

By Mr. BADILLO:

H.J. Res. 568. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 22d day of April of each year as "Queen Isabella Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. PICKLE, and Mr. QUILLLEN):

H.J. Res. 569. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the first week of October of each year as "National Gospel Music Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself, Mr. GERALD R. FORD, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BOLLING, Mr. BRADENAS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. FRASER, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. FREY, Mr. GUDE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. McCLODY, Mr. McFALL, Mr. MORSE, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin, Mr. STEPHENS, and Mr. BOB WILSON):

H.J. Res. 570. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the calendar week beginning on May 30, 1971, and ending on June 5, 1971, as "National Peace Corps Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution authorizing the President to designate June 5 of each year as "National Scoutmaster Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.J. Res. 572. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to establish a memorial museum at Las Vegas, N. Mex., to commemorate the Rough Riders and related history of the Southwest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Con. Res. 275. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the diplomatic recognition of the Government of Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 276. Concurrent resolution proposing a means for the establishment of a cease-fire in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Con. Res. 277. Concurrent resolution urging the President to initiate action with respect to a plan to secure the release of American prisoners of war from captivity by North Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. BADILLO, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NIX, Mr. PODELL, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. STOKES):

H. Con. Res. 278. Concurrent resolution relative to asset depreciation range; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Res. 399. Resolution to establish a House select committee to investigate the forced repatriation by the United States of prisoners of war and civilians to the Soviet Union during and after World War II; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CULVER:

H. Res. 400. Resolution; No termination of tribal council; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 7714. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Kurz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 7715. A bill for the relief of Franco Emilio Nardi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELSON:

H.R. 7716. A bill for the relief of Erlinda Alindogan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS of Tennessee:

H.R. 7717. A bill to exempt from taxation by the District of Columbia certain property in the District of Columbia which is owned by the Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the 33d Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 7718. A bill to exempt from taxation by the District of Columbia certain property

in the District of Columbia which is owned by the Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the 33d Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROTZMAN:

H.R. 7719. A bill to exempt from taxation by the District of Columbia certain property in the District of Columbia which is owned by the Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the 33d Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SEBELIUS:

H.R. 7720. A bill to exempt from taxation by the District of Columbia certain property in the District of Columbia which is owned by the Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the 33d Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 7721. A bill for the relief of Anna I. Duisberg, sole heir of Dr. Walter H. Duisberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 7722. A bill for the relief of Angelina do Carmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 7723. A bill for the relief of Moises Kankolsky Agosin, his wife, Frida Halpern Agosin, and their minor son, Mario D. Agosin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJAN:

H.J. Res. 573. Joint Resolution relating to 1st Lt. William L. Calley, Jr., and Capt. Ernest L. Medina, U.S. Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H. Res. 401. Resolution to refer the bill (H.R. 6204) entitled "A bill for the relief of John S. Attinello" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SAN FRANCISCO CIVIC CENTER FORUM

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the Civil Service Commission's recent announcement of its efforts to increase the number of minority group personnel working for the Federal Government, I would like to inform my fellow Members of Congress of a study completed by the San Francisco Civic Center Forum on the employment of Spanish-surnamed Americans in Government. This study reveals that Spanish-surnamed employees only constitute 2.8 percent of the total number of people employed by the Federal Government nationwide. The inequity of Spanish-surnamed employment in the Federal Gov-

ernment is even more apparent when one observes specific Federal agencies and departments. The Postal Service, for example, only claims 2.5 percent of its employees are Spanish-speaking while the two agencies in the Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare most concerned with the problems of migratory laborers and other Spanish-speaking groups show that no more than 1.7 percent of their employees have Spanish surnames. With these statistics in mind I would like my colleagues to consider the following list of recommendations compiled by the Civic Center Forum of San Francisco which relates to the President's 16-point program for the Spanish speaking:

CIVIC CENTER FORUM

(Recommendations for Implementation of President Nixon's Sixteen Point Program for the Spanish-Speaking)

Point 1—In order to effect the changes needed to bring about full participation by

the Spanish-Surnamed in federal jobs, the coordinator position at the national level should be of a policy-making nature (at least GS-16). Regionally, the Civil Service Commission should add Spanish-Surnamed recruiters to its staff (at least at GS-14 level) in order to insure that all possible sources of Spanish-Surnamed applicants are tapped.

Point 2—The Civil Service Commission and other federal agencies should identify and contact all present Spanish-Surnamed federal employees (not a difficult task, considering their number) and Spanish-Speaking organizations in order to insure that the recruiting program includes all possible persons with knowledge of the Spanish-Speaking community.

Point 3—Using the list of Spanish-Surnamed college graduates developed by the Cabinet Committee on Spanish-Surnamed Affairs, a mailer should be developed and used to complement recruiting drives.

Point 4—All federal agencies, not just the ones listed, should be included in an effort to assist Spanish-Surnamed applicants in the recruiting-selection-placement process.

Point 5—No additional recommendations.

Point 6—Require all agencies to report why they should not use selective-recruitment method (for the purpose of hiring Spanish-Surnamed applicants) in specific jobs and areas where bilingual skills are a necessary asset.

Point 7—Each region and each agency should hold its own seminar, thus insuring that the peculiar problems of each area are dealt with.

Point 8—Spanish-Surnamed teams should be used in these efforts.

Point 9—Special care should be taken to insure that applicants are hired into meaningful jobs in order to avoid negative results.

Point 10—Spanish-Surnamed service organizations, such as the G.I. Forum, should be included in these efforts.

Point 11—No additional recommendations.

Point 12—Each EEO program should include at least one Spanish-Surnamed officer.

Point 13—If these programs are to be successful, the trainers who conduct them must be Spanish-Surnamed and must have knowledge of the Spanish-Speaking community.

