior to the November 15 mass march on Washington.

On the following day, September 14, the steering committee met in Washington. According to the printed minutes, Sidney Peck served as chairman, with the following people listed as among those present:

(1) Marc Beallor, member of the New Mobe steering committee, representative of the CPUSA-controlled DuBois Clubs, and member of the CPUSA;

(2) Barbara Bick, WSP;

(3) Rennie Davis, Mobe steering committee;

(4) Dave Dellinger, non-Soviet communist;

(5) Jerry Gordon, CAPAC;

(6) Don Gurewitz, SMC, SWP, and YSA;

(7) Fred Halstead, SWP;

(8) Arnold Johnson, CPUSA;

(9) Carol Lipman, SMC, YSA, and SWP;

(10) Allen Myers, SMC, SWP, and YSA;

(11) Abe Weisburd, who has served on the administrative committee of Mobe's New York affiliate, the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, as the representative of Trade Unionists for Peace, described by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as an organization "set up by the Communist Party";

(12) LeRoy Wolins, member of Mobe's Washington Action Committee, founder of Veterans for Peace in Vietnam in Chicago, and an identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

At this meeting a committee was set up to handle legal and police problems anticipated in connection with the November march. On this committee, among others named, were SWP leader Fred Halstead. The March Against Death Committee included SMC leader Carol Lipman, with moratorium coordinator David Hawk among those also suggested. The committee to decide the program for the November rally consisted of 10 members, among whom were SWP member Fred Halstead, non-Soviet communist Dave Dellinger, former CPUSA Wisconsin State committeeman Sidney Peck, and CPUSA national legislative director Arnold Johnson.

Peck, according to the minutes, "reported that the Black Panther Party will be relating to the demonstration on the West Coast." Members of a committee to deal with such "Black and Third World Participation" included Dellinger, Weisburd, and Rennie Davis, with YSA member Andrew Pulley among those also suggested for membership.

The minutes further reflect that Fred Halstead was "hired immediately to work on logistics" for the march, while Carol Lipman and Arnold Johnson were named to serve on a committee concerned with "International Aspects." The committee on "Labor Participation" included Weisburd, Beallor, Peck, Lens, Halstead, and Johnson (six of the seven designated); and the "Promotional Material" committee included, of the 10 named to serve, Gurewitz, Lipman, Wolins, Peck, and Dellinger.

The important subject of "Youth Participation" was to be handled by a committee of five members, including SMC and YSA leader Carol Lipman, Vietnam Moratorium Committee coordinator David Hawk, and W. E. B. DuBois Clubs representative Marc Beallor, who also is a known member of the CPUSA.

On September 18 the New Mobe held a press conference in New York City to publicize the Fall Offensive. New Mobe leaders, according to a Mobe press release dated September 18, "revealed detailed and comprehensive plans for a fall 'offensive' of anti-war activity." Among those present at this news conference were Benjamin Spock; Mobe cochairmen Stewart Meacham, Dave Dellinger, and

Cora Weiss; and Vietnam Moratorium coordinator David Hawk.

The official New Mobilization Committee publication, the New Mobilizer, carried in its September 25 issue a lead article entitled "Fall Offensive Skyrockets—Meetings Held with over 5,000 in 50 Key Cities!" In this article were capsule accounts of numerous meetings held around the country during the week of September 15. Conducted by "New Mobe traveling teams," these sessions resulted in area offices being established "in between seven and ten locations \* \* \*." Plans for both the October 15 Vietnam Moratorium and the November New Mobe demonstrations were laid at meetings in the following listed cities: Milwaukee and Madison, Wis.; Columbus and Toledo, Ohio; Portland, Maine; Miami, Fla.; New Orleans; and Dallas-Fort Worth. The New Orleans session included representatives from Women Strike for Peace and Students for a Democratic Society.

A meeting held near St. Louis, Mo., on September 27 and 28 provided further evidence of communist participation in Fall Offensive planning. This meeting was called to plan for the October 15 Moratorium and the November 15 March on Washington. Among the groups sponsoring the session were Students for a Democratic Society and the young Socialist Alliance. One of the featured speakers at the September 27 evening session was YSA member Andrew Pulley. Two discussion leaders were identified as Communist Party member Hershel Walker and YSA member Larry Swingle, a key St. Louis area contact for New Mobe. Another identified Communist Party member, Orville Leach, was present at the conference; and a key workshop on organizing resistance to the Vietnam war among military personnel was led by identified CPUSA members Hershel Walker and Elliot Waxman.

On October 4 an estimated 300 anti-war organizers met in New York City, according to The Militant for October 17, 1969, "to map plans for the fall offensive against the war in Vietnam. The meeting, sponsored jointly by the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee and the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam, involved a very broad range of participants and endorsers." Spokesmen for the group included:

- (1) Morris Rosenzweig, an official in District 65 of the Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Workers Union and participant in the January 1970 Montreal meeting;
- (2) Joanna Misnik, SMC activist and member of the YSA;
- (3) Leon J. Davis, president of Local 1199, Drug and Hospital Employees Union;
- (4) Dave Dellinger, Mobe cochairman;
- (5) Adam Walinsky, leader in the New York Vietnam Moratorium Committee;
- (6) James Johnson of the Fort Hood Three and NBAWADU;
- (7) Cora Weiss, New Mobe cochairman who has traveled to North Vietnam under communist North Vietnamese auspices.

On October 5, the New York Times carried a brief item confirming again the close relationship between the New Mobe and moratorium people:

Student organizers of the Oct. 15 Vietnam Moratorium joined forces yesterday with the National [New] Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. The two organizations held a news conference and together pledged "the most massive and, we hope, final demonstration against the war in Vietnam". Both actions are a part of a "Fall Offensive." \* \* \*

As had been the case with projects of New Mobe's predecessors, foreign communist endorsement of New Mobe's projected Fall Offensive was unequivocal. On October 5, 1969, according to a clandestine Liberation Press Agency broadcast from South Vietnam on October 8, the South Vietnam People's Committee for Solidarity with the American People sent a message to the American Committee for Solidarity with the Vietnamese People, the *Guardian*, and the New Mobilization Committee.

Dear friends: We are very elated to learn that you will launch a big fall campaign against the Nixon administration's war policy, urging it to put an end to the war in Vietnam and to bring all U.S. troops home immediately.

The concluding portion of the message reads:

Lastly, we wish you great success in the fall campaign to urge the Nixon administration to end the war in Vietnam and to bring all U.S. troops home immediately without posing any condition. [Emphasis added.]

A broadcast from South Vietnam on October 6 revealed that Tran Buu Keim, chairman of the South Vietnam Liberation Students' Union, had "recently addressed a letter praising the American students and youth on the occasion of the 1969 fall struggle movement." Kiem stated:

While carrying out a firm resistance against the U.S. imperialists' aggressive war, the South Vietnamese youth and students are following, with keen sympathy, the struggle movement of their friends of the same ages, on the other side of the Pacific—regardless of whether they are white or black—against this aggressive war right in the United States. The heroic struggle of the friends in New York, Washington, Oakland, and Berkeley, has been much appreciated by the South Vietnamese youth and students.

The message specifically hailed the National Anti-War Conference held in Cleveland during July, as well as the activities of both SDS and the SMC, concluding: "Once again, we hope that you will achieve broad solidarity, struggle perseveringly, and win great victories."

On October 24, 1969, North Vietnamese Prime Minister Pham Van Dong cabled a message from Hanoi to the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam. As quoted in the *Guardian* for October 25, the message reads:

Progressive people in the U.S. have so far struggled against the war of aggression in Vietnam this fall. The broad masses of the American people, encouraged and supported by many peace and justice-loving American personalities, have again started a broad and powerful drive in the whole country to demand that the Nixon administration stop its

war of aggression in Vietnam and immediately bring home all U.S. troops. Your drive eloquently reflects the legitimate and pressing demand of your people to save the honor of the United States and to prevent the useless death of their sons in Vietnam. This is also a very fitting and timely response to U.S. authorities who stubbornly persist in intensifying and prolonging the war of aggression in Vietnam in defiance of massive protests and American and world public opinion. The Vietnamese people demand that the U.S. government completely and unconditionally pull out of Vietnam all U.S. troops and those of foreign countries belonging to its camp and let the Vietnamese people decide themselves their own destiny. The Vietnamese people deeply cherish peace, but a peace in independence and freedom. So long as the U.S. government has not stopped its aggression in Vietnam, the Vietnamese people will tenaciously fight on to defend their fundamental national rights. The patriotic fight of our people is also a fight for the objectives of peace and justice you are pursuing. We are firmly confident that with the solidarity and courage of our two peoples, with sympathy and support of the peace-loving peoples in world [sic], the struggle of Vietnamese people and of progressive people in the United States against U.S. aggressions will end in total victory. *I wish your "Fall Offensive" a brilliant success.* [Emphasis added.]

Support for the new Mobilization's program also came from the World Peace Council's Stockholm Conference on Vietnam, whose International Liaison Committee issued an "Information Letter No. 5" on October 5, 1969, specifically supporting the November 15 protest and urging that it be broadened into a "Day of International Mobilization." The document stated:

This "Fall Offensive" is the most encouraging development in the US since a long time. It is organized by the "New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam", which groups and unites the most active and significant US Peace Groups and other organizations opposed to Nixon's war policy.

We urge all organizations to support this campaign as it signifies the biggest move so far to oppose the war in Vietnam and to call for the immediate withdrawal of all US forces from Vietnam. It should be echoed in all countries with demonstrations and all sorts of suitable action on and around November 15, so as to show president Nixon that the peoples of the world want him to stop the US aggression in Vietnam. [Emphasis in original.]

In further emphasizing its view of the New Mobe's crucial importance, the ILC letter stated:

The New Mobe constitutes the crucial work of mobilizing the American people against the war of aggression and counterrevolution in Vietnam. What is so important about the "New Mobe" is that it is a coalition which now is said to reflect a majority movement and to that extent it encompasses within its midst the widest spectrum of forces yet to unite in opposition and resistance to the war. \* \* \*

Included also in the projects endorsed by the Stockholm Conference letter were projected activities of both the Vietnam Moratorium Committee and the Student Mobilization Committee.

On October 11-12, 1969, the International Liaison Committee of the Stockholm Conference met in Stockholm. According to an ILC mailing dated October 18, 1969, "The first and most im-



portant item on the agenda was support for the 'Fall Offensive' of the US anti Vietnam war movement." Further, "It was decided to call upon all organizations to organize demonstrations and other manifestations on November 15 [Emphasis in original], which is to be the Day of International Mobilisation to End the War in Vietnam." Cooperation with the New Mobe was specifically underlined:

This international campaign on November 15 is prepared in full co-operation with our American friends. The New Mobilization Committee was at the meeting represented by two members of its steering committee, Mr. Ronald Young, representing the movement on the East Coast, and Mr. Irving Sarnoff from the West. They gave impressing [sic] surveys of the present situation in the US and stressed that the majority of the people has now turned against the war. Never before the chances to end the war have been as great as now. [Emphasis added.]

The official statement adopted by the ILC and printed in the October 18 mailing is as follows:

The Stockholm Conference on Vietnam welcomes the formation of the broadest coalition of US anti-war forces yet known which have joined together in the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam to mount a series of massive demonstrations. The Fall Offensive began with demonstrations in Chicago on September 24 in support of the 8 Anti-War leaders on trial for conspiracy. The campaign will continue with the Vietnam Moratorium on October 15 and will culminate in mass national demonstrations in Washington and San Francisco from November 13 to 15. The New Mobilization Committee is committed to the total and immediate withdrawal of US forces and war material from South Vietnam.

The Stockholm Conference wholeheartedly supports the Fall Offensive and calls for mass demonstrations and other activities throughout the world on November 15 to match the unparalleled outpouring of popular opposition to the war now spreading across the United States. All actions on this day of International Mobilization should be centered on the demand of the Vietnam Appeal calling for the immediate, total and unconditional withdrawal of US and allied troops from South Vietnam. This is the only basis for bringing the war to a rapid conclusion. In those countries linked to the US war effort, there should be demonstrations demanding an end to these pacts of complicity.

Together with the New Mobilization Committee we call for a campaign which will not end on November 15 but will rise in intensity until US aggression in Vietnam is ended and the Vietnamese have won the independence and peace for which they have fought so long.

Among the organizations officially listed by the ILC document as supporting this International Mobilization Day were the following:

- (1) Hemispheric Conference to End the Vietnam War,
  - (2) International Association of Democratic Lawyers,
  - (3) International Union of Students,
  - (4) Women's International Democratic Federation,
  - (5) Women Strike for Peace,
  - (6) World Peace Council,
  - (7) World Federation of Democratic Youth,
  - (8) World Federation of Trade Unions.
- The IADL, IUS, WIDF, WPC, WFDY, and WFTU have all been officially cited as being international communist front

organizations controlled by the Soviet Union.

The October 28, 1969, *New Mobilizer* carried a lead article specifically calling attention to the Stockholm Conference's declaration and briefly describing proposed demonstrations in France, Chile, Australia, Sweden, Holland, West Germany, Belgium, Italy, Norway, Denmark, New Zealand, and Great Britain.

According to an article in the *Washington Post* for October 18, 1969, a significant repudiation of the Mobe's plans came from the Young People's Socialist League, youth group of the Socialist Party. The YPSL, which had repudiated the April 15, 1967 Mobe actions on the ground that they favored Hanoi, declared that "it wants no part of a proposed mid-November students' antiwar strike, claiming that many of the leaders 'are more committed' to a Communist victory in Vietnam than to peace." As quoted by the *Post*, the YPSL statement said:

The Mobe's marches convince no one to be against the war. Many in the leadership [of New Mobe] are more committed to an NLF victory than to peace. Hence they and those who join them are open to right-wing attack.

A similar statement condemning the Mobe for being pro-Hanoi was later made by Josh Muravchic, YPSL national chairman:

I think the November 15th movement failed because on the one hand I don't think a march was useful and on the other hand I think the New Mobilization Committee refused to make a distinction between people who are critical of our government's policies because they feel these are not going to lead to peace and those people who are active advocates of the communist side in Vietnam—active proclaimed supporters of the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese. \* \* \*

In the same vein, Muravchic also stated:

Well, there are many people involved in the [New] Mobe, by no means all, but many people who are active, proclaimed supporters in every public speech they make of the—what they call the "liberation movement" in Vietnam—the Viet Cong. I think those people do not properly belong in the peace movement. They are not for peace. They are hawks on the other side.

Illustrative of what Muravchic was talking about is this statement made by Mobe cochairman Sidney M. Peck, after initially claiming that "we don't want a communist Vietnam victory. That's not the principal demand that is being put forward":

We want an end to the war, a war that is a war of intervention and aggression and we want the complete and total withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam and if that results in a victory for the National Liberation Front or the Democratic Republic of Vietnam [North Vietnam], we are pleased with that result because that would in effect be the wishes of the Vietnamese people. [Emphasis added].

Another Mobe cochairman, Stewart Meacham of the American Friends Service Committee, has said:

It's quite likely, if we get out, that the government that would come into power in South Vietnam would be a communist government of some [sort]. \* \* \* I would much prefer to see that government emerge if that is the government that the political forces in Vietnam would end up with than to see the present situation continue.

But the most revealing statement has come from yet another Mobe cochairman, the strongly pro-Hanoi Douglas Dowd:

One of the tensions that we've had to work out within the National Mobilization [Committee] and consequently the New Mobilization [Committee] is that the people who are doing the organizing for this kind of thing, almost all of them, really feel that not only the war should end but if there had to be a side in that war I think most of us feel we would be on the other side. [Emphasis added.]

The August 17, 1969, demonstrations in San Clemente, Calif., which were endorsed by New Mobe, were officially organized and sponsored by the communist-controlled Peace Action Council of Southern California, one of the most important of Mobe's regional affiliates.

The PAC has included among its most prominent members and leaders such identified members of the CPUSA as Irving Sarnoff, Raphael Konigsberg, Don R. Healey, Sophie Silver, and Frank Wilkinson, in addition to Martin Hall, who has been identified as a former leading member of the communist underground in Germany. Hall, who invoked the fifth amendment before the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1956 when asked whether he was a member of the Communist Party, was at one time an active member of the communist-dominated Fair Play for Cuba Committee. In June 1962 he was a participant in a conference organized by the international communist-front World Peace Council. Though organized ostensibly as a united-front coalition of groups opposed to the war in Vietnam, the Peace Action Council of Southern California is, like the Chicago Peace Council, solidly controlled by members of the Communist Party.

The demonstrations, which had also been formally endorsed in June by the communist World Peace Assembly in East Berlin, drew a claimed 8,000 to 10,000 participants, including active-duty servicemen from nearby Camp Pendleton. Communist participation was most conspicuous. Logistics were handled by Peter Seidman, a member of the Young Socialist Alliance and Los Angeles organizer for the Socialist Workers Party, and the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee played a major role in organizing support among high school and college youth.

Speakers included, among others, Father Blase Bonpane, prominent supporter of SWP fronts and causes; Tamu Uhuru, a representative of the Black Student Union and self-described member of the Communist Party, who spoke on the East Berlin meeting, which she had attended; Donald Duncan, former Green Beret and military editor of the pro-Hanoi magazine Ramparts; Andrew Pulley, a member of the YSA; Donald Kalish, cochairman of New Mobe; and attorney Terence Hallinan, a member of the CPUSA.

International emphasis was supplied by the presence of Toshiaki Yokohama, a representative of the Japan Council Against A & H Bombs, a communist-oriented group prominent in anti-American activities in Japan. According to the *People's World* for August 1969:

Yokohama's presence provided Peace Action Council Chairman Irving Sarnoff an opportunity to demonstrate the international working class solidarity which was present at this occasion. \* \* \*

\* \* \* Speaking as "a representative of the country of Nagasaki and Hiroshima" he called for an international front against the U.S. war makers in Vietnam and those who use the soil of his country to carry on the war.

The massive protests staged by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee throughout the United States on October 15, 1969, were a source of great encouragement to the organizers of the Fall Offensive, especially to the New Mobilization Committee and Student Mobilization Committee, both of which had formerly endorsed the VMC's protests. Though officially initiated and organized by the VMC, the October 15 Vietnam Moratorium received all-out support from the CPUSA, SWP, and YSA, as well as from New Mobe's all-important regional coalition affiliates.

Again, as in all other phases of Fall Offensive activity, the communist presence on October 15 was an active one. At a convocation at the University of California at Los Angeles, for example, the assembled demonstrators heard such speakers as New Mobe cochairman Donald Kalish and wellknown CPUSA member Angela Davis.

A rally of a claimed 100,000 people in Boston, Mass., heard speeches by U.S. Senator George McGovern, pro-Hanoi professor Howard Zinn, and SWP-YSA-SMC activist Peter Camejo, who declared: "The fighters of the National Liberation Front are the most beautiful people in the world . . ."

Another rally in New York's Harlem was indicative of the breadth of support among left groups for the VMC's October 15 protests. The rally was sponsored officially by the Third World Committee for Solidarity with Vietnam, a recently organized, pro-Hanoi group which had issued a statement of support for the "heroic struggle being waged by Vietnamese" against "U.S. imperialism." Speakers included actor Ossie Davis, a supporter of the Communist Party; James Haughton of the Harlem Unemployment Center, part of the Parade Committee coalition; Jesse Gray, former Harlem organizer for the Communist Party; Rasheed Storey, chairman of the New York State Communist Party; Paul Boutelle, a leader in the SWP; and identified RAM member Herman Ferguson, east coast president of the Republic of New Africa, then led by Robert F. Williams.

Trotskyist activity on October 15 was conspicuous. In New York Paul Boutelle was among the speakers at a rally at Columbia University. In Atlanta, Ga., SWP member Linda Jenness joined SCLC leader Hosea Williams in denouncing the United States. And in Madison, Wis., SWP member and SMC official Allen Myers addressed a rally of an estimated 20,000 people. Even as far away as Anchorage, Alaska, YSA member Joe Miles addressed a Moratorium Day rally.

One of the most important groups in organizing mass support for October 15

was the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee, several of whose leaders were prominent speakers at major Moratorium Day rallies.

In Cleveland, for example, SMC leader Don Gurewitz, who is also a member of both the SWP and YSA, addressed a rally of an estimated 8,000, while SMC leader Carol Lipman and SWP supporter Prof. David Herreshoff were among the speakers at a rally of several thousand people at Detroit's Wayne State University. In Philadelphia, Pa., the SMC sent 20 speaking teams to no fewer than 32 high schools and colleges as part of the Moratorium Day observance.

The demonstrations on November 15 in Washington and San Francisco drew large numbers of people from around the country. The Justice Department estimated that approximately 250,000 people participated in the Washington action, while the San Francisco Examiner estimated the west coast crowd to be in the neighborhood of 100,000. Speakers at the San Francisco demonstration included, among others, Rennie Davis and Black Panther leader David Hilliard. Speakers in Washington included, among others listed,

(1) Ossie Davis, supporter of CPUSA fronts and causes;

(2) Dr. Benjamin Spock, supporter of communist causes;

(3) Dave Dellinger, who urged participation in a march on the Department of Justice in support of the defendants in the Chicago conspiracy trial, a march which resulted in violence;

(4) David Hawk, coordinator of the VMC;

(5) Phil Hutchings, staff columnist for the *Guardian*;

(6) Carol Lipman, SMC national secretary and YSA member.

Entertainment at the Washington rally was provided by a number of individuals and groups, including Dick Gregory and identified Communist Party member Pete Seeger. Endorsements for the New Mobe's activities in November came from a varied list, including:

(1) Leon Davis, New York labor leader and consistent supporter of the Communist Party;

(2) Louis Goldblatt; secretary-treasurer of the ILWU and identified member of the Communist Party;

(3) Jack Hall, ILWU official and identified member of the CPUSA;

(4) James Johnson, member of the Fort Hood Three and NBAWADU;

(5) David Livingston, District 65, RWDSU, leader and identified member of the CPUSA;

(6) Morris Rosenzweig, District 65 leader and participant in the January 1970 meeting with North Vietnamese representatives in Montreal;

(7) Dr. Benjamin Spock.

The ILWU leadership played a substantial role on the west coast in organizing the November 15, 1969, demonstrations. Identified Communist Party member and ILWU official Morris Watson has served as editor for the New Mobilization West, official Mobe west coast publication.

In San Francisco, according to an

authoritative article appearing in *The Militant* for November 18, 1969:

The Student Mobilization Committee was the predominant organization on the march and at the rally. Banners identifying chapters throughout the West were seen all over the march. Most of the march monitors were provided by the SMC.

Organizations which participated in the November 15 Washington march of the New Mobilization Committee included:

(1) the Communist Party, U.S.A.;

(2) the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America;

(3) Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam;

(4) the Committee of Returned Volunteers;

(5) the Black Panther Party;

(6) the National Committee to Combat Fascism, a support group for the Black Panther Party;

(7) the Southern Conference Educational Fund;

(8) the Citizens Committee for Constitutional Liberties;

(9) the Student Mobilization Committee;

(10) the Socialist Workers Party;

(11) the Young Socialist Alliance;

(12) Women Strike for Peace;

(13) the Revolutionary Youth Movement II faction of SDS;

(14) Worker-Student Alliance SDS, controlled by members of the Maoist communist Progressive Labor Party;

(15) Veterans for Peace in Vietnam;

(16) the GI Defense Organization, an offshoot of VFP;

(17) Youth Against War and Fascism;

(18) the Buffalo Nine Defense Committee, a YAWF front;

(19) the Committee to Support Middle East Liberation, another YAWF front group;

(20) the Spartacist League, a dissident Trotskyist group;

(21) The Temporary Organizing Committee for a Revolutionary Working Class Youth Organization, forerunner of the CPUSA's new youth organization, the Young Workers Liberation League;

(22) the Workers League, a dissident Trotskyist group;

(23) the Freedom and Peace Party;

(24) American Friends Service Committee;

(25) the New Party, a radical political group;

(26) the War Resisters League, a radical pacifist group;

(27) War Tax Resistance, a WRL offshoot;

(28) the Progressive Labor Party;

(29) the Youth International Party ("Yippies");

(30) the U.S. Committee for Justice to Latin American Political Prisoners, an SWP front organization.

The question of concentration on GIs was highlighted during the November actions by the convening of the National Conference on GI Rights on November 13-14 at a Washington hotel. Primary impetus for the conference came from Veterans for Peace and a VFP offshoot, the GI Defense Organization. A resolution advocating such a conference had



been presented at the National Anti-War Conference in Cleveland during July 1969.

Speakers at this conference included:

(1) David Rein, identified member of the Communist Party;

(2) Allen Myers, editor of SMC's GI Press Service and member of both the SWP and YSA;

(3) Terence Hallinan, leading DuBois Clubs activist and CP-USA member;

(4) Henri DiSuvero, director of the communist-dominated National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee;

(5) Andrew Stapp, founder of the American Servicemen's Union and member of Youth Against War and Fascism.

Sponsoring organizations for the conference, in addition to Chicago Veterans for Peace and the GI Defense Organization, included SMC's GI Press Service, the American Servicemen's Union, New York Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, and the SWP-YSA-front GI Civil Liberties Defense Committee.

On Thursday, November 13, the New Mobe's March Against Death began at Arlington National Cemetery. About 45,000 people marched from Arlington to the White House and on to the Capitol; each marcher carried a placard bearing the name of an American killed in Vietnam. Many had to return to Arlington to start again because arrivals on Thursday and Friday, the 2 days of this action, were lower than anticipated.

At noon on Friday, the first rally was held on the Mall. Afterwards, Dr. Benjamin Spock led about 1,000 people to the Justice Department to demand an interview with the Attorney General. When the interview was refused, tension rose. Spock led the marchers back to the Mall. Writer Dwight McDonald urged them to return to the Justice Department, and activists tried to incite the crowd, which finally dispersed because of rain.

At about 9 p.m. on Friday some 3,000 people gathered at Dupont Circle and marched toward the South Vietnamese Embassy. Groups involved in this action included Yippies, SDS, Mad Dogs, Craziies, and Weathermen. Many in the crowd had helmets and gas masks. Demonstrators at the Embassy threw rocks, bottles, and bricks. Police had to use tear gas and made about 20 arrests. The crowd moved back to the Dupont Circle area, attacked police vehicles, and threatened the police.

At 10 a.m. on Saturday, the coffins at the Capitol, in which the name cards carried in the March Against Death had been placed, were sealed and the November 15 demonstration began. The demonstration reached its peak about mid-afternoon with an estimated 250,000 people in and around the Washington Monument grounds. It was during this period that New Mobe cochairman Dave Dellinger made his speech urging the assembled crowd to join in the projected march on the Justice Department later that afternoon:

The American people must support the independence of Vietnam by supporting the provisional revolutionary government and by supporting North Vietnam. At 5:00 this afternoon, Abbie Hoffman, John Friends [Froines], Jerry Rubin and I will be marching with you—marching to the Justice De-

partment where repression is being programmed. . . . Right on!

At about 3 p.m. a group of activists marched on the Labor Department, ostensibly to rally support for a nationwide strike of General Electric workers. Their real purpose, however, as had been the case with the Friday night march on the South Vietnamese Embassy, was to spark a confrontation with the police. The crowd chanted and demonstrated, the police responded, and many demonstrators left to join the march on the Justice Department.

The 5 p.m. march on the Justice Department was ostensibly called to protest the so-called "Conspiracy trial" in Chicago; but, like the demonstrations at Dupont Circle and the Labor Department, it was in fact designed to force confrontation. The mob, in open violation of the march permit, continued to circle the Justice Department, chanting and parading fake casualties to incite the crowd. Demonstrators wearing helmets and gas masks carried knapsacks filled with rocks, bottles, flares, and paint bombs.

Again, the police were forced to use tear gas. The crowd retreated to the Labor Department and regrouped to challenge the police lines again, but police drove them back to the Washington Monument Grounds. About 5,000 to 6,000 people participated in this action, which saw considerable rock throwing, paint thrown at the Justice Department building, and the lowering of the American flag and raising of a Vietcong flag in its place.

The demonstrators eventually spread out toward the Dupont Circle and downtown area. Rock throwing and property damage continued until around 11 p.m.

In view of the violence that erupted during these demonstrations, the following news release issued by the New Mobe press office on November 10 is especially interesting.

ABBIE HOFFMAN AND "WEATHERMAN" ASSURE NEW MOBE "NO VIOLENCE"

WASHINGTON, D.C., November 10, 1969.—Three members of the "Conspiracy 8" being tried in Judge Julius Hoffman's court in Chicago, flew into Washington last night to reassure the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam that the demonstration they plan following the New Mobilization rally this Saturday will conform to the legal and nonviolent discipline the anti-war coalition has established for its November activities.

David Dellinger, Abbie Hoffman and Rennie Davis said that the participants in Saturday's evening rally at the Justice Department understand fully the need to counteract the "fears of violence raised by Attorney General Mitchell" and his staff.

A representative of the Weatherman faction of SDS gave a similar reassurance to the New Mobilization Executive Committee on Sunday evening in Washington. "In the light of the Administration's claims that Weatherman intends to disrupt the New Mobe demonstration by provoking violence," the representative said, "we want to advise you in the strongest terms possible that we intend to abide by the non-violent principles you have established for your November 13-15 actions, and that we want your rally to be a total success capable of influencing the American people against the war." (The Weatherman representative declined to be identified.)

While the New Mobilization Committee has made it a policy to endorse any demonstrations or actions this coming weekend other than its own March Against Death and the Mass March and Rally on Saturday, spokesmen today made it clear that New Mobilization considers the cause of the "Conspiracy 8" the cause of all antiwar elements in this country, and that thousands of people in the parade will be carrying banners to "Stop the Trial."

Mr. Sidney Lens, Co-chairman of the New Mobilization Committee said: "The eight members of the 'conspiracy' currently being victimized in Judge Hoffman's court on the unconstitutional charge of conspiring to cross state lines to incite a riot, are being harassed and prosecuted only because they have led anti-war demonstrations. They are guilty of no crime. Indeed they are the victims of the crimes committed by the city administration in Chicago last year and by the police riot which was designed to deny the anti-war movement its right to protest under the First Amendment. We intend to publicize the issue and to lend whatever weight we can to see that this gross injustice is reversed. Like the Spock-Coffin trial, this effort at repression is simply the strategy of the Government to intimidate and suppress the anti-war movement. We do not intend to let this happen." [Emphasis added.]

The statement of David Dellinger on the afternoon of November 15, taken with the statements of Sidney Lens as cited in the November 10 press release quoted above, leave no doubt whatever that, even though the Justice Department march did not have the Mobe's formal endorsement, it was certainly approved by an influential segment of the Mobe's leadership.

The official posture of New Mobe regarding the maintenance of order during the November demonstrations had been that established guidelines must be adhered to by all participants with New Mobe marshals regulating security within the actual line of march.

Regarding civil disobedience, Irwin Bock, who attended several New Mobe steering committee sessions, recalled that Sid Lens had stated at one of the planning meetings that "an opportunity would be given to those people who felt that more should be done after the official New Mobilization march had finished, \* \* \* that people would then have an opportunity for civil disobedience, \* \* \* but not under the official auspices" of New Mobe.

Asked whether anything was in fact said to the effect that those who refuse to abide by the rules should not come to Washington, however, Bock replied categorically that he had "never heard such a statement that I can recall from any of them. In fact, to the contrary, it was always said that we [meaning New Mobe] welcome everybody to come, no matter what your political views are or no matter what your tactics are \* \* \*."

In this connection it should be noted that the Friday night march on the South Vietnamese Embassy and the Saturday afternoon marches on the Labor and Justice Departments were not officially parts of New Mobe's planned activities, although the participants were largely drawn from those who had come to Washington for the New Mobe march and rally on November 15. New Mobe itself very carefully refrained from formally endorsing any of these activi-

ties, although the Mobe also very pointedly failed to issue any statement, either before or after the violence, entirely repudiating them.

Instead, New Mobe cochairman Douglas Dowd issued an official statement after the demonstrations in which he announced "that the violence and substantial gassing and arrests that began between 4 and 5 p.m. Saturday, November 15, were unnecessary, and not due to initial provocation from antiwar demonstrators." This statement was issued despite the overwhelming evidence that the violence being discussed and excused had in fact been deliberately provoked by bands of demonstrators bent on forcing confrontation with the police.

During the November 13-15 New Mobe Washington demonstrations, there were 175 arrests, 159 for disorderly conduct and the others for more serious offenses. Six hundred and six people were treated, mostly for tear gas inhalation, 26 were police officers.

The demonstrations cost an estimated \$234,000 to \$268,000 for property damage alone, added to \$544,000 for police overtime and \$741,000 for troop deployment, plus \$6,006 spent on clearing away 50 tons of debris—a total cost of from \$1,525,006 to \$1,559,006.

On December 8, 1969, the communist Stockholm Conference on Vietnam issued its "information letter No. 6" reaffirming its complete support of New Mobe's Fall Offensive activities:

*November 15—A new start*

The "Fall Offensive" of the American antiwar forces, united in the New Mobilization Committee, turned out to be the biggest campaign against the Vietnam war ever organized in the US. In support of this big campaign the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam called a meeting of its International Liaison Committee on October 11-12, and that meeting issued a call for demonstrations all over the world on November 15 to be made the "Day of International Mobilization to End the War in Vietnam".

We thank all those who responded to our call and showed that nothing, not even police dogs and tear gas, can prevent people from expressing their protest against the war in Vietnam. \* \* \*

The Stockholm Conference document included brief accounts of demonstrations conducted on November 15 in the following countries, among others listed: Argentina, Algeria, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic (East Germany), Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany), Great Britain, Hungary, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Poland, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Arab Republic, U.S.S.R., Venezuela, and Yugoslavia.

The mailing further claimed that demonstrations were held by American citizens at United States buildings in West Berlin, India, Ghana, Zambia, and Austria, and that "170 US citizens working in Geneva [emphasis in original] signed a petition supporting the Moratorium and demanding the withdrawal of all US military personnel from Vietnam."

On December 13-14, 1969, a steering

committee meeting was held in Cleveland, Ohio. Groundwork for the session had been laid on November 22 at a meeting of the New Mobe's executive committee, one of whose members was CPUSA leader Arnold Johnson. The following people were among those present at the Cleveland meeting:

(1) Carol Andreas, a leader in the Detroit Coalition to End the War Now, a key Mobe regional affiliate dominated by the Socialist Workers Party;

(2) Abe Bloom, New Mobe national committee member;

(3) Barbara Bick, WSP;

(4) Al Budka, CAPAC and SWP;

(5) Norma Becker, Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;

(6) Douglas Dowd, pro-Hanoi New Mobe cochairman;

(7) Dave Dellinger, New Mobe cochairman;

(8) Ted Dostal, Workers World Party;

(9) Frances Dostal, wife of Ted Dostal;

(10) Rennie Davis, Vietcong supporter;

(11) Al Evanoff, labor leader and supporter of communist fronts;

(12) Jerry Gordon, CAPAC, a leader in the Trotskyist wing of the peace movement;

(13) Don Gurewitz, SMC, member of the SWP and YSA;

(14) Fred Halstead, SWP;

(15) Arnold Johnson, CPUSA;

(16) Linda Jenness, SWP;

(17) Sylvia Kushner, Chicago Peace Council, member of the CPUSA;

(18) Carol Lipman, SMC, member of the SWP and YSA;

(19) Sidney Lens, Chicago Peace Council;

(20) John McAuliff, Committee of Returned Volunteers;

(21) Sidney Peck, Mobe cochairman;

(22) Andrew Pulley, YSA;

(23) Harry Ring, SWP;

(24) Syd Stapleton, SWP;

(25) Marcia Sweetenham, YSA;

(26) Nancy Strebe, SWP member and cochairman of the Minnesota Mobilization Committee;

(27) Abe Weisburd, Trade Unionists for Peace;

(28) Arthur Waskow, Mobe national committee member;

(29) David Wulp, SWP and YSA;

(30) Hilgert Allen, Cleveland SMC, YSA;

(31) Betsy Davis, Cleveland YAWF;

(32) Prof. William Davidon, Mobe national committee;

(33) Richard Finkel, Cleveland SMC, YSA;

(34) Molly Kirsch, Cleveland SMC, YSA;

(35) Max Kirsch, Cleveland SMC, YSA;

(36) Herman Kirsch, SWP;

(37) Stewart Meacham, Mobe cochairman;

(38) Max Primack, Chicago Peace Council;

(39) Roger Rudenstein, Cleveland SMC, YSA;

(40) Marty Rudenstein, Cleveland SMC, YSA;

(41) Robert Schwartz, Cleveland SMC, YSA;

(42) Gerald Schwinn, Committee of Returned Volunteers;

(43) Linda Sheppard, SWP and YSA;  
(44) Jeanette Tracy, Cleveland SMC, YSA;

(45) Ron Young, New Mobe national committee.

The result of this meeting was the formulation of a "six month campaign to end the war in Vietnam," as announced in a New Mobe press release dated December 17, 1969. This campaign was designed as an attack on three major areas of concern.

The first, as announced in the press release, involved, "calling for a variety of actions to oppose repression as a necessary aspect of opposing the war. The Mobilization will help to organize activities to support Black Panther demands for a UN investigation of the systematic pattern by government and police against the Panthers. Mobilization spokesmen announced that plans were being made for decentralized demonstrations to support the eight anti-war leaders on trial in Chicago as the Conspiracy trial comes to an end in January."

The second "major thrust" was announced under the heading "Who Pays for the War and Who Profits from the War?" This campaign was designed as a broad one intended to demonstrate to people "the high cost of the war in their own lives."

Anti-inflation picketing and boycotts at groceries, etc.; group tax protests or refusal, visits to IRS offices, tax payments to the poor, etc.; support for strikers resisting efforts of business and government to put the burden of the war on workers; demonstrations, sit-down, etc. at offices and stockholders meetings of major war corporations; savings bond returns (GI's); demonstrations, etc., protesting perpetuation of poverty, low level of welfare and medical payments, etc., caused by the war. These efforts will reach a peak on or around April 15, the time when Americans return tax payments.

The third emphasis announced was "draft age youth and GI's":

New Mobe announced that it will actively support GI's and draft age youth in exercising their right to refuse to serve the government's war against Vietnam. The spring campaign may culminate in massive GI support demonstrations for peace on May 30, Memorial Day.

In a major article appearing in the December 26, 1969, issue of *The Militant*, official SWP newspaper, Harry Ring, a Mobe steering committee member and prominent SWP leader, criticized the decisions reached at the Cleveland meeting as a "serious retreat from organizing mass struggles against the war." Ring vigorously challenged the major broadening of the Mobe's focus. Conceding that many of the issues raised were legitimate and "supported by all opponents of the war," Ring argued that "isolated from any central focus—such as mass action against the war—the prospects for getting any action related to them off the ground are, at best, slight."

Describing the United States as an "imperialist nation" that "is today waging a war of aggression against a revolutionary people," Ring declared:

*And the Vietnamese, with a body of experience in the concrete struggle against imperialism, have made public again and again their profound appreciation for the worth of such mass actions in the liberation fight.* [Emphasis added.]



Despite criticism of the broadening of Mobe's program, however, it should be emphasized that the SWP, YSA, and YSA—controlled Student Mobilization Committee continued to publicize and support Mobe activities. SMC, again as in the past, provided major organizational support to build the New Mobe's Spring Offensive.

Other communist support for the New Mobe's Spring Offensive came from the Young Workers Liberation League, founded in Chicago during February 1970 as the official youth arm of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and successor to the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America. One of the documents distributed by the YWLL to its membership, a "Memo on the April 14 and 15 Peace Actions From New York Section Leadership," stated that—

The "founding convention of the Young Workers Liberation League singled out the national anti-war mobilizations in April as one of our main activities in the immediate period." [Emphasis added.]

Another document distributed by the YWLL, a "Memo To All Sections Of The Young Workers Liberation League," included this item:

#### Peace Mobilization

A. In keeping with convention decisions, immediate concern should be to mobilize as many youth as possible against General Motors on April [no date in original], to demand an end to G.M. tax thieving and war profiteering. This will be our first public demonstration, and every branch should work to make it successful. We should aim at demonstrations and leafletting in front of plants where possible with the special aim of spurring an armband demonstration inside the plant. *This demonstration is part of a nationwide drive by New Mobilization To End the War to organize workplace demonstrations on April 14.*

Mobe leaders continued to maintain contact with international communist groups and leaders, looking forward to the Spring Offensive. The February 1970 issue of the *New Mobilizer*, for example, carried an article by New Mobe steering committee member John McAuliff:

Over the weekend of Jan. 17-18, I traveled to Sweden on behalf of the Coordinating Council of the New Mobilization Committee. The occasion was a meeting of the International Liaison Committee of the Stockholm Conference, an association of anti-war organizations from different countries. The formal purpose of the gathering was to plan major world conference on the war [sic]. We agreed on March 28-30 as the best dates and Stockholm as the location.

This Easter weekend conference is open to all organizations which support the total [sic], immediate, unconditioned withdrawal of US and allied troops from South Vietnam. It is anticipated that many countries will be represented. *Delegations from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam), the National Liberation Front and the Provisional Revolutionary Government (South Vietnam) will take part.* \* \* \*

The meeting last month in Stockholm also called for the mass circulation of total and immediate withdrawal petitions between now and the world conference. *In support of the plans of the New Mobe the meeting declared April 15 an international 'U.S. Out of Vietnam' day.*

Interest was expressed by some of the delegates present to develop supporting actions to the Mobe's late April campaign against

US war-profiteering and imperialist corporations. (A real opportunity exists here since the aggressive presence of US corporations is a sensitive issue in many European and third world countries [sic]. *The Mobe delegation to the Easter conference should do some energetic organizing to help bring off anti-US corporation actions world wide.*)

They talked also of the importance for the US antiwar movement to make concrete practical demands on our government, for example that the US should agree in Paris to negotiate directly with the Provisional Revolutionary Government on the basis of the NLF's overall 10 point solution. [Emphasis added.]

A February 23, 1970, letter on the Stockholm Conference's letterhead discussed the importance of the January 17-18 meeting in preparing for the Fifth Stockholm Conference on Vietnam, March 28-30, 1970, "with the aim of bringing about further co-ordination and unity of the numerous actions for the mobilization of public opinion to end the war in Vietnam." Referring specifically to the American antiwar movement, the letter stated:

We all appreciate the great actions of the US anti-war movement and wish to see it represented in the broadest possible way at the Conference. We have all been following with great attention and sympathy the growing strength of the movement in the USA during the second half of 1969. *The International Liaison Committee considered it one of its main duties to raise worldwide support for the US fall offensive and will continue to support the initiatives taken by the US movement.* [Emphasis added.]

The letter also referred to the Stockholm Conference's "Vietnam Appeal, which was formulated last October by the meeting of the International Liaison Committee in full co-operation and with the advise of the representatives of the New Mobilization Committee and other U.S. organizations."

On January 30-31, 1970, a meeting was held in Quebec, Canada. Vietnamese representatives were in attendance, along with representatives of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council. Americans attending included:

- (1) Morris Rosenzweig, Mobe endorser;
- (2) Sylvia Kushner, secretary of the Chicago Peace Council and member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;
- (3) Katherine Camp, Mobe steering committee member;
- (4) Stanley Faulkner, active member of the CPUSA-front National Lawyers Guild;
- (5) Stewart Meacham, Mobe cochairman;
- (6) Arnold Johnson, CPUSA leader and Mobe steering committee member;
- (7) Joseph Crown, leader in the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam and national committee member in the Communist-dominated National Emergency Civil Liberties Committee;
- (8) Pauline Rosen, member of Women Strike for Peace and prominent participant in activities of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;
- (9) Masai Hewitt, minister of education, Black Panther Party;
- (10) Rev. Richard Morford, leader of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, a CPUSA front, and identi-

fied member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Many of the subjects discussed and acted upon at this meeting were also part of the New Mobe's Spring Offensive program: promotion of demonstrations during March at Selective Service offices around the United States, organization of sit-ins and other demonstrations against the war, planning of demonstrations relating to major American corporations, and withholding of taxes and conducting of demonstrations in April as a means of protesting the war in Vietnam.

An article in the New Mobilization Committee West's "Newsletter Number 4," dated February 13, 1970, provided another example of cooperation by key New Mobe leaders with the international communist movement and demonstrated that the New Mobe's enlarged program as adopted at the December 1969 steering committee meeting in Cleveland remained in harmony with the stated objectives of the Soviet-controlled World Peace Council. Entitled "Vancouver Peace Conference," the article stated:

About 100 Americans from the West Coast, representing about 70 organizations, and a delegation of Canadian peace people met at a conference Feb. 7 & 8 in Vancouver, B.C. [British Columbia], called by the *World Peace Council* to discuss international cooperation to end the war in Vietnam [sic]. *New Mobe arranged the United States participation.* In fact, the meeting was initiated by Carlton Goodlett and Irving Sarnoff (both New Mobe steering committee members) at a WPC meeting in Africa last month.

WPC delegates were: Tran Cong Tuong, one of the chief DRV (Democratic Republic of Vietnam) negotiators at the Paris sessions; Ha Huy Oanh, DRV negotiating team; Krishna Menon, India, Pastor Martin Niemoller, Germany, Romesh Chandra, Secretary General of the WPC; and A. Ratsifihera, Madagascar.

*The conference endorsed and called for international support to the work stoppage being called on April 15 to protest the war.*

A statement unanimously adopted by the Conference declared that the most urgent need of all people is immediate withdrawal from Vietnam, but placed priority on overcoming the related evils of racism, poverty and repression.

The Conference recommended that an international meeting on racism be held in 1970; endorsed selection of Montreal as site for a Commission of Inquiry into war crimes on Vietnam, projected for summer 1970.

The Vietnam delegates addressed the assemblage, answered questions, and participated in workshops. The conference was historic in that it was the first time representatives of the DRV government have met with US citizens and the first time in the WPC [sic] has sponsored so broadly represented a meeting in the Western Hemisphere.

*New Mobe office has copies of the statement adopted by the conference; we will soon have tapes of talks by the Vietnamese and printed reports of what they said.* \* \* \* [Emphasis added.]

On March 28-30, 1970, the Fifth Stockholm Conference on Vietnam was held in Stockholm, Sweden. Like all such previous activities of the Stockholm Conference, this gathering and its pronouncements were blatantly communist-oriented in nature and keyed openly to the American antiwar movement, particularly the New Mobilization Committee.

The conference, attended by 354 repre-

representatives of 64 countries and 31 international organizations, adopted a resolution specifically supporting the communist National Liberation Front:

The Conference is convinced that in order to reach a correct solution of the problem of real peace in Vietnam, the United States government must satisfy the legitimate demands of the Vietnamese people as contained in the ten-point overall solution of the NLF and the PRG [Provisional Revolutionary Government] of the Republic of South Vietnam, which are based on the total immediate and unconditional withdrawal of the U.S. and allied forces and establishment of a provisional coalition government which would organize free, democratic elections.

In order to prevent the extension of the war in Indochina, the United States must be required to cease immediately and unconditionally its war of aggression in Vietnam and the bombing of Laos, it must put an end to the intervention in Cambodia and respect its independence, neutrality and territorial integrity.

The following passage from this resolution is of special interest:

\* \* \* The Conference recommends that there should [sic] be set up in each country an action programme in cooperation with the antiwar movement in the United States. In this way powerful pressure will be created throughout the world, that will oblige the U.S. government to respect the peace, independence and the right to self-determination of the Vietnamese, Laotian and Cambodian peoples. It recommends the organization of broadly-based, continuing actions that will be coordinated and developed in each region, each country, each sector, according to their conditions and to the concrete problems posed. [Emphasis added.]

Another document disseminated by the Stockholm Conference provided a further illustration of the cooperation between the New Mobe and the international communist "peace" campaign:

Responding to the call of the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam, the New Mobilization Committee in the USA has proposed a worldwide campaign to collect signatures of millions of people everywhere on appeals embodying the demand of the total, immediate, unconditional withdrawal of U.S. and allied troops and weapons from South Vietnam.

The campaign is to be known as the OUTNOW PROJECT. The campaign will take different forms in different countries. In the USA cables are being sent to president Nixon with the one word STOP.

All international and national organizations are invited to follow this method or obtain signatures to the Vietnam Appeal, which embodies the key OUTNOW demand. In countries whose governments support, directly or indirectly, the U.S. aggression in Vietnam, the campaign will be linked to the demands to break with these war policies.

The 5th Stockholm Conference on Vietnam fully supports this campaign, will assist on the collection of signatures, and will make the best possible use of these.

This was echoed in the following excerpt taken from an official New Mobe press release on the projected April 15 demonstrations:

The week of April 15 also marks the opening of the New Mobilization's international call for messages to President Nixon, consisting of one word: STOP This project will be known as the OUTNOW Campaign and will involve all individuals and groups (in this country and throughout the world) who wish to participate.

The extent of world communist appre-

ciation for the activities of both the Stockholm Conference and the New Mobilization Committee was indicated in the following statements of North Vietnamese official Xuan Thuy in remarks delivered to the conference:

Particularly, with regard to the American people's anti war movement, we are delighted to note that in spite of the Nixon Administration's policy of repression and maneuvers of concealing the truth, the American people, throughout last year, did not sit quiet and let the U.S. Government commit in their name acts of intervention and aggression and crimes in Vietnam and in many other places, impairing the honour and fine traditions of the American nation.

Last year, the American people's movement against the Vietnam war was marked by important events so far unknown in American history. *The "Moratorium Day" (October 15, 1969), the demonstrations on November 13, 14, 15, 1969, the opposition to the Chicago trial, the denunciation, of U.S. troops' crimes in South Vietnam, the anti-draft movement, the opposition to the war budget, the statements made inside and outside the Congress against the Nixon Administration's policy, and innumerable other actions of support to the Vietnamese people were warmly hailed and responded to by the Vietnamese people and the World people.*

*The Stockholm Conference expresses the firm determination of the various and massive forces of the world people, national and international organizations, of personalities embodying the desire for peace and genuine friendship among peoples. It constitutes once again a great source of encouragement for our people.*

It is necessary to make pressure on the U.S. government by concrete acts, demanding that it rapidly, totally withdraw from South Vietnam U.S. troops and those of the other foreign countries in the U.S. camp, without posing any condition, that it let the Vietnamese people settle themselves their own affairs without foreign interference.

\* \* \* reality shows that the Nixon Administration \* \* \* cannot be blind to the reaction of public opinion, in the first place American public opinion. What the United States has had to accept so far, for instance the cessation of bombardments against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam [North Vietnam], etc. is precisely prompted by its defeats on the battlefield and the pressure of public opinion. \* \* \*

That is why, the coordination between our people's struggle and the world people's support is one of the most important question [sic]. This co-ordination will surely compel the Nixon Administration to renounce its scheme of aggression and colonialism, to engage in serious negotiations so as to bring the Paris Conference to results as we wish. As to the forms of struggle, experience shows that they are increasingly multiple and varied. We have had an example: *the movement in the United States has so far imagined highly rich and effective forms of struggle.*

The Vietnamese people welcome and deeply thank the Stockholm Conference, all national and international organizations, and personalities that have been working in the aforesaid spirit.

Every expression of support, political or material, great or small, every word spoken, every concrete act from your part and from the world people constitutes a contribution that the Vietnamese people will remember for ever. [Emphasis added.]

In addition to the foregoing remarks,

a lengthy report on "Peace Activities in the U.S." was delivered at the opening plenary session by New Mobe steering committee member William Davidson. This report constituted a detailed summarization of New Mobe's Spring Offensive plans, including a letter of greeting and explanation of the so-called OUTNOW Project from Mobe steering committee members Douglas Dowd and Stewart Meacham.

American participation in this communist propaganda conference was later described by Mrs. Pauline Rosen, a member of the Communist Party, prominent activist in New Mobe, leader in Women Strike for Peace, and member of the administrative committee of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee.

In a major interview appearing in the May 21, 1970, issue of the CPUSA's Daily World, Mrs. Rosen revealed that "35 peace activists from the United States" had attended the Stockholm Conference, constituting the "largest and broadest delegation the United States has had" at one of these meetings. There were also six delegates from Communist North Vietnam and 10 representatives of the National Liberation Front.

American participants represented such groups as the University Christian Movement, Episcopal Peace Fellowship, Women Strike for Peace, Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, Peace Action Council of Southern California, Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, Chicago Peace Council, and, as we have already noted, New Mobe.

The Communist-serving nature of such activities as those described in this report was amply reflected in the following revealing comment by Mrs. Rosen:

There was great appreciation of the U.S. peace forces at Stockholm, especially among the Vietnamese, who call our movement the "Second front" of the Vietnam war. [Emphasis added.]

The first major item in the New Mobe Spring Offensive was a series of demonstrations across the country during Anti-Draft Week March 16-22. This project was announced in detail on the east coast at a press conference in Washington on March 9, 1970. Participants in this press conference included Mobe coordinator Trudi Young and SMC leader Carol Lipman. West coast plans were announced on March 14 at a press conference in San Francisco by Mobe cochairman and CPUSA member Terence Hallinan.

Prior to these demonstrations the New Mobe received a message of support from the Viet Nam Committee for Solidarity With the American People. As broadcast by Hanoi on March 6, the message stated: "We wish you new victories in the struggle for an end to the U.S. war in Viet Nam."

Testimony before our committee reflected that during the week of March 15-22 1970, 32 incidents of violence occurred at Selective Service offices in 16 States and the District of Columbia; 23 bomb threats, two personal threats against draft board personnel, two incidents of harassment of local board personnel, two incidents of sabotage, two of vandalism, and one of robbery. These



incidents dropped off to normal levels immediately following Anti-Draft Week, however. (There had also been 26 incidents of property damage and two bomb threats reported by Selective Service officers from January 1 to March 15.)

The April 15, 1970, demonstrations coincided with a series of demonstrations organized by the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee, which also played its usual key role in organizing for New Mobe's activities. Typical of the planning sessions prior to April 15 was the so-called New England Antiwar Conference held at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology on February 28 and March 1 under the joint auspices of the SMC and New Mobe. Speakers at this gathering included Florence Luscomb, an identified member of the CPUSA from Massachusetts, and Jerry Gordon of the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council. Greetings were also received from Allen Myers, a national leader in the SMC and member of both the Socialist Workers Party and Young Socialist Alliance.

As shown in testimony before the committee, a demonstration was held on April 15, 1970, at the national office of the Internal Revenue Service in Washington, D.C., to protest the use of tax money for the war in Vietnam. Demonstrators began to assemble about 3 p.m. An hour later there was a crowd of about 1,000 passing out leaflets marching, carrying placards, shouting obscenities, singing, and displaying the communist Vietcong flag.

At about 5 p.m. a contingent of some 50 people reportedly both Weathermen and SDS members, joined the demonstration, but there was no violence. By 6 p.m. all demonstrators had quit the area and gone on to the Capitol. However sometime in the late evening a splinter group of about 300 returned and broke 23 windows in the IRS Building along Pennsylvania Avenue.

The IRS reported 43 major demonstrations around the country in such cities as New York; Covington, Ky.; Denver, Colo.; and Des Moines, Iowa. There was some civil disobedience, and demonstrators were arrested for such offenses as trespassing, interference, obstructing an officer, and assaulting a Federal officer. Speakers in New York included David Dellinger, Black Panther attorney William Kunstler, and an unidentified member of the Black Panther Party.

Nationwide, according to *The Militant* for April 24, 1970, "Hundreds of thousands marched and rallied on [April 15] in major cities throughout the nation in a full day of mass actions against the war in Vietnam." This article claimed that there were 40,000 participants in the New York rally, with the Student Mobilization Committee prominent in organizing a strike of junior and senior high school students in all five boroughs of New York, while the Parade Committee organized a rally of some 3,500 people at the office of the Internal Revenue Service.

In Chicago a claimed 25,000 people marched down State Street in the culmination of a day of antiwar activities. After a rally at the Civic Center sponsored by the Vietnam Moratorium Com-

mittee the demonstrators marched to the Federal Building for a rally sponsored by the communist-dominated Chicago Peace Council and YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee. There were a claimed 15,000 participants in this rally, according to *The Militant*.

Another major demonstration was held in Boston, Mass., with an estimated 100,000 people gathered on the Boston Common to hear such speakers as Trotskyist communist Carol Lipman, national executive secretary of the Student Mobilization Committee; Abbie Hoffman, the Yippie leader who has stated that he believes in the overthrow of the United States Government; and Mike Kelly, Socialist Workers Party candidate for Massachusetts Governor in the 1970 elections.

On April 28, 1970, also as part of New Mobe's Spring Offensive, there were disruptive demonstrations at stockholders' meetings of the Gulf Oil Corporation in Pittsburgh, Pa., and the Honeywell Corporation in Minneapolis, Minn. In Pittsburgh, according to testimony before the committee, six demonstrators had to be ejected from the meeting, and seven people were arrested for disorderly conduct.

In Minneapolis, approximately 2,000 persons participated in the demonstration. Testimony disclosed that rocks were thrown at the building, several windows were broken, and demonstrators tried to force their way into the stockholders' meeting. Two hundred demonstrators who held proxies forced the termination of the session by shouting down the corporation officials.

During the weekend of May 8-10, 1970, New Mobe staged its last major activity, a Washington, D.C., demonstration to protest the war in Vietnam, the move into Cambodia, and the deaths of students at Kent State University. As had been the case on November 15, 1969, the Mobe's official posture was nonviolent; but, again as on November 15, there was violence. Indeed, as reported in the *Chicago Daily News* on May 8, 1970:

Radical groups and many of the estimated 50,000 demonstrators expected [in Washington] have warned the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (New Mobe) that they will not be content \* \* \* to rally, listen to speakers and go home peacefully.

Instead the decision was made to escalate mass civil disobedience in order to prevent spontaneous youthful attacks on the barricades [around the White House] and scattered acts of violence.

With the sudden escalation of the Indochina war, the peace movement has turned sharply toward the left. The more moderate youngsters are rather leaderless and the radicals have become the central spokesmen.

The demonstration had been hurriedly authorized at a meeting of the New Mobe coordinating committee at the Riverdale, N.Y., home of pro-Hanoi WSP leader and New Mobe cochairman Cora Weiss on April 29. Originally May 9 had been set for a meeting of the Mobe steering committee in Chicago.

The high point of the demonstration was a rally at the Ellipse south of the White House on May 9. An estimated 80,000 to 100,000 demonstrators heard

speeches by such movement activities as:

- (1) Dr. Benjamin Spock, an honorary cochairman of New Mobe;
- (2) Mrs. Coretta King, another honorary New Mobe cochairman;
- (3) Ron Young, a New Mobe coordinator;
- (4) David Livingston, an identified member of the CPUSA;
- (5) Fred Halstead, SWP leader, New Mobe steering committee member, and one of the chief marshals for the demonstration;
- (6) Charles Palmer, president of the National Student Association;
- (7) John Froines, a defendant in the Chicago "Conspiracy" trial;
- (8) Dave Dellinger, Mobe cochairman and coordinator;
- (9) Jane Fonda, well-known actress who has recently emerged as a supporter of communist causes, including the Wilfred Burchett 60th Birthday Committee, a communist front established to aid the work of *Guardian* writer Wilfred Burchett, Australian communist and KGB agent;
- (10) Mike Alewitz, a leader of the Kent State Student Mobilization Committee and member of the YSA;
- (11) Sid Finehirsch, a member of the YSA.

Another speaker was California Peace and Freedom Party candidate Robert Scheer, who stated: "Richard Nixon wants to Americanize the world. But dig it. If Richard Nixon Americanizes the world, then America's children will become Viet Cong, and we shall become warriors in the process."

Once again communist organizations gave all-out support to New Mobe's protest. Among groups which participated in the May 9 demonstration were:

- (1) the Communist Party, U.S.A.;
- (2) the Progressive Labor Party;
- (3) the Black Panther Party;
- (4) Worker-Student Alliance SDS;
- (5) the Spartacist League;
- (6) the Workers League;
- (7) the Socialist Workers Party;
- (8) the Young Socialist Alliance;
- (9) the Student Mobilization Committee;
- (10) Youth Against War and Facism.

Following the rally on May 9 several radical groups broke off and demonstrated at intersections north of the White House.

At 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue at about 4:15 p.m. 1,000 to 1,500 people occupied the intersection and tried to push a mock coffin over a bus barricade. Demonstrators threw rocks, bottles, and a homemade tear gas canister. No arrests were made.

At about 5 p.m. a group assembled in the 1700 block of H Street NW., north of Lafayette Park, and tried to climb over the bus barricade and to upset one of the buses. Police had to use Mace and tear gas to control the crowd. The demonstrators refused to leave, and arrests were made.

At about 6 p.m. another group sat in the roadway at 16th and K Streets NW. and refused to disperse. They were also arrested. During the evening there were several other smaller attempts to scale the buses.

There was also a rally in the George Washington University area. A crowd of about 50 moved up to Dupont Circle, smashed windows in the area, and had to be dispersed. After regrouping in the university area, demonstrators set fire to a truck and an automobile and caused considerable damage from broken windows. The police, who were forced to use tear gas, had to establish a police line around the university area and clear the streets to halt the property damage and rock throwing. Part of the group moved to the Washington Monument Grounds and confronted the Park Police. They were then forced back to the Ellipse, where most were arrested.

At 1:20 a.m. Sunday, May 10, a charge exploded along the west wall of the U.S. National Guard Association building on Massachusetts Avenue NW. The charge was hurled from a passing automobile and caused damage to 70 windows in the area and to the stone columns on the front of the building.

During the May 8-10 activities there were 365 arrests. Approximately 50 persons were treated at area hospitals for various injuries. Seven Park Police and six Metropolitan Police were seriously injured.

The official FBI figures on damages from this action reflect \$1,885 in damage to Government-owned or Government-leased buildings; \$73,760 in damage to private buildings; \$50,000 damage to the National Guard Association building; \$10,000 damage to private homes; \$16,700 damage to parks, especially the Ellipse and Washington Monument Grounds; and \$34,740 damage to police, fire, and private vehicles. Removal of debris cost \$11,000; and police overtime, bus rentals, and troop deployment cost \$949,331. The total estimated cost in damages and other expenses was at least \$1,147,416.

In his testimony before HCIS on June 9, 1970, D.C. Metropolitan Police Chief Jerry Wilson estimated that the four Mobe-sponsored demonstrations held in Washington, along with the October 15, 1969, Vietnam Moratorium Committee demonstration, had resulted in a total of \$1,372,000 in military costs, excluding the May 1970 action; \$1,495,000 in police costs; and from \$429,000 to \$451,000 in property damage. He also estimated that there had been 642 arrests, not including those at the Pentagon in 1967, and 756 personal injuries. He estimated the total number of participants in these demonstrations at from 425,000 to 445,000.

Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. SCHMITZ, will present recent information on Communist activity in the peace movement, including especially the Communist origins of the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice and the National Peace Action Coalition. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, after the May 1970 Washington demonstration, the New Mobe became relatively dormant. Rampant factionalism that had

plagued the coalition for months was the primary reason even though the two major competing factions had managed, as previously indicated, to work together on the basis of specific, overriding issues.

The basis for this factionalism was a major split over tactics. In this split, the two primary forces were the Trotskyists, representing the single-issue, mass mobilization strategy, and the CPUSA with its allies, representing a broader approach geared to the possible use of civil disobedience and emphasis on issues allegedly related to the war—poverty, racism, and repression.

As indicated earlier, various competing elements in a coalition like the New Mobe are united around specific issues which all parties deem to be of sufficient importance to merit the shelving of other concerns that would normally be the cause of bitter infighting.

Furthermore, the communists who participate in and provide essential organizing expertise for the antiwar movement are, despite sectarian differences, united in their singleminded desire to serve the ends of the international communist movement. The primary aim of all communists, no matter what their ideological bent, is the protection and perpetuation of the world communist cause. In practice this means simply any struggle, even a violent struggle, that advances the cause is, by definition, good, while any struggle that retards the advancement of communism is necessarily bad and must, therefore, be opposed at all costs. All communists are determined to bring about an American defeat in Southeast Asia, just as they were determined to encourage an American defeat in Korea (and just as they were determined to discourage American participation in the war against Hitler and nazism until Hitler invaded the Soviet Union, when overnight they became ardent supporters of what, until then, had been viewed by communists as a senseless imperialist war fought only to secure the position of capitalist exploiters).

Thus, after Nazi Germany attacked the Soviet Union in 1941, the American Communist Party became an ardent supporter of our military participation in World War II, but only after the communist heartland was attacked. Fascism ceased to be the "matter of taste" that Molotov had dubbed it upon the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact. Instead, members of the CPUSA were encouraged to enlist and fight alongside other Americans to eliminate the power of Nazism in Europe—and especially, of course, to protect the Soviet Union.

With the defeat of Nazi Germany, however, the communists once again assumed their bogus "peace" posture. Now the emphasis was on the perpetuation of peace, which within the postwar context meant protection of gains made by the Soviet Union during World War II. Thus, it was essential that any seemingly anti-Soviet policies adopted by the United States be frustrated to block or eliminate any potential threat to the newly expanded communist sphere of influence.

The outbreak of war in Korea in 1950 caused a predictable knee-jerk reaction

among the world's communists. As strongly as they had supported the military effort against Hitler and fascism, they opposed any military effort against communist expansion in Korea.

In the United States the communists launched a major propaganda offensive designed to aid the communists in Korea, China, and the U.S.S.R. by attempting to discredit the United States before the rest of the world as a nation guilty of the foulest war crimes, including alleged germ warfare against innocent Koreans. Here again the primary loyalty of American communists obviously lay with the international communist movement rather than with the United States. (Indeed, it is fair to judge the communist, by his very nature, knows no country, only his revolutionary cause.)

In the case of Vietnam, the communists in America, as this report clearly demonstrates, have been hyperactive. From the beginning communists have assumed leading roles in setting policies and in organizing people for public protest.

In this connection, it should be noted, a communist organization, the pro-Chinese, dissident Trotskyist Youth Against War and Fascism, rather than a pacifist one, claims credit for organizing in New York City in 1962 the first public protest against the Vietnam war. And it is another communist organization, the Socialist Workers Party, with its youth affiliate, the Young Socialist Alliance, which claims major credit for the success of the April 17, 1965, SDS-sponsored march on Washington. A major article in the October 10, 1969, issue of *The Militant* assessed the SWP-YSA involvement and its significance:

The new antiwar movement was born in a break with the policy of the old peace movement. This was most evident in the first national demonstration against the war in Vietnam, the April 17, 1965, mass march on Washington called by SDS. In calling the march, a section of the SDS leadership broke with the League for Industrial Democracy, a social-democratic relic which at that time was the official parent organization of SDS.

The march was not for "peace" in the abstract; rather, it was directed against the specific war in Vietnam. In a break with the cold-war liberalism, it characterized the Vietnam war as a civil war and called for self-determination for the Vietnamese people. The march was organized on a nonexclusionary basis; in particular, the SWP and YSA were welcomed to participate on the ground floor. And finally, the nature of the action was that of a militant, mass demonstration. It was independent and did not support any capitalist politicians.

The social democrats and sections of the old peace movement waged a bitter struggle against that march on Washington. They exerted all the pressure they could. To tone down its political line and impose the old exclusionary anticommunist norms. They demanded complete bureaucratic control over the action and, failing to achieve that, they even tried to have it called off. On the eve of the demonstration they issued a public statement denouncing it.

But the march occurred. Some 20,000 came to Washington—more than twice as many as had participated in any of the old peace demonstrations—which proved the feasibility of organizing militant mass actions against the war.

*It was this demonstration that established*



many of the basic political characteristics of the then new antiwar movement that remain to this day: nonexclusion; self-determination; and mass action.

The SWP and YSA played a large part in the struggle for the march on Washington. The issue was settled, not simply in meetings between SDS and the cold-war social democrats, but in battle—in actually building the march on the basis on which it had been conceived.

We recognized that this demonstration was a test. It was a means of establishing the new antiwar movement along the lines that we had fought for earlier. And so we plunged into the work of insuring its success.

The YSA endorsed the march. We sent speakers touring the country to build it and distributed literature on a far wider scale than had ever been done before. We took the lead—much more so than SDS itself—in establishing nonexclusive, ad hoc committees to build the march, to explain why it was important, and to argue for the policy of self-determination for the Vietnamese.

Though the self-serving nature of this article and its rhetoric is quite obvious, nevertheless there is much truth in it from the standpoint of establishing the role of the Trotskyists in developing the anti-Vietnam movement into the broad coalition it is today. There is little doubt the anti-Vietnam war movement would not be nearly as large or as broad as it is now had not the Trotskyists thrown their energies into it.

The other major communist organization that has played a crucial part in developing the antiwar movement is, of course, the Communist Party, U.S.A. The party has participated in all the major national anti-Vietnam war demonstrations, including the April 1965 SDS-sponsored Washington march mentioned above. It also played the central role in setting up the Student Mobilization Committee in 1966, although the Trotskyists were able to wrest control for themselves during 1968, as previously noted.

The pages of the CPUSA's official newspapers, the Daily World and People's World, are filled with propaganda designed to undermine America's will to resist communist aggression in Southeast Asia; and the party has been instrumental in establishing a variety of organizations whose business it is to undermine America's position abroad.

Thus, the party set up the Emergency Conference Committee, run by, among others, Mrs. Angie Dickerson, a member of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and of the World Peace Council, to resurrect the concept of a petition to the United Nations accusing the United States of genocide against minorities, a concept that had last achieved prominence in the early 1950's under the aegis of the Civil Rights Congress, at that time a leading front for the Communist Party, U.S.A. During the latter half of 1970 New Mobe collaborated closely with this CPUSA-organized group in promoting its phony genocide petition, a fact indicative of the increasingly prominent role of the CPUSA in Mobe affairs.

More recently the CPUSA's concern with this type of activity has led to the establishment of the American-Korean Friendship and Information Center, a New York group that attempts to link a demand for withdrawal from Korea to the already constant demands of the

movement for withdrawal from Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. The AKFIC boasts among its leadership no fewer than three current members of the CPUSA national committee: Joseph Brandt, Herbert Aptheker, and Jarvis Tyner, who also serves as national chairman of the CPUSA's Young Workers Liberation League. Sponsors of this new CPUSA front include the following people who have been supporters of Mobe: Ossie Davis, Irving Sarnoff, Carlton Goodlett, and Women's International League of Peace and Freedom leader Ruth Gage-Colby of New York. Of the 54 signers of the AKFIC's February 25, 1971, advertisement in the New York Times it is interesting to note that 27 are identified members of the CPUSA, 19 are involved with more than one or two CPUSA "front" organizations, and the remaining eight have participated in at least one "front" group.

The CPUSA has played a leading role in establishing and operating some of the most important "peace" coalitions in the country, coalitions like the Chicago Peace Council and the Peace Action Council of Southern California. The CPUSA has also been the dominant force in the New Mobilization Committee West, a primary west coast Mobe affiliate that has operated in major tactical disagreement with the SWP-dominated Bay Area Peace Action Council (which has also been known as the San Francisco GI-Civilian Alliance for Peace and as the New Mobe Membership Committee.)

This split between the SWP-dominated and CPUSA-dominated New Mobe forces in the San Francisco area was explained from the standpoint of the SWP in a remarkable memorandum written to all members of the New Mobe national steering committee by steering committee member Marjorie Colvin, a project director for New Mobe West and member of the SWP. Because of its importance, this memorandum of October 24, 1969, is here reproduced in full for the first time:

OCTOBER 24, 1969.

To all National Steering Committee Members of the New Mobilization Committee.  
Memorandum Re: San Francisco November 15 action and its problems  
From: Marjorie Colvin, National Steering Committee member and project director, New-Mobe-West

#### INTRODUCTION

The preparations for the San Francisco Nov. 15 mobilization have been marred by a disagreement over the character of the action. This difference has never been forthrightly debated. Instead, the NMC tentative west coast co-chairmen, Terence Hallinan and Donald Kallish, have sought to impose by undemocratic and high-handed bureaucratic methods, an approach contrary to that in Washington and that decided by the July 4th national antiwar conference in Cleveland.

This procedure has involved exclusion of tendencies, red-baiting, strong-arm tactics, etc. In short, because of the arrogant actions of the tentative co-chairman, a profound split among the peace forces has resulted in the Bay area.

I believe that the chief responsibility for this split lies with a minority group around Terence Hallinan and Karen Talbot (People's World). The Hallinan-Talbot group, in my opinion, is less concerned with a mass antiwar demonstration, than with building some

sort of political movement for the 1970 elections. It is their right to try and build such a movement on their own, but not to utilize the antiwar movement for their own factional purposes. Their factional methods have already dealt grave harm to the Nov. 15 demonstration and deserve the forthright repudiation of the entire antiwar movement.

When the July 4, 1969, national antiwar conference was called, the GI-Civilian Alliance for Peace (organizer of the April 6 march and rally of 30,000 in San Francisco) did its best to broaden the list of peace organizations invited to attend the Cleveland conference. We realized that some peace organizations in the Bay Area were not functioning as constituent parts of GI-CAP, and that the cooperation of every peace group in the Bay Area would be needed to make the fall offensive a success. Unfortunately, additional invitations from the conference convenors were few in number—for example, neither Terence Hallinan nor Karen Talbot received official invitations, although GI-CAP had written to them informing them of the conference and asking them to attend.

Our concern at broadening the antiwar coalition in the Bay Area continued, and particular emphasis was made toward involving those forces represented by Hallinan and Talbot. When the five San Francisco delegates (representing three organizations) returned from Cleveland, they tried to bring together the broadest possible coalition to build the fall antiwar offensive. All 99 antiwar and peace organizations, from Sacramento to Fresno, were asked to participate in a meeting called by the five delegates. In addition, 1,000 peace activists were sent a mailing acquainting them with the decisions of the Cleveland conference. I personally went to see Terence Hallinan and also spoke to Karen Talbot and Alice Hamburg.

Finally, on July 29, the projected meeting was held. 150 people attended. Chairman of the meeting was Henry McGuckin, professor at S.F. State College. The meeting was broadly representative, from Ben Seaver (AFSC) to Karen Talbot (Peoples' World) to Alice Hamburg (WILPF) to the SMC, to Asher Harer (SWP).

The meeting enthusiastically endorsed the decisions of the Cleveland conference, voted to organize support immediately for the demonstration Aug. 17 at Nixon's San Clemente "summer white house" and set up an interim volunteer planning committee responsible to the body as a whole. The meeting adjourned early before choosing a name—New Mobilization West would most likely have been the result. All decisions at the meeting were in line with the character of the fall antiwar offensive as had been decided at the Cleveland conference.

A prelude to the future West Coast problems developed, however, when Talbot and Hamburg walked out in the middle of the meeting, announcing to all within hearing that they "would march, but not work on the action." But to win support for their conception through the type of organization that was projected at the July 29th meeting—in which decisions would be made through open democratic discussion—was not what they had in mind. Within a few weeks it became clear that their object was to gain control of the apparatus.

Later, it was to become clear that they had a different political conception of the Nov. 15 demonstration. But the meeting's tone showed that it would have been quite difficult for them to win support for an alternative approach through open democratic discussion. This group, as events showed later, evidently placed its hopes in gaining control over the apparatus.

The minutes of the national NMC steering committee of July 30 record that Prof. Sidney Peck had received a call from Karen Talbot who complained that things were not "going satisfactorily" in the Bay Area. The

steering committee decided that Sid Peck should come to S.F. and see what could be done to get all the peace forces together. Those of us who had already started building the Nov. 15 action were hopeful that Peck's visit would bring the Hallinan-Talbot forces into active support for the action and that *modus vivendi* could be worked out. The antiwar activists were certainly willing to bend over backwards to draw other groups in and make the demonstration a success. Needless to say, we expected the same honest and open attitude on the part of the others, and a real effort at broadening out to occur. One point we were always insistent upon was that all decision-making be democratic and out in the open.

In the Bay Area, the history of the antiwar movement has been that of participation in planning, in organization and in *decision-making* by those building the action. This history goes back to the mass teach-ins organized by the Vietnam Day Committee in 1965. Steering committees have represented the range of organizations involved, but the steering committees and specific working committees (e.g. program, arrangements, finance, etc.) have *always* been responsible to the general meetings of the organizers of the action. These meetings are usually held once a week in the high point of building the action. This method of functioning is similar to the peace coalitions in other areas.

This *modus operandi* has been very successful as everyone knows. April 15, 1967 (70,000); April 27, 1968 (35,000); Oct. 12, 1968, a GI and Veterans led demonstration of 20,000; and April 6, 1969 (50,000). The antiwar movement in the Bay Area has developed in a tradition of democratic planning, organization and decision-making.

When Sid Peck came out to the Bay Area, the situation was as follows: The organization which grew out of the broad-based July 29 meeting adopted the name Bay Area Peace Action Council (BAPAC), similar to other peace coalitions in other cities. (Later we changed our name to the New Mobilization Membership Committee, in response to the suggestion of Brian Drolet, a West coast New Mobe project director. This change was made in order to eliminate the two-name confusion, i.e., BAYPAC and NMC-West.)

BayPac naturally became the main organizing center for the fall antiwar offensive. All necessary committees and task forces for the action were set up by BayPac. Money was collected to finance the action. BayPac people put out all the promotional literature for the Nov. 15 demonstration that has appeared to date. Attendance at the open and democratic meetings of BayPac, held every Thursday night, varied from 100 to 300 people. A headquarters was obtained (2170 Bryant St., San Francisco) together with the Student Mobilization Committee, and the New Mobe Working Committee, which was formed as a result of Peck's visit.

On Aug. 5 when Sid Peck was here, he chaired the 2nd meeting of the BayPac coalition, where 150 people attended. But the Hallinan-Talbot forces were still not involved (though the door was always open for them). So at Peck's initiative, a small meeting of some 30 people was called at Hallinan's apartment. Although the meeting was over-weighted towards the Hallinan-Talbot forces, BayPac people who were present were eager to patch up the differences and work out a formula to include all antiwar groups in the Nov. 15 action.

Suggested west coast officers were proposed and agreed to, with the understanding that they would be tentative, subject to the actual formation of a truly broad and representative working committee for the west coast action.

The tentative officers were: Terence Hallinan and Ron Dellums as Bay Area Co-Chairmen; Majorie Colvin, Brian Drolet and Mary-Louise Lovett as project directors and Don Kalish as Los Angeles Co-Chairman.

Those of us from BayPac reluctantly accepted this procedure, after (1) we were assured that this arbitrary gathering of 30 would be only the initial nucleus of a west coast working committee which would quickly expand itself politically, generationally (few youth were present), and geographically and (2) we felt that we could, as members of the working committee, be in a position to effect its merger with BayPac and create a very broad coalition effort of all forces available, i.e., BayPac would become the New Mobe West's membership body in action and name. (Hallinan and Peck had both already named BayPac as the "Bay Area arm of the NMC-West.")

Terence Hallinan, in position as a (tentative) co-chairman, was invited to attend the next BayPac meeting Aug. 8 to establish collaboration and mend fences. But he proceeded to tell the 150 activists assembled that they were "paranoid megalomaniacs" to think that they represented anybody or could in any way participate in decision-making! This remark was not only insulting, but coming from a person whose position required him to try to bring all groups together, it was totally out of order. It portended, not collaborative coalition efforts on his part, but crude and bureaucratic manipulation of his office. And that is exactly what was to happen.

Despite the insults, BayPac elected the chairmen of its five active subcommittees who were already working on the action to attend the meetings of the NMC working committee. Other members of BayPac attended as observers. We wanted to give the working committee every chance of success. But things did not work out.

High handed and arbitrary methods were used by Hallinan and his supporters to try and circumvent the feelings of the majority. Exclusionary moves were directed against the SMC. An attempt was made to change the antiwar character of the actions through the proposed device of co-sponsorship with the United Front Against Fascism. The New Mobe working committee was not expanded and broadened along the lines that had been agreed upon. No money was released for implementation of plans. BayPac—doing the work—also had to raise money. New Mobe did not even send out a fund letter until Oct. 16th!

During all this time, the real attitude of the different groups towards the Nov. 15 action became clear by virtue of the fact that almost all committees of NMC-West that were actually doing work to build the action were being organized by BayPac people. These included the Third World Task Force, the GI Task Force, the Arrangements Committee, the Publicity Committee. Where the Hallinan group focused its real interest was in the decisions of the program committee and the finance committee. These would decide the political character of the speakers and the outlay of money. It was because the Hallinan group lost over these issues that the split occurred.

The political issues involved are as follows:

Position 1: The Hallinan group favored the idea that there be *one* speaker at the rally—someone like Wayne Morse or Rev. Abernathy. The rest of the program to be devoted to poetry readings, singers, rock bands. This position was called, by Hallinan, the "political Woodstock." That is, a "cultural event" a "coming together of the people," according to Terence Hallinan, which would try for Woodstock Rock Festival mood with a low emphasis on politics. A main speaker would outline a program of "what next?" for the antiwar movement. The obvious question—what would the "what next" speaker say, and what was the money to be used for. This was left vague, it would be worked out by some small committee. In my opinion, the Hallinan group has in mind some sort of preliminary work for the 1970 gubernatorial election campaign here.