Point 14—The feasibility of such a program has already been established many times over. Meaningful implementation and commitment are necessary and these can be realized by including Spanish-Surnamed federal employees in the program.

Point 15—No additional recommendation.

Point 16—A norm for compliance must be established by the Civil Service Commission in order to gauge the effectiveness of the EEO program. Agencies which are found to be not in compliance should have their plans reviewed by the local CSC Spanish-Surnamed recruiter (see point 1) and, if necessary, appropriate administrative action should be taken against that agency.

THE IMPOSSIBLE DREAM OF SILENCE?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Southwest Messenger Press, serving over a dozen communities in southwest suburban Cook County, Ill., continually maintains an editorial policy directed to the best long-term interests of its readers.

On Thursday, April 15, the paper carried a very provocative and challenging editorial. In it, Messenger Press directs its readers attention to the complications we recognize in noise pollution.

The editorial follows:

THE IMPOSSIBLE DREAM OF SILENCE?

Americans live in an increasingly noisy world. The blare of horns, the screeching of brakes, the rumble of trucks and the jet engine's whine and roar assault not only the traveler but countless others trapped in the carpet of sound. The pneumatic drill can make a simple street repair job worse than a visit to an old-fashioned dentist, and a major construction project can disrupt a city block for months. Perhaps the worst hit are industrial workers who earn their living in noisy factories. But even white-collar workers are often subjected to the unending hum of inefficient heating and air conditioning equipment.

An advisory panel has recently reported to the Secretary of Commerce on the extent and seriousness of noise pollution. "Millions of

workers are now exposed to noise levels that have been shown conclusively to produce hearing damage," the panel declared. "Most of these workers are unaware of the hazard and do not act to protect themselves."

Yet almost all of this din and uproar is unnecessary. The science and technology of sound are well-known. If people are willing to pay the added costs and do the necessary advance planning, it is possible to engineer a quieter environment. The obstacles are related to money and social custom, not lack of technical knowledge.

President Nixon has submitted to Congress a bill to authorize the Environmental Protection Agency to set noise standards for certain equipment and products and to require other products to bear labels setting forth their noise characteristics. If the public makes itself heard with sufficient clarity, a strong bill can be written into law. A quiet world is not an impossible dream.

WHEREVER MY SHADOW FALLS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following letter, written by Capt. Tibor Bierbaum, U.S. Army Special Forces, deserves to be read by all my colleagues.

Captain Bierbaum is a Hungarian refugee who became a U.S. citizen and is now serving with the forces of freedom. His statement was awarded first prize in the Freedom Foundations annual military letter writing contest.

Why does Captain Bierbaum serve in our fighting forces?

When I left (Hungary), I knew I carried with me the obligation to help others resist such oppression. Wherever my shadow falls, I want this story heard. The Countries who lie silent under Communist rule are not content to do so. They are fearful countries; they are helpless countries; they are conquered countries. And worst of all, they are countries that may not remember freedom in another generation. The Communists in Vietnam would create such a silence there and the world would call it peace.

The letter follows:

For the fifth consecutive year and the tenth time since 1953, the Army has taken first place in the Freedoms Foundation's annual military letter writing contest.

(From more than 7,500 entries from all services, Captain Tibor Bierbaum, a Hungarian refugee and naturalized citizen, was designated the Defender of Freedom for submitting the best active duty entry. CPT Bierbaum is assigned to the 6th Special Forces Group at Fort Bragg, N.C.)

I saw my little brother die unattended in a Communist hospital because my parents were not members of the Communist Party. My father was being "detained" for four years in Russia and I helped my mother support my two younger brothers. When Stephen died, I vowed to leave Hungary to escape this tyranny and, after my father's return, I fled to the United States.

When I left, I knew I carried with me the obligation to help others resist such oppression. Wherever my shadow falls, I want this story heard. The countries who lie silent under Communist rule are not content to do so. They are fearful countries; they are helpless

countries; they are conquered countries. And worst of all, they are countries that may not remember freedom in another generation. The Communists in Vietnam would create such a silence there and the world would call it peace.

To be strong on the earth, a nation must first be strong in the mind of its youth for here it is the Communist's prey. Strength of mind comes before all other strength and youthful minds are being trained and controlled in all countries. Yes, here in the United States, too.

Idealism in the United States must not become the maudlin sentiment of pictures inside minds. Our "revolution" is here and the Communists will take every advantage to increase discord and dissension in our country. Hear me! I've lived through it once and clinging to those old ideals of honor and morality, especially with respect to our Country and the sanctity of freedom.

Enemy bullets are no different wherever I face them, but now I have my dreams of returning to my home, my family and choosing my way of life. I have been privileged to become a citizen in America.

Influence and man are inseparable. Those who have been as privileged as I will feel the obligation to protect and preserve the freedoms of the United States against all aggressors, within and without, and under the shadow of their strength, freedom will flourish. All the others who do not do so are the freeloaders—dead weight to freedom and have no right to the privilege because they do not apply their obligation.

EVANGEL COLLEGE WASHINGTON PROGRAM

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, students need an opportunity to get a firsthand view of their Government. Because of the alienation of a large segment of our youth and also because of their frustration with not being able to play a more active part in decisions which directly affect them, young people need an outlet to explore channels open to them.

A Washington studies program offers such an opportunity. I recently received a letter from one of my constituents, Dr. Nicholas Tavani, coordinator for Evangel College's Washington program. I had the opportunity to speak with the student from Evangel College when they were in Washington in January. So that my colleagues might be alerted to the potential such a program affords, I offer a portion of that letter, which describes the program's success, for inclusion in the RECORD:

As the New Year turned, twelve students from this midwestern college met in the nation's capital to begin an intensive three week study of governmental processes. The usual questions and suspicions plague them. For most of them it was a David meets Goliath experience. By the time the term ended they might have had more questions, but they were a different set of questions, and with them they not only had answers to many of their original questions but an invaluable experience that virtually

defies articulation. They spoke of the change which they could see they had undergone. Federal governmental processes were now identifiable with real people and real world. Perhaps more confusing than ever, but also more meaningful, throbbing with life, worth improving, and worth working for.