Position 2: the majority's position was that the San Francisco program be along antiwar lines as in the Washington, D.C. program, with speakers representing the breadth of the antiwar movement. Culture would certainly be a part of the program, but not the *central* feature. No one speaker would speak for the entire antiwar movement and outline what to do next. If there was a surplus of money from the collection, it would be used for future antiwar actions. And in the case of dispute, all surplus funds would go to the National New Mobilization Committee.

The Hallinan group's position lost by democratic vote. The tentative list of speakers agreed upon by the New Mobe West working committee on Oct. 11 is as follows: Rev. Ralph Abernathy, peace speaker; Dolores Huerta, labor leader; Rennie Davis, chairman; Andrew Pulley, collection speaker. The Third World task force was to pick one additional speaker.

It was at this meeting, Oct. 11, that Terence Hallinan went berserk after losing the vote. Hallinan, a former golden gloves boxer, challenged the 100 people assembled, "Anyone who wants to fight with me over this, meet me outside." Naturally everyone was appalled by this kind of conduct on the part of someone who was supposedly a chairman of the coalition. But more was in store. Hallinan later went outside and twice punched a peace activist in the face. More of this same method was to come from Hallinan and his group.

On Oct. 16, BayPac held a very large membership meeting to go over the decisions of the New Mobe Working Committee. Hallinan and Karen Talbot and others were present. The meeting re-affirmed the speakers program. The third World task force recommended two speakers, Corky Gonzalez, a Chicago leader in Denver, and David Hilliard of the Black Panther Party. It was still possible to add a couple of liberal speakers and/or a student speaker. The cast of "Hair" had offered a skit. Buffy St. Marie was singing, etc. Everything sounded fine, but. . .

#### IN THE MIDDLE OF THE NIGHT

Sometime, late at night, on Friday, Oct. 17, two days after the highly successful Moratorium, the Hallinan minority entered 2170 Bryant St., removed all the desks, tables, posters and leaflets (including those with name BayPac) and destroyed a silkscreen for a poster which had been paid for by a member of the Publicity Committee. The next morning, the New Mobilization Membership Committee staff discovered also that the telephones had been disconnected and the mail stopped—by order of Terence Hallinan. Note: The BayPac posters and leaflets were later returned.

#### STRONG ARM METHODS

On Saturday, Oct. 18, Kalish and Hallinan called a "Regional Working Committee" meeting by invitation only. To enforce the exclusion, a six-man goon squad which included Terence Hallinan, Archie Brown, Jack Rady, Jack Weintraub, and Karen Talbot's husband, stood at the door. Those not invited—which included previously agreed on working committee members—were stopped from entering by force.

Among those excluded were: an official representative of Painters Union Local 4; several Teachers Union delegates; Sara Hymes, treasurer of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Committee; the Vice-President of Cal-State Hayward Student Government; delegates from Stanislaus College; the University of California Moratorium Committee; the New Mobilization Committee representative from Portland; the chairman of the Third World Task Force; the chairman of the Student Task Force, the SMC representative on the Working Committee, etc., etc.

Those admitted and added to the Working Committee with voice and vote were all personal invitees of Kalish and Hallinan. For



several, this was their first meeting—and they were obviously uninformed of the differences. A motion to recognize the committee, to include broader representation from those excluded was narrowly defeated by the stacked meeting; 28-21. This, despite the fact that Kalish and Hallinan that very day had arbitrarily added 15 new faces of their choosing to the NMC-West Working Committee. (Incidentally, this appears to be the method of Kalish and Hallinan; if they lose a vote, they merely appoint a few more of their friends to the Working Committee, declare the previous vote "illegal" and proceed to vote again!)

They are no longer considered leaders by the majority of the movement—at least not in the Bay Area. They have accomplished chaos. The New Mobilization Membership Committee called a press conference at which its spokesmen took a "let's get back together" stance. This sincere public appeal for unity had no effect on the Hallinan group. So press releases have now gone out answering the "splitter" charge. And now the movement press is being fully informed of the differences.

A meeting of the New Mobilization Membership Committee, including official coalition representation from Seattle, Portland and Phoenix, was held on Sunday, Oct. 19. This meeting decided to call for a genuine non-exclusive, representative regional Steering Committee in San Francisco this Saturday, Oct. 25, to lay final plans for transportation, housing, march route, speakers, monitors, etc. This regional meeting will probably elect regional representative. SMC is holding a Western Regional Steering Committee meeting on Sunday, Oct. 26, in Hayward.

In the meanwhile, leaflets, posters, buttons are going out of 2170 Bryant Street just as before. The telephones have been reconnected, new tables and desks obtained, new leaflets printed—work is proceeding as before. A New Mobilization Membership Committee meeting of over 250 people on Oct. 23 reaffirmed this course.

However, permits for the rally are being held up by city authorities pending agreement between NMC-West and NMMC. Mail to both has been stopped, and the Fall offensive is temporarily stalled thereby.

The differences, in my opinion, are all negotiable. Probably the addition of a liberal speaker (or two) and a student would solve the speaker problem. An agreement that all bills of both NMC and NMMC pertaining to the march and rally be paid, that the NMMC treasurer be added to a merged finance committee, and that all surplus funds go to the National NMC would solve the financial question. A resolution of differences over the character of the rally must be attained. An honest, independent figure must preside over the coalition. Agreement would release the rally permits, the mail and the energies of hundreds of antiwar activists who are raring to go.

The NMMC, at its regular Thursday night membership meeting, Oct. 23, at 2170 Bryant St., San Francisco—attended by 261—endorsed the emergency actions of a special NMMC meeting of Sunday, Oct. 19th. Furthermore, this meeting decided (1) on a Regional Conference on Oct. 25 and (2) to send Bertha Dertz to Philadelphia to report to the NMC. It also decided that other NMMC members should go to Philadelphia if possible.

No matter what the outcome of the present dispute, all those on the West Coast who answered the call of the July 4th Cleveland Conference will continue to work to make Nov. 15 a success.

To bring the troops home now:

MARJORIE COLVIN,  
San Francisco, Calif.

In this dispute, CPUSA and SWP leadership of the respective factions was all

too apparent, providing a classic illustration of the primary role of communists in setting Mobe policies.

The New Mobilization Committee West faction was led by Terence Hallinan and Irving Sarnoff, both identified members of the CPUSA; Karen Talbot, an employee of the CPUSA's official west coast newspaper, the People's World; and Donald Kalish, a faithful supporter of the CPUSA position in New Mobe. Treasurer of New Mobe West was Dr. Carlton Goodlett, one of the Nation's most prominent and consistent supporters of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

The Bay Area Peace Action Council (later New Mobilization Membership Committee to End the War in Vietnam) faction was led primarily by members and supporters of the Socialist Workers Party: SWP member Marjorie Colvin, a principal spokesman for BAPAC; SWP members Lew Jones and Asher Harer; Paul Traficante, a supporter of the 1970 election campaign of the SWP; and Herman Fagg, SWP member and chairman of New Mobe's November 15 Third World Task Force.

In New Mobe as a whole, the disagreement over basic policy continued to grow during the latter months of 1969 and into 1970, with the SWP in particular giving major publicity to its point of view at the expense of its rivals.

A fundamental policy of the Communist Party, U.S.A., in the peace movement is that mass mobilizations based solely on a demand for withdrawal from Vietnam are insufficient to cause the essential alterations in American Government policy needed to facilitate advancing the communist cause.

The SWP's rationale for its single-issue mass mobilization strategy is that opposition to the war is of paramount importance, both because it aids in the building of a mass, broad-based radical movement in the United States and, most importantly, because it renders the greatest amount of positive aid and encouragement to the insurgent communist movement in Southeast Asia. Thus it is essential that the greatest possible number of people be brought into the antiwar movement.

Clearly, as the SWP sees it, such a broad mass movement assumes involvement by groups which are sharply divided in many ways. Logically, the only way to secure genuine unity of action is to focus on the one overriding issue on which all competing tendencies can presumably agree: the need to end the war and bring the troops home. Only to the extent that antiwar movements can unite around this one fundamental demand, argue the Trotskyists, can the movement as a whole function as a united, effective, and expanding counterweight to official government policy.

The policy of the CPUSA, on the other hand, is geared to a multi-issue approach. Where the SWP advocates the single-issue strategy to unite diverse forces around withdrawal from Vietnam, the Communist Party posits a program based on the fusion of the issue of Vietnam with such supposedly related issues as poverty, racism, and political repression, the goal being a total assault on the

fabric of our society through the tactical exploitation of disaffection with the war and of various grievances held by minority segments of the population.

As expressed in an editorial article appearing in the June 1970 issue of the CPUSA's official theoretical organ, Political Affairs,

Struggles are growing in scope and intensity, against the war, against the mounting repression and racist oppression. But far more is required. Above all, if success is to be won, these struggles must all be linked together. This means that masses of white Americans must link the fight against the war with that against the brutal oppression of the Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano peoples. The police killings of Black Americans in the South have brought forth a strong protest in the form of the March Against Repression through the state of Georgia, culminating in the mass demonstration in Augusta. What is needed, however, is a massive outpouring of protest by the trade union movement and by white working people generally against these and other murders, against the growing violence and terror and all other forms of oppression. Only thus can that unity be achieved which will assure the defeat of the reactionary Nixon policies.

What is called for, in the words of the statement of the Communist Party, USA, is "the creation of a militant people front whose scope and power surpasses anything history has ever seen. \* \* \*

Such a front, headed by the working class and the Black people, can compel the withholding of funds for military operations in Indochina and the withdrawal of all U.S. troops. It can compel the ending of racist terror and oppression at home. It can force an end to mammoth war budgets and to the war-induced inflation and high taxes which are wrecking living standards. It can enforce the sanctity of Constitutional rights and bring about the freeing of all political prisoners, such as the Black Panthers and the draft resisters.

This is the need of the day, a need which transcends all others. To this task Communists above all are called on to dedicate themselves to the fullest. On the successful building of such a people's front depends the future of our people, our country, and the world. [Emphasis in original.]

This policy was reemphasized in a later article in the October 1970 issue of Political Affairs. Written by former national committee member James Tormey, this article sets forth the broad "people's alliance" strategy by which the party hopes to use the left to undermine the United States:

In the above-mentioned report [to the CPUSA national committee], Gus Hall said: "We must now set our course, fix our priorities, assign our forces so that we work toward the crystallization of a broad people's alliance, an alliance which will gather all the forces of rebellion into a coalition that will have the power to challenge the policies of the monopoly-military-industrial complex on all levels, on all fronts. That is the key link."

He spoke of the need for a "real New Left," one that would understand its responsibilities toward the broader democratic forces and the importance of Left unity as a means of realizing this approach. This is how he posed the question: "We cannot move seriously to build a broader people's alliance, unless we undertake seriously the coalescence of Left unity that will be its very backbone." [Emphasis added.]

The following passage from the same article is most significant, constituting as it does an indirect admission by the

party that it has been a crucial factor in the development of the National Coalition Against War, Racism, and Repression after the decline of New Mobe:

Today there are huge numbers of forces at work in the fight-back against repression, but there is also much proliferation of effort. There are conflicting trends relative to the fightback and the almost total lack of coordination around major cases nationally. While everyone has been "doing his thing," few have been defending the Communists or overtly fighting anti-Communism. This condition is a threat not only to our Party but also to the people's movement. *At the same time, Communists in many places have been active in the movements which do exist, and have in most cases been responsible for bringing about a number of conferences against repression.* Where this is taking place, some semblance of unity is being brought about.

*The main thrust of our line in the fight against repression must be to build alliances and coalitions wherever we can influence events.* However, the question arises how we can increase our power base in order to play an effective role in influencing the broader democratic movement to fight for the preservation of democracy and its extension to the millions who have never had it: the poor and especially the Black and other racial minorities. In this context there arises the question of whether and how to build a new national organization. [Emphasis added.]

Further, this party policy now presupposes the open leadership of party members:

A national organization to meet today's requirements should be composed of both Communists and non-Communists who subscribe to the concepts here outlined, with identifiable leaders of the Communist Party sharing leadership with others.

In furtherance of this policy, and with a significant degree of success, the CPUSA, simultaneously with its activities in "peace" groups, has assiduously cultivated its relationship to such organizations as the National Welfare Rights Organization, Black Panther Party, and Southern Christian Leadership Conference. A prime example of this has been seen in the Emergency Conference Committee.

The Emergency Conference Committee is the outgrowth of the Emergency Conference To Defend the Right of the Black Panther Party To Exist, held in Chicago during March 1970. Initiated and controlled by CPUSA, the conference and its continuations committee, popularly known simply as the Emergency Conference Committee, have enjoyed all-out support from key leaders of the NWRO, BPP, and SCLC and represent major attempts by the party to gain close working relations with key groups operating among minorities.

At the same time the CPUSA's representatives in the peace movement have encouraged greater participation in anti-war activities on the part of minority group representatives. Thus, partly through this party effort, representatives of the NWRO and SCLC in particular became increasingly prominent in New Mobe activities as the Mobe's program broadened to include the issues of poverty and racism on an ever-increasing scale.

Similarly, the party has made a major attempt to fuse organized labor with the

antiwar movement, a fact shown by the convening of the National Rank-and-File Conference in Chicago on June 27-28, 1970. This conference, which went formally on record against the Vietnam war and in favor of the Emergency Conference Committee's "genocide" petition, was initiated by the CP-controlled trade union magazine Labor Today. The importance of the conference in implementing the party's multi-issue fusion strategy is seen in the following extracts from a major article by CPUSA national secretary Gus Hall in the August 1970 issue of Political Affairs:

The U.S. policy of imperialist aggression has emerged both as a serious moral problem and an urgent economic problem for workers. Their sons are being killed. The priorities of the government are war priorities. These are resulting in escalation of taxes and the cost of living. In spite of these clearly anti-working-class priorities, most of the trade union leadership supports them either openly or by remaining neutral. This is cause for growing anger and a mood of revolt in the ranks of labor. It leads to the crystallization of special forms, through which the rank and file can express their antiwar sentiments.

Further on in this article, Hall quotes approvingly from a statement adopted by the National Rank-and-File Conference.

This new class unity was clearly evident at the Chicago Conference. It is significant that all attempts to create divisions were rejected. The actions and statements of the Conference reflect this new understanding and new unity. One statement said:

We call upon our unions and all organized labor to join hands with the black freedom movement, the Chicano and Puerto Rican freedom movements, the students and professional people, the peace movements and the farm movements in a mighty coalition comprising the majority of Americans to compel a complete change in the direction of governmental policy away from war, repression and racism, and towards peace and the expansion of democratic rights.

It is significant that representatives of the CPUSA-controlled National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy, the official outgrowth of the National Rank-and-File Conference, have played active roles in the National Coalition Against War, Racism, and Repression, the multi-issue-oriented successor to New Mobe that is now known as the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice.

Each of the two major communist groups within New Mobe, then, has tried to use the peace movement for essentially the same purpose: to capture it and subvert it to the service of the international communist cause. Their disagreement has arisen solely from their advocacy of differing tactical means to that end.

To summarize briefly, the SWP assumes that it is necessary to concentrate on a single basic issue to achieve maximum involvement in the peace movement, while the CPUSA believes that the multi-issue strategy, with its positive appeals to certain key groupings in our society, is the only means by which new constituencies can be won for the movement.

The result of this factionalism was the breaking up of New Mobe in June 1970. The Trotskyists managed to stage a National Emergency Conference Against the Cambodia-Laos-Vietnam War in Cleveland under the nominal sponsorship of the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council on June 19-21, 1970, while other Mobe groupings, with strong support from CPUSA, convened the Strategy Action Conference in Milwaukee, Wis., on June 26-28.

The Cleveland conference which was absolutely controlled by the Trotskyists, established the National Peace Action Coalition, a group which operates under the firm control of the Socialist Workers Party, to organize mass single-issue anti-Vietnam protests throughout the United States on October 31, 1970. Both the NPAC and the October protests are discussed in detail in chapter VIII of this report.

The Strategy Action Conference was attended by an estimated 800 delegates representing a wide variety of organizations, including especially the CPUSA, Chicago Peace Council, National Welfare Rights Organization, Black Panther Party, and Southern Christian Leadership Conference, along with several key leaders of New Mobe itself, many of them Communists. The official call to the conference, bearing the address of New Mobe's national headquarters in Washington, D.C., reflected a broad range of sponsorship including, among others, the following:

- (1) Dr. Ralph Abernathy, SCLC;
- (2) Dorothy Cotton, SCLC;
- (3) Charles R. Garry, attorney for the Black Panther Party and identified member of the Communist Party, U.S.A.;
- (4) David Hilliard, Black Panther Party;
- (5) Rev. Jesse Jackson, Operation Breadbasket (economic arm of the SCLC);
- (6) Big Man, Black Panther Party;
- (7) Beulah Sanders, National Welfare Rights Organization;
- (8) Johnnie Tillmon, NWRO;
- (9) Dr. George Wiley, NWRO, an honorary cochairman of New Mobe,
- (10) Rennie Davis, Conspiracy, a New Mobe coordinator;
- (11) David Dellinger, Liberation, New Mobe coordinator;
- (12) David Hawk, Vietnam Moratorium Committee;
- (13) Ken Kirkpatrick, Seattle New Mobe;
- (14) Stewart Meacham, AFSC, New Mobe coordinator;
- (15) Dr. Sidney Peck, New Mobe coordinator;
- (16) Dr. Benjamin Spock, New Mobe honorary cochairman;
- (17) Ron Young, Fellowship of Reconciliation, New Mobe;
- (18) Rev. A. Cecil Williams, Glide Methodist Foundation, member of the World Peace Council;
- (19) Ron Dellums, Berkeley City Councilman;
- (20) Dr. Carlton Goodlet, member of the presidium of the World Peace Council;
- (21) Charlotte Bunche Weeks, Women's Liberation, New Mobe coordinator;



(22) Trudi Young, Women Strike for Peace, New Mobe coordinator;

(23) David Livingston, District 65, Distribution Workers of America, identified member of the CPUSA.

The CPUSA-dominated Chicago Peace Council, one of the most potent of Mobe's affiliates, went so far as to repudiate the Cleveland conference by voting on June 4, 1970, not to send any representatives to Cleveland because, in the words of the June 9 issue of the *Daily World*, "they felt its timing and purpose were to divide the peace movement." Prominent in arguing in support of the New Mobe's projected Milwaukee conference were CPC leaders and CPUSA members Jack Spiegel and Jay Schaffner, with support for the Cleveland meeting coming primarily from the SWP and Student Mobilization Committee representatives.

The *Daily World* summed up the result thusly:

By its overwhelming vote, with only the Student Mobilization Committee, the [Chicago Citywide] Strike Council, and the Socialist Workers Party voting for sending representatives, the CPC clearly repudiated the attempt to replace the New Mobe coalition by something new in which, as one trade unionist said, "only one tendency in the peace movement will have all the control."

The question of which conference to endorse had also come up at a meeting of the Mobe steering committee in Atlanta, Ga., on May 23-24. According to the June 13, 1970, issue of the *Guardian*—the Mobe leadership meeting in Atlanta, while not publicly attacking the Cleveland conference, voted by more than 50 to 1 not to endorse it (the opposing vote was [SWP leader Harry] Ring's). The principal reason, according to Mobe steering committee member Abe Weisburd of New York was that the organizers of the Cleveland meeting did not include the issue of racism and repression. "The entire text of their call," he said, "says absolutely nothing about racism or black people—absolutely nothing."

Illustrative of much of the sentiment at this meeting was the observation by Mary Louise Lovett, a member of New Mobe's San Francisco steering committee, that mass demonstrations like the November 15, 1969, action had "outlived their usefulness at this time."

The steering committee thereupon decided to go ahead with the June conference in Milwaukee, but not without causing further disaffection and bitterness among the Trotskyists. Harry Ring, writing in the June 12, 1970, issue of *The Militant*, acidly observed:

A meeting of the steering committee of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam held in Atlanta May 23-24 graphically demonstrated how a once significant antiwar coalition has been reduced to a small, heterogeneous group of cliques united only by their common opposition to any form of mass action against the war. To hold themselves together, they decided that the time is ripe for massive civil disobedience and undefined "direct action."

The Trotskyists claimed that the Cleveland conference had been voted by the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council on May 5, 1970, only after sustained effort had been made to convince the Mobe leadership to call a national conference at which all interested forces could work

together to formulate antiwar plans. This proposal had been rejected by New Mobe's coordinating committee, obviously because the Trotskyist line on mass action was no longer in accord with developing Mobe sentiment.

The thinking of several New Mobe leaders had been turning increasingly to civil disobedience. While the Trotskyists are in no sense believers in the philosophy of nonviolence, they see massive civil disobedience as a divisive force within the antiwar movement because it alienates many people who would willingly participate in peaceful mass marches, but who shun potentially violent confrontations.

In a June 10, 1970, CAPAC mailing setting forth the Trotskyist side of the dispute over the rival conferences, CAPAC chairman Jerry Gordon quoted the following passage from a paper written by the increasingly influential Mobe steering committee member Arthur Waskow after the May protest in Washington:

If even just 15,000 (let alone 75,000) had nonviolently sat down in the D.C. streets as they were prepared to do, and waited (in shifts, etc.) until the Monday 50-governors' meeting or until mass-arrested or until gassed, I think there would have been numerous massive imitations of that action all over the country by Tuesday or Wednesday. New York City and San Francisco would have shut down, the national crisis would have been intensified, and the war might well have been ended within six weeks.

In a similar vein, the following extract from Gordon's letter is most revealing, both for its statement of the Trotskyist criticism of the New Mobe's leadership and for its reflection of the thinking of David Dellinger, one of the most consistently influential of all New Mobe leaders:

Typical of the thinking of these New Mobe leaders were the plans they made for the Washington May 9 demonstration. Over 100,000 people went to Washington on a few days notice to register their profound opposition to the Cambodia invasion. The demonstration dramatized for millions of Americans the depth and breadth of opposition to the invasion in a way few other anti-war demonstrations ever have. The anti-war movement gained wide public support as a result of this demonstration in no small part because it was conducted in a peaceful and orderly fashion. But credit for this goes to the good sense of the thousands of demonstrators and to the skill of the marshals—over 4,000 students—who frustrated the high risk confrontation plans of the New Mobe coordinating committee. Heading up the marshals together with Fred Halstead was Brad Lyttle, who has himself advocated and practiced civil disobedience for years. Yet Lyttle opposed the plans of action advanced by New Mobe leaders and he explained why in a memorandum:

"We calculated that it would take more than an hour to move 100,000 people out of the H Street area. A gas attack or a police charge with clubbing in a situation like that could result in hundreds of people being trampled to death. Victims would be those who had come just to attend a peaceful rally as well as people who were prepared for the dangers of a sit-down. The idea that the enormous crowd should surround the White House posed many of the same problems."

Dave Dellinger, a key spokesman for the New Mobe, wrote an article in the June 4, 1970 *Village Voice* which reveals how some of the New Mobe leadership views the historic

May 9 demonstration and the dangerous possibilities described by Lyttle above. Dellinger begins his article by explaining what he considers the need for "open, disciplined, carefully focused non-violent resistance" and he cautions against mass marches and demonstrations that "fail to prepare people for more militant forms of resistance." He then explains that "non-violent direct action" was "the de facto tactic called for by the New Mobe when it invited people to protest in Washington on May 9 not only without government permits but in an area near the White House which, as the Mobe clearly pointed out, had been declared 'off limits' to protestors." "Because the Mobe clearly called for massive protest without permits in a banned area," he says, "thousands of persons came conscious of the fact that they might be arrested, gassed, or otherwise assaulted." He then laments "the mistake . . . of asking for the Ellipse" and explains that "if there was a 'failure of nerve' and a 'betrayal' that weekend, it occurred when this decision [to ask for the Ellipse] was made."

Another mailing circulated by Gordon and CAPAC to the antiwar movement later in June included a useful description of the differences between the two conferences, based on original documents disseminated by the two factions:

As stated in the call to the Cleveland conference, its purpose is "to plan antiwar demonstrations and other anti-war activities of the most massive kind centering on the crucial issue of withdrawal from the war and conducted in a peaceful and orderly fashion . . . This conference is not intended to solve or even necessarily to discuss all the problems of our crisis-ridden society. It is not a conference to hammer out the strategy or tactics of social revolution or to found a new political party or movement. It is not a conference in competition with any tendency or movement for social change. It is a conference to organize massive opposition to the war."

The Milwaukee conference, on the other hand, has a quite different purpose. The minutes of the New Mobe held in Atlanta May 24, 1970 project the Milwaukee conference this way: "Mobilization will join with other groups in calling an Emergency Action Conference [later Strategy Action Conference] where community people can explore the potential for developing a unifying offensive in face of the deepening interrelated crises of race, war and the economy. One major focus of the conference will be to project actions that promise stepped-up massive, disciplined direct actions."

The two major antiwar proposals before the Strategy Action Conference on June 27 were those on so-called emergency perspectives and the proposed "long march" program. Both emphasized disruption in preference to mass mobilizations.

The "emergency perspectives" group was led by Professor Douglas Dowd of Cornell, who opined that the incursion into Cambodia would lead inevitably to a decision by the administration to use nuclear weapons. As the July 4, 1970, issue of the *Guardian* recounted Dowd's presentation:

"The only way to bring the antiwar movement back to life," Dowd summed up, "is not by just repeating mass marches, but by creating chaos and upheaval. This would probably be small at first, but as the escalation became more evident, it could grow massive. He was seconded by Cora Weiss of New York Women Strike for Peace, also calling for "chaos," but with the added urgency that

the possibility of nuclear attacks would arrive "not in a matter of months, but of weeks."

The "long march" proposal was written by Arthur Waskow of the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington. As originally conceived, a series of marches would begin with rallies at so-called symbolic sites such as Kent State University, after which smaller groups would march throughout the country, pausing in cities to gather support and hold rallies related to local issues. Ultimately all marchers would converge on Washington for a period of mass civil disobedience and direct action.

This proposal was the subject of considerable discussion and alteration. National coordination was dropped, as was mass participation. Instead, emphasis was placed on local and regional planning for activities in which small "collectives" of around 20 people would form the basic units. The political and tactical orientation of each action was to be left entirely to local groups.

Waskow himself finally proposed the elimination of any reference to marches in deference to the antimass-march sentiment of the delegates. Someone suggested the proposal be renamed the "Liberation of Washington." When objection was voiced by Norma Becker of the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, Waskow conceded that "disruption would be a more honest word than liberation."

On June 28 the various proposals put before the conference for endorsement. All demands by the NWRO were unanimously endorsed in the conference's only real moment of unity. Another proposal for a so-called Chicano Moratorium at the end of August, was also endorsed, as was a proposal by Jack Spiegel that the conference establish active liaison with the organizers of the National Rank-and-File Conference.

Neither Dowd's nor Waskow's proposal, however, was formally adopted. Instead, the conference agreed to authorize regional conferences to discuss and implement the various proposals advanced in Milwaukee on a local decision-making basis.

The Strategy Action Conference quite clearly marked the end of the mass mobilization strategy in New Mobe and the defeat of the single-issue Trotskyist position, at least for a time. According to an article appearing in *The Washington Post* on June 29, 1970:

One conference spokesman, William Douthard of "Public Employees Against War, Repression and Exploitation," declared that "the treatment of the Vietnam war as a single issue has ended," as he outlined new links between the anti-war movement, black organizations and Mexican-American protest groups.

Despite the extremely chaotic nature of the Strategy Action Conference, the Communist Party, U.S.A., expressed great satisfaction at the adoption of a definitely multi-issue program. The following extract from an article in the *People's World* for July 11, 1970, is indicative of the Party's attitude:

Significant progress was made here [in Milwaukee] last weekend toward forging a unit-

ed movement with a common strategy for ending the war in Indochina, stopping repression at home and redirecting the energies of the nation to the needs of the people.

[A proposed] Washington action is viewed as focusing the war, not as a single issue, but as a part of the whole system of world wide repression sponsored by the U.S. government at home and abroad.

MILITANT CONFRONTATION AND CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE: THE NATIONAL COALITION AGAINST WAR, RACISM, AND REPRESSION AND PEOPLES COALITION FOR PEACE AND JUSTICE

Subsequent to the Milwaukee conference, several regional strategy action conferences were organized in various sections of the United States. This was accomplished at a meeting of the regional conference organizers in Chicago on July 20, 1970. The composition of this gathering, attended by 25 movement activists, was similar to that of the Milwaukee conference. Groups represented most prominently included the New Mobe, Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee, New University Conference, and Chicago Peace Council, with representatives also present from both SCLC and NWRO.

Delegates included Diane Appelbaum and CPUSA member Sylvia Kushner of the Chicago Peace Council; Sidney Lens, Sidney Peck, Douglas Dowd, and Rennie Davis from New Mobe; William Douthard from the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee; Robert Greenblatt of the New University Conference; and CPUSA member Jack Spiegel of the Trade Union Committee for Peace. The official minutes of this meeting reflect that identified CPUSA member Irving Sarnoff of the Peace Action Council of Southern California had been invited, but was unable to attend.

The July 20 Chicago conference agreed to call for about two dozen smaller regional conferences organized along the lines of the Milwaukee conference. According to the *Daily World* for July 29, 1970, the call to the projected Chicago area conference read as follows:

It is our feeling that if this incipient collaboration began in Milwaukee can be continued and enlarged, it will represent a great step forward towards a broad progressive coalition in this country dedicated to fight war and imperialism, racism and poverty, exploitation at the point of production, sexism, repression and other social evils.

Such a call was, of course, in complete accord with the Communist Party's multi-issue line.

The minutes of the July 20 meeting reflect that the Chicago Peace Council was to serve as the coordinating agency for the projected Midwest conference in Chicago during August, a fact that is indicative of the extremely important part played by this CPUSA-controlled group in Midwest peace activities. The *Daily World* for July 29 listed the following people as being among the sponsors of the upcoming Chicago meeting: Ginger Mach of the Chicago Welfare Rights Organization; Sidney Lens of the Chicago Peace Council; Jack Spiegel of the CPC; and Sylvia Kushner, CPC executive secretary.

The regional conferences held subsequent to the July 20 planning session in

Chicago enjoyed the complete support of the Communist Party, U.S.A. A weekend regional United Action Conference in Philadelphia on August 28-30, for example, was hailed in the *Daily World* for August 27, 1970:

This weekend's regional United Action Conference in Philadelphia marks an important development in the peace struggle, bringing together activists on a regional level from Eastern Pennsylvania, Southern New Jersey, and Delaware.

The call for the conference focuses on the war in southeast Asia and sees withdrawal from Indochina as the key to the solution of the crisis in which the nation finds itself.

The purpose of the conference is to augment the forces fighting to end the war, to establish socio-economic priority goals, and to plan special projects in the region.

Again the multi-issue program of the conference was in complete accord with that of the CPUSA, which was among the organizations represented, along with such other groups as the Black Panther Party, Young Workers Liberation League, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Women Strike for Peace, American Friends Service Committee, SANE, and New Mobe.

On August 28-30 another regional conference held in Wheeling, Ill., reflected a significant degree of participation by members of the CPUSA. Among the 80 people attending were the following known CPUSA members:

- (1) Jack Spiegel, Trade Union Committee for Peace;
- (2) Jack Kling, secretary, Illinois Communist Party;
- (3) Natalie Myers, representative, Illinois Communist Party;
- (4) Dorothy Hayes, WILPF;
- (5) Eva Friedlander, Women for Peace;
- (6) Ben Friedlander, SANE;
- (7) Lula Saffold, Women's Peace and Unity Club;
- (8) Jay Schaffner, Chicago Peace Council;
- (9) Betty Smith, Minnesota Communist Party;
- (10) Frances Gabow, Illinois Senatorial candidate on the Communist Party ticket;
- (11) Ted Pearson, CPUSA candidate for the Illinois Constitutional Convention and local correspondent for the *Daily World*.

In addition, the conference was attended by the following members of the CPUSA's official youth arm, the Young Workers Liberation League: Joan Phillips, Roger Kapfhammer, and Hugh Stinnette, all of Chicago. Other groups represented included the Committee of Returned Volunteers, New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (New Mobe), Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, New University Conference, Chicago Welfare Rights Organization, National Welfare Rights Organization, and the Movement for a Democratic Military. Conspicuously absent were any official representatives from the Socialist Workers Party, Young Socialist Alliance, or Student Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam.



On August 26, 1970, New Mobe circulated a mailing that claimed a total of 16 regional conference committees, "most of whom will have held conferences by September 11th." Recipients of the New Mobe letter were urged "to attend a National Conference at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee from September 11th to 13th." This second Milwaukee gathering proved to be the final meeting for New Mobe as such, as well as the culmination of activities carried on as a result of the Strategy Action Conference in June.

The September Milwaukee conference resulted in the formal establishment of the National Coalition Against War, Racism and Repression as the successor to New Mobe. The program of the NCAWRR was to remain multi-issue in character, geared partially to the use of civil disobedience and other direct action in decentralized local demonstrations instead of to single-issue mass national mobilizations alone.

The conference was attended by approximately 80 delegates representing such Mobe-affiliated groups as the National Welfare Rights Organization, Black Panther Party, Women Strike for Peace, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Chicago Peace Council, Communist Party, U.S.A., and Young Workers Liberation League. Once again, the Trotskyists were conspicuous by their absence.

The two principal action proposals approved by the conference were advanced by Prof. Sidney Peck of New Mobe and Gilbert Green of the Communist Party, U.S.A., a fact which indicates the importance of the CPUSA in the NCAWRR.

Green's proposal called for a month of activity beginning on October 15 and related to such issues as the war, racism, "sexism," poverty, welfare, and genocide, culminating in a national demonstration in New York on November 15 centered around the presentation of the Emergency Conference Committee's "genocide" petition to the United Nations.

Peck's action proposal, which exemplified most clearly the shift away from peaceful mass marches, called for a massive protest in Washington, D.C., in May 1971, involving civil disobedience and other direct action tactics in an attempt to obstruct the operation of government.

Another project endorsed by this conference was a national boycott of Standard Oil products. According to the September 22, 1970, issue of the "Midwest Regional Newsletter of the National Coalition Against War, Racism and Repression," the boycott of Standard Oil was being organized because of the company's alleged role as "one of the largest war contractors \* \* \* and because Standard Oil urged the U.S. government into Vietnam in the first place \* \* \* and because S.O. has lobbied for a great build-up of the U.S. military \* \* \*."

The newsletter urged interested parties to contact the Standard Oil Boycott Committee in care of the CPUSA-controlled Chicago Peace Council office. This project has been given major attention by the CPC in recent months.

The extent to which the CPUSA and its allies had succeeded in dominating the program of the new coalition, with its firm commitment to multi-issue actions and explicit rejection of single-issue mobilization, was shown by the NCAWRR's policy statement, which was printed in full in the October 29, 1970, issue of the CPUSA's *Daily World*:

A new approach in protest strategy: Policy statement of The National Coalition against War, Racism, Repression and Poverty.

A National Coalition Against War, Racism and Repression has been formed growing out of a Strategy Action Conference of 800 "movement" representatives in Milwaukee last June. The Coalition represents a major change in protest strategy.

The Coalition was initiated by representatives of the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the National Welfare Rights Organization, the Chicago Moratorium Committee and other national and regional groups.

Formation of the Coalition reflects a widespread realization of the inter-connection between the issues of war, racism, poverty, repression, oppression of women, and the need to conduct a united struggle against all of these social evils.

The goals of the Coalition are:

To coordinate and join efforts of a broad range of groups presently acting separately against war, racism, poverty and thereby make these efforts more meaningful and effective.

To initiate year-round daily protest and resistance activity at the local and regional level in addition to mass national demonstrations.

To continue to plan major national actions as in the past but emphasizing the interrelation of social problems rather than focusing on a single issue.

The Coalition, with its national organizations and its seventeen affiliates, is currently involved in scores of local actions.

Issued for the Interim Committee of the Coalition by:

Thierry Cook, Seattle Liberation Front, Seattle, Washington

Doug Dowd, Prof. of Economics, Cornell Univ., New Mobe, Ithaca, N.Y.

Bennie Davis, Conspiracy Eight, New Mobe, Washington, D.C.

Roberto Elias, National Chicano Moratorium, Los Angeles, Calif.

Willie Jenkins, N.Y. Region, New York City.

Stewart Meacham, American Friends Service Comm., Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. Sidney Peck, Cambridge Institute, MIT, New Mobe, Boston, Mass.

William Douthard, Coordinator, Washington, D.C. and New York City

On October 27, 1970, NCAWRR national coordinator William Douthard announced a week of "confrontation and education" in New York City on November 15-21 prior to the presentation of the Emergency Conference Committee's "genocide" petition to the U.N. According to the *Daily World* for October 28, 1970.

The demonstration (sic), which will consist of "a series of massive non-violent actions involving civil disobedience, are scheduled to begin on Nov. 15 and end with a march and rally on Nov. 21.

William Douthard, national coordinator of the coalition, told a press conference at the Overseas Press Club that the rally will be the prelude to acts of non-violent civil disobedience.

Denouncing "America's violent and racist acts against mankind," he said that the coalition is in contact with and will invite

Madame Nguyen Thi Binh, foreign minister of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, and Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia to address the Nov. 21 rally.

Other participants in this press conference included Rev. Metz Rollins of the National Committee of Black Churchmen; William Jenkins, a trade union representative and a NCAWRR New York coordinator; Rev. James Bevel; John Froines; and CPUSA member Angie Dickerson, national coordinator of the genocide petition project.

On November 21 the CP-organized genocide petition campaign reached its climax with a NCAWRR-sponsored rally of some 2,000 demonstrators in New York, opposite the United Nations. This rally was characterized by significant participation by members of the CPUSA, including Jack Spiegel of the Chicago Peace Council; William L. Patterson, cochairman of the Black Liberation Commission of the CPUSA; and Charlene Mitchell, prominent CPUSA leader and a moving force in the CPUSA-organized campaign in behalf of Angela Davis.

Other speakers included Ozzie Edwards of the National Federation of Social Service Employees; David Perez, a field marshal in the Young Lords Organization; Bevel; Peck; and Douthard. Black Panther Huey Newton, though scheduled to speak, did not appear.

The NCAWRR's plans for May 1971 in Washington were discussed in remarks by NCAWRR leader Rennie Davis. As quoted in *The Militant* for December 4, 1970, Davis said that if the Government did not stop the war by May 1, "we are going to stop the Government." One of the tactics advanced by Davis was to disrupt the city on May 4 by having cars conveniently "break down."

Major CPUSA involvement in Midwest NCAWRR activity was indicated by a mass protest march held in South Bend, Ind., on December 12, 1970. This protest reflected the policy of the CPUSA in attempting to fuse labor concerns with opposition to the war in Vietnam.

The demonstration was sponsored by the Midwest Coalition Against War, Racism, and Repression and an affiliate known as the South Bend Project. Scheduled speakers included Jack Spiegel, CPUSA member and cochairman of the Chicago Peace Council; Sidney Lens; LeRoy Wolins, CPUSA member and dominant force in Chicago Veterans for Peace in Vietnam; Charles Wilson, CPUSA member and leader in the CPUSA-organized National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy; and John Kallin, editor of the CPUSA's magazine *Labor Today*.

Organizations represented included, among others, the NCCTUAD; Chicago Peace Council; National Welfare Rights Organization; United Farm Workers Organizing Committee; Young Workers Liberation League; Chicago Committee to Defend the Bill of Rights, which is a front for the Communist Party; and the Afro-American Heritage Association, a Chicago group led by CPUSA member Ishmael Flory.

After the demonstration people gathered for a conference to discuss such topics as the relationship between the peace movement and the unemployment problem. This conference, which received messages of support from several members of Congress, ended with the adoption of a so-called Bill of Rights for the unemployed.

The predominant influence of the Communist Party in this project may be seen in the composition of the continuations committee set up to implement the conference program. The four groups represented were the CPUSA-controlled Chicago Peace Council; the Midwest region of the NCAWRR, which was in fact run by the CPC; the South Bend Project, an affiliate of the CPC-run Midwest Coalition; and the National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy, which is completely controlled by the CPUSA.

On November 28-30, 1970, many of those connected with the National Coalition Against War, Racism and Repression journeyed to Stockholm for the World Conference on Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, staged by the communist Stockholm Conference on Vietnam. On June 10, 1970, the Stockholm Conference had issued the following statement, adopted by the group's executive committee at a meeting on May 23-24:

The Stockholm Conference on Vietnam stands with the peoples of Indo-China. We support the joint declaration of the recent summit conference of the Indo-Chinese peoples. *We support their legitimate representatives: the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam, the Lao Patriotic Front and the Royal Cambodian Government of National Unity.* [Emphasis added.]