JEWES TOLD OF GAIN IN TIES TO BLACKS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, April 19, 1971, marked the 28th anniversary of the Jewish revolt against the Nazi tyranny in Warsaw, Poland. Twenty-eight years ago, a group of Polish Jews, when faced with segregation, starvation, and execution, chose to die for a cause rather than be murdered in ignominy. It is that cause I honor today.

I choose to commemorate the ghetto uprising on its 28th anniversary because it is not an action to be acknowledged at 25-year intervals, but annually, if not daily.

This uprising was more than an historic battle, it was a dramatic demonstration of pride and desire for freedom in the face of inevitable death. Their pride lives today and should be acknowledged.

Jews in America today have learned through their own hardships to respect human rights in a way that few can. They, along with the black community which has a similar picture of civil rights, have been leaders in the civil rights movement in this country. In fact, Jews and blacks have joined forces and made important advances in other areas, despite widespread publicity of friction between the two groups. The following article by Irving Spiegel which appeared in the March 30 New York Times explains some of the programs and may be of interest to my colleagues.

The article follows:

JEWES TOLD OF GAIN IN TIES TO BLACKS
REPORT DESCRIBES PROJECTS JOINED BY BOTH GROUPS

(By Irving Spiegel)

BOSTON, March 29.—The American Jewish Congress reported today "a significant number of projects" in which blacks and Jews were working together to strengthen relations between the two groups.

The report was presented at the biennial meeting of the organization's National Women's Division at the Statler Hilton Hotel.

Mrs. Naomi Levine, director of the congress' Commission on Urban Affairs, said the information had been gathered from 400 organizations and agencies working in civil rights, education and human relations.

She said that these agencies were linked together through the Information Center on Jewish-Negro Relations, established a year ago by the congress as a clearinghouse to compile and distribute news on current programs, activities and studies involving Negroes and Jews.

"While the mass media often stress tension and conflict between blacks and Jews,"

Mrs. Levine said, "the reality is that a remarkable—and increasing—number of programs are taking place in which blacks and Jews are cooperating for social progress."

For example, she said, many Jewish institutions are making special efforts to increase the number of black builders in the construction of new synagogues and schools.

Under the heading of social services, Mrs. Levine reported, Congregation B'nai Amoona in University City, Mo., has worked with residents of a St. Louis low-income public housing development and programs aimed at improving physical conditions in the project.

"With the growth of confidence in the partnership has come a comparable growth in effectiveness and scope, ranging from providing baseball uniforms and organizing adult classes in reading, typing and sewing," Mrs. Levine said.

In Chicago, she added, the Jewish Council on Urban Affairs has worked with local community groups in a project with Negro home owners who had been forced to pay unfair prices for their homes. The program includes legal services, fund raising assistance for court costs, and the use of an architect city planner to work with local residents and join plans for improving the neighborhood.

NEGROES USING TEMPLE

In Philadelphia, the Beth David Reform Temple is sharing its facilities with a local Negro Baptist congregation in formation, the First Baptist Winnefield, in a racially mixed area. One recent joint project was a combined effort by the temple and the church to keep new taverns out of the area.

At a joint meeting in the temple, an appeal for funds to publish a newspaper advertisement on the plight of Soviet Jewry was supported by blacks in the audience.

Mrs. David Smith of New York, chairman of the urban affairs committee of the American Jewish Congress' women's division, said that her organization itself was working through chapters in Cleveland, Westchester County and Long Island with black and other community groups in efforts to attack suburban zoning regulations that prevent the construction of low and moderate income housing in suburban areas.

Reflecting the "improved climate of communication" Mrs. Levine observed "is a growing interest by black groups in Israel and the lessons which Israel offers for the black community in this country."

In one such project the Southern Cooperative Development Program composed of black leaders of Lafayette La. recently sent eight black community leaders to study technological methods of agriculture in Israel with a view to adapting them to their similarly situated Southern communities.

"These programs indicate that blacks and Jews are beginning to recognize that they have more in common than in conflict" Mrs. Levine said. "Only by working together can the stereotypes and suspicions that separate one group from the other be overcome."

DEATH OF CAPT. R. B. HANDY, JR.

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of sadness that I announce the death of Capt. Robert B. Handy, Jr. Captain Handy passed away April 13, 1971, following a lingering illness which

had confined him to his home and more recently to the hospital where he died.

Captain Handy concluded a period of long and distinguished service to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States when he retired as quartermaster general in February 1962. Prior to that time, Captain Handy had served the national organization as director of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Service Bureau in Washington, D.C., inspector general and adjutant general. Captain Handy served as quartermaster general from December 1923 until he retired in 1962.

The delegates to the 71st national convention unanimously adopted a resolution that named Captain Handy, quartermaster general emeritus. Commonly referred to as "Mr. VFW," Captain Handy also served as national historian following his retirement in 1962.

Comrade Handy attained the rank of captain—a title that he retained throughout his service with the Veterans of Foreign Wars by serving with the 318th Infantry, 80th Division, in World War I.

Comrade Handy was well known and respected throughout the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States as well as in private life. His dedicated service to veterans and especially to members of our organization has left an indelible mark on the history of our organization.

Born in Northampton County, Va., Captain Handy was 85 at the time of his passing. Captain Handy's wife, Edna, survives him.