There could be no clearer statement of the pro-Hanoi purposes of the Stockholm Conference than this. It is significant in evaluating the New Mobilization Committee and its successors that New Mobe had been formally invited to join the Stockholm Conference executive committee at the May 23-24 meeting at which the above statement was adopted.

Among the organizations represented at this conference, which was in reality a sounding board for pro-Hanoi communist propaganda, were such international communist fronts as the Afro-Asian People's Solidarity Organization, International Association of Democratic Lawyers, International Organization of Journalists, International Union of Students, Women's International Democratic Federation, World Federation of Democratic Youth, World Federation of Trade Unions, and World Peace Council, along with the Organization for Solidarity with the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, a communist group headquartered in Castro's Cuba. The World Peace Council was officially represented by, among others, James Forest of the United States.

The official "List of Participants" issued by the Stockholm Conference reflected participation by an American delegation of 35 people, including:

- (1) Mrs. Lucille Berrien, NWRO;
- (2) Bruce Beyer, American Deserters Committee;

- (3) Gerry Condon, ADC;
- (4) Mrs. Estelle Cypher, WILPF;
- (5) Dave Dellinger, NCAWRR and New Mobe;
- (6) Ronald Dellums, associated with west coast MOBE activities;
- (7) William Douthard, NCAWRR;
- (8) Stanley Faulkner, Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam;
- (9) Mrs. Eleanor Fowler, WILPF;
- (10) Dr. Carlton Goodlett;
- (11) Gil Green, CPUSA;
- (12) Mrs. Janey Hayes, WSP;
- (13) Rev. Thomas Lee Hayes, Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam and Fifth Avenue Peace Parade Committee;
- (14) Willie Jenkins, NCAWRR;
- (15) Mrs. Ola Kennedy, United Steelworkers' Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy;
- (16) Mrs. Sylvia Kushner, Chicago Peace Council;
- (17) Curtis MacLain, ILWU;
- (18) Mrs. Jerrie M. Meadows, New Mobilization Committee West;
- (19) Prof. Sidney Peck, NCAWRR and New Mobe;
- (20) Mike Powers, ADC;
- (21) Mrs. Pauline Rosen, WSP;
- (22) Richard E. Ward, Guardian;
- (23) John Woods, ADC;
- (24) Ron Young, Fellowship of Reconciliation.

The concern of the international communist movement with antiwar activities in the United States was voiced by Professor Hoang Minh Giam, Minister of Culture in the North Vietnamese Government, speaking as official representative for North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong:

At this time when the lying propaganda and the demagogic actions and words of Nixon are attempting to confuse people and to create an illusion to cover the real intentions, the Delegation of the DRV proposes that our Conference:

Organize a campaign of explanation to denounce and condemn the obstinate and perfidious policy of the Nixon administration in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia.

Support politically, morally and materially the struggle of the Indochinese peoples to attain their common aims and their particular aims as defined in the Joint Declaration of the Summit Conference of the Indochinese peoples and in other official documents of the various parties at this Conference.

Support the anti-war movement in America, and establish a broad program of mass action in coordination with the activities of this movement in the Spring of 1971. [Emphasis added.]

Similar appreciation for the activities of the American antiwar movement was expressed in the speech of Prof. Nguyen Van Hieu, a member of the central committee of the Communist National Liberation Front, who addressed himself particularly "to the American representatives here, and through them to the various mass organizations in the antiwar movement in the United States":

The Nixon administration is obliged to consider the condemnation of its policy by world opinion, including American opinion. \* \* \* *The union of forces of freedom and peace, in a world wide mass movement, fighting against American aggression in Indochina, has been shown to be of the utmost*

*importance and greatly contributes to isolating the Nixon administration and its henchmen.* \* \* \* To the American people, struggling as we are against the policy of war and oppression of its administration, we convey our deep friendship. We are particularly pleased at the increasingly close cooperation between American antiwar movements and urban South Vietnamese which open the way to new kinds of solidarity between our two peoples. [Emphasis in original.]

A particularly anti-U.S. statement was that of the official representative of the Soviet Peace Committee, who emphasized the need for international coordination of peace activity by urging "all national and international organizations and all peoples of good will throughout the world to start a campaign of action on a national and international scale, to stop American aggression in Indochina."

The December 20, 1970, Stockholm Conference "information letter No. 5" included the full text of the program adopted by the World Conference on Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, a major portion of which is reprinted here because of the heavy emphasis placed on activities related to the movement in the United States—emphasis added:

This Conference decided to launch a new campaign, larger and more urgent than ever before on the basis of the political declaration.

*For the withdrawal of American forces from Indochina*

This campaign should begin immediately: A delegation of this Conference should go now to Paris to present to the participants of the Paris Talks the conclusions of the discussions in Stockholm in which more than 300 delegates from 70 countries express the demands of a very large gathering from movements of many different kinds throughout the world.

*We propose to win support of the greatest possible number of organizations of all kinds, on a national and international level for the essential aims of this campaign.*

This campaign will take on different forms and methods and will have different durations according to national conditions but will follow the main theme and slogan which we propose.

In order to facilitate concerted action on an international level, the campaign could be organized around a number of dates:

December 20—the 10th anniversary of the foundation of the National Liberation Front.

January 26—the national Tet festival (traditional people's festival in Vietnam, for the lunar new year).

March 6—the 1st anniversary of the declaration of the Central Committee of the Patriotic Front of Laos on the solution to these problems.

April 3-4—days of solidarity with actions in the United States against the American aggression in Indochina, on the occasion of the anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King.

April 30—International Day of Solidarity with the Khmer people one year after the aggression by American troops and their allies; support for the international youth day in solidarity with the Indochinese people.

May 1-16—the US movement will mobilize massive nationwide action to end the war against Indochina during the first two weeks of May, one year after Nixon's invasion of Cambodia.

The Stockholm Conference calls for worldwide demonstrations and mass actions throughout the world at this very important stage which will be continued throughout May and June.



June 30, 1971: This is the deadline set by the representatives of the peoples of Indochina for the complete and total withdrawal of all American and satellite forces. We call upon all organizations and all the peoples of the world to mobilize a mass movement in an effort to put a final stop to American aggression.

This campaign, which should include diverse initiatives and various forms of action taking into account specific national conditions but with the constant aim of preserving their international nature, can take the following forms, among others:

Pressure on governments to disassociate themselves from the American aggression, to recognize the true representatives of the Indochinese peoples and to support the just struggle of these peoples;

Movements to encourage parliamentarians to subscribe to this campaign, to support it and to intervene directly with members of the American Congress. Concurrently and in the same way, movements to encourage scientists, scholars, etc., to subscribe to and to support this campaign and to intervene with their American colleagues;

Specific actions decided upon by the labor unions;

Specific actions decided upon by women's movements, particularly on March 8;

Any and all other actions which will better explain the reasons for the struggle of the Indochinese peoples and popularize the political solutions which have been proposed by the true representatives of these peoples. Maximum pressure on the US government to stop its aggression;

Mass support for material aid as proposed by the Special Commission of this Conference;

*Boycott of American products or companies, and especially, in cooperation with the American movement, boycott of those companies participating in the war effort.*

## II.

This Conference condemns all repression of those opposing the war in Indochina.

1. We call on all movements, governments and peoples, and especially on movements in the United States and other countries allied to the US, to organize support for movements, groups and individuals opposing the Thieu-Ky-Khiem regime in South Vietnam, calling for the total withdrawal of US and allied forces and working for peace.

These include students, women's organizations, buddhists, catholics and members of the Senate and Assembly. The constant censorship of newspapers critical of the administration and opposed to the war and the continued presence of American and other foreign troops must be exposed and condemned.

The recent delegation to Saigon of American, Australian and European students is a good example of the sort of activity which is needed and which must be extended and intensified.

2. This Conference reaffirms its position at previous meetings that: "resistance to the war in Vietnam is a political, moral and international duty of all people, not merely a right".

When such resistance results in a need for political refuge outside one's own country for those involved, nothing less than political asylum is required for them. Such persons are, in the words of the United Nations' Convention on the Status of Refugees, fearful "of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality and membership of a particular social group or political opinion", and should be considered political refugees.

We call upon all governments and peoples to support this resistance to the US war against the peoples of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. We especially call for support of those whose war resistance means that they just live in exile from their home-

land as a result of the political persecution which they face if they return.

*We call upon all countries where war resisters, such as American GIs reside, whether they are in the military or outside it, to support them and to create the most favourable conditions for their sanctuary or asylum. We view these good conditions as an encouragement of them in their resistance and as a base for winning over more of their compatriots to their struggle.*

This Conference affirms that such support is a significant contribution to the just struggle for independence by the Indochinese peoples and also ensures respect for the human rights of those in exile for political reasons.

3. *This Conference calls on all movements, governments and peoples to oppose the brutal repression taking place in the United States, for instance, in the Chicago Conspiracy Trial, the present Tacoma Conspiracy trial, the shooting of students at Kent State and Jackson State colleges, the murder of 28 Black Panther leaders and of leaders of the Chicago and Puerto Rican liberation movements.*

We urge a special exposure of the racist policies of the U.S. government which find their genocidal expression in Indochina in the wanton murder of hundreds of thousands of men, women and children and, in the United States, in the oppressive treatment of black, brown, red, and yellow minorities.

We call special attention to the grave threat confronting a number of Americans facing the death penalty for their heroic struggle against the war and against racist repression. These include Angela Davis, Erica Huggins and Bobby Seale, and John Sweeney who faces the death penalty on the charge of desertion from the field of battle. This is the first such charge against a deserter and shows the determination of the U.S. government to crush the anti-war movement in the U.S. armed forces.

All movements and groups are urged to establish special committees to organize meetings and demonstrations and to promote parliamentary and other protests in defense of these and other American political victims.

The similarity between the program of the National Coalition Against War, Racism and Repression and that of the communist World Conference on Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia is all too plain. The World Conference specifically endorsed the April actions on the anniversary of the assassination of Martin Luther King, which are part of the official schedule of spring 1971 activity being promoted by the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, successor to the NCAWRR, and the May Washington protests, the NCAWRR's and PCPJ's primary spring 1971 project.

In addition, the World Conference's program placed heavy emphasis on support for other activities endorsed by the NCAWRR and PCPJ as part of their expanded multi-issue program: opposition to racism and repression, boycotts of companies involved in the war effort, and support for such alleged "victims of oppression" as Angela Davis and Bobby Seale.

On January 8-10, 1971, the National Coalition Against War, Racism and Repression met at a conference in Chicago to discuss projected activity for 1971. The official report on the conference, issued by the Chicago Peace Council, stated that there were in attendance "365 delegates from 25 states representing 119 organizations \* \* \*." Organiza-

tions prominently represented included the Communist Party, Chicago Peace Council, NCAWRR, National Coordinating Committee for Trade Union Action and Democracy, Committee of Returned Volunteers, Women Strike for Peace, and several CPUSA-organized committees for the defense of Angela Davis. As had been the case in past conferences conducted by the NCAWRR, there was a significant degree of active participation by known members of the Communist Party, as well as by other NCAWRR people who act in support of the CPUSA's position in the peace movement.

There were three primary activities approved by the conference. The first was the April 2-4, 1971, demonstrations in various cities around the United States to commemorate the assassination of Martin Luther King and relate the issue of the war to the issues of poverty, racism, and political repression.

The second was the circulation of the so-called "Joint Treaty of Peace Between the People of the United States, South Vietnam, and North Vietnam," more commonly known simply as the "People's Peace Treaty," a document signed a few months prior to the conference by a delegation consisting of representatives of the National Student Association and Saigon, NLF, and North Vietnamese student groups. This so-called treaty, signed in North Vietnam, is in complete accord with the communist position in Vietnam.

The treaty proposal was received most enthusiastically by the conference when a draft was presented by NSA leader David Ifshin, part of the NSA delegation to the conference, made up of NSA activists who had recently returned from communist North Vietnam, and it has been actively promoted by the NCAWRR and by its successor organization, the PCPJ, which declared in a February 20, 1971, mailing that the treaty "is the anti-war theme for the Spring Campaign. It underlines our resolve that the war must end."

The third major activity endorsed by the conference was the May 1971 demonstration in Washington. The official report on the conference described this proposal as follows:

The consensus of the group was that there would be a week of concentrated activities both locally and nationally at the beginning of May with details to be worked out later. As a multi-issue action, the Washington demonstration and those around the country will join together the issues of racism, poverty, unemployment, repression, sexism, inflation, taxes, and a demand to implement the peace treaty. The actions will go beyond rallies and demonstrations, even though they may include them and they will be continuing, not just one day.

From the tone of the discussions, it was clear that the projected May activities were designed to be militant and confrontational in nature. This was especially evident in the rhetoric of Dave Dellinger and Rennie Davis. Dellinger, claiming that his proposals were non-violent, advocated a week of "direct action" at the beginning of May, "going beyond rallies and demonstrations \* \* \* into active struggle." Davis was even more explicit, as quoted in the January 23, 1971, Guardian:

"In this situation," he said, "we have to create an atmosphere of struggle in May that leads to an international crisis. I don't agree that the Vietnamese are screaming for one big action on one day united under one big umbrella. We have to organize a militant, protracted struggle that may divide us from certain constituencies."

According to the Guardian article, Davis's remarks were presented "in the context of a dramatic collapse of the Saigon regime and a mutiny of U.S. troops in Vietnam."

On February 5-7, 1971, an estimated 2,000 people gathered at the University of Michigan to map plans for the so-called Spring Offensive against the war. This meeting, known as the Student and Youth Conference on a People's Peace, was initiated by the NSA and two other groups. As a result of the discussions, the conference voted to endorse the "People's Peace Treaty" and the May demonstrations. Among the more active participants in this pro-Hanoi conference were Rennie Davis and Ron Young of the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, Trotskyist Don Gurewitz of the Student Mobilization Committee, and black revolutionary Robert F. Williams.

The Ann Arbor conference also received a message from the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, as quoted in the February 12, 1971, issue of the *Workers World*:

The PRG in Paris has today [February 7] issued an appeal to the student and youth conference in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and to peace loving people throughout the world to initiate firm, broad and immediate actions, including massive street demonstrations to condemn U.S. aggression in Laos and to check new plans to invade Cambodia, Laos and North Vietnam.

It is clear that the program adopted by the Ann Arbor conference, like the program of the NCAWRR-PCPJ, which supported the Ann Arbor meeting, is completely in accord with that of the communists in Vietnam and that the Vietnamese communist leaders regard such demonstrations as the May actions with approval, deriving much encouragement from them.

Subsequent to the January 8-10 conference, the National Coalition Against War, Racism and Repression became known as the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice. Despite the change in name, however, the leadership of the PCPJ is fully as communist oriented as that of its predecessors, as well as being fully as pro-Hanoi. A paper issued by the PCPJ, entitled "The Politics of the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice" and written by Sidney M. Peck, theorizes that "the war abroad and the repression at home [are] typically justified by an anti-communist mythology. Therefore, we must challenge that mythology head on by a non-exclusionary attitude to all forces on the radical left \* \* \*."

A letterhead of the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice dated February 20, 1971, lists the following people among the members of the PCPJ coordinating committee, emphasizing once again the pro-communist nature of the coalition's leadership:

- (1) Irving Beinlin, Guardian employee;
- (2) Rennie Davis;
- (3) Dave Dellinger, self-professed communist and militant partisan of Hanoi;
- (4) William Douthard, staff employee of the communist-dominated Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee;
- (5) Carlton Goodlett, supporter of the Communist Party and member of the presidium of the World Peace Council;
- (6) Gil Green, prominent leader in the CPUSA;
- (7) Terence Hallinan, member of the CPUSA;
- (8) Sylvia Kushner, member of the Illinois State Committee of the Communist Party;
- (9) Sid Lens, leader of the Chicago Peace Council;
- (10) Sidney Peck, former member of the Wisconsin State Committee of the Communist Party;
- (11) Irving Sarnoff, identified member of the CPUSA and leader of the CPUSA-controlled Peace Action Council of Southern California;
- (12) Jack Spiegel, identified member of the CPUSA and leader in the CPUSA-controlled Chicago Peace Council;
- (13) Jarvis Tyner, member of the National Committee of the CPUSA.

**A FRONT FOR THE TROTSKYISTS: THE NATIONAL PEACE ACTION COALITION**

The other major group organizing for the so-called Spring Offensive has been the National Peace Action Coalition, which until recently operated in open conflict with the National Coalition Against War, Racism and Repression and the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice.

The NPAC was formed at the National Emergency Conference Against the Cambodia-Laos-Vietnam War, held in Cleveland on June 19-21, 1970, in competition with the June 26-28 Strategy Action Conference conducted by the multi-issue-oriented New Mobe groups. The National Emergency Conference was completely dominated by the Socialist Workers Party, its youth group, the Young Socialist Alliance, and the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee.

The conference received the endorsement of a large number of movement people who are either members of the SWP or YSA or who have been active supporters of SWP-YSA fronts and causes. Among the endorsers were:

- (1) Fred Brode, chairman, Houston Committee to End the War in Vietnam, and member of the YSA;
- (2) Joe Cole, a member of the YSA;
- (3) Stephanie Coontz, a member of the SWP and YSA;
- (4) Laura Dertz, High School Student Mobilization Committee, San Francisco;
- (5) Sid Finehersh, University of Massachusetts Mobilization Committee, member of the YSA;
- (6) Carl Finamore, Chicago Strike Council, member of the SWP and YSA;
- (7) Jerry Gordon, chairman, CAPAC, and a primary spokesman for the Trotskyists faction in the peace movement;
- (8) Don Gurewitz, national coordinator, Student Mobilization Committee,

and member of the SWP and YSA;

- (9) Fred Halstead, member, SWP national committee;
- (10) Edward Heisler, member of the YSA, Chicago;
- (11) Prof. David Herreshoff, cochairman, Detroit Coalition to End the War Now, and prominent supporter of SWP fronts and causes;
- (12) Carol Lipman, national executive secretary, SMC, and member of both the SWP and YSA;
- (13) John McCann, coordinator, Massachusetts Referendum '70, and member of the YSA;
- (14) Pvt. Joe Miles, a member of the YSA;
- (15) Geoff Mirelowitz, HSSMC, Chicago, member of the YSA;
- (16) Andrew Pulley, member of the YSA.

Organizations and coalitions which endorsed the conference included several that operate under the substantial domination of the SWP, including the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, Atlanta Mobilization Committee, Detroit Coalition to End the War Now, Bay Area Peace Action Council, Chicago Strike Council, Student Mobilization Committee, and Houston Committee to End the War in Vietnam, in addition to the Committee of Kent State Massacre Witnesses, an offshoot of the YSA-controlled Student Mobilization Committee, and New York Veterans for Peace in Vietnam, which is dominated by Ron Wolin, a self-professed Trotskyist.

Conspicuously absent were representatives from such organizations as the Communist Party, U.S.A., or Women Strike for Peace, a group that has been subject to major CPUSA infiltration. The Guardian for June 27, 1970, commented that "All of the organized political tendencies present, except the Progressive Labor Party, had their roots in the Trotskyist movement."

The Militant for July 3, 1970, claimed that participants in the conference "came from 240 colleges, 73 high schools, and 30 states" and that the total registration was exactly 1,447 people. Further, according to this source, "More than 50 different organizations were represented, including student strike committees, trade unions, and local antiwar coalitions."

The program adopted by this conference was, in contrast to that of the Strategy Action Conference, one of non-violent mass mobilizations focused on the single issue of withdrawal from the war in Southeast Asia. The major project authorized by the conference was a series of mass antiwar demonstrations on October 31, 1970.

The Cleveland conference was characterized by significant involvement on the part of labor leaders from around the United States, with an estimated 100 delegates officially registered as members of trade unions. In this respect the NPAC has shown a striking similarity to the NCAWRR and PCPJ, with both sides attempting to fuse organized labor with the peace movement.

Foreign communist support for the



Cleveland meeting and its program was reflected in the following item appearing in the July 3, 1970, issue of *The Militant*:

CLEVELAND—Among the greetings received by the National Emergency Conference were telegrams from Nguyen Van Sao for the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and Ly Van Sau for the Paris delegation of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam. Both messages hailed the conference for focusing on the demand for immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia and welcomed the growing solidarity of the American and Vietnamese people in the fight for peace.

Immediately upon completion of the National Emergency Conference, the national steering committee of the Student Mobilization Committee met in Cleveland and voted, predictably and unanimously, to support the entire program adopted by the conference. The decision was also made that SMC would play an active role in the NPAC, which merely emphasizes the tight control the Trotskyists hold over the NPAC machinery inasmuch as the SMC is controlled, both nationally and locally, by members of the SWP and YSA.

This Trotskyist control of the NPAC is also evident in the composition of the coalition's leadership. The NPAC has five national coordinators, among who the two most active and influential are Jerry Gordon, cochairman of CAPAC and one of the most important spokesmen for the SWP line in the peace movement, and Donald Gurewitz, a member of the Socialist Workers Party. Another coordinator is James Lafferty, cochairman of the SWP-dominated Detroit Coalition to End the War Now.

The NPAC steering committee includes representatives of several organizations that are dominated by the SWP and YSA and which faithfully follow the lead of the SWP in peace activities; the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, Detroit Coalition to End the War Now, Student Mobilization Committee, Greater Boston Peace Action Coalition, High School Student Mobilization Committee, and New York Peace Action Coalition. SWP members who serve on the NPAC steering committee include Fred Halstead, Don Gurewitz, Carol Lipman, and Bob Wilkinson, editor of SMC's *GI Press Service*. YSA members on the steering committee include Pvt. Joe Miles, Geoff Mirelowitz, and Deborah Notkin, representative of the October 31 Peace Action Committee in Chicago.

The October 31 demonstrations planned by NPAC, with major support from the SMC, were held in cities throughout the United States, though with a generally smaller turnout than had been anticipated.

In Chicago, an estimated 500 demonstrators marched through the downtown area and held a rally in Grant Park. The demonstration was endorsed by several UAW locals and sponsored officially by the October 31 Peace Action Coalition. The Chicago Peace Council, aligned with the rival NCAWRR, did not participate, but CPC leader Jack Spiegel did address the rally.

In Austin, Tex., about 10,000 demonstrators, including a contingent of active duty servicemen, heard speakers such as Bobby Washington, a member of the SMC's New York Third World Task Force, and Franklin Alexander, prominent CPUSA member and leading activist in the CPUSA-directed campaign to defend Angela Davis.

A Minneapolis march and rally with an estimated 2,000 to 2,500 participants heard speeches from Prof. Mulford Q. Sibley of the University of Minnesota, Nancy Strebe of the SWP, and Betty Smith of the Communist Party, among others. Demonstrations were also held in such widely scattered cities as New York, Los Angeles, Detroit, Boston, San Diego, Seattle, Atlanta, Philadelphia, and Columbus, Ohio.

On December 4-6, 1970, the NPAC held a National Convention of the U.S. Antiwar Movement in Chicago. Speakers at this gathering, attended by a claimed 1,200 antiwar activists, included Jerry Gordon, Chicago Alderman A. A. Rayner, SWP-YSA member Carol Lipman, recently chosen SMC west coast coordinator, and SMC national executive secretary Don Gurewitz, also a member of the SWP and YSA.

The convention again demonstrated the Trotskyist domination of the NPAC and its policies by reelecting the five NPAC coordinators and setting April 24, 1971, as the date for mass antiwar mobilizations in Washington and San Francisco built around the central demand for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of all American forces from Indochina, coupled with a similar demand for an immediate end to the draft. These demonstrations were projected as nonviolent, single-issue mass marches in stark contrast to the May 1971 actions planned by the NCAWRR and PCPJ.

One of the more interesting aspects of the convention was the presence of a group of activists associated with the NCAWRR: Sidney Peck, Ron Young, Rennie Davis, Sid Lens, and Sylvia Kushner. Peck, Young, and Kushner had only recently returned from the communist World Conference on Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia in Stockholm. Lens has tended to function as a sort of liaison between the two major communist-led peace coalitions, serving both as a leader in the NCAWRR and as a member of the steering committee of the NPAC.

The NCAWRR people proposed that the NPAC conference delay setting a precise date for its spring 1971 demonstration and agree instead to support the spring demonstrations of the NCAWRR, which were to be formally authorized at the upcoming January 8-10 Chicago conference. This seeming attempt at unity failed, however, and the NPAC insisted on its own April 24 date, partly because of disagreement with the multi-issue character of the NCAWRR's proposed actions. The NPAC meeting did, however, agree to endorse the April 2-4, 1971, activities commemorating the assassination of Martin Luther King, also a part of the NCAWRR program of actions.

The disagreement between the NPAC and NCAWRR-PCPJ over the best date for a spring demonstration continued until March 1971, with a great deal of rhetoric from both sides and with representatives of each faction attending the other side's conferences in efforts at achieving agreement on a mutually satisfactory date for a united action.

Then, on February 27, Xuan Thuy, DRV ambassador to the Paris peace talks, issued an urgent message to the American antiwar movement, as quoted in the *Guardian* for March 6, 1971:

Facing the serious situation now presented, I call upon the progressive American people and all antiwar organizations in the United States to unite closely, to associate all forces and strata of the population irrespective of their skin color, religion and political trend, thus making a wide and strong movement so as to curb in time new military adventures by the U.S. Administration, to demand an end to their war of aggression in South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, to demand the withdrawal of all American troops from Indochina, and let the Indochinese people settle their own internal affairs. Such as the way beneficial to the peoples of Vietnam and Indochina, beneficial to the American people, beneficial to peace in the world.

Finally, on March 2, leaders of the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice held a press conference in the Rayburn House Office Building in Washington to announce that the PCPJ and NPAC had finally agreed to cosponsor one major antiwar demonstration on April 24, 1971, in Washington and San Francisco. Participants in the press conference included PCPJ coordinators Dave Dellinger, Carol Evans, and Sidney Peck, Dr. George Wiley of the National Welfare Rights Organization, David Ifshin of the National Student Association, Al Hubbard of Vietnam Veterans Against the War, and Cynthia Fredericks of the Committee of Concerned Asian Scholars.

The PCPJ statement made it clear that the group will continue to stress the multi-issue strategy in the peace movement, while the NPAC will continue as before with its single-issue approach. But it is plain that the new unity was a direct result of the urgent plea from Xuan Thuy in behalf of North Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, it cannot be doubted that the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice is under the effective domination of Communists. The leading organization in the Peoples Coalition is unquestionably the Communist Party, U.S.A., acting in close collaboration with such influential and militantly pro-Hanoi activists as Sidney M. Peck, David Dellinger, and Rennie Davis.

It is also clear that the leadership of the PCPJ is dedicated to the subversion of America's foreign policy objectives in Southeast Asia in the interests of the Communists in Hanoi and in the National Liberation Front. Specifically, the leadership of the PCPJ is dedicated to the achievement of a Communist victory in Vietnam and throughout Southeast Asia.

The leadership of the largest and most influential segments of the organized antiwar movement in the United States

has fallen into the hands of a coalition of Communists and others whose fundamental aims and purposes are at variance with the best interests of the United States and the preservation of freedom in the world. At least since the founding of the November 8 Mobilization Committee in 1966, the primary impetus for major anti-Vietnam war actions has been a Communist one.

The November 8 Mobilization Committee and its direct successors—the Spring, National, and New Mobilization Committees to End the War in Vietnam—have all operated under the dominant influence of Communist organizations primarily the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the Socialist Workers Party.

The Strategy Action Conference held by New Mobe in June 1970 demonstrated clearly the loss of effective control of the coalition's basic program by the SWP and its allies. The conference showed the increasing emphasis by the Mobe on a multi-issue approach involving massive civil disobedience and even possible tactical violence. It further showed that the Mobe had passed into the hands of the Communist Party, U.S.A., and a group of extreme militants who will advocate and practice any means to achieve their ends. Though the Communist Party was not in absolute control of the coalition, the Party, in concert with such militants as Dave Dellinger, Rennie Davis, and Arthur Waskow, exercised a far greater degree of influence after the SAC than in previous years.

The predominance of the Communist Party and its allies continued in the National Coalition Against War, Racism, and Repression, formed as a direct result of the Strategy Action Conference. The Chicago Peace Council, which is controlled by members of the Communist Party, played a leading role in the development of the NCAWRP, which was supplanted early in 1971 by the present Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice.

On the other hand, the National Emergency Conference Against the Cambodia-Laos-Vietnam War, also held in June 1970, demonstrated the willingness of the SWP and its allies to branch out beyond the Mobe itself in order to make their views felt effectively within the movement. The conference was completely dominated by the SWP, YSA, and SMC. The group which was formed as a result of this conference—the National Peace Action Coalition—operates primarily as a front for the Socialist Workers Party and, with the single exception of the Student Mobilization Committee, represents the main thrust of SWP activity in the anti-Vietnam war movement today.

The major regional antiwar coalitions are also effectively dominated by Communists. For example, the Chicago Peace Council is controlled by a clique of known members of the Communist Party: Sylvia Kushner, Eva and Ben Friedlander, Dorothy Hayes, and Jack Spiegel. These people work in concert with Sidney Lens, a pro-Castro propagandist and one-time leader of the dissident Communist Revolu-

tionary Workers League, to give the Chicago Peace Council a consistently Communist bias. Though representing itself as a coalition of diverse groups united around the issue of the war in Vietnam, the Chicago Peace Council, through the control exercised by the above-named people, actually operates as a front for the Communist Party.

In San Francisco, one of the major support groups, first for New Mobe and more recently for the NPAC, has been the Bay Area Peace Action Council, formerly known as the GI-Civilian Alliance for Peace and New Mobilization Membership Committee. This group, led primarily by such SWP members as Marjorie Colvin and Ken Shilman, is in fact controlled by the Socialist Workers Party and is one of the most important SWP-dominated "peace" coalitions in the United States.

Another San Francisco group which operates in rivalry with the BAPAC is the New Mobilization Committee West. This organization is under the effective domination of members and supporters of the Communist Party. Like the Chicago Peace Council, the New Mobilization Committee West actually functions as a vehicle for the implementation of the Communist Party line in the peace movement.

In Los Angeles, the major organizing force is the Peace Action Council of Southern California. Led primarily by Irving Sarnoff, an identified high-ranking functionary in the CPUSA's Southern California District, the PAC operates, and has operated from its inception, as a front for the Communist Party. As a CPUSA-front group, the Peace Action Council has been in the forefront of every major anti-Vietnam war activity in southern California in recent years.

Both the Peace Action Council of Southern California and the New Mobilization Committee West have maintained close liaison with the international Communist-front World Peace Council, a Soviet-controlled organization for the promotion of Soviet objectives among peace activists around the world.

The major New York City affiliate of the PCPJ is the Fifth Avenue Vietnam Peace Parade Committee. Formed in 1965 as an ad hoc coalition, the Parade Committee has operated primarily as a vehicle for pro-Hanoi agitation by Communists and their allies in the Greater New York area. The Parade Committee, which functions as the New York office of the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice, is dominated primarily by self-professed Communist David Dellinger and by Norma Becker, a supporter of CPUSA causes who heads the Teachers Committee for Peace in Vietnam, a pro-Hanoi organization that forms part of the Parade Committee coalition. One of the moving forces in organizing Parade Committee demonstrations through the years has been SWP leader Fred Halstead.

In Cleveland, Ohio, the major NPAC affiliate is the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, which played a primary role in organizing the November 8 Mobe

and New Mobe. This coalition, once headed by former CPUSA Wisconsin State Committeeman Sidney Peck, is currently led by Jerry Gordon, a former member of the Communist Party and one-time Ohio leader in the CPUSA's Labor Youth League who has in recent years emerged as one of the leading spokesmen for the Trotskyist faction in the peace movement. The CAPAC operates today under the substantial domination of the Socialist Workers Party.

The Detroit affiliate of the NPAC is the Detroit Coalition To End the War Now. This organization, like others mentioned in this report, is a coalition of diverse groups united around the demand for withdrawal from Southeast Asia. There can be no doubt, however, that the moving force in this coalition is and has been the Socialist Workers Party. The leadership of the Detroit Coalition is completely in tune with the policies of the SWP and YSA as applied to the peace movement; and the Detroit Coalition functions, as does the Cleveland Area Peace Action Council, as one of the primary vehicles for the implementation of the SWP's anti-Vietnam war programs.

These coalitions and others like them, all controlled by Communists of one or another persuasion, provide the principal local and regional organizational focus for the present-day American peace movement. They represent the alarming extent to which the machinery of antiwar protest in the United States has been captured by Communist activists and subverted to Communist purposes.

There are many sincere pacifist individuals and organizations involved in opposition to the Vietnam war, and it is most certainly not our intention to impugn their motives or integrity. Nevertheless, it must be observed that these individuals and groups have shown that they cannot by themselves mount a major national demonstration, certainly nothing approaching the size and scope of the November 1969 Washington and San Francisco marches, for example. For such coordinated national activities, the organizational expertise of the Communists has proven itself to be of crucial value to the antiwar movement in this country, constituting a major factor in the Communist drive for control of the peace movement.

Because of the extent to which Communists control the present-day anti-Vietnam war movement in this country, there can be no doubt that the April and May activities planned by the National Peace Action Coalition and Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice will redound to the benefit of the Communists in Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow, providing great encouragement to insurgent Communist movements throughout the world.

In this connection, we have noted with great dismay the extent to which Members of Congress have seen fit to endorse the April 24 marches in Washington and San Francisco, sponsored by the SWP-controlled National Peace Action Coalition and endorsed by the Communist-led Peoples Coalition for Peace and Jus-



tice. The foreign Communist endorsements for such allegedly antiwar activities in recent years have been so numerous, and the anti-American and pro-Hanoi positions of major antiwar leaders have been so blatant, that there can be no excuse for public servants lending their considerable prestige to this movement. We must urge all sincerely motivated people to disassociate themselves from this Communist propaganda project.

We have also noted with dismay the number of prominent figures who have lent their names to the promotion of the so-called People's Peace Treaty. This treaty, which is in reality a Communist-serving propaganda stunt that follows completely the Hanoi Communist line, was signed by representatives of the National Student Association and various Vietnamese student groups in December 1970. During the negotiation process, NSA people spoke with official representatives of the Communist North Vietnamese Government. It is our recommendation that the U.S. Government investigate seriously the possibility that those Americans who participated in this project may well have violated the provisions of the Logan Act.

Another aspect of peace movement activity that appears to be in violation of a Federal law is exemplified by the Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam, which was discussed in detail in the House Committee on Internal Security's annual report for 1970, where it was concluded that—

The Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam, is a propaganda tool of the North Vietnamese Government, playing upon the hopes and anxieties of the wives of American prisoners of war for Communist propaganda purposes. The activities of the Committee of Liaison aid and abet a nation with which the United States is engaged in armed conflict.

*The Committee of Liaison appears to be acting as an agent for a foreign power—the Government of North Vietnam. [Emphasis added.]*

In view of this conclusion, and because the activities of the Committee of Liaison have continued to be of the same nature as those which caused the HCIS to reach its initial conclusion, we strongly urge that the U.S. Government proceed with all due vigor against the Committee of Liaison under the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

#### OUR PRISONERS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDWARDS of California). Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, once again I wish to voice my deep and continuing concern for our American soldiers who suffer in prisons in Southeast Asia and for the valiant families of these men who endure the agony of separation here at home.

Some of these men will soon begin their 7th year of captivity, an unprecedented duration of confinement for an American soldier.

While this figure is in itself staggering, the conditions to which these men are subject are equally intolerable. The Geneva Convention was written in accordance with humanitarian, ethical, and moral considerations governing the treatment of prisoners of war. At the very least these provisions should be observed and world attention focused on this issue which is not merely a national concern; the treatment of any prisoners of any war merits careful scrutiny by the community of nations.

The fact that these brave men are not forgotten is vividly illustrated by the many hundreds of letters that I have received from my constituents expressing their sensitive, sincere concern. This manifest sentiment, coupled with my own concern, prompted me to send the following letter today to the head of the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1971.

Minister XUAN THUY,  
Head, Democratic Republic of Vietnam Delegation,  
8 Avenue General Le Clerc, 94  
Choisy-le-Roi, France.

DEAR MR. MINISTER: I should like to add my voice to the multitude of the American public petitioning for humane treatment of American servicemen held as prisoners of war.

The Geneva Convention delineates sound and proper standards of treatment of prisoners of war, and we, the legislators and citizens of the United States, must insist that the government of North Vietnam comply with those provisions.

Names of all the prisoners should be released so that the families of these men can at least know whether their loved ones are or are not captives. Gifts should be permitted, and transmission of mail and ample food and medical treatment should be guaranteed.

The Geneva rules also require scheduled and unscheduled inspections of prison facilities and prisoners by the International Committee of the Red Cross—another basic, humane guarantee.

While these minimal steps are essential not only to the observance of the Geneva accords but also to the maintenance of basic human dignity, they are interim measures. It is the firm and consistent desire of the American people to see these corrective steps result in the repatriation of these brave men—to reunite them with the families that wait in agonizing uncertainty.

With the hope that as statesmen and fellow human beings you will respond to the appeals of the American public, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALPHONZO BELL,  
U.S. Congressman.

#### THE RECLAMATION LANDS AUTHORITY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KASTENMEIER) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain the national importance of H.R. 5236, a bill I introduced on

March 1, 1971, "to provide for the creation of an authority to carry out the congressional intent respecting the excess land provisions of the Federal Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902." Although physically, reclamation takes place in Western States, the waters that it uses and the money that finances the projects both belong to the Nation.

The purpose of H.R. 5236, stated broadly, is to modernize reclamation law so as to fulfill unrealized potentials of this historic 1902 statute that marked the dawn of the national conservation movement. Specifically, its proposals are threefold:

One, to enact a long overdue, and long recommended, method for enforcing the public interest provisions of reclamation law effectively;

Two, to finance public education by grants of revenues created from public water development, just as grants of 94 million acres of public lands financed public education at an earlier point in our history; and

Three, to enable the public itself, through a newly established authority, to plan the environment that public water development creates.

President Theodore Roosevelt, who signed the Reclamation Act into law and founded the Nation's conservation movement, explained to the Commonwealth Club of California at a 1911 meeting in San Francisco the meaning of the public policy provision in the law that—

No right to the use of water for land in private ownership shall be sold for a tract exceeding 160 acres to any one landowner.

He said:

If we had a right to dispose of the land, not absolute but on condition that certain requirements are complied with, doing that in the interest of the democracy as a whole, we have a right to dispose of the land with a proviso as to the use of the water running over it, designed to secure that use for the people as a whole and to prevent it from ever being absorbed by a small monopoly.

But administration of Theodore Roosevelt's "excess" land law has fallen far short of original conservationist hopes. This has been testified to before congressional committees, declared on the floor of Congress, written into statistical Government reports and conceded by Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall in 1964 when, in these subdued words, he stated that administrators had "on occasion" exhibited a "degree of concern for the excess landowner—difficult to reconcile with the policies embraced by the excess land law." Hundreds of thousands, yes, millions, of acres received subsidized water above the legal limit. The extent of subsidy appears to range from \$600 to \$2,000 per acre, which remains unrepaid to the public treasury. The doorway of the treasury opens wider and wider. Congress has appropriated or authorized spending \$10 billion on reclamation projects. Meanwhile the doorway of public policy limitations shrinks narrower and narrower. Is it any wonder why giant corporations and large landowners holding many thousands of acres want the

160-acre limitation removed? In a 1945 letter to the San Francisco News explaining why the giant landowners wanted the 160-acre law removed, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes bluntly wrote:

It is the age-old battle over who is to cash in on the unearned increment in land values created by a public investment. . . . Their principal objective is to avoid application . . . of the long-established reclamation policy of the Congress which provides for the distribution of the benefits of great irrigation projects among the many and which prevents speculation in lands by the few.

The principal legal loophole that permits this evasion of public policy is the absence of a provision that the Government itself shall purchase "excess" lands. The statute requires sale of "excess" lands by their owners at a preproject price, but provides no ready purchaser. H.R. 5236 creates a ready market by authorizing the Government to purchase these lands at the same preproject price at which the owner already is bound to sell.

The concept that the Government should purchase "excess" lands is well established. As early as 1892, Gov. Joseph Toole, of Montana, proposed that the public "first acquire title to" lands to be reclaimed. In 1924, the historic Fact Finders Commission, reviewing the operation of the reclamation program, repeated the recommendation by stating that—

No reclamation project should hereafter be authorized until all privately owned land in excess of a single farmstead unit for each owner shall have been acquired by the United States or by contract placed under control of the Bureau of Reclamation.

H.R. 5236 formally proposes Government purchase of "excess" lands to make public policy truly effective. It would authorize the Government to buy "excess" land at a preproject market price and lease or sell it at a postproject market price. The public treasury itself would be able to reap from public investment the windfall profits that the "excess" land law now gives only to the few, and would thus fulfill the purposes of this law. As described by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1958, this purpose is to distribute the benefits from reclamation "in accordance with the greatest good to the greatest number of individuals," and to prevent "use of the Federal reclamation service for speculative purposes."