Funeral services for Captain Handy were held April 15, 1971, in Kansas City, following which his body was flown to Washington, D.C., where services were held April 16, after which his body was laid to rest in the Congressional Cemetery, Washington, D.C.

Certainly the VFW and the veterans of this Nation have lost a true friend and a great leader. My deepest sympathy is extended to his wife, Mrs. Edna Handy, and the members of his family.

EARTH WEEK IN ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, Alaska's principal resource is her magnificent natural environment. It is this environment which brought many of us to the State in the beginning, and it is this environment which we feel obligated to preserve and protect.

Repeatedly, Alaska's Gov. William Egan and all of our citizens have concerned themselves with the responsibility of caring for Alaska's principal natural resource; they have again demonstrated their awareness of the crisis in environmental problems facing not only Alaska, but in each State. This week Gov. William Egan has proclaimed the third week of April as Earth Week.

I heartily concur in this proclamation. Each State needs and, indeed, must take time to both reexamine the problems facing its own environment now and in the future as well as dedicate itself to the maintenance and development of its principal resource—the natural environment.

PROCLAMATION: EARTH WEEK

There is an urgent need to promote a broader awareness and understanding of the environmental crisis facing each and every state in the United States; and

There is a compelling need to encourage a continuing commitment by all interests including education, agriculture, business, labor and civil and private organizations, to work to solve these fundamental environmental problems;

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, proclaim the third week in April "Earth Week" in Alaska and seek the broadest participation in its activities.

THE CIVIL WAR IN PAKISTAN

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of East Pakistan are now engaged in a bitter, bloody struggle for those human rights that all men are entitled to by birth. Their desire for a representative government and freedom from the shackles of a colonial-like existence with the ruling West have resulted in wide scale oppression and suffering at the hands of a military regime that is perpetrating a senseless massacre of defenseless citizens, unparalleled in recent history.

The nature of this conflict is civil war, and no doubt we should allow the Pakistani people to resolve their own political questions. However, we can, indeed, we should provide active leadership in all efforts designed to lessen the plight of the sick, and the suffering, and the dying of East Pakistan, not because of any political preference or considerations, but because it is the right, the proper, and the humanitarian course for this Nation to follow.

On April 2 of this year, a plane carrying food and medical supplies, under the aegis of the International Red Cross, sought entry to East Pakistan on a mission of unquestionably nonpartisan good will. The West Pakistan Government denied entry to this Red Cross mission. In discussions with Mr. S. N. Qutb, press attaché for the Pakistani Embassy in Washington, I have learned that the West Pakistani Government considered those Red Cross supplies delivered in the aftermath of Pakistan's recent cyclone disaster to be sufficient to cover their current needs. They also felt that they did not have at this time the administrative capacity to handle increased Red Cross aid or that of individual nations.

When dealing with questions of human survival, answers such as these are clearly unacceptable. I cannot help be-

ing reminded of the thousands of Biafran men, women, and children who died of disease and starvation as the United States and much of the world sat and watched the Nigerian Government isolate these people from essential foods and medicines.

We cannot profess to be a humanitarian people and allow the horror of Biafra to repeat itself in East Pakistan.

It is with this in mind that I today introduce a resolution that would call upon the President of the United States to:

First, urge the West Pakistan Government, out of concern and respect for the lives of all men, to allow the International Red Cross, or any such organization or government concerned with welfare and not politics, to immediately ship food and medical supplies to those people of East Pakistan who require such assistance;

Second, offer to provide the food and medicines required for any such relief effort as a gesture of international goodwill.

It is my hope that my colleagues in this House would support such a resolution and also that a way might soon be found to end this latest struggle between a people striving for justice, and a government unwilling to respond to their pleas.

JACKSONVILLE'S WALK FOR MANKIND: AN INSPIRATION FOR ALL

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, recently it was my honor and privilege to participate in a "Walk for Mankind" project in my hometown of Jacksonville, Fla. This was an inspiring example of young America working toward a better world in which to live.

"Walk for Mankind" was sponsored by the Jacksonville Junior Chamber of Commerce, six area Jacksonville Junior Women's Clubs and the Duval County Association of Student Councils. The demonstration attracted thousands of people and about \$20,000 was raised for Project Concern. The funds will go to help build hospitals and provide medical care to needy people throughout the world, and to also assist in local drug control programs in Jacksonville.

So that this great civic undertaking might be recognized and perhaps duplicated throughout the Nation, I include in the RECORD news reports on the "Walk for Mankind":

[From the Florida Times Union, Mar. 8, 1971]

THOUSANDS TURN OUT HERE TO "WALK FOR MANKIND" IN CHARITABLE MARATHON

(By Bill Waller)

An estimated 7,500 people—mostly students from Jacksonville schools—turned out Sunday to tackle a 21-mile endurance course in the Walk for Mankind—a project

designed to raise funds for medical care for needy people throughout the world and to help fight drug abuse in Jacksonville.

A Jaycee vice president, Eric Smith, called it "the most fantastic thing that has ever been done in this community."

Each of the participants had gotten a list of sponsors to pay him—the walker—a negotiable rate per mile for every mile covered in the walkathon. Numerous participants had more than 25 sponsors.

The march—originally slated to begin at 8 a.m. from the Regency Square starting point—got off to a damp and dreary note as predawn rains threatened to make the event a wet walk.

But the rains stopped and hundreds crowded around the registration tables to register for the event.

They braved the damp cold wind—some dressed in shorts and short-sleeved shirts—to add their names to the list of participants.

The walk itself started shortly before 9 a.m. with U.S. Rep. Charles E. Bennett leading a crowd of several hundred to the first checkpoint a mile into the course.