With windfall profits from the public investment once in an "education, conservation, and economic opportunity fund," these revenues can be disposed of to serve public purposes. H.R. 5236 proposes that 70 percent of the revenues be earmarked as grants to public education, following the Thomas Jefferson-Abraham Lincoln tradition of financing education with land grants, and for such purposes as Congress may authorize. It transfers 10 percent of the net revenues to the land and water conservation fund. The remaining 20 percent of the fund shall be made available upon specific appropriation by Congress for the development of public facilities servicing project areas, for advancing economic opportunities of veterans and persons liv-

ing in substandard conditions, for the development of healthful environments and communities needing open spaces, and for such other environmental and ecological benefits as Congress may authorize.

H.R. 5236 creates a "Reclamation Lands Authority" to administer the program as an independent agency under a board of three members, appointed by the President with consent of the Senate and responsible to the President.

The Authority is charged with attacking such conditions to lands at its disposal "as will preserve open spaces and agricultural greenbelts and in other respects preserve an environment of beauty, health, and attractive quality for now and for the future."

The Authority shall "give due weight to benefits to the revolving funds and the advancement of economic opportunity for persons who have served the Nation in the Armed Forces and disadvantaged citizens seeking such opportunity as ownership, lease, or use of irrigated or irrigable lands afford."

In carrying out the purposes of H.R. 5236, the Authority is charged with encouraging "effective regional, State, and local planning of land usage and environmental adjustment in the areas where excess lands are located."

In these ways, H.R. 5236 reaffirms the "historic purpose of the Federal Reclamation Act, especially as it applies to the development and use of excess lands," and provides modern means "to make that intent and purpose operative in the national interest and the direct benefit of its citizens."

The reclamation program of the 1970's can adopt the same human spirit that pervaded in the 1860's. This can be done, but it will not be done unless the public insists that the circumvention of the 160-acre limitation be brought to an end, and the attacks upon it cease. The public must insist that Congress provide for purchase of "excess" lands receiving publicly subsidized water, and that the use of these lands be turned away from private speculation and monopoly toward the truly public purposes of education, conservation, and economic opportunity.

#### SUPREME COURT USURPS LAW OF LAND BY BUSING DECISIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RARICK) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court continues to behave as if it is above and beyond obedience to the supreme law of the land; that is, the U.S. Constitution and the laws of Congress enacted pursuant thereto.

The Court decisions handed down Tuesday are in contravention of the Constitution itself, are contrary to the statutes enacted by this Congress and constitute clear usurpation. Certainly the Court's continued role of tyranny cannot go unchallenged. Our people must be reminded of the proper perspective of the respective roles of Government to

prevent chaos and further distrust of our federal system.

Tragically, truth has become all but a stranger in our land and those who control the vehicle and means of communication to inform our people either are not doing so or they are distorting the truth.

The average American is being told from his TV set and reads from his newspaper that the Supreme Court has now "legalized" busing of schoolchildren and that the Supreme Court's order is the law of the land. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, disregarding the constitutional questions presented, the latest decisions, if they do anything, leave the question of busing in a more confused state than before—except for the Southern litigants involved.

But what is the law of the land?

We start with the Constitution of the United States, where the law of the land is defined in no uncertain terms in what is called the supremacy clause, found in article VI.

This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby . . .

The crucial provision of our Constitution is:

This Constitution and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof . . . shall be the supreme Law of the Land . . .

Nothing is provided about Supreme Court decisions being the law of the land. On the other hand, judges are bound by acts of Congress.

Now Congress has enacted laws pursuant to the Constitution which are the law of the land. One of these laws goes right to the heart of our school problems today and points out the usurpation by the Supreme Court's ruling on busing.

Title 42 of the United States Code, section 2000C-B reads:

. . . provided that nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or the school district to another in order to achieve racial balance or otherwise enlarge the existing power of the court to insure compliance with Constitutional Standards.

42 U.S.C. 2000C Definition (b) reads:

Desegregation means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race . . . but desegregation shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance.

And then to make sure that the intent of Congress was not misunderstood, when we appropriated money to operate the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we wrote into that law—in English so plain no one can misunderstand—a provision forbidding HEW to misuse taxpayers moneys in busing to achieve racial balance.

The language of the HEW Appropriations Act reads:



No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to force busing of students, abolishment of any school, or to force any student attending any elementary or secondary school to attend a particular school against the choice of his or her parents or parent in order to overcome racial imbalance.

These laws are the law of the land.

And the courts are in direct disobedience of the very law which they are sworn to uphold.

Can such blatant misconduct be tolerated as "good behavior" or is it not grounds for impeachment of the full court?

Supreme Court decisions are not—I repeat "not"—the law of the land. All they are is the decision in a certain lawsuit between certain parties.

Of course, they may mean that the same Judges, on the same facts, dealing with the same law, will decide a new case in the same way. But again, they may not.

The law of the land is the Constitution—and the laws enacted pursuant thereto.

The word of the Constitution repeatedly establishes the supremacy of Congress over the Supreme Court. It grants Congress general powers to regulate all the Federal courts. It takes up the question of the courts' honoring the Constitution, and instructs the State courts to do so. While on the subject it omits any mention of either a right or responsibility of the Supreme Court in the matter.

It gives the Supreme Court original jurisdiction in certain federal matters, such as cases arising out of treaties. But in allowing the Supreme Court to hear appeals (which is where it has raised the most ruckus) it was made inferior to Congress, for the Constitution explicitly gives Congress the right to regulate the Court's hearing of appeals. The Constitution, in naming three things that will be the "supreme law of the land," limits them to three—thus excluding all pretensions of the modern Court that it is the author of "supreme law" too, unless it is conceded that the Court is free to rewrite the Constitution.

The "independence of the judiciary" is applauded on all sides, but what is meant by it is not settled. As some see it, it means that the Congress shall not tamper with the functioning of the courts. There shall be trial by jury. On the High Court the Justices shall be appointed for life "during good behavior" and Congress shall not meddle with this. Congress does have power to impeach judges for "bad behavior," and it has been exercised a few times on federal jurists, though not at the Supreme Court level. In this view, any right of courts to annual laws is not part of the "independence of the judiciary." It is rather a trampling on the "independence of the legislature."

But this dilemma has often been voiced: Suppose that the States and Congress defy the Constitution? Who, then, if not the Supreme Court, will defend it? As Jefferson implied in his "Bunker Hill" analogy, the people will. They can get at legislators who defy the basic law on each election day and replace them. But there is no election day for the Supreme Court, so the more serious dilemma is "Who will

defend the Constitution if the Court abuses it?"

Our responsibility under that Constitution is plain. The American people have no redress but in this House. The power of impeachment rests with us. The power of the purse rests with us. The very existence and jurisdiction of every district court and court of appeals in the federal system rests with us. The appellate and supervisory jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is entirely ours to bestow, limit or abolish.

We behold judges, ignore the positive statute law which we have enacted and the Constitution which they have sworn to uphold.

Freedom of choice is not an empty slogan. Freedom of choice is the heart and soul of American liberty. The American people still understand this and we must understand that there is a point beyond which the great law-abiding majority can not be pushed. We are perilously near that point.

Mr. Speaker, I state plainly and simply that this action of the Supreme Court of the United States is founded neither in any possible construction of the Constitution nor in any possible understanding of the law.

It is a classic example of the arbitrary and unfettered exercise of naked power.

Long years ago, Thomas Jefferson warned free men of this very possibility, when he dramatically pointed out that of all tyranny, judicial tyranny is the most fearful.

If the Constitution of the United States forbids a State to assign pupils to a school solely because of their race, it makes no difference whether the object of such assignment is segregation or forced integration under the newly invented "Doctrine of Racial Proportion." If government has no power to forcefully segregate, it has no power to forcefully integrate.

It does not take genius to understand that the State either has that power or does not. Until 1954, it had such power. The Constitution did not change, but in 1954 the Warren court decided the power had vanished. The Warren Burger court has now decided that although the State has no such power, the court has.

What this preposterous decision amounts to is that racial school assignments are unconstitutional if they are made by the States, but constitutional if made by the courts.

These decisions are a gross distortion of any possible interpretation of the Constitution.

There is yet another problem.

The Constitution of the United States places the legislative power in the Congress. It requires that the President execute the laws. Congress has stated plainly that desegregation does not mean integration, and has prohibited the use of Federal moneys for busing to further the "doctrine of racial proportions."

Mr. Speaker, this is judicial tyranny in its worst form. Federal judges—not one of whom was elected by or is responsible to the people—have combined to promulgate and attempt to enforce by judicial fiat compliance with rules con-

trary to the laws enacted by the Congress which are the law of the land.

The people whose children are endangered by this usurpation of power cannot be expected meekly to submit—nor should they.

In the guise of controlling public education, the judiciary has now destroyed it. The people are not deceived. They understand the total lawlessness of this attempt. As free Americans, they will do what is necessary to protect their children, and what they can to educate them. People across the Nation are awakening. They are asking questions, and they are demanding answers. They are not satisfied with the explanations they are receiving.

We must be strong and patient. These are dark times for those of us who love our children. But we have had other dark times in our history, and the courage to face them and win out.

Valley Forge was dark—so was Reconstruction.

Mr. Speaker, when loyal Americans refuse to bow to lawless tyranny, will the President use the Armed Forces, as have his predecessors, to enforce lawless judicial fiat? And if he does, how clean are our hands unless we take positive action to curb tyranny and right these wrongs?

To condone tyranny which we have the power to end, makes us responsible parties with the initial perpetrators.

I include the busing decisions as follows:

[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 281. Argued October 12, 1970—Decided April 20, 1971\*]

SWANN ET AL. V. CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION ET AL.

(Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit)

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg school system, which includes the city of Charlotte, North Carolina, had more than 84,000 students in 107 schools in the 1968-1969 school year. Approximately 29% (24,000) of the pupils were Negro, about 14,000 of whom attended 21 schools that were at least 99% Negro. This resulted from a desegregation plan approved by the District Court in 1965, at the commencement of this litigation. In 1968 petitioner Swann moved for further relief based on *Green v. County School Board*, 391 U.S. 430, which required school boards to "come forward with a plan that promises realistically to work . . . now . . . until it is clear that state-imposed segregation has been completely removed." The District Court ordered the school board in April 1969 to provide a plan for faculty and student desegregation. Finding the board's submission unsatisfactory, the District Court appointed an expert to submit a desegregation plan. In February 1970, the expert and the board presented plans, and the court adopted the board's plans, as modified, for the junior and senior high schools, and the expert's proposed plan for the elementary schools. The Court of Appeals affirmed the District Court's order as to faculty desegregation and the secondary school plans, but vacated the order respecting elementary schools, fearing that the provisions for pairing and grouping of elementary schools would unreasonably burden the pupils and the board. The case was remanded to the

\*Together with No. 349, *Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education et al. v. Swann et al.*, also on certiorari to the same court.

District Court for reconsideration and submission of further plans. This Court granted certiorari and directed reinstatement of the District Court's order pending further proceedings in that court. On remand the District Court received two new plans, and ordered the board to adopt a plan, or the expert's plan would remain in effect. After the board "acquiesced" in the expert's plan, the District Court directed that it remain in effect. *Held*:

1. Today's objective is to eliminate from the public schools all vestiges of state-imposed segregation that was held violative of equal protection guarantees by *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483, in 1954. Pp. 10-11.

2. In default by the school authorities of their affirmative obligation to proffer acceptable remedies, the district courts have broad power to fashion remedies that will assure unitary school systems. Pp. 11-12.

3. Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 does not restrict or withdraw from the federal courts their historic equitable remedial powers. The proviso in 42 U.S.C. § 2000c-6 was designed simply to foreclose any interpretation of the Act as expanding the existing powers of the federal courts to enforce the Equal Protection Clause. Pp. 12-13.

4. Policy and practice with regard to faculty, staff, transportation, extracurricular activities, and facilities are among the most important indicia of a segregated system, and the first remedial responsibility of school authorities is to eliminate invidious racial distinctions in those respects. Normal administrative practice should then produce schools of like quality, facilities, and staffs. P. 14.

5. The Constitution does not prohibit district courts from using their equity power to order assignment of teachers to achieve a particular degree of faculty desegregation. *United States v. Montgomery County Board of Education*, 395 U.S. 225, was properly followed by the lower courts in this case. Pp. 14-16.

6. In devising remedies to eliminate legally imposed segregation, local authorities and district courts must see to it that future school construction and abandonment are not used and do not serve to perpetuate or re-establish a dual system. Pp. 16-17.

7. Four problem areas exist on the issue of student assignment:

(1) *Racial quotas*. The constitutional command to desegregate schools does not mean that every school in the community must always reflect the racial composition of the system as a whole; here the District Court's very limited use of the racial ratio—not as an inflexible requirement, but as a starting point in shaping a remedy—was within its equitable discretion. Pp. 18-21.

(2) *One-race schools*. While the existence of a small number of one-race, or virtually one-race, schools does not in itself denote a system that still practices segregation by law, the court should scrutinize such schools and require the school authorities to satisfy the court that the racial composition does not result from present or past discriminatory action on their part. Pp. 21-22.

An optional majority-to-minority transfer provision has long been recognized as a useful part of a desegregation plan, and to be effective such arrangement must provide the transferring student free transportation and available space in the school to which he desires to move. P. 22.

(3) *Attendance zones*. The remedial altering of attendance zones is not, as an interim corrective measure, beyond the remedial powers of a district court. A student assignment plan is not acceptable merely because it appears to be neutral, for such a plan may fall to counteract the continuing effects of past school segregation. The pairing and grouping of noncontiguous zones is a per-

missible tool; judicial steps going beyond contiguous zones should be examined in light of the objectives to be sought. No rigid rules can be laid down to govern conditions in different localities. Pp. 23-25.

(4) *Transportation*. The District Court's conclusion that assignment of children to the school nearest their home serving their grade would not effectively dismantle the dual school system is supported by the record, and the remedial technique of requiring bus transportation as a tool of school desegregation was within that court's power to provide equitable relief. An objection to transportation of students may have validity when the time or distance of travel is so great as to risk either the health of the children or significantly impinge on the educational process; limits on travel time will vary with many factors, but probably with none more than the age of the students. Pp. 25-27.

8. Neither school authorities nor district courts are constitutionally required to make year-by-year adjustments of the racial composition of student bodies once a unitary system has been achieved. Pp. 27-28.

431 F. 2d 138, affirmed as to those parts in which it affirmed the District Court's judgment. The District Court's order of August 7, 1970, is also affirmed.

BURGER, C. J., delivered the opinion for a unanimous Court.

[Supreme Court of the United States, Nos. 281 and 349.—October Term, 1970]

JAMES E. SWANN ET AL., PETITIONERS, v. CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION ET AL.; CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION ET AL., PETITIONERS, v. JAMES E. SWANN ET AL.

(On Writs of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, Apr. 20, 1971)

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER delivered the opinion of the Court.

We granted certiorari in this case to review important issues as to the duties of school authorities and the scope of powers of federal courts under this Court's mandates to eliminate racially separate public schools established and maintained by state action. *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

This case and those argued with it<sup>1</sup> arose in states having a long history of maintaining two sets of schools in a single school system deliberately operated to carry out a governmental policy to separate pupils in schools solely on the basis of race. That was what *Brown v. Board of Education* was all about. These cases present us with the problem of defining in more precise terms than heretofore the scope of the duty of school authorities and district courts in implementing *Brown I* and the mandate to eliminate dual systems and establish unitary systems at once. Meanwhile district courts and courts of appeals have struggled in hundreds of cases with a multitude and variety of problems under this Court's general directive. Understandably, in an area of evolving remedies, those courts had to improvise and experiment without detailed or specific guidelines. This Court, in *Brown I*, appropriately dealt with the large constitutional principles; other federal courts had to grapple with the flinty, intractable realities of day-to-day implementation of those constitutional commands. Their efforts, of necessity, embraced a process of "trial and error," and our effort to formulate guidelines must take into account their experience.

I

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg school system, the 43d largest in the Nation, encompasses the city of Charlotte and surrounding Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. The area is large—550 square miles—spanning roughly 22 miles east-west and

36 miles north-south. During the 1968-1969 school year the system served more than 84,000 pupils in 107 schools. Approximately 71% of the pupils were found to be white and 29% Negro. As of June 1969 there were approximately 24,000 Negro students in the system, of whom 21,000 attended schools within the city of Charlotte. Two-thirds of those 21,000—approximately 14,000 Negro students—attended 21 schools which were either totally Negro or more than 99% Negro.

This situation came about under a desegregation plan approved by the District Court at the commencement of the present litigation in 1965, 243 F. Supp. 667 (WDNC), aff'd, 369 F. 2d 29 (CA4 1966), based upon geographic zoning with a free transfer provision. The present proceedings were initiated in September 1968 by Petitioner Swann's motion for further relief based on *Green v. County School Board*, 391 U.S. 430 (1968), and its companion cases.<sup>2</sup> All parties now agree that in 1969 the system fell short of achieving the unitary school system that those cases require.

The District Court held numerous hearings and received voluminous evidence. In addition to finding certain actions of the school board to be discriminatory, the court also found that residential patterns in the city and county resulted in part from federal, state, and local government action other than school board decisions. School board action based on these patterns, for example, by locating schools in Negro residential areas and fixing the size of the schools to accommodate the needs of immediate neighborhoods, resulted in segregated education. These findings were subsequently accepted by the Court of Appeals.

In April 1969 the District Court ordered the school board to come forward with a plan for both faculty and student desegregation. Proposed plans were accepted by the court in June and August 1969 on an interim basis only, and the board was ordered to file a third plan by November 1969. In November the board moved for an extension of time until February 1970, but when that was denied the board submitted a partially completed plan. In December 1969 the District Court held that the board's submission was unacceptable and appointed an expert in education administration, Dr. John Finger, to prepare a desegregation plan. Thereafter in February 1970, the District Court was presented with two alternative pupil assignment plans—the finalized "board plan" and the "Finger plan."

The *Board Plan*. As finally submitted, the school board plan closed seven schools and reassigned their pupils. It restructured school attendance zones to achieve greater racial balance but maintained existing grade structures and rejected techniques such as pairing and clustering as part of a desegregation effort. The plan created a single athletic league, eliminated the previously racial basis of the school bus system, provided racially mixed faculties and administrative staffs, and modified its free transfer plan into an optional majority-to-minority transfer system.

The board plan proposed substantial assignment of Negroes to nine of the system's 10 high schools, producing 17% to 36% Negro population in each. The projected Negro attendance at the 10th school, Independence, was 2%. The proposed attendance zones for the high schools were typically shaped like wedges of a pie, extending outward from the center of the city to the suburban and rural areas of the county in order to afford residents of the center city area access to outlying schools.

As for junior high schools, the board rezoned the 21 school areas so that in 20

Footnotes at end of article.



the Negro attendance would range from 0% to 38%. The other school, located in the heart of the Negro residential area, was left with an enrollment of 90% Negro.

The board plan with respect to elementary schools relied entirely upon gerrymandering of geographic zones. More than half of the Negro elementary pupils were left in nine schools that were 86% to 100% Negro; approximately half of the white elementary pupils were assigned to schools 86% to 100% white.

**The Finger Plan.** The plan submitted by the court-appointed expert, Dr. Finger, adopted the school board zoning plan for senior high schools with one modification: it required that an additional 300 Negro students be transported from the Negro residential area of the city to the nearly all-white Independence High School.

The Finger plan for the junior high schools employed much of the rezoning plan of the board, combined with the creation of nine "satellite" zones.<sup>3</sup> Under the satellite plan, inner-city Negro students were assigned by attendance zones to nine outlying predominantly white junior high schools, thereby substantially desegregating every junior high school in the system.

The Finger plan departed from the board plan chiefly in its handling of the system's 76 elementary schools. Rather than relying solely upon geographic zoning, Dr. Finger proposed use of zoning, pairing, and grouping techniques, with the result that student bodies throughout the system would range from 9% to 38% Negro.<sup>4</sup>

The District Court described the plan thus:

"Like the Board plan, the Finger plan does as much by rezoning school attendance lines as can reasonably be accomplished. However, unlike the board plan, it does not stop there. It goes further and desegregates all the rest of the elementary schools by the technique of grouping two or three outlying schools with one black inner city school; by transporting black students from grades one through four to the outlying white schools; and by transporting white students from the fifth and sixth grades from the outlying white schools to the inner city black school."

Under the Finger plan, nine inner-city Negro schools were grouped in this manner with 24 suburban white schools.

On February 5, 1970, the District Court adopted the board plan, as modified by Dr. Finger, for the junior and senior high schools. The court rejected the board elementary school plan and adopted the Finger plan as presented. Implementation was partially stayed by the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit on March 5, and this Court declined to disturb the Fourth Circuit's order, 397 U. S. 978 (1970).

On appeal the Court of Appeals affirmed the District Court's order as to faculty desegregation and the secondary school plans, but vacated the order respecting elementary schools. While agreeing that the District Court properly disapproved the board plan concerning these schools, the Court of Appeals feared that the pairing and grouping of elementary schools would place an unreasonable burden on the board and the system's pupils. The case was remanded to the District Court for reconsideration and submission of further plans. This Court granted certiorari, 399 U. S. 926, and directed reinstatement of the District Court's order pending further proceedings in that court.

On remand the District Court received two new plans for the elementary schools: a plan prepared by the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (the HEW plan) based on contiguous grouping and zoning of schools, and a plan prepared by four members of the nine-member school board (the minority plan) achieving substantially the same results as the Finger plan but

apparently with slightly less transportation. A majority of the school board declined to amend its proposal. After a lengthy evidentiary hearing the District Court concluded that its own plan (the Finger plan), the minority plan, and an earlier draft of the Finger plan were all reasonable and acceptable. It directed the board to adopt one of the three or in the alternative to come forward with a new, equally effective plan of its own; the court ordered that the Finger plan would remain in effect in the event the school board declined to adopt a new plan. On August 7, the board indicated it would "acquiesce" in the Finger plan, reiterating its view that the plan was unreasonable. The District Court, by order dated August 7, 1970, directed that the Finger plan remain in effect.

## II

Nearly 17 years ago this Court held, in explicit terms, that state-imposed segregation by race in public schools denies equal protection of the laws. At no time has the Court deviated in the slightest degree from that holding or its constitutional underpinnings. None of the parties before us challenges the Court's decision of May 17, 1954, that—

"In the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. Therefore, we hold that the plaintiffs and others similarly situated . . . are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment. . . ."

"Because these are class actions, because of the wide applicability of this decision, and because of the great variety of local conditions, the formulation of decrees in these cases presents problems of considerable complexity." *Brown v. Board of Education, supra*, at 495.

None of the parties before us questions the Court's 1955 holding in *Brown II*, that—

"[s]chool authorities have the primary responsibility for elucidating, assessing and solving these problems; courts will have to consider whether the action of school authorities constitutes good faith implementation of the governing constitutional principles. Because of their proximity to local conditions and the possible need for further hearings, the courts which originally heard these cases can best perform this judicial appraisal. Accordingly, we believe it appropriate to remand the cases to those courts.

"In fashioning and effectuating the decrees, the courts will be guided by equitable principles. Traditionally, equity has been characterized by a practical flexibility in shaping its remedies and by a facility for adjusting and reconciling public and private needs. These cases call for the exercise of these traditional attributes of equity power. At stake is the personal interest of the plaintiffs in admission to public schools as soon as practicable on a nondiscriminatory basis. To effectuate this interest may call for elimination of a variety of obstacles in making the transition to school systems operated in accordance with the constitutional principles set forth in our May 17, 1954, decision. Courts of equity may properly take into account the public interest in the elimination of such obstacles in a systematic and effective manner. But it should go without saying that the vitality of these constitutional principles cannot be allowed to yield simply because of disagreement with them." *Brown v. Board of Education*, 349 U. S. 294, 299-300 (1955).

Over the 15 years since *Brown II*, many difficulties were encountered in implementation of the basic constitutional requirement that the State not discriminate between public school children on the basis of their race. Nothing in our national experience prior to 1955 prepared anyone for dealing with changes and adjustments of the magnitude and complexity encountered since then. Deliberate resistance of some to the Court's

mandates has impeded the good-faith efforts of others to bring school systems into compliance. The detail and nature of these dilatory tactics have been noted frequently by this Court and other courts.

By the time the Court considered *Green v. County School Board*, 391 U. S. 430, in 1968, very little progress had been made in many areas where dual school systems had historically been maintained by operation of state laws. In *Green*, the Court was confronted with a record of a freedom-of-choice program that the District Court had found to operate in fact to preserve a dual system more than a decade after *Brown II*. While acknowledging that a freedom-of-choice concept could be a valid remedial measure in some circumstances, its failure to be effective in *Green* required that—

"The burden on a school board today is to come forward with a plan that promises realistically to work . . . now . . . until it is clear that state-imposed segregation has been completely removed." *Green*, at 439.

This was plain language, yet the 1969 Term of Court brought fresh evidence of the dilatory tactics of many school authorities. *Alexander v. Holmes County Board of Education*, 396 U. S. 19, restated the basic obligation asserted in *Griffin v. School Board*, 377 U. S. 218, 234 (1964), and *Green, supra*, that the remedy must be implemented forthwith.

The problems encountered by the district courts and courts of appeals make plain that we should now try to amplify guidelines, however incomplete and imperfect, for the assistance of school authorities and courts.<sup>5</sup> The failure of local authorities to meet their constitutional obligations aggravated the massive problem of converting from the state-enforced discrimination of racially separate school systems. This process has been rendered more difficult by changes since 1954 in the structure and patterns of communities, the growth of student population,<sup>6</sup> movement of families, and other changes, some of which had marked impact on school planning, sometimes neutralizing or negating remedial action before it was fully implemented. Rural areas accustomed for half a century to the consolidated school systems implemented by bus transportation could make adjustments more readily than metropolitan areas with dense and shifting population, numerous schools, congested and complex traffic patterns.

## III

The objective today remains to eliminate from the public schools all vestiges of state-imposed segregation. Segregation was the evil struck down by *Brown I* as contrary to the equal protection guarantees of the Constitution. That was the violation sought to be corrected by the remedial measures of *Brown II*. That was the basis for the holding in *Green* that school authorities are "clearly charged with the affirmative duty to take whatever steps might be necessary to convert to a unitary system in which racial discrimination would be eliminated root and branch." 391 U. S., at 437-438.

If school authorities fail in their affirmative obligations under these holdings, judicial authority may be invoked. Once a right and a violation have been shown, the scope of a district court's equitable powers to remedy past wrongs is broad, for breadth and flexibility are inherent in equitable remedies.

"The essence of equity jurisdiction has been the power of the Chancellor to do equity and to mould each decree to the necessities of the particular case. Flexibility rather than rigidity has distinguished it. The qualities of mercy and practicality have made equity the instrument for nice adjustment and reconciliation between the public interest and private needs as well as between competing private claims." *Hecht Co. v. Bowles*, 321 U. S. 329-330 (1944), cited in *Brown II, supra*, at 300.

Footnotes at end of article.

This allocation of responsibility once made, the Court attempted from time to time to provide some guidelines for the exercise of the district judge's discretion and for the reviewing function of the courts of appeals. However, a school desegregation case does not differ fundamentally from other cases involving the framing of equitable remedies to repair the denial of a constitutional right. The task is to correct, by a balancing of the individual and collective interests, the condition that offends the Constitution.

In seeking to define even in broad and general terms how far this remedial power extends it is important to remember that judicial powers may be exercised only on the basis of a constitutional violation. Remedial judicial authority does not put judges automatically in the shoes of school authorities whose powers are plenary. Judicial authority enters only when local authority defaults.

School authorities are traditionally charged with broad power to formulate and implement educational policy and might well conclude, for example, that in order to prepare students to live in a pluralistic society each school should have a prescribed ratio of Negro to white students reflecting the proportion for the district as a whole. To do this as an educational policy is within the broad discretionary powers of school authorities; absent a finding of a constitutional violation, however, that would not be within the authority of a federal court. As with any equity case, the nature of the violation determines the scope of the remedy. In default by the school authorities of their obligation to proffer acceptable remedies, a district court has broad power to fashion a remedy that will assure a unitary school system.

The school authorities argue that the equity powers of federal district courts have been limited by Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000c. The language and the history of Title IV shows that it was not enacted to limit but to define the role of the Federal Government in the implementation of the *Brown I* decision. It authorizes the Commissioner of Education to provide technical assistance to local boards in the preparation of desegregation plans, to arrange "training institutes" for school personnel involved in desegregation efforts, and to make grants directly to schools to ease the transition to unitary systems. It also authorizes the Attorney General, in specified circumstances, to initiate federal desegregation suits. Section 2000c(b) defines "desegregation" as it is used in Title IV:

"Desegregation" means the assignment of students to public schools and within such schools without regard to their race, color, religion, or national origin, but 'desegregation' shall not mean the assignment of students to public schools in order to overcome racial imbalance."

Section 2000c-6, authorizing the Attorney General to institute federal suits, contains the following proviso:

"Nothing herein shall empower any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another or one school district to another in order to achieve such racial balance, or otherwise enlarge the existing power of the court to insure compliance with constitutional standards."

On their face, the sections quoted purport only to insure that the provisions of Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, will not be read as granting new powers. The proviso in § 2000c-6 is in terms designed to foreclose any interpretation of the Act as expanding the existing powers of federal courts to enforce the Equal Protection Clause. There is no suggestion of an intention to restrict those powers or withdraw from courts their

historic equitable remedial powers. The legislative history of Title IV indicates that Congress was concerned that the Act might be read as creating a right of action under the Fourteenth Amendment in the situation of so-called "de facto segregation," where imbalance exists in the schools but with no showing that this was brought about by discriminatory action of state authorities. In short, there is nothing in the Act which provides us material assistance in answering the question of remedy for state-imposed segregation in violation of *Brown I*. The basis of our decision must be the prohibition of the Fourteenth Amendment that no State shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

We turn now to the problem of defining with more particularity the responsibilities of school authorities in desegregating a state-enforced dual school system in light of the Equal Protection Clause. Although the several related cases before us are primarily concerned with problems of student assignment, it may be helpful to begin with a brief discussion of other aspects of the process.

In *Green*, we pointed out that existing policy and practice with regard to faculty, staff, transportation, extracurricular activities, and facilities were among the most important indicia of a segregated system. 391 U.S., at 435. Independent of student assignment, where it is possible to identify a "white school" or a "Negro school" simply by reference to the racial composition of teachers and staff, the quality of school buildings and equipment, or the organization of sports activities, a *prima facie* case of violation of substantive constitutional rights under the Equal Protection Clause is shown.

When a system has been dual in these respects, the first remedial responsibility of school authorities is to eliminate invidious racial distinctions. With respect to such matters as transportation, supporting personnel, and extracurricular activities, no more than this may be necessary. Similar corrective action must be taken with regard to the maintenance of buildings and the distribution of equipment. In these areas, normal administrative practice should produce schools of like quality, facilities, and staffs. Something more must be said, however, as to faculty assignment and new school construction.

In the companion *Davis* case, the Mobile school board has argued that the Constitution requires that teachers be assigned on a "color blind" basis. It also argues that the Constitution prohibits district courts from using their equity power to order assignment of teachers to achieve a particular degree of faculty desegregation. We reject that contention.

In *United States v. Montgomery County Board of Education*, 395 U.S. 225 (1969), the District Court set as a goal a plan of faculty assignment in each school with a ratio of white to Negro faculty members substantially the same throughout the system. This order was predicated on the District Court finding that—

"The evidence does not reflect any real administrative problems involved in immediately desegregating the substitute teachers, the student teachers, the night school faculties, and in the involvement of a really legally adequate program for the substantial desegregation of the faculties of all schools in the system commencing with the school year 1968-69." Quoted at 395 U.S. at 232.

The District Court in *Montgomery* then proceeded to set an initial ratio for the whole system of at least two Negro teachers out of each 12 in any given school. The Court of Appeals modified the order by eliminating what it regarded as "fixed mathematical ratios" of faculty and substituted an initial requirement of "sub-

stantially or approximately" a five-to-one ratio. With respect to the future, the Court of Appeals held that the numerical ratio should be eliminated and that compliance should not be tested solely by the achievement of specified proportions. *Id.*, at 234.

We reversed the Court of Appeals and restored the District Court's order in its entirety, holding that the order of the District Judge—

"Was adopted in the spirit of this Court's opinion in *Green* . . . in that his plan 'promises realistically to work, and promises realistically to work now.' The modifications ordered by the panel of the Court of Appeals, while of course not intended to do so would, we think, take from the order some of its capacity to expedite, by means of specific commands, the day when a completely unified, unitary, nondiscriminatory school system become a reality instead of a hope. . . . We also believe that under all the circumstances of this case we follow the original plan outlined in *Brown II* . . . by accepting the more specific and expeditious order of [District] Judge Johnson. . . ." 395 U.S. at 235-236 (emphasis in original).

The principles of *Montgomery* have been properly followed by the District Court and the Court of Appeals in this case.

The construction of new schools and the closing of old ones is one of the most important functions of local school authorities and also one of the most complex. They must decide questions of location and capacity in light of population growth, finances, land values, site availability, through an almost endless list of factors to be considered. The result of this will be a decision which, when combined with one technique or another of student assignment, will determine the racial composition of the student body in each school in the system. Over the long run, the consequences of the choices will be far reaching. People gravitate toward school facilities, just as schools are located in response to the needs of people. The location of schools may thus influence the patterns of residential development of a metropolitan area and have important impact on composition of inner city neighborhoods.

In the past, choices in this respect have been used as a potent weapon for creating or maintaining a state-segregated school system. In addition to the classic pattern of building schools specifically intended for Negro or white students, school authorities have sometimes, since *Brown*, closed schools which appeared likely to become racially mixed through changes in neighborhood residential patterns. This was sometimes accompanied by building new schools in the areas of white suburban expansion farthest from Negro population centers in order to maintain the separation of the races with a minimum departure from the formal principles of "neighborhood zoning." Such a policy does more than simply influence the short-run composition of the student body of a new school. It may well promote segregated residential patterns which, when combined with "neighborhood zoning," further lock the school system into the mold of separation of the races. Upon a proper showing a district court may consider this in fashioning a remedy.

In ascertaining the existence of legally imposed school segregation, the existence of a pattern of school construction and abandonment is thus a factor of great weight. In devising remedies where legally imposed segregation has been established, it is the responsibility of local authorities and district courts to see to it that future school construction and abandonment is not used and does not serve to perpetuate or re-establish the dual system. When necessary, district courts should retain jurisdiction to assure that these responsibilities are carried out. *Cf. United States v. Board of Public Instruction, School Board*, 397 F. 2d 37 (CA4 1968).



v

The central issue in this case is that of student assignment, and there are essentially four problem areas:

- (1) to what extent racial balance or racial quotas may be used as an implement in a remedial order to correct a previously segregated system;
- (2) whether every all-Negro and all-white school must be eliminated as an indispensable part of a remedial process of desegregation;
- (3) what are the limits, if any, on the rearrangement of school districts and attendance zones, as a remedial measure; and
- (4) what are the limits, if any, on the use of transportation facilities to correct state-enforced racial school segregation.

(1) *Racial Balances or Racial Quotas.*

The constant theme and thrust of every holding from *Brown I* to date is that state-enforced separation of races in public schools is discrimination that violates the Equal Protection Clause. The remedy commanded was to dismantle dual school systems.

We are concerned in these cases with the elimination of the discrimination inherent in the dual school systems, not with myriad factors of human existence which can cause discrimination in a multitude of ways on racial, religious, or ethnic grounds. The target of the cases from *Brown I* to the present was the dual school system. The elimination of racial discrimination in public schools is a large task and one that should not be retarded by efforts to achieve broader purposes lying beyond the jurisdiction of school authorities. One vehicle can carry only a limited amount of baggage. It would not serve the important objective of *Brown I* to seek to use school desegregation cases for purposes beyond their scope, although desegregation of schools ultimately will have impact on other forms of discrimination. We do not reach in this case the question whether a showing that school segregation is a consequence of other types of state action, without any discriminatory action by the school authorities, is a constitutional violation requiring remedial action by a school desegregation decree. This case does not present that question and we therefore do not decide it.

Our objective in dealing with the issues presented by these cases is to see that school authorities exclude no pupil of a racial minority from any school, directly or indirectly, on account of race; it does not and cannot embrace all the problems of racial prejudice, even when those problems contribute to disproportionate racial concentrations in some schools.

In this case it is urged that the District Court has imposed a racial balance requirement of 71%-29% on individual schools. The fact that no such objective was actually achieved—and would appear to be impossible—tends to blunt that claim, yet in the opinion and order of the District Court of December 1, 1969, we find that court directing:

"that efforts should be made to reach a 71-29 ratio in the various schools so that there will be no basis for contending that one school is racially different from the others . . . that no school [should] be operated with an all-black or predominantly black student body, [and] that pupils of all grades [should] be assigned in such a way that as nearly as practicable the various schools at various grade levels have about the same proportion of black and white students."

The District Judge went on to acknowledge that variation "from that norm may be unavoidable." This contains intimations that the "norm" is a fixed mathematical racial balance reflecting the pupil constituency of the system. If we were to read the holding of the District Court to require, as a matter of substantive constitutional right, any par-

ticular degree of racial balance or mixing, that approach would be disapproved and we would be obliged to reverse. The constitutional command to desegregate schools does not mean that every school in every community must always reflect the racial composition of the school system as a whole.

As the voluminous record in this case shows,<sup>7</sup> the predicate for the District Court's use of the 71%-29% ratio was twofold: first, its express finding, approved by the Court of Appeals and not challenged here, that a dual school system had been maintained by the school authorities at least until 1969; second, its finding, also approved by the Court of Appeals, that the school board had totally defaulted in its acknowledged duty to come forward with an acceptable plan of its own, notwithstanding the patient efforts of the District Judge who, on at least three occasions, urged the board to submit plans.<sup>8</sup> As the statement of facts shows, these findings are abundantly supported by the record. It was because of this total failure of the school board that the District Court was obliged to turn to other qualified sources, and Dr. Finger was designated to assist the District Court to do what the board should have done.

We see therefore that the use made of mathematical ratios was no more than a starting point in the process of shaping a remedy, rather than an inflexible requirement. From that starting point the District Court proceeded to frame a decree that was within its discretionary powers, an equitable remedy for the particular circumstances.<sup>9</sup> As we said in *Green*, a school authority's remedial plan or a district court's remedial decree is to be judged by its effectiveness. Awareness of the racial composition of the whole school system is likely to be a useful starting point in shaping a remedy to correct past constitutional violations. In sum, the very limited use, made of mathematical ratios was within the equitable remedial discretion of the District Court.

(2) *One-Race Schools.*

The record in this case reveals the familiar phenomenon that in metropolitan areas minority groups are often found concentrated in one part of the city. In some circumstances certain schools may remain all or largely of one race until new schools can be provided or neighborhood patterns change. Schools all or predominately of one race in a district of mixed population will require close scrutiny to determine that school assignments are not part of state-enforced segregation.

In light of the above, it should be clear that the existence of some small number of one-race, or virtually one-race, schools within a district is not in and of itself the mark of a system which still practices segregation by law. The district judge or school authorities should make every effort to achieve the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation and will thus necessarily be concerned with the elimination of one-race schools. No *per se* rule can adequately embrace all the difficulties of reconciling the competing interests involved; but in a system with a history of segregation the need for remedial criteria of sufficient specificity to assure a school authority's compliance with its constitutional duty warrants a presumption against schools that are substantially disproportionate in their racial composition. Where the school authority's proposed plan for conversion from a dual to a unitary system contemplates the continued existence of some schools that are all or predominately of one race, they have the burden of showing that such school assignments are genuinely nondiscriminatory. The court school scrutinize such schools, and the burden upon the school authorities will be to satisfy the court that their racial composition is not the result of present or past discriminatory action on their part.

An optional majority-to-minority transfer provision has long been recognized as a useful part of every desegregation plan. Provision for optional transfer of those in the majority racial group of a particular school to other schools where they will be in the minority is an indispensable remedy for those students willing to transfer to other schools in order to lessen the impact on them of the state-imposed stigma of segregation. In order to be effective, such a transfer arrangement must grant the transferring student free transportation and space must be made available in the school to which he desires to move. Cf. *Ellis v. Board of Public Instruction*, 423 F. 2d 203, 206 (CA5 1970). The court orders in this and the companion *Davis* case now provide such an option.