The 21-mile course began with a westward march along Regency Square Road. Trekking along Townsend Boulevard, Lone Star Road and other thoroughfares, the group reached Jacksonville University, then struck out for Ft. Caroline Road to the national monument doubling back a distance before heading down Monument Road and on toward the starting point.

At first, the pace was brisk as the participants kept moving in the chilling wind. But as the morning progressed, the cloud cover moved and, by early afternoon, it was warm if not hot, along the walkathon course.

There were 10 checkpoints along the route—at 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17 and 19 miles.

Free refreshments and live entertainment were offered at most of the checkpoints and the walkers continuously flocked to them to have their progress cards stamped and to take a short break.

The further a participant progressed along the route the slower he ambled. As the trek for mankind neared its end, walkers frequently sat down to take it easy before starting on the last leg to Regency Square.

The walk was enlivened occasionally by group singing. One walker had a harmonica to help pass the time.

There were three "very minor accidents" along the route, according to Mrs. Tom Boal Jr. Boal is the Jaycee chairman of the project. One of the mishaps involved a sprained ankle.

The walk was sponsored by the Jaycees six local junior women's clubs and the Duval County Association of Student Councils.

Mrs. Boal estimated that 90 percent of all entrants finished.

She said it would probably be approximately two weeks before all of the money earned in the Walk would be turned in by the participants. She also hesitated to estimate how much money that would be.

Smith said he expected "at least \$15,000," although he said that was a conservative figure.

Smith concurred with Mrs. Boal in that it would be at least a week or 10 days before project officials would have any idea of how much money was earned.

Of the money turned in, 80 percent is to go to Project Concern, an organization that helps build hospitals and provide medical care in needy areas of the world. The remaining 20 percent of the fund will help fight drug abuse in Jacksonville.

Sunday's walk was one of more than 50 such walks scheduled throughout Florida. Two such walks were conducted last year by Jaycee chapters in Ocala and St. Petersburg.

and checks totaling \$11,200 were presented to the head of Project Concern, Dr. James Turpin, last August at a Jaycee state meeting in Winter Haven.

While most of the walkers covered the course in more than five or six hours, a Marine established two records Sunday. He was the first walker to cross the finish line and also did it in the shortest amount of time—two hours and 27 minutes, according to Mrs. Boal.

The youngest to cross the finish line was a seven-year-old boy who was accompanied by his mother along the course.

The track team from Fletcher High School was the first team to cross the finish line in competition with track teams from other Jacksonville schools, Mrs. Boal said.

Smith also had high praise for the youth participating in the community. He commented that while many people may be "down" on today's youth, thousands of them "behaved themselves" in Sunday's walk.

He said that "every step they took helped a child somewhere in the world."

Finding food for the walkers proved a problem at one point in the walkathon. Boal said a radio appeal was broadcast asking people to bring some food to Regency Square so sandwiches could be made. He said, "There was some response to the appeal, but I don't know how much."

Extra drinks also had to be purchased, Boal said.

WALK FOR MANKIND

There's a lot of wringing of hands and scratching of heads about young people these days. But there's less reason for wringing and scratching in Jacksonville when you consider some of the things that are happening.

Walking seems to be the latest thing. It's a fund-raising idea. The kids line up sponsors who pay an amount of money for every mile they walk. It may be a dime or ten dollars for every mile walked.

A couple of weeks ago it was the "walk for development". Five hundred walkers raised \$7,500 to help feed underprivileged people.

And some students from Terry Parker High did their thing out at the zoo. Their thing was a rock concert. With cooperation from Zoo Superintendent Raymond Gray, the rock musicians provided Sunday afternoon entertainment for hundreds of young people. And zoo visitors had some unexpected music to watch animals by.

This Sunday it's walking time again. It's the "walk for mankind," sponsored by Project Concern. The money goes to help the helpless—those who need medical aid, food and other assistance.

All of this hoofing is a pretty good deal. The kids get exercise. The good causes get money. You can't beat it.

And it might just cause a little less wringing of hands and scratching of heads about our young people.

This was a WJXT Editorial.

[From the Florida Times-Union,
Mar. 11, 1971]

TRUSTEES NAMED FOR "WALK" FUNDS

Representatives from Jacksonville high school student councils, Jacksonville area Jaycees and Junior Woman's Clubs will be trustees for funds raised in last Sunday's Walk for Mankind.

Andrew Johnson, president of the county association of student councils, said Wednesday the 18-member board of trustees will oversee use of funds for a halfway house for drug addicts.

From 20 to 30 percent of about \$15,000 raised by the walk will go to the local halfway house project. The rest will be given to

Project Concern for international and national relief work.

The trustees are:

Students—Johnson, from Paxon High School, Keith Bailey (Jackson), Clyde Patterson (Englewood), Jim Nevin (Fletcher), Curtis Davis (Episcopal) and Louis LaBlanc (Stanton).

Jaycees—Tom Boal, Bruce Smathers, Ric Arrington, Fred Cone, Byron Bollingberg, Cliff Hardy, Treat Cowart.

Junior Woman's Clubs—Mrs. Pat Boal, Mrs. Paula Holleman, Mrs. Carolyn Kenyon, Mrs. Monica Hayes and Mrs. Donna Darby.

[From the Florida Times-Union,
Mar. 23, 1971]

WALK FOR MANKIND HITS \$10,000 MARK

About \$10,000 has already been collected as part of the money raised from the March 7 Walk for Mankind, sponsored by the Jacksonville Jaycees, six area junior women's clubs and the Duval County Association of Student Councils.

Tom Boal Jr., Jaycee chairman of the project, said Monday only about 350 people of the approximately 4,000 to 5,000 people who participated in the 21-mile walk had turned in their money collected from their sponsors.

Boal said the money had not "been coming in quite as quickly as anticipated," although he hopes to see "an acceleration in the influx of money."