(3) *Remedial Altering of Attendance Zones.*

The maps submitted in these cases graphically demonstrate that one of the principal tools employed by school planners and by courts to break up the dual school system has been a frank—and sometimes drastic—gerrymandering of school districts and attendance zones. An additional step was pairing, "clustering," or "grouping" of schools with attendance assignments made deliberately to accomplish the transfer of Negro students out of formerly segregated Negro schools and transfer of white students to formerly all-Negro schools. More often than not, these zones are neither compact<sup>10</sup> nor contiguous; indeed they may be on opposite ends of the city. As an interim corrective measure, this cannot be said to be beyond the broad remedial powers of a court.

Absent a constitutional violation there would be no basis for judicially ordering assignment of students on a racial basis. All things being equal, with no history of discrimination, it might well be desirable to assign pupils to schools nearest their homes. But all things are not equal in a system that has been deliberately constructed and maintained to enforce racial segregation. The remedy for such segregation may be administratively awkward, inconvenient and even bizarre in some situations and may impose burdens on some; but all awkwardness and inconvenience cannot be avoided in the interim period when remedial adjustments are being made to eliminate the dual school systems.

No fixed or even substantially fixed guidelines can be established as to how far a court can go, but it must be recognized that there are limits. The objective is to dismantle the dual school system. "Racially neutral" assignment plans proposed by school authorities to a district court may be inadequate; such plans may fall to counteract the continuing effects of past school segregation resulting from discriminatory location of school sites or distortion of school size in order to achieve or maintain an artificial racial separation. When school authorities present a district court with a "loaded game board," affirmative action in the form of remedial altering of attendance zones is proper to achieve truly nondiscriminatory assignments. In short, an assignment plan is not acceptable simply because it appears to be neutral.

In this area, we must of necessity rely to a large extent, as this Court has for more than 16 years, on the informed judgment of the district courts in the first instance and on courts of appeals.

We hold that the pairing and grouping of non-contiguous school zones is a permissible tool and such action is to be considered in light of the objectives sought. Judicial steps in shaping such zones going beyond combinations of contiguous areas should be examined in light of what is said in subdivisions (1), (2), and (3) of this opinion concerning the

Footnotes at end of article.

objectives to be sought. Maps do not tell the whole story since non-contiguous school zones may be more accessible to each other in terms of the critical travel time, because of traffic patterns and good highways, than schools geographically closer together. Conditions in different localities will vary so widely that no rigid rules can be laid down to govern all situations.

#### (4) Transportation of Students.

The scope of permissible transportation of students as an implement of a remedial decree has never been defined by this Court and by the very nature of the problem it cannot be defined with precision. No rigid guidelines as to student transportation can be given for application to the infinite variety of problems presented in thousands of situations. Bus transportation has been an integral part of the public education system for years, and was perhaps the single most important factor in the transition from the one-room schoolhouse to the consolidated school. Eighteen million of the nation's public school children, approximately 39%, were transported to their schools by bus in 1969-1970 in all parts of the country.

The importance of bus transportation as a normal and accepted tool of educational policy is readily discernible in this and the companion case.<sup>11</sup> The Charlotte school authorities did not purport to assign students on the basis of geographically drawn zones until 1965 and then they allowed almost unlimited transfer privileges. The District Court's conclusion that assignment of children to the school nearest their home serving their grade would not produce an effective dismantling of the dual system is supported by the record.

Thus the remedial techniques used in the District Court's order were within that court's power to provide equitable relief; implementation of the decree is well within the capacity of the school authority.

The decree provided that the buses used to implement the plan would operate on direct routes. Students would be picked up at schools near their homes and transported to the schools they were to attend. The trips for elementary school pupils average about seven miles and the District Court found that they would take "not over 35 minutes at the most."<sup>12</sup> This system compares favorably with the transportation plan previously operated in Charlotte under which each day 23,600 students on all grade levels were transported an average of 15 miles one way for an average trip requiring over an hour. In these circumstances, we find no basis for holding that the local school authorities may not be required to employ bus transportation as one tool of school desegregation. Desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school.

An objection to transportation of students may have validity when the time or distance of travel is so great as to risk either the health of the children or significantly impinge on the educational process. District courts must weigh the soundness of any transportation plan in light of what is said in subdivisions (1), (2), and (3) above. It hardly needs stating that the limits on time of travel will vary with many factors, but probably with none more than the age of the students. The reconciliation of competing values in a desegregation case is, of course, a difficult task with many sensitive facets but fundamentally no more so than remedial measures courts of equity have traditionally employed.

#### VI

The Court of Appeals, searching for a term to define the equitable remedial power of the district courts, used the term "reasonableness." In *Green, supra*, this Court used the term "feasible" and by implication, "workable," "effective," and "realistic" in the mandate to develop "a plan that promises realistically to work, and . . . to work now." On the

facts of this case, we are unable to conclude that the order of the District Court is not reasonable, feasible and workable. However, in seeking to define the scope of remedial power or the limits on remedial power of courts in an area as sensitive as we deal with here, words are poor instruments to convey the sense of basic fairness inherent in equity. Substance, not semantics, must govern, and we have sought to suggest the nature of limitations without frustrating the appropriate scope of equity.

At some point, these school authorities and others like them should have achieved full compliance with this Court's decision in *Brown I*. The systems will then be "unitary" in the sense required by our decisions in *Green* and *Alexander*.

It does not follow that the communities served by such systems will remain demographically stable, for in a growing, mobile society, few will do so. Neither school authorities nor district courts are constitutionally required to make year-by-year adjustments of the racial composition of student bodies once the affirmative duty to desegregate has been accomplished and racial discrimination through official action is eliminated from the system. This does not mean that federal courts are without power to deal with future problems; but in the absence of a showing that either the school authorities or some other agency of the State has deliberately attempted to fix or alter demographic patterns to affect the racial composition of the schools, further intervention by a district court should not be necessary.

For the reasons herein set forth, the judgment of the Court of Appeals is affirmed as to those parts in which it affirmed the judgment of the District Court. The order of the District Court dated August 7, 1970, is also affirmed.

*It is so ordered.*

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> *McDaniel v. Barresi*, No. 420; *Davis v. Board of School Commissioners of Mobile County*, No. 436; *Moore v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, No. 444; *North Carolina State Board of Education v. Swann*, No. 498. For purposes of this opinion the cross-petitions in Nos. 281 and 349 are treated as a single case and will be referred to as "this case."

<sup>2</sup> *Raney v. Board of Education*, 391 U.S. 443 (1968), and *Monroe v. Board of Commissioners*, 391 U.S. 450 (1968).

<sup>3</sup> A "satellite zone" is an area which is not contiguous with the main attendance zone surrounding the school.

<sup>4</sup> In its opinion and order of December 1, 1969, later incorporated in the order appointing Dr. Finger as consultant, the District Court stated:

"Fixed ratios of pupils in particular schools will not be set. If the board in one of its three tries had presented a plan for desegregation, the court would have sought ways to approve variations in pupil ratios. In default of such a plan from the school board, the court will start with the thought . . . that efforts should be made to reach a 71-29 ratio in the various schools so that there will be no basis for contending that one school is racially different from the others, but to understand that variations from that norm may be unavoidable."

<sup>5</sup> The necessity for this is suggested by the situation in the Fifth Circuit where 166 appeals in school desegregation cases were heard between December 2, 1969, and September 24, 1970.

<sup>6</sup> Elementary public school population (grades 1-6) grew from 17,447,000 in 1954 to 23,103,000 in 1969; secondary school population grew from 11,183,000 in 1954 to 20,775,000 in 1969. Digest of Educational Statistics, 1964 ed. 1, 6, Office of Education Publication #10024-64; Digest of Educational Statis-

tics, 1970 ed. Table 28, Office of Education Publication #10024-70.

<sup>7</sup> It must be remembered that the District Court entered nearly a score of orders, numerous sets of findings and for the most part each was accompanied by a memorandum opinion. Considering the pressure under which the court was obliged to operate we would not expect that all inconsistencies and apparent inconsistencies could be avoided. Our review, of course, is on the orders of February 5, 1970, as amended, and August 7, 1970.

<sup>8</sup> The final board plan left 10 schools 86% to 100% Negro and yet categorically rejected the techniques of pairing and clustering as part of the desegregation effort. As discussed below, the Charlotte board was under an obligation to exercise every reasonable effort to remedy the violation, once it was identified, and the suggested techniques are permissible remedial devices. Additionally, as noted by the District Court and Court of Appeals, the board plan refused to assign white students to any school unless the student population of that school was at least 60% white. This was an arbitrary limitation negating reasonable remedial steps.

<sup>9</sup> In his August 3, 1970, memorandum holding that the District Court plan was "reasonable" under the standard laid down by the Fourth Circuit on appeal, the District Court explained the approach taken as follows:

"This court has not ruled, and does not rule that 'racial balance' is required under the Constitution; nor that all black schools in all cities are unlawful; nor that all school boards must bus children or violate the Constitution; nor that the particular order entered in this case would be correct in other circumstances not before this court." (Emphasis in original.)

<sup>10</sup> The reliance of school authorities on the reference to the "revision of . . . attendance areas into compact units," *Brown II*, at 300, is misplaced. The enumeration in that opinion of considerations to be taken into account by district courts was patently intended to be suggestive rather than exhaustive. The decision in *Brown II* to remand the cases decided in *Brown I* to local courts for the framing of specific decrees was premised on a recognition that this Court could not at that time foresee the particular means which would be required to implement the constitutional principles announced. We said in *Green, supra*, at 439:

"The obligation of the district courts, as it always has been, is to assess the effectiveness of a proposed plan in achieving desegregation. There is no universal answer to complex problems of desegregation; there is obviously no one plan that will do the job in every case. The matter must be assessed in light of the circumstances present and the options available in each instance."

<sup>11</sup> During 1967-1968, for example, the Mobile board used 207 buses to transport 22,094 students daily for an average round trip of 31 miles. During 1966-1967, 7,116 students in the metropolitan area were bussed daily. In Charlotte-Mecklenburg, the system as a whole, without regard to desegregation plans, planned to bus approximately 23,000 students this year, for an average daily round trip of 15 miles. More elementary school children than high school children were to be bussed, and four- and five-year-olds travel the longest routes in the system.

<sup>12</sup> The District Court found that the school system would have to employ 138 more buses than it had previously operated. But 105 of those buses were already available and the others could easily be obtained. Additionally, it should be noted that North Carolina requires provision of transportation for all students who are assigned to schools more than one and one-half miles from their homes. N.C. Stat. § 115-186(b).



[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 436. Argued October 13-14, 1970—Decided April 20, 1971]

DAVIS ET AL. V. BOARD OF SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS OF MOBILE COUNTY ET AL.

(Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit)

East of the major highway that divides the metropolitan area of Mobile, Ala., live 94% of the area's Negro students, and the schools there are 65% Negro and 35% white. West of the highway the schools are 12% Negro and 88% white. The Court of Appeals approved a desegregation plan which, like the District Court's plan, insofar as those areas were concerned, treated the western section as isolated from the eastern, with unified geographic zones and providing no transportation of students for desegregation purposes. Though some reduction in the number of all-Negro schools was achieved for the 1970-1971 school year, nine elementary schools in the eastern section (attended by 64% of all Negro elementary school pupils in the metropolitan area) were over 90% Negro, and over half of the Negro junior and senior high school students went to all-Negro or nearly all-Negro schools. With regard to the faculty and staff ratio in each of Mobile County's schools, the Court of Appeals directed the District Court to require the school board to establish "substantially the same" ratio as that for the whole district.

*Held:*

1. The Court of Appeals decision dealing with the faculty and staff ratio is affirmed. *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, ante, p. —, at 14-16. P. 2.

2. The Court of Appeals erred in treating the eastern part of metropolitan Mobile in isolation from the rest of the school system, and in not adequately considering the possible use of all available techniques to achieve the maximum amount of practicable desegregation. P. 4.

430 F. 2d 883 and 889, affirmed in part and reversed and remanded in part.

BURGER, C. J., delivered the opinion for a unanimous Court.

[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 436.—October Term, 1970]

BIRDIE MAE DAVIS ET AL., PETITIONERS, V. BOARD OF SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS OF MOBILE COUNTY ET AL.

(On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, April 20, 1971)

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER delivered the opinion of the Court.

Petitioners in this case challenge as inadequate a school desegregation plan for Mobile County, Alabama. The country is large and populous, embracing 1,248 square miles and the City of Mobile. The school system had 73,500 pupils in 91 schools at the beginning of the 1969 academic year; approximately 58% of the pupils were white and 42% Negro. During the 1967-1968 school year, the system transported 22,000 pupils daily in over 200 school buses, both in the rural areas of the country and in the outlying areas of metropolitan Mobile.

The present desegregation plan evolved from one developed by the District Court in response to the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit in *Davis v. Board of School Commissioners*, 414 F. 2d 609 (CA5 1969), that an earlier desegregation plan formulated by the District Court on the basis of unified geographic zones was "constitutionally insufficient and unacceptable, and such zones must be redrawn." The Court of Appeals held that the earlier plan had "ignored the unequivocal directive to make a conscious effort in locating attendance zones to desegregate and eliminate past segregation." *Id.*, at 610.

The District Court responded with a new zoning plan which left 18,623, or 60%, of the system's 30,800 Negro children in 19 all-Negro or nearly all-Negro schools. On appeal, the Court of Appeals reviewed all aspects of desegregation in Mobile County. Additional information was requested regarding earlier desegregation plans for the rural parts of the county, and those plans were approved. They are not before us now. The Court of Appeals concluded that with respect to faculty and staff desegregation the board had "almost totally failed to comply" with earlier orders, and directed the District Court to require the board to establish a faculty and staff ratio in each school "substantially the same" as that for the entire district. We affirm that part of the Court of Appeals' opinion for the reasons given in *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, ante, at 14-16.

Regarding junior and senior high schools, the Court of Appeals reversed the District Court and directed implementation of a plan which was intended to eliminate the seven all-Negro schools remaining under the District Court's scheme. This was to be achieved through pairing and adjusting grade structures within metropolitan Mobile, without bus transportation or split zoning. The Court of Appeals then turned to the difficult problem of desegregating the elementary schools of metropolitan Mobile. The metropolitan area is divided by a major north-south highway. About 94% of the Negro students in the metropolitan area live on the east side of the highway between it and the Mobile River. The schools on that side of the highway are 65% Negro and 35% white. On the west side of the highway, however, the schools are 12% Negro and 88% white. Under the District Court's elementary school plan for the metropolitan area, the eastern and western sections were treated as distinct, without either interlocking zones or transportation across the highway. Not surprisingly, it was easy to desegregate the western section, but in the east the District Court left 12 all-Negro or nearly all-Negro elementary schools, serving over 90% of all the Negro elementary students in the metropolitan area.

The Court of Appeals rejected this solution in favor of a modified version of a plan submitted by the Department of Justice. As further modified after a second appeal, this plan reduced the number of all-Negro or nearly all-Negro elementary schools from 12 to six schools, projected to serve 5,310 students, or about 50% of the Negro elementary students in the metropolitan area. Like the District Court's plan, the Court of Appeals' plan was based on treating the western section in isolation from the eastern. There were unified geographic zones, and no transportation of students for purposes of desegregation. The reduction in the number of all-Negro schools was achieved through pairing, rezoning, and adjusting grade structures within the eastern section. With yet further modifications not material here, this plan went into effect at the beginning of the 1970-1971 school year.

The enrollment figures for the 1970-1971 school year show that the projections on which the Court of Appeals based its plan for metropolitan Mobile were inaccurate. Under the Court of Appeals' plan as actually implemented, nine elementary schools in the eastern section of metropolitan Mobile were over 90% Negro as of September 21, 1970 (instead of six as projected), and they housed 7,651 students, or 64% of all the Negro elementary school pupils in the metropolitan area. Moreover, the enrollment figures indicate that 6,746 Negro junior and senior high school students in metropolitan Mobile, or over half, were then attending all-Negro or nearly all-Negro schools, rather than none as projected by the Court of Appeals. These figures are derived from a report of the school board to

the District Court; they were brought to our attention in a supplemental brief for petitioners filed on October 10, 1970, and have not been challenged by respondents.

As we have held, "neighborhood school zoning," whether based strictly on home-to-school distance or on "unified geographic zones" is not the only constitutionally permissible remedy; nor is it *per se* adequate to meet the remedial responsibilities of local boards. Having once found a violation, the district judge or school authorities should make every effort to achieve the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation, taking into account the practicalities of the situation. A district court may and should consider the use of all available techniques including restructuring of attendance zones and both contiguous and noncontiguous attendance zones. See *Swann*, ante, at pp. 18-27. The measure of any desegregation plan is its effectiveness.

On the record before us, it is clear that the Court of Appeals felt constrained to treat the eastern part of metropolitan Mobile in isolation from the rest of the school system, and that inadequate consideration was given to the possible use of bus transportation and split zoning. For these reasons, we reverse the judgment of the Court of Appeals as to the parts dealing with student assignment, and remand the case for the development of a decree "that promises realistically to work, and promises realistically to work now." *Green v. County School Board*, 391 U.S. 430, 439 (1968).

*It is so ordered.*

[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 444. Argued October 13, 1970—Decided April 20, 1971]

MOORE ET AL. V. CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION ET AL.

(Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina)

Since both parties in this action challenging a school desegregation plan seek the same result, *viz.*, a holding that North Carolina's Anti-Busing Law is unconstitutional, there is no Art. III case or controversy. Additionally, on the facts of this case, no direct appeal to this Court lies under 28 U.S.C. § 1253.

312 F. Supp. 503, appeal dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 444.—October Term, 1970]

MRS. ROBERT LEE MOORE ET AL., APPELLANTS, V. CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG BOARD OF EDUCATION ET AL.

(On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, April 20, 1971)

PER CURIAM.

Appellants seek review of the decision of the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina declaring a portion of the North Carolina anti-busing statute unconstitutional, and enjoining its enforcement. It is a companion case to No. 498, *ante*, *North Carolina State Bd. v. Swann*. We postponed decision on the question of jurisdiction, 400 U.S. 803 (1970), and after hearing on the merits we now dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

At the hearing both parties argued to the three-judge court that the anti-busing law was constitutional and urged that the order of the District Court adopting the Finger plan should be set aside. We are thus confronted with the anomaly that both litigants desire precisely the same result, namely a holding that the anti-busing statute is constitutional. There is, therefore, no case or controversy within the meaning of Article III of the Constitution. *Muskrat v. United States*, 219 U.S. 346 (1911). Additionally, since

neither party sought an injunction to restrain a state officer from enforcing a state statute alleged to be unconstitutional, 28 U.S.C. § 2281, this is not an appeal from "any civil action, suit or proceeding required . . . to be heard . . . by a district court of three judges," 28 U.S.C. § 1253, and hence no direct appeal to this Court is available.

*Dismissed.*

[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 498. Argued October 13, 1970—Decided April 20, 1971]

NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ET AL. V. SWANN ET AL.

(Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina)

North Carolina's Anti-Busing Law, which flatly forbids assignment of any student on account of race or for the purpose of creating a racial balance or ratio in the schools and which prohibits busing for such purposes, held invalid as preventing implementation of desegregation plans required by the Fourteenth Amendment. Pp. 2-4.

312 F. Supp. 503, affirmed.

BURGER, C. J., delivered the opinion for a unanimous Court.

[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 498.—October Term, 1970]

NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION ET AL., APPELLANTS, V. JAMES E. SWANN ET AL.

(On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, April 20, 1971)

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER delivered the opinion of the Court.

This case is here on direct appeal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1253 from the judgment of a three-judge court in the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina. The District Court declared unconstitutional a portion of the North Carolina General Statutes known as the Anti-busing Law,<sup>1</sup> and granted an injunction against its enforcement.<sup>2</sup> The proceeding before the three-judge court was an ancillary proceeding connected with the school desegregation case heretofore discussed. *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg*, supra p. —. The instant appeal was taken by the North Carolina State Board of Education and four state officials. We granted the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School Board's motion to join in the appeal, 400 U.S. 804 (1970).

When the litigation in the *Swann* case recommenced in the spring of 1969, the District Court specifically directed that the school board consider altering attendance areas, pairing or consolidation of schools, bus transportation of students, and any other method which would effectuate a racially unitary system. That litigation was actively prosecuted. The board submitted a series of

<sup>1</sup> So far as here relevant, North Carolina General Statute § 115-176.1 reads as follows:

"No student shall be assigned or compelled to attend any school on account of race, creed, color or national origin, or for the purpose of creating a balance or ratio of race, religion or national origin. Involuntary busing of students in contravention of this article is prohibited, and public funds shall not be used for any such busing."

<sup>2</sup> 312 F. Supp. 503 (1970). The opinion as printed grants only declaratory relief. However the District Court amended its original opinion by withdrawing Part V and entering an order dated June 22, 1970, which enjoined all parties "from enforcing, or seeking the enforcement of," the portion of the statute found unconstitutional.

proposals, all rejected by the District Court as inadequate. In the midst of this litigation over the remedy to implement the District Court's order, the North Carolina Legislature enacted the anti-busing bill, set forth in relevant parts in footnote 1.

Following enactment of the anti-busing statute the plaintiffs in the *Swann* case obtained leave to file a supplemental complaint which sought injunctive and declaratory relief against the statute. They sought to convene a three-judge court, but no action was taken on the requests at that time because the school board thought that the anti-busing law did not interfere with the school board's proposed plan to transport about 4,000 Negro children to white suburban schools. 306 F. Supp. 1291 (WDNC 1969). Other parties were added as defendants by order of the District Court dated February 25. In addition certain persons who had brought a suit in state court to enjoin or impede the order of the federal court, the attorneys for those litigants, and state judges who at various times entered injunctions against the school authorities and blocked compliance with orders of the District Court were also enjoined; a three-judge court was then convened.

We observed in *Swann*, ante, p. 12, that school authorities have wide discretion in formulating school policy, and that as a matter of educational policy school authorities may well conclude that some kind of racial balance in the schools is desirable quite apart from any constitutional requirements. However, if a state-imposed limitation on a school authority's discretion operates to inhibit or obstruct the operation of a unitary school system or impede the disestablishing of a dual school system, it must fall; state policy must give way when it operates to hinder vindication of federal constitutional guarantees.

The legislation before us flatly forbids assignment of any student on account of race or for the purpose of creating a racial balance or ratio in the schools. The prohibition is absolute, and it would inescapably operate to obstruct the remedies granted by the District Court in the *Swann* case. But more important the statute exploits an apparently neutral form to control school assignment plans by directing that they be "color blind"; that requirement, against the background of segregation, would render illusory the promise of *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954). Just as the race of students must be considered in determining whether a constitutional violation has occurred, so also must race be considered in formulating a remedy. To forbid, at this stage, all assignments made on the basis of race would deprive school authorities of the one tool absolutely essential to fulfillment of their constitutional obligation to eliminate existing dual school systems.

Similarly the flat prohibition against assignment of students for the purpose of creating a racial balance must inevitably conflict with the duty of school authorities to disestablish dual school systems. As we have held in *Swann*, the Constitution does not compel any particular degree of racial balance or mixing, but when past and continuing constitutional violations are found, some ratios are likely to be useful starting points in shaping a remedy. An absolute prohibition against use of such a device—even as a starting point—contravenes the implicit command of *Green v. County School Board*, 391 U.S. 430 (1968), that all reasonable methods be available to formulate an effective remedy.

We likewise conclude that an absolute prohibition against transportation of students assigned on the basis of race, "or for the purpose of creating a balance or ratio," will similarly hamper the ability of local author-

ities to effectively remedy constitutional violations. As noted in *Swann*, ante, p. 25, bus transportation has long been an integral part of all public educational systems, and it is unlikely that a truly effective remedy could be devised without continued reliance upon it. Cf. *McDaniel v. Barresi*, post, p. 3.

The remainder of the order of the District Court is affirmed for the reasons stated in its opinion, 312 F. Supp. 503.

*Affirmed.*

[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 420. Argued October 13, 1970—Decided April 20, 1971]

Syllabus

MCDANIEL, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, ET AL., V. BARRESI ET AL., CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA

The Board of Education of Clarke County, Ga. (with a two-to-one white-Negro elementary school system ratio), devised a student assignment plan for desegregating elementary schools which establishes geographic zones drawn to promote desegregation and also provides that pupils in heavily concentrated Negro "pockets" walk or go by bus to schools in other attendance zones. The resulting Negro elementary enrollment ranges from 20% to 40% in all but two schools, where it is 50%. Respondent parents sued to enjoin the plan's operation. The state trial court denied an injunction. The Georgia Supreme Court reversed, holding that the plan violated (1) equal protection because it "[treated] students differently because of their race," and (2) the Civil Rights Act of 1964, because Title IV prohibits a school board from requiring busing to achieve a racial balance. *Held:*

1. In compliance with its duty to convert to a unitary system, the school board properly took race into account in fixing the attendance lines. Pp. 2-3.

2. Title IV, a direction to federal officials, does not restrict state officials in assigning students within their systems. P. 3. 226 Ga. 456, 175 S.E. 2d 649, reversed.

BURGER, C. J., delivered the opinion for a unanimous Court.

[Supreme Court of the United States, No. 420.—October Term, 1970]

CHARLES MCDANIEL, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, ET AL., PETITIONERS, V. JOSEPH BARRESI, JR., ET AL.

(On Writ of Certiorari to the Supreme Court of Georgia, April 20, 1971)

MR. CHIEF JUSTICE BURGER delivered the opinion of the Court.

We granted certiorari in this case to review a state court order enjoining the operation of a school desegregation plan. The action was brought in the Superior Court of Clarke County, Georgia, by parents of children attending public elementary schools in that county. Named as defendants were the Superintendent of Education and members of the Clarke County Board of Education. The trial court denied respondents' request for an injunction, but on appeal the Supreme Court of Georgia reversed, 226 Ga. 456, 175 S.E. 2d 649 (1970). This Court then granted certiorari, 400 U.S. 804 (1970).

Beginning in 1963, the Clarke County Board of Education began a voluntary program to desegregate its public schools. The student-assignment plan presently at issue, involving only elementary schools, has been in effect since the start of the 1969 academic year. The plan, adopted by the Board of Education and approved by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare,<sup>1</sup> relies primarily upon geographic attendance zones drawn to achieve greater racial balance. Additionally, the pupils in five heavily Negro "pockets" either walk or are transported by



bus to schools located in other attendance zones.<sup>2</sup> As a consequence the Negro enrollment of each elementary school in the system varies generally between 20% and 40%, although two schools have a 50% Negro enrollment. The white-Negro ratio of elementary pupils in the system is approximately two to one.

Respondents contend in this action that the board's desegregation plan violates the Fourteenth Amendment of the Federal Constitution and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Supreme Court of Georgia upheld both contentions, concluding first that the plan violated the Equal Protection Clause "by treating students differently because of their race." The court concluded also that Title IV prohibited the board from "requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another . . . in order to achieve such racial balance. . . ." We reject these contentions.

The Clarke County Board of Education, as part of its affirmative duty to disestablish the dual school system, properly took into account the race of its elementary school children in drawing attendance lines. To have done otherwise would have severely hampered the board's ability to deal effectively with the task at hand. School boards that operated dual school systems are "clearly charged with the affirmative duty to take whatever steps might be necessary to convert to a unitary system in which racial discrimination would be eliminated root and branch." *Green v. County School Board*, 391 U.S. 430, 437-438 (1968). In this remedial process, steps will almost invariably require that students be assigned "differently because of their race." See *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, No. 281; *Youngblood v. Board of Public Instruction*, 430 F. 2d 625, 630 (CA5 1970). Any other approach would freeze the status quo that is the very target of all desegregation processes.

Nor is the board's plan barred by Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The sections relied upon by respondents (42 U.S.C. §§ 2000c (b), 2000c-6) are directed only at federal officials and are designed simply to foreclose any interpretation of the Act as expanding the powers of federal officials to enforce the Equal Protection Clause. *Swann, ante*, at 13. Title IV clearly does not restrict state school authorities in the exercise of their discretionary powers to assign students within their school systems.

*Reversed.*

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> It may well be that the Board of Education adopted the present student-assignment plan because of urgings of federal officials and fear of losing federal financial assistance. The state trial court, however, made no findings on these matters. No federal officials are parties in this case.

<sup>2</sup> Where the distance between the student's residence and his assigned school is more than 1½ miles, free transportation is provided. There is no challenge here to the feasibility of the transportation provisions of the plan. The annual transportation expenses of the present plan are reported in the record to be \$11,070 less than the school system spent on transportation during the 1968-1969 school year under dual operation.

#### ADDITIONAL NAMES TO BE ADDED TO THE SOCIAL SECURITY HONOR ROLL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BURKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr.

Speaker, I include at this point additional names to be added to the Social Security Honor Roll that appeared on page 10993 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 20, 1971. This distinguished list of colleagues have joined with me in cosponsoring legislation to provide for a 50-percent across-the-board increase in social security benefits thereunder, with the resulting benefit cost being borne equally by employers and employees and the Federal Government, and to raise the amount of outside earnings which the beneficiary may have without suffering a deduction from his benefits up to \$3,000.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is long overdue. The present recipients of social security are frozen into a rather miserable position with inadequate checks. What does a 50-percent increase on \$70 a month mean? It just means that the benefits will be increased to \$105. If he is receiving \$90 per month, it will go up to \$135 per month. This, to me, seems to be a very meager amount.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the additional names to the honor roll:

#### SOCIAL SECURITY HONOR ROLL

John Dent of Pennsylvania.  
James Corman of California.  
Hale Boggs of Louisiana.  
Dominick Daniels of New Jersey.  
Peter Rodino of New Jersey.  
Peter Kyros of Maine.  
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey.  
William Cotter of Connecticut.  
Cornelius E. Gallagher of New Jersey.  
Robert Roe of New Jersey.  
Bella Abzug of New York.  
Louis Stokes of Ohio.  
John Kluczynski of Illinois.  
Melvin Price of Illinois.

#### DO NOT RUSH TO EMBRACE RED CHINA

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the rush to embrace Red China may not be in the best interests of the United States and our allies. Since World War II the Red Chinese have made it very clear that they consider us their primary enemy. They invaded North Korea when our forces were engaged there and killed and wounded thousands of Americans. They are providing most of the weapons which are being used by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong against our forces in Indochina. They are inciting rebellion against constituted authority throughout Southeast Asia.

It is scarcely fitting to disregard all of this in return for an invitation to play ping-pong. It must be assumed that Red China wants something, and wants it badly. They want us out of South Vietnam. They want us to turn our backs on the Chinese Nationalists, who have been our staunch friends. They want to be a member of the United Nations. They are apprehensive about their own relations with Russia. These are reasons enough to seek new friendships. But let them first demonstrate they are sufficiently

concerned to show real changes in policy. Then there will be time enough and reason enough to consider a closer relationship with Red China.

#### ADMINISTRATION INFRINGEMENT OF CIVIL LIBERTIES REJECTED

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

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, there exists in this Nation a very real concern regarding the protection and security of our civil liberties. Numerous events have cultivated this concern—the surveillance of civilians by the Army, the burgeoning outreach of the FBI regarding political groups and individuals, the support by the administration of harsh and very probably unconstitutional measures such as pretrial detention and no-knock entry.

Each of these activities, as well as others, has contributed to an atmosphere of repression, which in no way has been diminished by the spokesmen for the administration. The Vice President has made a profession of polemic. Supreme Court nominees have, at least in some instances, been far less noted for their espousal of civil liberties than for their so-called toughness.

The damage being done the basic precepts of this Nation is severe, I believe. An increasing alienation between the Government and the people is developing, and this can only bode ill. And, I must confess, I do not find the administration attempting to decrease that alienation either by speech or by action.

One of the most invidious policies which has emanated from the administration, via the Justice Department, has been the assertion by the Attorney General of the power to authorize wiretapping in internal security matters without a court order. The 1968 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act empowered the Attorney General to tap telephones in national security cases with the approval of a court. The Attorney General contends that the President, acting through the Attorney General, possesses the "inherent" power to do whatever he deems "reasonable" to protect the security of the Nation, the absence of judicial authorization notwithstanding. One might expect these words in some other countries; certainly not in the Nation whose very foundation is interwoven with the Bill of Rights.

Fortunately, Judge George Edwards, of the Sixth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, has rejected the Attorney General's position. As Judge Edwards stated in his opinion, in *United States v. U.S. District Court*, No. 71-1105, on April 8, 1971:

The government has not pointed to, and we do not find, one written phrase in the Constitution, in the statutory law, or in the case law of the United States, which exempts the President, the Attorney General or federal law enforcement from restrictions of the Fourth Amendment in the case at hand . . .

I will include the full text of Judge Edwards' holding at the end of this statement; I hope that my colleagues will

take the time to read it and ponder its import.

It is a very sad day when we are forced to look to the courts for the salvation of our civil liberties, because the executive rejects them. I can think of no more pernicious development than the apparent willingness to flout the Bill of Rights, or to cut corners to edge around it, because some in power deem that expedient. Nations survive because of the principles they cherish, not on the basis of those they sacrifice. These principles are not a matter of partisan politics; they are not rhetoric to be caught up in the verbiage of "conservatives" versus "liberals." They are uncompromising and immune to compromise.

I am today introducing legislation to bring into immediate operation the National Commission for the Review of Federal and State Laws Relating to Wiretapping and Electronic Surveillance. This Commission was established by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, but its actual existence was to be delayed until 6 years after the enactment of that law. Last year, the delay was shortened to 5 years. The bill I am today introducing brings the Commission into actual existence as of July 1 of this year. The problem exists now; so too should the Commission designed to investigate the problem.

At this point, I am including the holding of the court in United States against U.S. District Court:

#### HOLDING OF THE COURT

During more difficult times for the Republic than these, Benjamin Franklin said: "They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety."<sup>1</sup>

It is the historic role of the Judicial to see that in periods of crisis, when the challenge to constitutional freedoms is the greatest, the Constitution of the United States remains the supreme law of our land. No one proclaimed this message with more force than did one of the first and one of the greatest Chief Justices of the United States. In *Marbury v. Madison*, 1 Cranch (5 U.S.) 137 (1803), Chief Justice Marshall spoke on constitutional supremacy:

"That the people have an original right to establish, for their future government, such principles as, in their opinion, shall most conduce to their own happiness, is the basis on which the whole American fabric has been erected. The exercise of this original right is a very great exertion; nor can it nor ought it to be frequently repeated. The principles, therefore, so established are deemed fundamental. And as the authority, from which they proceed, is supreme, and can seldom act, they are designed to be permanent.

"This original and supreme will organizes the government, and assigns to different departments their respective powers. It may either stop here; or establish certain limits not to be transcended by those departments.

Certainly all those who have framed written constitutions contemplate them as forming the fundamental and paramount law of the nation, and consequently the theory of every such government must be, that an act

of the legislature repugnant to the constitution is void.

"This theory is essentially attached to a written constitution, and is consequently to be considered by this court as one of the fundamental principles of our society." *Marbury v. Madison*, *supra* at 68-69.

In the same opinion Chief Justice Marshall outlined the function of the courts in interpreting the Constitution:

"It is emphatically the province and duty of the judicial department to say what the law is. Those who apply the rule to particular cases, must of necessity expound and interpret that rule. If two laws conflict with each other, the courts must decide on the operation of each.

"So if a law be in opposition to the constitution; if both the law and the constitution apply to a particular case, so that the court must either decide that case conformably to the law, disregarding the constitution; or conformably to the constitution disregarding the law: the court must determine which of these conflicting rules governs the case. This is of the very essence of judicial duty.

"If then the courts are to regard the constitution; and the constitution is superior to any ordinary act of the legislature; the constitution, and not such ordinary act, must govern the case to which they both apply.

"Those then who controvert the principle that the constitution is to be considered, in court, as a paramount law, are reduced to the necessity of maintaining the courts must close their eyes on the constitution, and see only the law.

"This doctrine would subvert the very foundation of all written constitutions." *Marbury v. Madison*, *supra* at 70.

The government has not pointed to, and we do not find, one written phrase in the Constitution, in the statutory law, or in the case law of the United States, which exempts the President, the Attorney General, or federal law enforcement from the restrictions of the Fourth Amendment in the case at hand. It is clear to us that Congress in the Omnibus Crime Control & Safe Street Act of 1968, 18 U.S.C. § 2510 et seq. (Supp. V, 1965-69), refrained from attempting to convey to the President any power which he did not already possess.

Essentially, the government rests its case upon the inherent powers of the President as Chief of State to defend the existence of the State. We have already shown that this very claim was rejected by the Supreme Court in *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. v. Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 (1952), and we shall not repeat its holding here.

An additional difficulty with the inherent power argument in the context of this case is that the Fourth Amendment was adopted in the immediate aftermath of abusive searches and seizures directed against American colonists under the sovereign and inherent powers of King George III. The United States Constitution was adopted to provide a check upon "sovereign" power. The creation of three coordinate branches of government by that Constitution was designed to require sharing in the administration of that awesome power.

It is strange, indeed, that in this case the traditional power of sovereigns like King George III should be invoked on behalf of an American President to defeat one of the fundamental freedoms for which the founders of this country overthrew King George's reign.

The argument for unrestricted employment of Presidential power to wiretap is basically an argument in *terrorem*. It suggests that constitutional government is too weak to survive in a difficult world and urges worried judges and worried citizens to re-

turn to acceptance of the security of "sovereign" power. We are earnestly urged to believe that the awesome power sought for the Attorney General will always be used with discretion.

Obviously, even in very recent days, as we shall see, this has not always been the case. And the history of English-speaking peoples (to say nothing of others) is replete with answers. See e.g., *Entick v. Carrington*, 19 How. St. Tr. 1029 (1765). In *Marcus v. Search Warrant*, 367 U.S. 717 (1961), the opinion for the United States Supreme Court summarized the long history of the English striving for freedom of expression and press and noted:

"Historically the struggle for freedom of speech and press in England was bound up with the issue of the scope of the search and seizure power." *Marcus v. Search Warrant*, *supra* at 724.

The Court also pointed out that as early as the 1760's Lord Camden had denounced a "discretionary power given to messengers to search wherever their suspicions may chance to fall. If such a power is truly invested in a secretary of state, and he can delegate this power, it certainly may affect the person and property of every man in this kingdom, and is totally subversive of the liberty of the subject." *Id.*, 1167 [*Wilkes v. Wood*, 19 How. St. Tr. 1153]. *Marcus v. Search Warrant*, *supra* at 729.

The Court's opinion concluded:

"This history was, of course, part of the intellectual matrix within which our own constitutional fabric was shaped. The Bill of Rights was fashioned against the background of knowledge that unrestricted power of search and seizure could also be an instrument for stifling liberty of expression. For the serious hazard of suppression of innocent expression inhered in the discretion confided in the officers authorized to exercise the power." *Id.* at 729.

That which has distinguished the United States of America in the history of the world has been its constitutional protection of individual liberty. It is this which has created the wonderful diversity of this great country and its many and varied opportunities. It is this which has created Justice Holmes' free market-place of ideas from which have come our most signal advances in scientific and technological achievement and in social progress. Beyond doubt the First Amendment is the cornerstone of American freedom. The Fourth Amendment stands as guardian of the First.

Of course, it should be noted that the Fourth Amendment's judicial review requirements do not prohibit the President from defending the existence of the state. Nor does the Fourth Amendment require that law enforcement officials be deprived of electronic surveillance. What the Fourth Amendment does is to establish the method they must follow.

If, as the government asserts, following that method poses security problems (because an indiscrete or corruptible judge or court employee might betray the proposed investigation) then surely the answer is to take steps to refine the method and eliminate the problems. No one could be in better position to help the courts accomplish this goal than the Attorney General.

If there be a need for increased security in the presentation of certain applications for search warrant in the federal court, these are administrative problems amenable to solution through the Chief Justice of the United States and the United States Judicial Conference and its affiliated judicial organizations. The inclination of the judiciary to meet the practical problems of enforcement in this area is evidenced in the specific holding of this court and the United States

<sup>1</sup> *Historical Review of Pennsylvania* cited in J. BARTLETT, *BARTLETT'S FAMILIAR QUOTATIONS* 227 (C. Morley & L. Everett ed. 1951).



Supreme Court in *United States v. Osborn*, 350 F.2d 497 (6th Cir. 1965), *aff'd*, 385 U.S. 323 (1966), and in the dictum in *Katz v. United States*, 389 U.S. 347 (1967), upon which the search warrant terms of the Omnibus Crime Control & Safe Streets Act § 2516 were largely based. Congress clearly conceived situations so delicate that, for example, the Attorney General might seek his warrant for a search from the Chief Judge of the appropriate United States Court of Appeals. 18 U.S.C. § 2510 (Supp. V, 1965-69). So do we. But what we cannot conceive is that in the midst of the turmoil of the present day, the courts of the United States should suspend an important principle of the Constitution. The very nature of our government requires us to defend our nation with the tools which a free society has created and proclaimed and which, indeed, are justification for its existence.