He encourages those who have not turned in their money to do so as soon as possible.

Boal said the money could either be mailed to Walk for Mankind at P.O. Box 1349 or turned in at the Jaycee office at 60 N. Hogan St.

And, if anyone needs any information about the walk, then they should contact the Jaycee office.

The money was raised via the walk to help build hospitals and provide medical care to needy people throughout the world. Eighty percent of the money raised is to go to Project Concern, which is designed to build the hospitals and provide the needed medical care. The remaining 20 percent is to go to help area drug programs.

Regency Square served as both the starting and finishing points of the walk. Ten checkpoints were set up on the walk route and refreshments provided at the checkpoints.

Boal said the Jaycees have discussed making such walk an annual affair but definite plans have not yet been set.

[From the Amerco World, Apr. 2, 1971]
ABOUT 17,000 CONVERGE ON DEALERSHIP
(By Craig Shrum)

JACKSONVILLE, FLA.—A band played and television cameras focused in on the Union 76 station of U-Haul Dealers George and Mike Regas as an estimated 17,000 people converged on the scene during a "Walk for Mankind."

"We had no idea it would be this big," said Mike Regas. "The response was beyond everyone's imagination until it started happening. Fantastic."

The big "Walk for Mankind" was sponsored by the Jacksonville Jaycees to raise money for hospitals and schools in underdeveloped countries, and for hospitals in poorer sections of the United States.

As the first checkpoint on the 20-mile walk, the Regas dealership was the center of activity and focal point for television and newspaper coverage.

Each volunteer walker obtained sponsors from the business community to donate an amount per mile walked by the volunteer. For instance, the Amerco Marketing Co. of Northern Florida sponsored Roddy Coffin, 18-

year-old son of U-Haul Dealer Almond Coffin, at the rate of 60 cents per mile. Six U-Haul Dealers, including his father, also sponsored young Coffin.

The Regas dealership sponsored "anybody who came in and asked," at the rate of 10 cents per mile. Mike Regas was too busy to keep a count of the people he sponsored, but his checks to the "Walk for Mankind" fund totaled \$54.

A total of 7,500 persons registered for the big walk, and turned in proceeds estimated at \$18-\$20,000.

The Sunday affair started at Jacksonville's Regency Square, and, led by Florida Congressman Charles Bennett, headed for the Regas station, one and three-quarter miles away.

Due to the nippy weather and winds gusting to 50 miles per hour, Regas set up a horse-shoe formation of U-Haul trailers to encompass the officials' area.

A five-piece band played as the throng of walkers flowed through the U-Haul windbreak to have their cards validated. The Regas station and U-Haul equipment were "splashed all over newspapers and TV channels."

The walkers stopped at several check points along the route to have cards validated as evidence that they were applying shoe leather to asphalt for the full 20 miles.

An estimated 17,000 people joined the spectacle, counting a caravan of parents and other on-lookers. Some chose to follow the event in cars, rather than compete with the volunteers, most of whom were students from high schools and nearby Jacksonville University.

"The walk was primarily of and by the kids," Regas said, "with guidance from the Jaycees. A high school senior did most of the organizing. But you'd be surprised at how many adults joined in—about 500. I saw several of my customers going through the checkpoint."

Walkers flowed through the Regas station from 9:15 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.

Seven months ago Regas teamed up with his father, George, to open the service station and U-Haul dealership.

"I was an oil company representative," Regas said, "and many dealers I worked with had very healthy businesses. One of them was a top U-Haul dealer in the national rankings, and I'm sort of copying his operation. As soon as the yellow page ads break, I'll expand to a 24-hour business, and U-Haul will be the main support for that round-the-clock operation. I don't know what I'd do without those trucks and trailers. They've given me a beautiful cash flow."

Regas predicts that similar "Walks" will happen soon in other cities because of the overwhelming success in Jacksonville. The Jaycees are distributing organizational information to affiliates across the nation.

"The routes are organized around service station check points, and there may be opportunities for other U-Haul dealers to do their part, while receiving invaluable publicity," Regas added.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IS NOT DEFENSE COUNSEL

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. WYMAN, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is the chief law enforcement officer of the Nation. His basic responsibility by oath and commitment is to just-

ly, fairly, and firmly enforce the laws of the United States. He is obliged to refrain from undermining law enforcement or encouraging violations of law by speech or act.

The Attorney General's duty is to protect society against criminal conduct. He is not counsel for the defense. One who by penchant, philosophy, or temperament is so inclined, cannot fulfill the requirements of the office, for the Attorney General is a prosecutor. He is not attorney for the defendant.

This does not mean indifference to the requirements of justice and fairness in all cases, or that humanity and compassion should be lacking in the evaluation of cases. But adherence to justice and compassion is a far cry from permissivism in the job of chief law enforcement officer of the United States.

If there have been any lingering doubts concerning the appropriateness of certain critical public references concerning the record and activities of former Attorney General Ramsey Clark they should be dispelled by his latest writing called "Crime in America," in which statistics and basic truths in law enforcement have been subverted to Clark's personal predilection to permissivism. He is making more difficult the attainment of society's need for just, sure, and firm protection against rising crime in the Nation.

In this connection, I commend the reading of a recent column by William F. Buckley, Jr., appearing in the New Hampshire Sunday News of April 18, 1971:

RAMSEY CLARK'S BOOK

(By William F. Buckley Jr.)

During this period, presidential hopefuls are bringing out books; either that, or else authors are writing books about them. In the case of Ramsey Clark, it is not fair to suppose that someone else wrote his book, the widely heralded "Crime in America." It is a true expression of this amiable, well-meaning man who, in the world of thought, cannot even ride a bicycle.

Every now and again, the American critical mechanism really goes to work on somebody like Ramsey Clark: and this has now happened.