We hold that in dealing with the threat of domestic subversion, the Executive Branch of our government, including the Attorney General and the law enforcement agents of the United States, is subject to the limitations of the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution when undertaking searches and seizures for oral communications by wire.

We seek to be equally explicit about what we do not decide in this case:

(1) We do not decide what the President of the United States can or cannot lawfully do under his constitutional powers as Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy to defend this country from attack, espionage or sabotage by forces or agents of a foreign power. As we have noted, the certificate filed by the Attorney General in this case makes no reference to and claims no reliance upon any such authority.

(2) We do not decide whether or not there were facts available to the Attorney General in this case which might have constituted probable cause for issuance of a prior warrant for the wiretaps under 18 U.S.C. § 2516 (Supp. V, 1965-69), or a subsequent warrant (within 48 hours) as provided for by 18 U.S.C. § 2518(7) (Supp. V, 1965-69). This record indicates plainly that no such applications were made. Indeed, this record is devoid of any showing that any presentation of information under oath was ever made before, or any probable cause findings were ever entered by any administrative official—let alone any judge.

In our view, the *Clay* case (*United States v. Clay*, 430 F.2d 165 (5th Cir. 1970), *cert. granted*, limited to question 4, 39 U.S.L.W. 3297 (U.S. Jan. 11, 1971) (No. 783)) cannot appropriately be read as authority for warrantless wiretaps in domestic security cases. In that case the government did not contest the illegality of four separate domestic wiretaps made under the same inherent powers relied on in this case. The transcripts of defendant Clay's intercepted conversations were turned over to him by the Department of Justice. In one such instance the illegal wiretap was upon the telephone of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. One wonders, if the inherent powers of the Presidency were broad enough to authorize the wiretaps in the first instance, how these wiretaps become concededly unconstitutional in court.

As to the "fifth" wiretap disclosed in the *Clay* case, the Attorney General's certificate said that it was "for the purpose of gathering foreign intelligence information." The Fifth Circuit did squarely hold that such foreign intelligence surveillance without judicial warrant was not a constitutional violation. This was the second issue on which certiorari was sought from the Supreme Court, but, as we have noted, the Supreme Court refused certiorari on this issue while granting certiorari on another unrelated matter.

In the case before us, however, the Attorney General's certificate makes clear that

the wiretaps involved were thought to be warranted by domestic security problems. We have noted the special constitutional powers of the Presidency in foreign affairs which the Fifth Circuit thought justified his "gathering foreign intelligence information" without judicial warrant. Without passing on that issue, we reiterate that we have found no such specific constitutional authority to disregard the Fourth Amendment in domestic security cases like this one.

The last issue argued (this one by the government) concerns the order of disclosure of the overheard conversations. In effect the government contends that even though the District Judge found the interceptions to have been illegal, he should have determined *in camera* that they were not relevant to this case, and hence, not subject to disclosure. This very issue has been recently decided by the United States Supreme Court in *Alderman v. United States*, 394 U.S. 165 (1969). In this case the opinion of the Court said:

"An apparently innocent phrase, a chance remark, a reference to what appears to be a neutral person or event, the identity of a caller or the individual on the other end of a telephone, or even the manner of speaking or using words may have special significance to one who knows the more intimate facts of an accused's life. And yet that information may be wholly colorless and devoid of meaning to one less well acquainted with all relevant circumstances. Unavoidably, this is a matter of judgment, but in our view the task is too complex, and the margin for error too great, to rely wholly on the *in camera* judgment of the trial court to identify those records which might have contributed to the Government's case.

"[I]f the hearings are to be more than a formality and petitioners not left entirely to reliance on government testimony, there should be turned over to them the records of those overheard conversations which the Government was not entitled to use in building its case against them." *Alderman v. United States*, *supra* at 182-83 (Footnotes omitted.)

In a subsequent but closely related case, the Supreme Court applied *Alderman* as giving the District Court *in camera* the right and duty to screen government files for the illegally intercepted conversations of a defendant and held unanimously:

"Here the defendant was entitled to see a transcript of his own conversations and nothing else. He had no right to rummage in government files." *Taglianetti v. United States*, 394 U.S. 316, 317 (1968).

Thus the Supreme Court held that all illegally intercepted conversations of a defendant must be made available to him, but that the District Judge may *in camera* ascertain which transcripts are covered by this ruling. Of course, in this case we have no problem concerning standing. The government concedes that Plamondon's own voice was intercepted and recorded and the District Judge and this court have held the interception to have been illegal.

We cannot agree with the dissent that Justice Stewart's concurring opinion in *United States v. Giordano*, 394 U.S. 310, 313-15 (1969), in any way weakened the disclosure requirement of *Alderman*. The full text of Justice Stewart's opinion makes it clear that the "preliminary determination" with which he was concerned was whether or not "any of the surveillances did violate the Fourth Amendment." This determination Justice Stewart held could be made by *in camera* inspection—as has been done in this case both by the District Judge and this court.

We believe that the Supreme Court has

held that a defendant whose personal conversations have been illegally recorded is entitled to transcripts of the illegally recorded material without regard to whether a judge on inspection *in camera* might or might not be able to find relevancy. Nonetheless, we have considered remand of this case to the District Judge for an expression on the relevancy issue so as to have a complete appellate record. On inspection of the sealed exhibit in this case, however, we cannot (and we do not believe the District Judge could) ascertain with any certainty whether or not the government had derived prosecutorial benefits from this illegal search to which benefits defendant would have the right to object at trial under the doctrine of "the fruit of the poisonous tree." *Nardone v. United States*, 308 U.S. 338, 341 (1939); *Wong Sun v. United States*, 371 U.S. 471 (1963).

The dissent in this case makes this comment upon the sealed exhibit:

"The sealed exhibit, which contained only a few pages, was examined more than once by the members of this panel. The monitored conversations took place *subsequent* to the bombing and *after* the conspiracy alleged in the indictment had terminated. They did not relate in any way either to the conspiracy or to the substantive offense charged in the indictment, and would not be relevant or admissible at the trial; nor did they lead to any relevant and admissible evidence."

If this paragraph be read as carefully as it has been written, we have no reason to disagree. With all respect, however, we think two other facts need to be added before conclusions are drawn. First, the illegal interceptions occurred well before the indictments in this case were returned, and thus they could have been employed in the investigation which led to the indictments. Second, we have no way of knowing whether or not the government's investigation was materially aided by associations or leads developed from these conversations, regardless of whether or not the statement providing the lead appears on its face to be "admissible at the trial."

These considerations, of course, primarily affect this trial. Far more important, however, is the fact that disclosure may well prove to be the only effective protection against illegal wiretapping available to defend the Fourth Amendment rights of the American public.

For these reasons, we hold that the District Judge properly found that the conversations of defendant Plamondon were illegally intercepted, and we cannot hold that his disclosure order (as interpreted below) is an abuse of judicial discretion.

In perhaps an excess of caution, we note that we read the District Judge's disclosure order as limited solely to the transcripts and dates of defendant Plamondon's illegally intercepted telephone conversations. (See *Taglianetti v. United States*, *supra*.)<sup>2</sup>

The petition for writ of mandamus is denied.

#### DAV DAY IN CONGRESS—PRINTING OF REMARKS OF MEMBERS

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

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to have reprints made of the remarks made in the House of Repre-

<sup>2</sup> In the unlikely event that this interpretation of the District Judge's order proves erroneous, the government may seek relief from any broader order by filing a motion under Rule 40, Fed. R. App. P.

sentatives by all Members on "DAV Day in Congress." If any Member objects to the reprinting of his remarks in booklet form, please contact my office or the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Clerk at the Capitol within 5 days. This statement is being made in order to comply with the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing in respect to the reprinting of remarks of other Members of Congress.

#### LEST WE FORGET

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, 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 have not 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.

Capt. John Galbreath Dunn, U.S. Army, XXXX, Hutchinson, Kans. Married. The son of Mr. and Mrs. Harry H. Dunn, Hutchinson, Kans. 1965 graduate of the University of Kansas. Officially listed as captured March 18, 1968. As of today, Captain Dunn has been detained in Southeast Asia for 1,129 days.

#### MCPL STUDY ON FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, while I was chairman of the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law during the 91st Congress, a development committee was created and placed under the leadership of my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. CULVER). His committee has recently issued a report on American foreign assistance programs which examines in detail the proposals that have been advanced for their reorganization. Issuance of the study now is especially timely in view of the administration's legislative proposals to the Congress which were received today. I would, therefore, like to make it available to my colleagues who I am sure will find it extremely useful in their consideration of the reform legislation this year.

FOREIGN AID FOR THE SECOND DEVELOPMENT DECADE: AN MCPL REPORT ON THE FOREIGN AID REORGANIZATION OF 1971

(Prepared by the Development Committee, 91st Congress, John C. Culver, chairman, Members of Congress for Peace Through Law, Washington, D.C.)

#### INTRODUCTION

Profound, fundamental revolutions against the tyranny of poverty, affecting two-thirds of the people of the earth will continue into

the foreseeable future. The United States cannot and should not seek to prevent these political, social and economic changes it helped to unleash by its own example of revolutionary development of the last two hundred years. Although they may wish to be detached observers, Americans must understand that they will be directly affected by the struggles of the peoples of the less developed countries to radically improve the quality of their lives.

Much to the chagrin of some of its strongest supporters, American foreign assistance has frequently been an instrument of foreign policy designed to achieve short-term objectives—objectives which often include support for an unviable *status quo*, a policy motivated by a fear of change rather than a recognition that rapid change is a way of life in our dynamic twentieth century world. Relatively unimportant events like *coup d'etat*s and other unscheduled changes of governments, have overshadowed the more significant social revolution which the United States must help, rather than hinder, with its foreign aid.

Whether American participation in development efforts has such a positive influence will be determined in significant part by its foreign assistance policies. If the United States is to assist in shaping the outcome of the world-wide revolution instead of being overwhelmed by its tides of change, sophisticated, innovative, sometimes daring use of foreign aid will be essential.

The post-World War II experience upon which present aid programs are based has been overtaken by events and conditions of the 1960's. During this year of major review of foreign aid, the Congress will have an unprecedented opportunity to alter American foreign assistance efforts in the light of the first decade of experience with the complex problems of political and economic development of poor nations of the world. Only with the establishment of the Development Loan Fund during the Eisenhower Administration, did the United States begin to grapple with development problems of the Third World. The lessons learned during the Marshall Plan and the security-oriented assistance programs of the 1950's are only partially relevant to the more intractable problems of the Second Development Decade and beyond.

#### MCPL STUDY

The Members of Congress for Peace Through Law conducted a survey of corporate, academic, and other national leaders' opinions on the rationale and structure of foreign assistance policies. Despite all the stresses foreign aid undergoes in Congress, one remarkable finding of the survey was the conviction that aid should be continued and that the downward trend of U.S. aid contributions should be reversed during these early years of the Second Development Decade. The reasons expressed for continued aid-giving ranged from the moral to the political, from the conviction that the richest nation on earth should assist those less fortunate, to the political judgment that international order will be impossible in a stratified world of a few rich peoples and many poor ones.

The moral commitment to American foreign assistance was clearly demonstrated by spontaneous relief efforts to assist victims of natural disasters in China, Japan, India and other parts of the world well before any formal foreign aid programs were undertaken by the government of the United States. Although political pressures often overshadow moral considerations, the belief that the world's richest nation should assist other peoples' efforts to improve the quality of their lives is deeply imbedded in the Judeo-Christian traditions of this country.

A variety of political reasons for supporting foreign assistance also appeared in the MCPL survey responses. They ranged from long term objectives for international political stability to more immediate foreign policy considerations. For long term international stability, respondents to the questionnaire recognized that the United States could not remain an island of plenty in a sea of poverty without suffering serious international challenges to its own security in the shrinking world of the twentieth century. They recognize that the disparity in income between the United States and the less developed world is widening at an increasingly rapid rate. Although debate continues over the merits of the use of foreign assistance to secure short term political goals, sophisticated observers discount the utility of aid as a device for winning friends, securing votes at the UN or countering the Soviet Union's initiatives in less developed countries. In the long run, it was generally agreed by the respondents that aid can, if wisely used, and despite some short-term instability, help to bring about changes in less developed countries which will lead ultimately to greater prospects for future political stability. In short, there is a recognition that nothing is as unstable as meaningful social change, but these temporary dislocations should be considered in the perspective of a larger development time frame. In addition, it is widely believed that military, security and supporting assistance can also help nations defend themselves when threatened by foreign aggression if the security of those nations is important to the United States, and if it is not improperly used to suppress legitimate internal forces for change.

Some business observers in the survey emphasized that one of the immediate benefits of economic assistance to the United States is an increase in the productivity and export capacity of less developed countries which enables them to earn the hard currency with which to purchase American goods and services. Investors also recognized that only with the development of a solid infrastructure of trained personnel, transport systems, financial institutions and government facilities, do less developed countries become attractive places for investment in non-extractive industries. As nations overcome the initial obstacles to foreign investment, the demand for American capital and technology increases. The leaders of capital importing nations are more likely to offer a hospitable climate for foreign investment, which will increase the probability of long-term acceptance, if enlightened and innovative arrangements have been made to accommodate host country participation and interests.

Respondents recognized that the debt servicing problem for less developed countries may well be one of the most important underlying factors in the success or failure of foreign assistance. A crisis in debt servicing is about to overtake all development efforts and the United States Congress must face this problem squarely. In a few years, debt repayments may equal or exceed inflows of foreign assistance. The causes of this crisis are numerous and complex. Unless a solution is found, through increased aid, debt rescheduling, or other measures, development efforts will be disastrously impeded.

It was freely acknowledged that some peoples in the United States have "development" problems and needs as severe as residents of less developed countries. It is widely recognized that the needs of American Indians, Black Americans, Spanish-Americans and other groups in need of assistance correctly receive a higher national priority than recipients of foreign assistance, but it must be clearly understood that these national and



international development goals are not mutually exclusive undertakings. They do not compete for funds only against each other; rather, their priority is established among all of the competing demands on the national budget.

#### NEW AID PROPOSALS

The Nixon Administration has indicated that it will soon send new authorizing legislation for foreign assistance to Congress to replace the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. The Administration will ask for the establishment of three new structures to formulate, administer, and coordinate economic assistance. Unlike the present Foreign Assistance Act, separate legislation will be presented for economic and military assistance, but the Administration will attempt to have all bills considered by the Senate Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs Committees. This latest series of changes in recommendations for foreign assistance is the outgrowth of reports prepared by several public and private commissions who have recently completed studies of foreign assistance.

This MCPL study identifies the most significant of these reports, surveys their basic recommendations, and examines some of the implications of those proposals for American foreign assistance efforts and for American foreign policy in the light of the experience of the past decade and the revolutionary requirements of the Second Development Decade.

It is significant to note that, although each report makes critical comments about the present aid program, each recommends the continuation of American foreign assistance efforts and a reversal of the downward trend in American foreign aid flows. The reports did not agree on a general level for aid spending; the most prominent among U.S. domestic studies, the Peterson Task Force report to the President, specifically refraining from adhering to the one percent of GNP spending level recommended by most development assistance economists and the United Nations.

The reports did agree on the desirability of increasing the flow of American foreign aid through multilateral channels and providing bilateral aid within a framework established by international organizations in consultation with recipient nations.

#### PEARSON REPORT

The most comprehensive of the recent series of aid studies is the product of a commission appointed by World Bank President Robert MacNamara, chaired by Lester Pearson of Canada and commonly referred to as the Pearson Commission. Entitled *Partners in Development*,<sup>1</sup> the report contains a series of specific recommendations and general policy guidelines for the consideration of aid donors and recipients. It is also a good, quick reference source for data on current status of the development assistance field.

The Pearson Commission recommended:

1. The removal of some obstacles to the exports of less developed nations and the promotion of greater stability of conditions for direct foreign investment in order to provide a basis for an equitable, productive framework for world trade beneficial to all nations.

2. The establishment of a goal for development assistance aimed at helping the developing countries reach a path of self-sustained growth at a level of six percent growth per annum. A volume of aid approximately equal to one percent of the GNP of the more developed nations will be necessary to meet this goal.

3. Redirection of technical assistance programs to meet the demonstrated needs of the less developed countries, especially in the areas of agriculture, education, and popula-

tion growth. Technical assistance also needs to be more carefully coordinated with capital assistance projects.

4. Strengthening the multilateral aid system through the use of international organizations as leaders in establishing the framework and channels for development assistance. The share of multilateral aid flow should be raised from its present level of ten percent to a minimum of twenty percent of the official flow by 1975.

#### JACKSON REPORT

An examination of the development capabilities of the United Nations System was undertaken by a commission chaired by Sir RGA Jackson.<sup>2</sup> The United Nations Development Program maintains its own aid activities in the form of pre-investment surveys and projects. It also attempts to coordinate the development activities of the specialized agencies of the United Nations (WHO, FAO, UNESCO, etc.). The UNDP could have an extremely useful, complementary relationship with the capital lending activities of the World Bank Group and with bilateral programs, but it has been relatively ineffective. The Jackson Report:

1—Explains the reasons for this ineffectiveness and recommends organizational changes designed to improve operational capability.

2—Examines the basic causes of the UNDP's problems in delivering effective, efficient development assistance beginning with project formulation itself. Projects are often more the result of salesmanship on the part of the Specialized Agencies than rational, coordinated calculations of development priorities and needs. Coordination problems in the field and within the UN budgetary and administrative system itself, plus the normal politics of an international organization exacerbate the difficulties.

3—States that, "The World Bank Group should be the chief arm of the UN system in the field of capital investment, while the UNDP should perform the same function for basic technical cooperation and pre-investment." The Commission proposed several basic modifications of the UNDP.

4—Suggests that, "the introduction of a programming method which would enable all inputs from the UN development system to be programmed comprehensively at one time in a program corresponding to the needs and duration of each country's national development plan." Implementation of such a suggestion would be inhibited by the sometimes conflicting interests of independent, sovereign Specialized Agencies, the political conditions of an international organization, the opinions of major donor governments and development priorities of member nations.

5—Recommended reforms which "should combine greater control at the center with maximum decentralization to the field level, where the authority of the Resident Representative should be greatly strengthened."

The UNDP is in the process of implementing some of the recommendations of the Jackson Commission. If the United States is to continue to increase its donations to multilateral organizations, UNDP reorganization efforts must be successful.

#### PETERSON REPORT

In response to an Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act, President Nixon appointed a Task Force to examine U.S. foreign economic and military assistance programs. Rudolph A. Peterson, President of the Bank of America, was chairman of the Task Force.<sup>3</sup>

The report of the Peterson Commission has provided the basis upon which the Adminis-

<sup>2</sup> RGA Jackson. *A Study of the Capacity of the United Nations Development System*. Two volumes. United Nations; Geneva, 1969.

<sup>3</sup> Rudolph A. Peterson. *U.S. Foreign Assistance in the 1970's: A New Approach*. Washington, D.C.; Government Printing Office, 1970.

tration has developed legislative proposals for the reorganization of American foreign assistance programs.

Task forces from the Department of State, AID and the National Security Council accepted the basic principles of the Peterson Commission recommendations and have almost completed the task of constructing organizational structures and operating directives to carry out the new aid programs.

The major recommendations of the Peterson Report are in consonance with the Pearson Report, Jackson Report, and most of the other public and private proposals concerning foreign assistance, with the notable exception of Peterson's reluctance to specify an aid target of one percent of GNP per year.

The Peterson Report affirms that:

1—The "U.S. has a profound national interest in cooperating with developing countries in their efforts to improve conditions of life in their societies."

2—The U.S. should not look for gratitude or votes, or any specific short-term foreign policy gains from our participation in international development. Nor should it expect to influence others to adopt U.S. cultural values or institutions. Neither can it assume that development will necessarily bring political stability. Development implies change—political and social, as well as economic—and such change for a time, may be disruptive.

Recognition of the burdens and limitations of bilateral aid diplomacy lays the ground for recommendations to increase the multilateral flow of the United States.

Each of the study groups and many public officials and private persons in the U.S. and the developing countries have advocated the increased use of multilateral channels for planning and administration of development assistance programs. Although there is a division of opinion about the degree to which the U.S. should give development assistance through the World Bank Group, the United Nations System and other international bodies, the Peterson Task Force recommended a new emphasis on multilateral assistance in which:

3—the developing countries stand at the center of international development efforts, establishing their own priorities and receiving assistance in relation to the efforts they are making on their own behalf;

4—the international lending institutions become the major channel for development assistance; and

5—U.S. bilateral assistance is provided largely within a framework set by the international organizations.

#### ADMINISTRATION PROPOSALS

The President will recommend a large increase in U.S. multilateral aid contributions with the World Bank Group and the Inter-American Development Bank receiving the bulk of the increase. It will be necessary for other developed nations to increase their donations through these channels or the United States will be contributing a disproportionate share of the budgets of the multilateral agencies.

To implement its recommendations, the Peterson Task Force proposed a new institutional structure for American foreign assistance consisting of two new agencies coordinated by a White House Council.

An International Development Corporation offering capital development loans and related technical assistance is one of the proposed structures. Capital loans are to be given within a framework established by the multilateral agencies in consultation with recipient nations.

The Administration will seek assured sources of financing for the Corporation, including authority to borrow in the public capital market. The IDC will have:

1—"A range of lending terms appropriate to the development requirements of each borrowing country."

<sup>1</sup> Lester B. Pearson. *Partners in Development*. New York, Praeger, 1969.

2—The Corporation, unlike AID, will not be a lender of last resort, but should seek more high-priority capital investments.

3—The IDC will have little field staff of its own, reminiscent of the Development Loan Fund operations, and will consequently have to rely on the World Bank Field missions.

The Peterson Report also called for the establishment of an International Development Institute, "to seek new breakthroughs in the application of science and technology to resources and processes critical to developing nations." The IDI would:

1—Be established on a long term basis and be designed to concentrate on research, training and population problems and social and civic development.

2—Have both a permanent staff of the Institute and private contractors who would undertake research, training and other technical assistance activities.

The Institute will need a field staff to keep the research and development personnel in touch with the realities of the needs of developing nations.

The Peterson Report also recommended that coordination of all foreign assistance agencies, IDC, IDI and OPIC, be carried out in an International Development Council.

1. The chairman of the Council would be an appointee of the President and would operate under the broad foreign policy guidance of the Secretary of State, as the Administrator of Aid does under the current structure.

2. A subcommittee of the newly established Council on International Economic Policy will coordinate aid with trade, investment, and foreign policy.

The final basic change advocated by the Peterson Task Force was the separation of military and economic assistance legislation. The debate over the merits of this proposal has been going on for some time. The administration of military assistance and military sales programs will remain in the Department of Defense, while the Department of State will continue to administer supporting assistance, but unlike the Foreign Assistance Act, the new programs will be presented in two separate authorization and appropriations bills.

#### SOME IMPLICATIONS OF REORGANIZATION PROPOSALS

The recommendations of the Peterson Commission create a series of issues which Congress will need to consider as it acts upon Administration proposals.

##### LEVEL OF SPENDING FOR FOREIGN AID

If aid budgets are reduced much more than the current levels, the organizational changes will make little difference and the viability of the institutions proposed by the Peterson Task Force would be questionable.

##### MULTILATERAL PARTICIPATION

The Administration proposals to shift a large portion of American aid contributions to international institutions have serious implications.

1—An international institution has, because of the sovereignty of its members, certain limitations on its activities. The Executive Directors of the World Bank and the Ambassadors to the United Nations are frequently in position to effectively object to activities which they consider to be interference in the internal affairs of their nation in violation of the Articles of Agreement of the World Bank or the Charter of the United Nations.

Recipient representatives would strenuously object to an international aid agency's attempts to demand fundamental changes in the social or economic conditions in their nation which could threaten the established government. Without overstating the case, it is not difficult to understand how an international agency could reinforce the *status quo* in recipient nations and become a conservative force in a revolutionary world.

On this point, the fundamental difference between a bilateral and multilateral agency is that the aid policy parameters on the bilateral donor are established by its own government's bargaining power, not by the government of the recipient.

Although, at present, the ability and willingness of some bilateral donors to foster fundamental change in recipient nations may not be as great as the World Bank's, it is necessary to carefully consider the implications of international organizations becoming the predominant conduit for foreign assistance flows.

2—An increased flow of financial resources through the World Bank Group will change those institutions. The staff will have to be increased, a measure which may affect its quality, and important decisions about projects and programs will shift to lower levels of responsibility. Informed observers disagree about the effects of these changes on the performance of the Bank.

3—As the Bank becomes the leading, and most visible, lender, with more of its personnel in the field, it may well become the object of some of the unfavorable attention formerly reserved for U.S. AID. Its personnel will be in the position of making sometimes unpopular recommendations and demands on government officials in the less developed countries.

Given the voting structure of the Bank, the nationality of its presidents and other personnel, and its physical location, an increase in the American contributions could foster the belief that the Bank was another quasi-American organization. For this reason, and because Congress has been understandably reluctant to allow the United States to pay an unfairly disproportionate share of international organizations' budgets, the willingness of the other donor nations to increase their bank flows becomes critical to the success of the Administration's proposals and the continued success of the World Bank Group.

4—As the Bank becomes a principal conduit for American aid its operations will inevitably come under much more careful Congressional scrutiny. Politically questionable or financially risky projects, bad loans, scandals and misuse of funds will provoke Congressional criticism formerly reserved for AID.

5—Congress has always been concerned with its responsibility to account for the use of funds appropriated for foreign assistance. When funds are given to international organizations, the ability to check on the use of the money will be severely curtailed. There may be some question about the willingness of the Congress to consistently appropriate funds for which inadequate end-use checking is available.

6—One other characteristic of some international institutions is the tendency for members to participate in logrolling exercises during the consideration of funding for development projects. Although this phenomenon is not confined to international political bodies, bilateral programs are not as susceptible to the particular distortions of development priorities.

7—Finally, the level of professional competence among the staff of development institutions varies greatly. The World Bank Group has a fine, professional staff, but some of the other younger regional institutions have not yet come up to the high standards demanded of professionals in the complex field of development finance and economic planning.

##### COORDINATION

Sophisticated observers of the development process have expressed grave reservations about the coordination problems which may be created by the disestablishment of a unified U.S. agency and its replacement with multiple structures. Coordination in the formulation and execution of development

programs is of paramount importance if scarce resources, human and financial, are not to be wasted.

1—Technical and capital assistance must be carefully coordinated with investment and trade policy. In this new structure, different agencies will have jurisdiction over these parts of the whole foreign assistance system. They will have to be coordinated, whether it be through a specified structure or a series of *ad hoc* arrangements and informal procedures worked out by operating personnel.

2—It will be incumbent upon the Congress to determine, in as much detail as possible, exactly how the new agencies will coordinate their operational research, and political activities with each other and with other agencies involved in the formation and conduct of American foreign relations. The crucial role of the Treasury, which has had a virtual veto over foreign aid expenditures, should be especially noted.

##### SEPARATION OF MILITARY AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Some Congressional leaders believe that economic assistance would have serious difficulty politically if it is separated from the military assistance programs; however, others argue that the recent criticisms of defense policies result in the political climate changing so as to favor a separate economic assistance proposal.

##### LONG-TERM AUTHORIZATION

Proposals for long-term, as opposed to yearly authorizations, for the International Development Institute and the International Development Corporation could provoke adverse Congressional reactions. It is argued by some that multi-year funding denies to the Congress sufficient opportunity to perform effectively its oversight functions. On the other hand, it has been suggested that a long-term authorization will improve the ability of the Congress to examine and influence the operations and policies of the foreign assistance agencies.

##### SUMMARY

In short, some of the most important points for the consideration of Congress are: (1) the level of spending for foreign assistance and the quality of flows from the United States; (2) the problems of coordination raised by the establishment of three agencies to administer aid programs currently undertaken by AID; (3) the implications of the changes resulting from increased multilateral contributions; (4) the possibility that separation of military and development assistance will jeopardize development assistance legislation; and (5) the effect of multi-year authorizations on Congressional oversight functions.

The Development Committee of the Members of Congress for Peace Through Law hopes that each member carefully evaluates the role of American foreign aid for the Second Development Decade and examines the effects of the Administration's foreign aid recommendations in the light of that evaluation. Foreign assistance, like many aspects of foreign affairs, does not have a large, interested voting constituency, it does not consume a substantial portion of the national budget; but foreign assistance can be a vital part of American efforts to secure a more stable, prosperous future for all peoples. It is imperative that the very real national interests that are served by an effective program of foreign assistance be conveyed to the American people. This will require the abandonment of the false rationale and short-sighted political pronouncements that have characterized the avowed purpose of U.S. foreign assistance in the past, and replacement by a new era of enlightened educational initiatives, more effective mobilization of concerned constituencies and above all, more courageous leadership on this vital matter from both the Executive and Legislative branches of our government.



INSTITUTIONS OF DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE: BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL

Purpose	1972 budget estimate (millions)	Legal authority	Committee jurisdiction
<b>U.S. agencies:</b>			
International Development Corporation <sup>1</sup> .....	Concessional loans to Idc's in which United States has long-term interest.	\$655.0 Pending.....	HCFA/SCFR.
International Development Institute <sup>1</sup> .....	Technical assistance, research and development for application to Idc's.	397.0 do.....	HCFA/SCFR.
Inter-American Social Development Institute.....	Promote social and civic development through nonprofit organizations.	7.2 Foreign Assistance Act.....	HCFA/SCFR.
Food for Peace.....	Promote U.S. agricultural exports, humanitarian relief, some development activities.	962.0 Agricultural Trade and Development Act of 1954.	Agriculture.
Export-Import Bank.....	Export promotion by financing and guarantees.....	290.0 Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.....	Banking and Currency.
Overseas Private Investment Corporation.....	Investment guarantees and feasibility studies for American investment in Idc's.	Foreign Assistance Act of 1969.....	HCFA/SCFR.
International Development Council.....	Coordinate and promote development programs.....	71.0 Pending.....	HCFA/SCFR.
Peace Corps.....	Technical assistance, manpower for Idc's.....	Peace Corps Act of 1961.....	HCFA/SCFR.
<b>Multilateral agencies:</b>			
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.....	Capital development loans.....	<sup>2</sup> (246.0) Bretton Woods Act, Articles of Agreement.	Banking and Currency/SCFR.
International Finance Corporation.....	Encourage growth of productive private enterprise—loans, participations.	International Finance Corporation Act of 1955.	Do.
International Development Association.....	Promote economic development by providing loans on easier terms than market or IBRD.	320.0 International Development Association Act of 1960.	Do.
Inter-American Development Bank Social Progress Trust Fund.....	Promote economic development in Latin American members with loans.	<sup>2</sup> (500.0) Inter-American Development Bank Act of 1959.	Do.
Asian Development Bank.....	Promote economic development in Asia with loans.....	40.0 Asian Development Bank Act of 1966.....	Do.
United Nations development program.....	Coordinate United Nations and specialized agency technical assistance operations and operate its own programs.	100.0 Foreign Assistance Act.....	HCFA/SCFR.

<sup>1</sup> Alliance for Progress budget included.

<sup>2</sup> Capital subscription.

**THIRTY-TWO MEMBERS COSPONSOR BILL TO BAN SPORTS FROM CLOSED-CIRCUIT TELEVISION**

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

Mr. ASPIN, Mr. Speaker, on April 2, a bipartisan group of 19 Congressmen joined me in cosponsoring the ban sports from closed-circuit television bill (H.R. 6718). Today, I am pleased to resubmit this legislation with 11 additional cosponsors, thus bringing the total in the House to 32 cosponsors.

This legislation would prohibit the production of sports over closed-circuit television whenever a sports event is of sufficient public interest for a TV station or network to want to broadcast the event. This ban would apply to all sports events of general interest, not just to "championship" events. Senator STEVENSON has introduced similar legislation in the Senate.

A list of the 32 House cosponsors follows:

- Representative Bella Abzug of New York.
- Representative Joseph Addabbo of New York.
- Representative Les Aspin of Wisconsin.
- Representative Herman Badillo of New York.
- Representative Shirley Chisholm of New York.
- Representative John H. Dent of Pennsylvania.
- Representative William Jennings Bryan Dorn of South Carolina.
- Representative Thomas N. Downing of Virginia.
- Representative Don Edwards of California.
- Representative O. C. Fisher of Texas.
- Representative William Ford of Michigan.
- Representative James Fulton of Tennessee.
- Representative Ella T. Grasso of Connecticut.
- Representative Seymour Halpern of New York.
- Representative Lee Hamilton of Indiana.
- Representative Michael Harrington of Massachusetts.
- Representative Wayne L. Hays of Ohio.
- Representative W. R. Hull, Jr. of Missouri.
- Representative Robert L. Leggett of California.

Representative G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery of Mississippi.

Representative F. Bradford Morse of Massachusetts.

Representative John E. Moss of California.

Representative Edward J. Patten of New Jersey.

Representative Jerry L. Pettis of California.

Representative Roman C. Pucinski of Illinois.

Representative Benjamin S. Rosenthal of New York.

Representative William R. Roy of Kansas.

Representative Fernand J. St Germain of Rhode Island.

Representative Louis Stokes of Ohio.

Representative Guy Vander Jagt of Michigan.

Representative Victor V. Veysey of California.

Representative John M. Zwach of Minnesota.

The bill has been referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Subcommittee on Communication, whose distinguished chairman is Representative MACDONALD of Massachusetts. While it is clear that the chairman's views concerning sports on closed-circuit television are quite different from my own, I applaud Mr. MACDONALD for recognizing the public and congressional interest in this issue, and for contributing to a dialog on it in a speech he gave in Memphis to the Southern CATV Association regional conversion on April 13.

The Washington Post article on Chairman MACDONALD's speech follows:

**CLOSED CIRCUIT BAR RAPPED**

(By Dave Brady)

Rep. Torbert H. Macdonald (D-Mass.) said yesterday in Memphis he saw no reason for Congress to bar sports events on closed circuit television because the Joe Frazier-Muhammad Ali fight turned out to be "very profitable" for the promoters.

The chairman of the House subcommittee on communications addressed the Southern CATV (community antenna television) Association regional convention and the speech was made available in Washington.

Macdonald said reaction by the media to the fight promotion "engendered more emotion than reason."

He continued, "I myself look upon the promoters as enterprising individuals who took

a calculated risk in investing their money and who, from all indications, will make money in return.

"I see no cause for panic that closed circuit television will result in robbing the American public of the opportunity to see on so-called free television such important sports events as the Super Bowl and the World Series."

Macdonald recalled that, at hearings conducted by his subcommittee, baseball commissioner Bowie Kuhn and football commissioner Pete Rozelle assured the subcommittee they had no intention of turning those events into "studio sports."

The congressman reminded his audience in Memphis: "You should bear in mind that before heavyweight boxing championship fights had begun to appear on closed circuit television, boxing as a sport had almost disappeared from (home, or free) television."

"I vividly remember that in the early days of television, boxing was one of the most popular sports shown on the TV screen. But boxing wasn't lured off television by big money—rather the advertising support for it disappeared."

Again, while I disagree with the distinguished chairman's statements I feel he has raised cogent and important arguments. Because of the public and congressional interest in the issue of sports events on closed-circuit TV, I am hopeful that Mr. MACDONALD will hold hearings on this subject so that the arguments and proposals concerning the use of closed-circuit TV for the production of sports events can be adequately and publicly aired.

**STRIP MINING**

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

Mr. SEIBERLING, Mr. Speaker, in the April issue of The Nation, Caudill, author of Night Comes to the Cumberland, and one of this Nation's foremost authorities on the history, problems and potential of his native Appalachian mountains, writes about strip mining.

Caudill describes strip mining as "a land use that threatens to devour the

continent in a single-benefit operation. Before most urbanized Americans are aware of what is happening, the land on which they depend may have been ruined past technology's capacity to restore it."

I commend Mr. Caudill's article to my colleagues, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

#### STRIP MINING—COAST TO COAST

(By Harry M. Caudill)

Some developments in recent weeks inspire a faint hope that at last—at the eleventh hour—this mineral-rich country may save itself from virtual ruin at the hands of strip miners. America is so abundantly endowed with ores and fuels, world demand for them is so great, and earth-moving technology is so efficient that strip mining—until recently associated primarily with coal and Appalachia—has become a reality or an imminent prospect for every state and nearly all counties. An ecological nightmare of unimaginable dimensions suddenly looms everywhere.

Since 1950, according to Census Bureau figures, the nation's population has swollen by more than one-third. During that time the land area has not grown by a single inch. On the contrary, the amount of land available for crops, forests, recreation and other uses has been effectively and permanently diminished. Highways, housing developments, shopping centers and man-made lakes are insatiable consumers of land, but they have the virtue of being continuously useful to large numbers of people. However, strip mining is a land use that threatens to devour the continent in a single-benefit operation. Before most urbanized Americans are aware of what is happening, the land on which they depend may have been ruined past technology's capacity to restore it.

From coast to coast the United States is marvelously blessed—or cursed—with valuable stones, clays, ores and solid fuels. Beneath the ancient and varied forests of Appalachia are gigantic coal beds, vast ledges of limestone and silica sand, iron ore, clays, marble, granite and such seldom mentioned substances as gneiss, grahamite and gibbsite. In Florida there are huge beds of phosphate. Georgia has kaolin and Texas and Wisconsin have iron fields. Coal is abundant across the Great Plains in West Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Iowa and Kansas. It strates the hills of Colorado, alongside immense deposits of oil shale. Low-grade coal and lignite are found under hundreds of thousands of acres in Arizona, Utah and the Dakotas. California and Nevada boast of gold and silver; Arizona has copper. And nearly everywhere, sand and gravel can be scooped up for an endless variety of construction projects.

In short, something mineable can be found practically anywhere, and the pressure on natural resources is so great in our highly industrialized society that all of them are practically certain to be mined. These facts are of the gravest consequence to the nation.

The cheapest way to obtain solid-state minerals from the land is by strip mining. This revolution in the technology of earth moving has swept the world in the last two decades. A combination of nitrate fertilizer and diesel oil makes a cheap and potent substitute for dynamite. Some bulldozers now plow into the soil with blades 7 feet high, and near Cumberland, Ohio, a supercolossus looms over a devastated county like an all-consuming titan. It is "Big Muskie," the planet's largest earth-moving machine, with a boom 310 feet long and a bucket that lifts 325 tons at a gulp. Not far away in the same state slightly smaller machines, "The Gem of Egypt" and "The Silver Spade," work their way through wooded hills as easily as a hungry man devours a steak and potatoes.

In stripping, the overlying strata of soil and rock—and their flora and fauna—are

blasted and shoved aside to expose the mineral. It is then loosened by explosions, lifted into trucks and hauled away. The effect on the ecology has been widely documented, but remains indescribable.

For example, in mountainous eastern Kentucky much stripping has been done for coal. A 1955-59 study by state and federal agencies compared two adjacent watersheds. The valley that remained in timber yielded 27.9 tons of silt per square mile annually. The other, which had been "disturbed" by strip mining, flooded its silt basins with 30,000 tons of acid-reddened mud from each square mile!

In 1967 the Interior Department sent to Congress its little noted study, "Surface Mining and Our Environment." It reflected conditions as of January 1, 1965, when 3.2 million acres had already been surface mined. Hawaii claimed only 10 acres of stripped soil; at the other end of the scale, Pennsylvania reported a massive 370,202 acres. Coal and lignite accounted for 40 per cent of the total. An area equal to that of Connecticut had been devastated.

Congress disregarded the report and the last five years have seen an unprecedented mining boom. Today the equivalent of two Connecticut lies as maimed as Flanders in 1917.

Half the states have no compulsory laws for reclaiming the land after the strippers have finished with it, and no state enactment approaches the strict, no-nonsense requirements of Germany and Great Britain. In such ravaged states as Kentucky, Tennessee, West Virginia and Ohio, enforcement is a farce in which the industries generally select the reclamation officers.

Surface mining kills every living plant and drives out, initially at least, all wild life. It pollutes water and permanently degrades it. Most important, perhaps, it produces unnering ugliness.

Any serious national commitment to save our deteriorating environment would treat surface mining as an exceedingly grave problem. It would outlaw stripping where prompt and complete restoration of the land to its original and natural purpose cannot be achieved. It would require an industry to restore completely lands it is permitted to tear up, and would impose a severance tax on future mining to finance reclamation of America's ghastly backlog of plundered acreage.

The word that best fits the climate of West Virginia is "benign." Its mixed mesophytic forests have embraced and sheltered nearly all plant forms that the ancient ice shields pushed down from the north. Its 2,000 varieties of flowering plants make it a botanical wonderland without parallel anywhere outside the tropics. But all this profuse, interwoven and indescribably old web of life has been for twenty years under a brutal assault by corporations digging fuel for domestic and foreign electric power plants and steel mills, and for hundreds of chemical byproducts. The very life of the state is threatened by industrial processes that leave its splendid land as dead and piteous as the bloody carcass of a flayed lion.