In the current "Commentary," Professor James Q. Wilson of Harvard goes through the book and concludes, pained, that "As a statement of personal moral and political conviction, it conveys a message that will reassure those who wish to avoid coming to grips with the crime problem and will disappoint those who wish to think seriously about it."

As analysis, he finds that the "book contains individual sentences supportive of a wide range of mutually inconsistent positions." And consider:

"Even the question of whether street or violent crime is important enough to worry about is left unclear. On page 49, we are told that since only one person in 400 was the victim of a crime of violence in 1967, the average individual's chance of being a victim was 'once in 400 years.'"

If one assumes that only half of all violent crimes are reported, then the individual's chances are "one in 200 years." "The implication is clear: what are we so excited about?"

"One thing we should be excited about," says Professor Wilson, "is the misrepresentation embodied in these figures. If the average person has each year a one in 200 chance of

being a victim then his lifetime chances of being a victim are the sum of these annual probabilities over his life expectancy."

"If the average man lives 70 years, then his chances of being a victim of a violent crime at some time are seven in 20, or about one in three, not one in 200."

Professor Sidney Hook, writing in "Fortune," is equally mystified. "Clark's failure to face up to the necessity for hard choices in the prevention and control of crime results in a shocking absence of common sense. 'There is no conflict between liberty and safety,' he declares. 'We will have both, or neither.' That is sheer balderdash. In many situations, liberty and safety are inversely related. . . . The safety of a traffic system depends upon restriction of motorists' freedom to drive in any lane or at any speed they please."

It is left for Professor van den Haag, in "National Review," to inter this pathetic book, around which the left-liberals are forming. I give you an example of what happens when you analyze Ramsey Clark:

"Clark," says van den Haag, "has mastered misleading comparisons. He indignantly denounces 'Spiro Agnew who supported the looters,' since 'fewer than 250 died in riots' while 25,000 are killed by drunken drivers. Whereupon he asks sarcastically, 'why not shoot drunken drivers?' . . . Why call for shooting looters when no one is heard to suggest the same treatment for the deadlier crime?"

"Now proportionately, I think drunken driving leads to injury less often than rioting—as Clark should have known. He also knows that this is the only relevant comparison, since elsewhere he (rightly) attacks as misleading, statistics which state crime frequencies rather than crime rates (proportions). However, both drunken driving and looting are certainly dangerous criminal acts. Policemen should arrest the offenders and, if they resist, or try to escape, use whatever force is needed to control them."

Nobody advocated shooting looters after arrest. The Vice President (unlike Clark, Lindsay, et al.) urged that the necessary force be used to make arrests and to prevent continuation of the criminal action.

I am sure Mr. Agnew advocates no less for any escaping or resisting offender, driving or walking, drunk or sober. So do I.

It is the former Attorney General who advocates an exemption for looters—not, as he disingenuously suggests, the Vice President for drunken drivers.

Now that, of which there is much more in the extensive review, is 24-karat analysis, and it leaves Mr. Clark and his jejune book quite simply speechless. Or rather it should. It hasn't, of course: Mr. Clark is busy reciting his good-sounding clichés everywhere—the college students go mad, by the way, mad with pleasure, while, far away, the muses of rigor and thought, sulk in their gardens, despondent as they have not been since the golden days of Eleanor Roosevelt.

EMERGENCY DETENTION CAMPS: THE CASE FOR REPEAL

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there are presently two bills pending dealing with title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950. I earnestly hope that every Mem-

ber of this House will pause to familiarize himself or herself with this issue, for it is one which goes to the heart of the kind of freedom our Constitution and laws are to provide.

In brief, the act in question authorizes the Federal Government to construct and maintain "emergency detention camps" which can be employed in an emergency to detain people whom the Government considers security risks.

Legislation has been submitted to the Judiciary Committee by the distinguished Representative from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA) and others which would repeal these provisions which are so odious to a free society and are antithetical to the most fundamental principles of the Bill of Rights. Hearings have been held by Subcommittee No. 3 of the Judiciary Committee on which I am privileged to serve, the bill has been favorably reported to the full committee, and on April 6 the full committee reported the bill favorably.

In hopes of avoiding repeal of the emergency detention camps provision of the Internal Security Act, Representative ICHORN has introduced a more limited measure which would amend the act instead of repealing it. In a short time, it will be up to the Rules Committee and ultimately to the House to decide whether this obnoxious law should be wiped off the books, or merely white-washed so as to present a less offensive appearance.

I commend to my colleague the following excerpts from an article by Alan Dershowitz which recently appeared in "The Nation," and which recounts the history of the present legislation authorizing emergency detention:

"STRETCH POINTS" OF LIBERTY

(By Alan Dershowitz)

At 4 A.M. on October 16, 1970, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau proclaimed a "state of apprehended insurrection" throughout Canada. Pointing to the kidnapping of a Canadian minister and a British consul by members of Le Front de Liberation du Québec (FLQ), he invoked the "War Measures Act," thereby authorizing extraordinary powers of arrest, search and detention. Before dawn, the police—who had been strategically deployed in anticipation of the announcement—began to round up French Canadians suspected of association with the FLQ. Though most of the 450 arrested were never charged with any crime, many were held incommunicado for considerable periods of time. The Canadian Bill of Rights—which prohibits such detention—was rendered inapplicable by the emergency decree.

In the middle of the night of December 4, 1970, Irish Prime Minister John Lynch announced that a grave emergency existed in his country. Citing information that Saor Eire (a splinter group of the Irish Republican Army) was conspiring to kidnap "prominent" ministers, he declared that "unless this threat is removed," he would, without further notice, empower the police to "intern any citizen without trial." The government issued instructions "that places of detention be prepared immediately" and that the Council of Europe be notified that "these proposals will involve derogations from certain provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights."