West Virginia is fortunate, though, in that it has been adopted by two remarkable men whom voters have had the good sense to elect to public office. John D. Rockefeller IV—"Jay" to West Virginians—came to the state as a VISTA worker when Lyndon Johnson was building the Great Society. He stayed to serve a term in the state legislature and is now Secretary of State in the dingy capitol at Charleston. Unless his latest undertaking brings him to grief, this scion of New York's wealthiest family is likely to be elected governor as a Democrat in next year's election.

What he is attempting requires a breathtaking boldness. He has endorsed Sen. St. Galperin's bill to outlaw strip mining in the state "completely and forever," and has set off a political earthquake in the process.

The bill challenges the state's vast absentee mining interests head-on in an "us-or-them" battle. Most West Virginians undoubtedly support the Rockefeller faction, but they are divided and generally inexperienced, whereas their opponents are tightly organized, unbelievably well heeled, ruthless and resourceful.

The first tactic of the mining cabal was to flood Charleston with lobbyists toting heavy satchels, and with hundreds of people who claim to make their living by strip mining. The strippers said that their activities employ 6,700 persons who support an additional 16,300 women and children. As the "abolitionists" promptly pointed out, these figures show the tiny stake West Virginians have in the industry that is wrecking their state. Even if the statistics are correct, only 1 per cent of the people derive economic benefits from stripping. Actually, if Galperin's bill becomes law, new deep mines will promptly provide employment for many times as many men—men now on welfare and food-stamp rolls. For another generation or so, Appalachian coal is an economic imperative which will have to be mined by other means if strip mining is banned as ecologically unacceptable.

The state's other good angel is its Congressman from the Fourth District, Ken Hechler, another New Yorker and a one-time college professor turned politician. Hechler brings a formidable background of achievement to the service of his constituency. In 1969 he fought through a reluctant Congress a stringent—but as yet unenforced—new federal mine safety bill. On February 18 he dropped into the legislative hopper a bill bearing the names of twenty-nine co-sponsors and designed to outlaw strip mining for coal totally and everywhere in the United States.

These bills will probably be crushed between the wheels of public apathy and industry alarm. In fact these two able and dedicated men may find themselves driven from public life by sustained, lavishly financed campaigns. In any event, their efforts provide some measure of the despair that grips intelligent people when they comprehend the immensity of the destruction being visited on their native soil.

The Nixon Administration has made some gestures toward control over this runaway industry, but they are so gutless as to inspire no fear among strippers and little support from conservationists. Amid an almost limitless outpouring of rhetoric concerning our deteriorating environment, the most serious of all such problems has been largely ignored. Now the true scope of our national peril is recognized by growing numbers of people in and out of office who are willing to lay everything on the line in a struggle for survival. They see, clearly and with horror, that our present methods of obtaining minerals is incompatible with timber growing, wildlife, farming, potable water, natural beauty, and continued human occupancy of mined areas. That a third of our coal, to name but one mineral, is extracted by this ruinous practice outlines the magnitude of our reliance upon it. But does a high standard of living built by such means represent progress in any real sense?

Ken Hechler's colleague, freshman Ohio Rep. John Seiberling answered the question this way: "The Romans created a desert and called it peace. We create a desert and call it progress." The desert Mr. Seiberling referred to is the only land Americans will ever have.

#### CAMPING RIGHTS FOR ANTIWAR VETERANS

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



Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply distressed to hear of Chief Justice Warren E. Burger's decision to ban anti-war veterans from camping in the Mall during their week of protest against the war in Southeast Asia. I was disturbed to know that his action was taken in response to an emergency petition from the Justice Department.

How can the executive and judicial branches of our Government turn their backs on these young men who have fought valiantly in a war we now agree was a tragic mistake, but a war which is, nevertheless, our national policy in Southeast Asia? This I cannot answer. The action makes clear, however, that defense of the legitimate right of these veterans to express their opinions on the war which they know from the inside, is left up to the Congress.

These are our boys. They are veterans whom we laud with praise for their courage and patriotism. They are trying to tell us something about the war which we, sitting in our plush offices, do not know. Many of them have returned without limbs. All have been shaken by the hideous experience of combat. Do we want to shake their remaining faith in our Nation and our system? I fervently hope not.

All that the veterans are asking in return for their service to their country is to camp on the Mall and to be heard by their elected representatives. We have responsibility to listen to them although it may make us question our national priorities. We have an ultimate responsibility to stand by them whether or not we share their views.

I therefore urge my distinguished colleagues to voice their concern for the reversal of the U.S. Court of Appeals ruling which permits the veterans to camp on the Mall and to support, in every way possible, their right of free expression.

APRIL 20, 1971.

HON. WARREN EARL BURGER,  
Chief Justice of the United States, Supreme Court, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly object to reversal of U.S. Court of Appeals ruling which permits veterans to camp in Mall. Urge that Supreme Court favorably reconsider this action. We and other colleagues will join the veterans on the Mall at 4:30 p.m. in protest. If Supreme Court refuses to modify your order, we are prepared to open our offices as sleeping quarters for these patriotic young men who served their country well and now ask only to be heard.

Congressman Don Edwards is organizing the effort to convert Congressional offices into sleeping quarters for the veterans.

PARREN J. MITCHELL, M.C.  
DON EDWARDS, M.C.

#### COLUMBUS DAY ESSAY WINNERS

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, recently the south Florida area was honored, as three young people received distinguished awards for their essays on Columbus Day. The National Columbus Day Committee sponsored the contest which was conducted in the Archdiocese of Miami. The recipients of these awards were: Paul Edwards and Arthur Proulx of St. John Vianney Minor Seminary

and Eleanor Fournasier of Madonna Academy. These three young adults have, through their well written essays, described facets of Christopher Columbus that are very worthy of our attention. Once again our youth has afforded us an opportunity to view an important event in the history of this great country of ours through their eyes. We must listen to and recognize this view and so Mr. Speaker, I insert these three essays, as well as the attached article from the Voice, a Miami paper in the RECORD:

#### SEMINARIANS AMONG ESSAY WINNERS

Two St. John Vianney Seminary students and a senior at Madonna Academy in Hollywood are the winners in a pilot essay contest conducted in the Archdiocese of Miami by the National Columbus Day Committee.

A \$100 U.S. Savings Bond was awarded to Arthur Proulx, 11th grade seminary student who is a son of Mrs. Florence Proulx, Bradenton, and is studying for the priesthood of the Diocese of St. Petersburg.

Eleanor Fournasier, a niece of Mr. and Mrs. M. Suarez, North Miami, was the second winner and the recipient of a \$50 U.S. Savings Bond.

Paul Edwards, Archdiocese of Miami seminarian, and son of Mrs. Geraldine Finlen, Hialeah, received the third prize of a \$25 U.S. Savings Bond.

Awards were presented during a dinner last Saturday evening at the Columbus Hotel by Mariano Lucca, national chairman of the National Columbus Day Committee.

Conducted this year in the secondary schools of the Archdiocese of Miami under the sponsorship of the Catholic Teachers' Guild, the contest will be inaugurated on a nationwide basis next year with a \$2,000 scholarship provided for the winner.

In his essay on Christopher Columbus, Proulx described Columbus as "true man of God," and as a perfect example of "one who placed his entire fate in the Almighty's hands."

"When Columbus set sail he hadn't the slightest notion of what unknown dangers he would encounter. His only assurance was that his God, to whom he was so devoted, would be with him even to death."

#### CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS

(By Arthur Proulx, Saint John Vianney Minor Seminary, Miami, Fla., first award)

Christopher Columbus has been a true inspiration for all men of adventurous spirit, since his fateful discovery five hundred years ago. This unique man will always be a symbol of adventure, courage, and devotion to God for all generations.

Columbus was a true man of God. He is a perfect example of one who placed his entire fate in the Almighty's hands. When Columbus set sail he hadn't the slightest notion of what unknown dangers he would encounter. His only assurance was that his God, to whom he was so devoted, would be with him even to death.

He has been described as a dynamic leader of men. When his crew became terrified of continuing the voyage, Columbus encouraged them. He managed to convince the crew that if they kept sailing they would reach land in a few days. A poor leader would not have been able to persuade a frightened group of sailors into continuing a voyage that seemed hopeless. His crew trusted his good judgment; if they had not, mutiny would have been easy.

He was an adventurous man. He left his family and friends to seek a new route to the East. He realized that he might never return, yet something in him told him that he must go.

It was this spirit of courage, adventure, and love for God that led Columbus into discovering a New World. By his inspiration

others will be encouraged to discover new horizons, and thereby benefit all mankind.

#### CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS—THE GREAT EXPLORER

(By Eleanor Fournasier, Madonna Academy, second award)

The year 1492 will certainly be remembered by everyone who gives any thought to history. The discovery of the New World by Christopher Columbus marks a milestone in the record of man's existence on the earth, yet it was accomplished by a simple Italian seaman who had comparatively little knowledge in astronomy and geometry. Many of Columbus' qualities show that he was an outstanding historical figure.

At a time when most everyone thought that the earth was flat, and that the sun and the moon revolved around it, Columbus reasoned that the earth was a sphere which revolved around the sun. He had the mind of the true scientist who refused to believe in accepted myths, but through the proven processes of investigation with scientific facts and experiments comes to a conclusion, and sets out to prove it, often risking his own life. As often happens with a man who has an original idea, Columbus was greatly ridiculed, and called a madman.

But Columbus was more than just scientific-minded. He was also a practical man. At this time some European countries were engaged in lucrative trade with the Orient. Many problems existed. The land caravans suffered great losses from bandits and hostile tribes, while the sea routes around the Cape of Good Hope were too long and perilous.

Columbus had a simple solution. If the world was round, then by sailing westward, he could reach the East. With this practical theory, he proposed to make his country the richest in the world.

Finding no support from his native land, he ventured to Spain where Queen Isabella supplied him with all that he needed for his eventful voyage. So again, like so many of history's great men, Columbus found support from a nation other than his own.

Columbus possessed all the qualities which make a truly great employer—courage, perseverance, initiative, and courage to support his beliefs in the face of ridicule.

There never will be an explorer quite like Christopher Columbus. It is true that the twentieth century space explorers are courageous men, but these men go into space with their vast resource of knowledge and precise instruments. Columbus, however, displayed true daring because he ventured into the sea with no idea of what lay ahead, and accomplished much more than he ever expected. His discovery of the New World in 1492 was a definite turning point in the history of western civilization.

#### THE PRAYER OF COLUMBUS

(By Paul E. Edwards, Saint John Vianney Minor Seminary, Miami, Fla., third award)

It would seem that Columbus composed this poetic prayer on his fourth journey. At that time, Columbus and his crew were forced to land at Jamaica. His ships were leaking badly from teredos (shipworms). The waterlogged Capitana and Santiago were beached at Saint Ann's Day on June 25. There Columbus spent twelve months.

Columbus' prayer can be likened to the hundred and first Psalm of David. In Psalm 101, David cries out to God in his anguish and affliction. As David, Columbus recounts his life and good deeds and pours out his lamentations. Like David, he praises God for His Kindness and faithfulness to him.

From reading this prayer, I am of the opinion that Columbus was a deeply religious person. He speaks of "the prayers and vigils of my youth, and solemn and visionary meditations of manhood, and the vows I have ratified and strictly kept."

Columbus is getting old. He is constantly

being threatened with mutiny. Governor Ovando is refusing to send help from Hispanola because he fears that Columbus will try to depose him as governor. He is also in great need of food for his men.

Columbus, heavily laden as was David, approaches God and seeks consolation in prayer. He is unable to rest or sleep or eat or drink until he comes to God in prayer. He feels the need to bathe himself in communion with God.

At last, after throwing himself on God, he seems to find rest and peace of soul.

### THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

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

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, this week the General Subcommittee on Education is holding hearings on a bill to assure that needy children will continue to receive free or reduced price lunches for the rest of this school year.

I introduced that bill, H.R. 5257, because of the commitment Congress made last year to feeding needy children in Public Law 91-248, the Child Nutrition Amendments of 1970. That law, which passed both Houses of Congress unanimously, requires that every school district participating in the school lunch or commodity distribution program must provide free or reduced-price lunches for every needy schoolchild. After signing that bill into public law, President Nixon requested, and the Congress granted, a supplement appropriation of \$209 million to reimburse school districts for the additional costs of providing these lunches. That law and the subsequent appropriation are truly a milestone in our efforts to eradicate hunger and malnutrition among our children.

Within the past year most States and school districts have expeditiously moved to fulfill the congressional mandate to provide these meals. In fact, today almost 2 million more needy children are being fed free or reduced-price school lunches than during the last school year. Although this figure does not represent a total compliance with the congressional mandate, it does demonstrate the honest effort being made to meet the requirements of the law.

But we are discovering now that this great progress is in serious jeopardy. The States and school districts increased their number of free and reduced-price lunches as a direct response to the congressional mandate and in a reasonable reliance upon the action of Congress which provided increased funds to meet the additional costs. Now, however, we are learning that our supplemental appropriation is not adequate to meet the increased expense of providing these meals.

This appropriation was based upon an estimate by the administration that there was a total of 6.6 million school-children in the country in need of these free or reduced-price meals. This figure has now been admitted to be a great underestimate by the Department of Agriculture. In testimony before my committee this week, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Richard Lyng, admitted that there were at least a million

and a half more needy children this year than had previously been estimated and that this number would be even greater next year.

My own studies have confirmed this fact. Last June I conducted an extensive survey of the 50 State directors of school lunch on the number of eligible needy children and on the number of these children served free or reduced price lunches. The results of this survey are that there were 8.9 million needy children and only 5.2 million of them were receiving free or reduced price lunches. This figure of 8.9 million needy children becomes even more staggering when we realize that in my survey the State directors were using an income standard which was lower than that subsequently set by the Department of Agriculture as the need index and that the survey did not include the number of eligible needy children in private nonprofit schools in 25 States.

This miscalculation on the number of needy children is having disastrous effects in the States. California claims that unless it receives an additional \$5 million it will have to discontinue its program on May 1. Florida needs an additional \$1.4 million to pay local school districts for costs which they have already incurred. Massachusetts needs \$1,551,000. Georgia needs \$416,575 to keep its program in operation. If New Mexico does not receive \$1.2 million more, all of its school lunch programs will be terminated immediately.

For the past week the committee has been receiving telegrams from State officials describing their plight. This is why the General Subcommittee on Education began hearings this week on H.R. 5257. That bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to use up to \$150 million from section 32 funds to pay States for their additional expenses in providing free and reduced price lunches during this fiscal year. In other words, if this bill is passed, the Secretary would have standby authority—which would be used at his discretion—to avert the financial crisis which is developing in the States today because of inadequate funding.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the passage of H.R. 5257 is essential if Congress and the President are to fulfill the commitment embodied in Public Law 91-248 that no schoolchild would be denied a lunch because of poverty. We can do no less than that.

With unanimous consent I insert at this point in the RECORD some of the telegrams and letters the committee has been receiving for the past week. I also ask consent to insert a chart from the Department of Agriculture showing an unused balance of almost \$300,000 in section 32 funds this year:

BOSTON, MASS., April 10, 1971.

Representative ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
Chairman, General Education Subcommittee,  
Washington, D.C.

For fiscal year 1971 reapportionment purposes we will need total one million five hundred and 51 thousand 048.0 of section 32 to cover national school lunch and child nutrition programs.

JOHN C. STALKER,

Director, Bureau of Nutrition education and School Food Department of Education.

OLYMPIA, WASH., April 9, 1971.

Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
Chairman, General Education Subcommittee,  
House Education and Labor Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

Washington State Agency needs \$100,000 section 32 funds for fiscal year 1971 for foods service equipment.

EMMA SIMPSON,

Supervisor Food Services Department of Public Instruction.

ATLANTA, GA., April 13, 1971.

Congressman ROMAN PUCINSKI,  
Chairman, General Education Subcommittee,  
House Education and Labor Committee,  
Washington, D.C.:

Estimates base on latest data available indicate Georgia will need \$416,575.00 additional section 32 funds for fiscal year 1971.

MISS JOSEPHINE MARTIN,

Administrator, School Food Service Program.

APRIL 13, 1971

Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
Chairman, General Education Subcommittee,  
House Education and Labor Committee,  
Washington, D.C.:

Virgin Islands would need an additional sixty thousand dollars (\$60,000) in section 32 funds for fiscal year 1971.

JOHN STEVENS,

Director, School Lunch, U.S. Virgin Islands.

BALTIMORE, MD., Apr. 13, 1971.

Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
Chairman, General Education Subcommittee,  
House Education and Labor Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

We would like to request consideration for \$338,759 additional section 32 funds for fiscal year 1971 for the State of Maryland.

ELEANOR G. WEAGLY,

Coordinator for Food Services Programs.

SANTA FE, N. MEX., Apr. 14, 1971.

Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
Chairman, General Education Subcommittee,  
House Education and Labor Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

New Mexico school lunch funds section 4 and 32 are depleted, as of April 1, 1971. Funds needed for balance of current school year are \$1,244,000.

GRETCHEN Y. PLAGGE,

Director, School Food Service Division,  
State Department of Education.

MONTPELIER, VT., Apr. 14, 1971.

Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
General Education Subcommittee, House  
Education and Labor Committee, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

The Department of Education has indicated to USDA regional office in New York City a need for an additional \$12,000 in section 32 for fiscal year 1971.

EDWARD L. RYAN,

Chief, Education Field Services.

ALBANY, N.Y., Apr. 15, 1971.

Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
Chairman Education Subcommittee, House  
Education and Labor Committee, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

Increase in service of free lunches to needy children in New York State has created need for additional funds during remainder fiscal year 1971, nine million dollars in section 32 funds can be utilized by June 30 and are herewith requested.

CHARLES J. QUINN,

Director of Educational Finance.

SALEM, OREG., April 15, 1971.

Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
Chairman, General Education Subcommit-  
tee, House Education Labor Commit-  
tee, Washington, D.C.

Oregon school need increase financial help to meet greatly increase operating cost of



casioned by increase meal loads and rising prices for food and labor increased non-food assistant is also needed to equip schools adequately to handle the constantly increasing number of meals being served. Additional section 32 funds are needed for transfer to section four funds to permit a higher over all reimbursement to assist schools meet their rising cost and for transfer to nonfood assistance fund to up bring present inadequate facilities. As a minimum amount Oregon can justify a need of an additional \$703,000.00 of section 32 money.

RICHARDS S. MILLER,  
Coordinator School Food and Nutrition Service, Oregon Board of Education.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.,  
April 12, 1971.

Hon. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HAWKINS: The California PTA is extremely concerned about the deficit of over \$5 million in the California allocation for the School Lunch Program. This means that unless the needed funds are made available, the Breakfast Program will have to be discontinued as of April 1st, and the Special Assistance Program of free meals for needy pupils will have to be discontinued as of May 1st.

The California PTA has long been concerned about the nutritional needs of school children. We appreciate the extreme importance of the School Lunch Program, making it possible for every child in school to have a nutritionally balanced lunch and where indicated, a breakfast.

We ask your help in securing the needed funds for this valuable program.

Sincerely,  
Mrs. DOYLE HOFFMAN,  
President.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, April 9, 1971.  
Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
Chairman, General Education Subcommittee,  
House Education and Labor Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

Utah needs additional \$780,049 section 32 funds. We have excess funds breakfast \$90,000 special food service \$35,000 if transferred allowed for use within State reduce need to \$655,049 additional information follows.

CLUFF D. SNOW,  
Administrator School Food Service,  
Utah State Board of Education.

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY,  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
April 12, 1971.

Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
Chairman, General Education Subcommittee,  
House Education and Labor Committee,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The Kentucky Department of Education, Division of School Lunch, is in the process of submitting to USDA, Southeast Region, Atlanta, Georgia, a request for the transfer of Section 32 funds for Section 4 purposes. If approved, our total additional needs for Section 32 purposes will amount to \$100,000.

Sincerely,  
C. E. BEVINS, Director,  
Division of School Lunch.

STATE OF FLORIDA,  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,  
Tallahassee, April 9, 1971.

Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
Chairman, General Education Subcommittee,  
House Education and Labor Committee,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PUCINSKI: Florida's needs for additional Section 32 Funds, as reported to the U.S. Department of Agriculture today, for maintenance of current programs total \$1,409,307.

If further information is needed, let us know.

Sincerely,  
Mrs. THELMA G. FLANAGAN,  
Administrator, Food and Nutrition Serv-  
ices.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,  
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT  
OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,  
Springfield, April 13, 1971.

Congressman ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,  
Chairman, General Education Subcommittee,  
House Education and Labor Committee,  
Rayburn House Office Building, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We have just completed project-  
ing our need for additional funds to com-  
plete paying claims in the School Lunch  
Program for the fiscal year 1971. In Section  
32 we will need \$1,512,430.00 in additional  
monies to complete the year.

We will appreciate your assistance.  
Very truly yours,  
RAY SUDDARTH, Jr.,  
Director, School Food Services Unit.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

REMOVAL OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES, FISCAL YEARS 1969, 1970, AND 1971—OBLIGATIONS

[In thousands of dollars]

	1969	1970	1971 (estimated)		1969	1970	1971 (estimated)
(a) Carryover funds available at beginning of year.	300,000	299,921	300,000	Family feeding program:			
(1) Recovery of prior year obligations		130		Commodities distributed to families.	190,282	173,180	155,163
(b) Additional amount available based on 30 per- cent of customs revenue	596,646	698,463	728,760	Financial assistance to States for program operation	4,154	6,026	19,700
(c) Total amount available	896,646	998,514	1,028,760	Nutrition supplement to mothers and infants	8,067	13,667	16,136
(d) Amounts transferred or utilized:				Total, family feeding	202,503	192,873	190,999
Child nutrition programs:				Food distribution to institutions (com- modities)	11,747	9,577	1,466
Cash grants to States:				Food and nutrition aides	9,948	33	
School lunch program (sec. 4)		129,941	174,033	Export payments	4,810	5,336	4,966
Free and reduced price lunches	32,039	87,953	151,653	Operating expenses	6,871	7,186	7,224
School breakfasts	2,057	1,162	3,000	Marketing agreements and orders	2,277	2,576	3,084
Nonfood (equipment assist- ance)	9,513	6,715		Transfers to:			
State administrative expenses	391	1,257	2,000	Foreign Agricultural Service	3,117	3,117	3,117
Special milk program	102,048	20,000		Agricultural Research Service	15,000	15,000	15,000
Commodities to States	185,101	204,744	164,592	Department of Commerce (to pro- mote and develop fishery products)	7,413	7,636	7,626
Total, child nutrition	331,149	451,772	495,278	(e) Additional amounts to become available in fiscal year 1972 based on 30 percent of customs revenue (\$766,000,000).			

1 Includes sec. 32 transfer to sec. 6 of the National School Lunch Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of ab-  
sence was granted as follows to:

Mr. BROTZMAN (at the request of  
Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the remainder  
of the week, on account of official duties  
as a member of the Board of Visitors  
to the Air Force Academy.

Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr.  
GERALD R. FORD), for today, on account  
of illness.

Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. GERALD  
R. FORD), on account of official business.

Mr. PRICE of Texas (at the request of  
CXVII—706—Part 9

Mr. GERALD R. FORD) on account of of-  
ficial business.

Mr. NEDZI, on account of official busi-  
ness on April 22, 1971.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to  
address the House, following the legisla-  
tive program and any special orders here-  
tofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SCHMITZ (at the request of Mr.  
ASHBROOK), for 60 minutes, today, to re-  
vise and extend his remarks and include  
extraneous material.

Mr. BELL (at the request of Mr. Mc-  
KEVITT), for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the re-  
quest of Mr. MCKAY) to address the  
House and to revise and extend their re-  
marks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 15 minutes, to-  
day.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RARICK, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, for 5  
minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 15 minutes, on April  
22.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

- Mr. BENNETT in three instances.  
 Mr. BETTS and to include extraneous matter.  
 Mr. JONES of Alabama to revise and extend remarks made in Committee of the Whole.  
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. McKEVITT) and to include extraneous matter:)  
 Mr. HASTINGS.  
 Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania in five instances.  
 Mr. DUNCAN.  
 Mr. HALL.  
 Mr. SCHMITZ in three instances.  
 Mr. WYMAN in two instances.  
 Mr. THONE.  
 Mr. RIEGLE in two instances.  
 Mr. QUIE.  
 Mr. HUNT.  
 Mr. ESHLEMAN.  
 Mr. DELLENBACK.  
 Mr. BELL.  
 Mr. HUTCHINSON.  
 Mr. HOGAN in five instances.  
 Mr. BROTZMAN.  
 Mr. YOUNG of Florida in four instances.  
 Mr. KEMP.  
 Mr. CONTE.  
 Mr. DERWINSKI.  
 Mr. BUCHANAN.  
 Mr. BRAY in two instances.  
 Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia.  
 Mr. MCCOLLISTER in three instances.  
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. McKAY) and to include extraneous matter:)  
 Mr. MURPHY of New York in three instances.  
 Mr. EILBERG.  
 Mr. HARRINGTON in six instances.  
 Mr. CARNEY.  
 Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.  
 Mr. DENT in three instances.  
 Mr. SCHEUER in three instances.  
 Mr. STOKES in two instances.  
 Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.  
 Mr. PATMAN.  
 Mr. NEDZI in two instances.  
 Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey in three instances.  
 Mr. HÉBERT.  
 Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD.  
 Mr. JACOBS.  
 Mr. ICHORD in two instances.  
 Mr. PEPPER.  
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.  
 Mr. RODINO.  
 Mr. HAGAN in two instances.  
 Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.  
 Mr. DINGELL in two instances.  
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.  
 Mr. GARMATZ in three instances.  
 Mr. DIGGS in two instances.  
 Mr. PICKLE in six instances.  
 Mrs. GRASSO in five instances.  
 Mr. DOWNING in two instances.  
 Mr. MELCHER.  
 Mr. BEGICH.  
 Mr. EVINS of Tennessee in five instances.  
 Mr. JAMES V. STANTON in two instances.  
 Mr. TIERNAN in two instances.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McKAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 22, 1971, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

601. A communication from the President of the United States, proposing a supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 1971 for the Department of Labor to finance summer employment and recreation programs (H. Doc. No. 92-95); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

602. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on the operation of section 501 of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1970, establishing a limitation on budget outlays for fiscal year 1971 (H. Doc. No. 92-96); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

603. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

604. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, transmitting an annual report on the orderly liquidation of stocks of agricultural commodities held by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the expansion of markets for surplus agricultural commodities, pursuant to section 201 (b) of Public Law 540, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture.

605. A letter from the Acting Administrator of General Services, transmitting an amendment revising the authorized project for lease construction of a courthouse and office building at Shreveport, La., pursuant to 84 Stat. 1449; to the Committee on Appropriations.

606. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting his semiannual report for the 6 months ended December 31, 1970, pursuant to section 10(g) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

607. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Housing), transmitting notice of the location, nature, and estimated cost of various facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

608. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

609. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend laws relating to savings and loan associations, to broaden their mortgage credit powers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

610. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the public health and safety by reducing the risks of death, illness, and injury associated with the use of consumer products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

611. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1970; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

612. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Vyacheslav Pavlovich Artemlev and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

613. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Federal wage system for fixing and adjusting the pay of certain employees of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

614. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting a report on grants for basic scientific research made by the Department of Defense to non-profit institutions during 1970, pursuant to Public Law 85-934; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'NEILL: Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures. Report on campaign expenditures investigation (Rept. No. 92-137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1899. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria G. Orsini (nee Mari) (Rept. No. 92-138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1931. A bill for the relief of Jesus Manuel Cabral (Rept. No. 92-139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SEIBERLING: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1995. A bill for the relief of Miss Margaret Gale (Rept. No. 92-140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENNIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2117. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nguong Thai Tran (formerly Nguyen Thi Nguong, XXXXXX) with an amendment (Rept. No. 92-141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DENNIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3713. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Maria Baldini Dela Rosa (Rept. No. 92-142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BETTS:  
 H.R. 7577. A bill to amend section 3306 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLBORN (for himself and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 7578. A bill to authorize a White House Conference on Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FISH:  
 H.R. 7579. A bill to amend title II of the



Social Security Act to provide for standard-of-living increases in the benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7580. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$2,400 a year the amount of outside earnings a beneficiary may have without the loss of benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7581. A bill to amend chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code, to establish a survivor benefit plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 7582. A bill to amend section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit foreign assistance from being provided to foreign countries which do not act to prevent narcotic drugs from unlawfully entering the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 7583. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the survivorship reduction during periods of nonmarriage of certain annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7584. A bill to increase the contribution by the Federal Government to the costs of employees' group life and health benefits insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7585. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (for himself and Mrs. DWYER):

H.R. 7586. A bill to amend the act of December 30, 1969, establishing the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People, to authorize appropriations for 2 additional years; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 7587. A bill to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day at Fort Phoenix, Fairhaven, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAZZOLI:

H.R. 7588. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt from the overtime penalty any employee of a retail or service business who receives at least twice the minimum wage for all hours worked; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MONAGAN (for himself, Mr. McFALL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. CARTER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. REES, Mr. DENT, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. TIERNAN, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. ULLMAN):

H.R. 7589. A bill to establish a temporary Emergency Guidance Board to facilitate economic recovery with minimum inflation by establishing price and wage guidelines and encouraging voluntary adherence thereto; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 7590. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to gather and compile information with respect to the financial cost of assisting taxpayers to comply with the tax laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 7591. A bill to provide increases in certain annuities payable under chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7592. A bill to increase the contribution by the Federal Government to the costs of employees' group life and health benefits insurance; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7593. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the

survivorship reduction during periods of nonmarriage of certain annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REUSS (for himself, Mr. BARRET, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MNISH):

H.R. 7594. A bill to establish a program of assistance to State and metropolitan development agencies in order to promote the provision of low- and moderate-income housing and related facilities, sound neighborhood growth and development, and the development of new job opportunities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7595. A bill to bring into immediate operation the National Commission for the Review of Federal and State Laws Relating to Wiretapping and Electronic Surveillance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7596. A bill to establish a commission to conduct a study and investigation of ways and means of maintaining an adequate military Reserve force after transition to an all-volunteer system for meeting the military manpower needs of the Nation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 7597. A bill to create a National Agricultural Bargaining Board, to provide standards for the qualification of associations of producers, to define the mutual obligation of handlers and associations of producers to negotiate regarding agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 7598. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide a system for the redress of law enforcement officers' grievances and to establish a law enforcement officers' bill of rights in each of the several States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 7599. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish criteria for determining charges for physicians' services (or certain other medical services) which may be recognized as reasonable for purposes of payment under the medicare program, and to require the reporting and publication of such charges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 7600. A bill to amend section 3104 of title 38, United States Code, to permit certain service-connected disabled veterans who are retired members of the uniformed services to receive compensation concurrently with retired pay, without deduction from either; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7601. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount payable on burial and funeral expenses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7602. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that progressive muscular atrophy developing a 10 percent or more degree of disability within 7 years after separation from active service during a period of war shall be presumed to be service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7603. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, with respect to the manner of determining annual income for pension purposes of certain persons who are entitled to annuities under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7604. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates, income limitations, and aid and attendance allowances relating to payment of pension and parents' dependency and indemnity compensation; to exclude certain payments in determining annual income with respect

to such pension and compensation; to make the Mexican border period a period of war for the purposes of such title; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 7605. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on certain sueded leather gloves, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 7606. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a woman may simultaneously receive (without any reduction or offset) both an old-age or disability insurance benefit and a widow's insurance benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7607. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income any payments made under the retired serviceman's family protection plan by an individual who has waived his military retirement pay in order to receive a civil service retirement annuity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 7608. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to require that accurate medical records be kept with respect to each member of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 7609. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Gateway National Recreational Area in the States of New York and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 7610. A bill to eliminate certain authority of the Administrator of General Services with respect to trade and exchange of real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7611. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the purchase and construction of railroad rolling stock by persons other than common carriers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. ROE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. KYROS, Mr. COTTER, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. STORES, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, Mr. DENT, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, and Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey):

H.R. 7612. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 50-percent across-the-board increase in benefits thereunder, with the resulting benefit costs being borne equally by employers, employees, and the Federal Government, and to raise the amount of outside earnings which a beneficiary may have without suffering deductions from his benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRON:

H.R. 7613. A bill to provide for the expansion of the Antietam National Battlefield in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7614. A bill to amend titles 5, 10, and 32, United States Code, to authorize the waiver of claims of the United States arising out of certain erroneous payments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 7615. A bill to provide for the creation of an authority to be known as the Reclamation Lands Authority to carry out the congressional intent respecting the excess land provisions of the Federal Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 7616. A bill to amend section 715 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize the

application of local law in determining the effect of contributory negligence on claims involving members of the National Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 7617. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 7618. A bill to provide for the abatement of air pollution by the control of emissions from motor vehicles; preconstruction certification of stationary sources; more stringent State standards covering vehicular emissions, fuel additives and aircraft fuels; emergency injunctive powers; and public disclosure of pollutants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7619. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by providing for the orderly regulation of dumping in the ocean, coastal, and other waters of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 7620. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7621. A bill to extend to all unmarried individuals the full tax benefits of income splitting now enjoyed by married individuals filing joint returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7622. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in relation to expenses for care of certain dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 7623. A bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to prevent the imposition thereunder of any prohibition on the importation into the United States of any strategic and critical material from any free world country for so long as the importation of like material from any Communist country is not prohibited by law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HANLEY (for himself, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. DICKINSON, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. GRAY, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. PODELL, and Mr. HELSTOSKI):

H.R. 7624. A bill to provide for an equitable procedure for establishing congressional districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 7625. A bill to adjust the pay of the police forces at Washington and Dulles Airports; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7626. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, relating to qualifications for appointment and retention in the civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 7627. A bill to provide for the protection of the pensions and other benefits of coal miners working in the coal mines of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 7628. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 20 to 10 years the length of time a divorced woman's marriage to an insured individual must have lasted in order for her to qualify for wife's or widow's benefits on his wage record; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINK:

H.R. 7629. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 in order to improve and make more effective

certain programs pursuant to such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 7630. A bill to terminate the Airlines Mutual Aid Agreement; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NIX (for himself, Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. MIKVA, and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 7631. A bill making an appropriation to provide support for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer support program for the summer of 1971; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 7632. A bill to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7633. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage rate required under that act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETTIS (for himself and Mr. HICKS of Washington):

H.R. 7634. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the estate tax treatment of certain interests created by community property laws in employees' trusts and retirement annuity contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER (for himself and Mr. COTTIER):

H.R. 7635. A bill to establish the Office of Drug Abuse Control within the Executive Office of the President; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 7636. A bill to designate the Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge as the Okefenokee Wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 7637. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, relating to qualifications for appointment and retention in the civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 7638. A bill to protect seals from being pursued, harassed, or killed; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.J. Res. 563. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the last Friday of April of each year as "National Arbor Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 564. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to freedom from forced assignment to schools or jobs because of race, creed, or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEMP (for himself, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DOW, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LENT, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PODELL, Mr. ULLMAN, and Mr. WHITEHURST):

H.J. Res. 565. Joint resolution authorizing additional appropriations to the Secretary of Transportation for the purpose of providing urgently needed intercity rail passenger service around the Nation and for the purpose of research and development in the field of high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 566. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH:

H. Con. Res. 272. Concurrent resolution to encourage an early end to the war in Indochina and to bring about the rehabilitation of Indochina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Con. Res. 273. Concurrent resolution requesting the President of the United States to take affirmative action to aid the victims of the civil war in Pakistan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON:

H. Con. Res. 274. Concurrent resolution designating the last full week in July of 1971 as "National Star Route Mail Carriers Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARNEY:

H. Res. 394. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the treatment of Jews within the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RARICK:

H. Res. 395. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the demography of the United States with the view toward providing relief from racial tensions by more equal distribution of underprivileged racial groups throughout the several States and in the political subdivisions of each State; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 396. Resolution on dismissal of professional air traffic controllers by the Federal Aviation Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

136. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, relative to the treatment of prisoners of war by North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

137. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the importation of men's wearing apparel, textile goods, and shoes from countries employing cheap labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

138. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, relative to regulations of the Department of Transportation classifying farm vehicles as commercial vehicles to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

139. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age and older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BEGICH:

H.R. 7639. A bill for the relief of Wallace O. Craig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7640. A bill for the relief of the Ferris Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 7641. A bill for the relief of Chung Chi Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 7642. A bill for the relief of the Saint Sophia Greek Orthodox Cathedral, Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 7643. A bill for the relief of Kwong Kam Choi and Kwong Ka-Hop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



By Mr. O'NEILL:  
H.R. 7644. A bill for the relief of Michele Pernice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
By Mr. ROYBAL:  
H.R. 7645. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Hernandez Macawile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
By Mr. BOB WILSON:  
H.R. 7646. A bill for the relief of Horace H. Easterday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.  
By Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama:  
H. Res. 397. Resolution to authorize the pardon of Lieutenant Calley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

59. By Mr. FUQUA: Petition of the citizens of Putnam County, Fla., registering their formal protest against the unjust prosecu-

tion and conviction of Lt. William Calley. It is their firm opinion that in order to justify the Army's action it would be necessary to try every man who dropped a bomb or fired a shot in warfare. It is their opinion that war itself is premeditated killing and therefore Lt. William Calley was trained, paid, and sent to Vietnam to do the very job he has now been convicted for. It is their opinion that the conviction of Lieutenant Calley constitutes an insult to the dignity of American men who have fought or will ever fight for their country; to the Committee on Armed Services.

60. Also, petition of the people of Starke, Fla., expressing their opposition to the conviction of Lt. William Calley, an American fighting man; to the Committee on Armed Services.

61. Also, petition of over 5,000 citizens of Live Oak, Fla., circulated by the Suwannee Broadcasting Co. The expression the feelings of these citizens that if Lt. William Calley is guilty, his only guilt is that of defending these great United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

62. Also, petition of the citizens of Chiefland, Fla., circulated by Dr. Kenneth Wise, expressing their concern that the decision rendered in the Lt. William Calley case was unjust; to the Committee on Armed Services.

63. Also, petition of 11,633 citizens of Lake City, Fla., expressing their concern about the conviction of Lt. William Calley, Jr. The signers of the petition did so not only for the benefit of Lieutenant Calley, but also as a plea for a united America in the face of a world crisis; as a plea for justice for one, and for all; as a plea for the complete review of the Uniform Code of Military Justice; and as a plea for the enactment of laws that do not infringe on those guaranteed rights of the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

64. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors, County of San Luis Obispo, Calif., relative to airport and airway development; to the Committee on Appropriations.

65. Also, petition of the King County Council, Washington; relative to health security; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Wednesday, April 21, 1971

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou giver of life, amid the tumult of our times, we would make our hearts a quiet sanctuary for Thy spirit, and here on an unseen altar offer to Thee ourselves—our souls, minds, and bodies in service to our fellow man. In Thy strength and in the light of Thy truth may the divine vocation be lived in common tasks. Enable all of us to keep our priorities just and true, and to keep commitments vivid and real. While we labor with all our human energies for a better world, may we keep alive our faith in Thee so that we may not be surprised or unprepared for the miracle of Thy grace in the affairs of nations.

When our work is done, give us the grace of gratitude for Thy providence at work in and through each of us.

We pray in the name of the Lord and Master of life. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of

the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 20, 1971, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR VOTE ON RIBICOFF AMENDMENT TO OCCUR AT 1:30 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending Ribicoff amendment occur at the hour of 1:30, rather than 1 o'clock.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And, Mr. President, at that time, there will be a brief quorum call.

ORDER FOR EXTENSION OF THE PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the period for the transaction of routine morning business today be extended, but not to exceed one-half hour.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DIVISION OF TIME ON RIBICOFF AMENDMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, of the remaining time under the unanimous agreement for today, 2 hours be given to those who

are opposed to the Ribicoff amendment and the remainder of the time, which will be less, to those in favor of the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TIME LIMITATION OF 3 MINUTES DURING PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TODAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the period for the transaction of routine morning business there be a time limitation of 3 minutes on statements made therein.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

U.S. CIRCUIT COURTS

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald Stuart Russell of South Carolina to be a U.S. circuit judge, fourth circuit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that this nomination is before the Senate. It will be a great honor and privilege to vote to confirm Judge Russell; he is a former colleague of ours in the Senate. He served here with great distinction. He performed his duties always with dignity, with industry, and with deep understanding. As a Senator, Donald Stuart Russell was a decided asset to this body. His contributions were outstanding. As a judge of the District