Within the past few months, then, one

democracy has suspended, and another has threatened to suspend, fundamental constitutional protections in response to political kidnappings and other disruptions of a kind not unknown to the United States. This raises the obvious question: could President Nixon take to the airwaves some night and announce that the nation was confronted with an emergency requiring suspension of the Bill of Rights? . . .

Abraham Lincoln proclaimed Emancipation, but he also issued another, less well-known proclamation which had the effect of virtually suspending the Bill of Rights. A week after the fall of Fort Sumter, in a communiqué authorizing Gen. Winfield Scott to commence the "bombardment" of certain cities in Maryland "if necessary," Lincoln also empowered the General to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* in designated areas, but only "in the extreme necessity." (*Habeas corpus*, though not a part of the Bill of Rights, is the critical safeguard without which all other constitutional protections would remain largely unenforceable, since its suspension would deny the courts the power to release persons held in violation of other protections.) Shortly after Lincoln issued his "incarceration proclamation," an obscure Marylander named John Merryman, whose loyalties were apparently with the South, was roused from his bed at two in the morning, taken to Fort McHenry and imprisoned there under military guard. A writ of *habeas corpus* was sought from the Chief Justice of the United States, Roger B. Taney—a Lincoln protagonist and author of the infamous Dred Scott decision. Taney's opinion gave Lincoln a failing grade in constitutional law: "I had supposed it to be one of those points in constitutional law upon which there was no difference of opinion," he commented sarcastically, "that the privilege of the writ could not be suspended, except by act of Congress." But though the Chief Justice ordered him released, Merryman remained confined: the general in charge of the fort simply denied a marshal permission to serve the necessary papers, and Lincoln took no official notice of the opinion (which was personally transmitted to him by order of the Court).

Following this confrontation between the Executive and the judiciary, Congress enacted a statute giving Lincoln even broader authority to suspend constitutional safeguards than he had requested. And so, when Lambdin Milligan was arrested in Indiana on October 5, 1864, there was little doubt that the privilege of the writ of *habeas corpus* had been properly suspended.¹ Not content to detain him, the military authorities decided to try Milligan—a civilian—before a military commission, which promptly sentenced him to hang. By the time the case worked its way up to the Supreme Court, the war was over and, in Justice Davis' words, "now that the public safety is assured, this question . . . can be discussed and decided without passion or the admixture of any element not required to form a legal judgment." The Supreme Court held that since the civil courts of Indiana—a loyal state—had been open and "needed no bayonets" to protect them, it had been unconstitutional to try Milligan before a military commission. Recognizing that Milligan was arrested in wartime, when passions run high and "considerations of safety" are deemed all important, the Court concluded that the framers of our Constitution . . . foresaw that troublous times would arise, when rulers

and people would become restive under restraint, and seek by sharp and decisive measures to accomplish ends deemed just and proper; and that the principles of constitutional liberty would be in peril, unless established by irrepealable law.

This nation . . . has no right to expect that it will always have wise and humane rulers, sincerely attached to the principles of the Constitution. Wicked men, ambitious of power, with hatred of liberty and contempt of law, may fill the place once occupied by Washington and Lincoln, and if this right [to suspend provisions of the Constitution during the great exigencies of government] is conceded, and the calamities of war again befall us, the dangers to human liberty are frightful to contemplate.

Having delivered itself of this bold rhetoric about "irrepealable law," the Supreme Court then proceeded to suggest that the right to bail could be suspended during emergencies:

If it was dangerous, in the distracted condition of affairs, to leave Milligan unrestrained of his liberty, . . . the law said to arrest him, confine him closely, render him powerless to do further mischief; and then . . . try him according to the course of the common law.

That is what Congress meant, reasoned the Court, when it authorized the suspension of the privilege of *habeas corpus*.²

This view was reaffirmed—and strengthened—by Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in a case growing out of a private war between Colorado coal miners and owners which led to a declaration of local martial law. In addition to suppressing newspapers, deposing civil magistrates and closing all saloons, the Governor suspended *habeas corpus* and ordered the arrest of certain "objectionable characters." One of these characters, a leader of the miners, was detained without bail for two and a half months and sued the Governor after his release. Though Holmes need never have reached the legality of the detention, he went out of his way to justify the Governor's action. Employing "logic" for which he surely would have chastised his first-year Harvard law students, Holmes argued that since a governor can order soldiers to "kill persons who resist" efforts to put down a rebellion, it certainly follows that "he may use the milder measure of seizing the bodies of those whom he considers to stand in the way of restoring peace." (This *non sequitur* would, if taken seriously, justify detention of all persons suspected of felonies, since under the laws of most states deadly force can be used against anyone resisting a felony arrest.)

Although Holmes intimated that the Court might not sustain a detention of undue duration, his uncritical legitimization of the Governor's exercise of extraordinary power was a clear invitation to abuse; and abuse was not long in coming. Numerous governors invoked the magic phrase "martial law" as a kind of "household remedy" to accomplish such diverse and illegitimate ends as closing a race track, manipulating a primary election, keeping a neighborhood segregated and, frequently, settling labor strikes to the advantage of management. It was inevitable that the Supreme Court could not long tolerate such bogus declarations of martial law.

² The Milligan case suggests an interesting argument against the constitutionality of pretrial preventive detention during normal times: if it requires suspension of *habeas corpus* to deny bail on grounds of danger (as Milligan implies); and if *habeas corpus* cannot be suspended except in cases of "rebellion" or "invasion" then it would seem to follow that bail cannot be denied on such grounds except during extreme situations.

The case that finally made the Court lose patience arose in the east Texas oil fields during the early years of the depression. The Governor declared martial law and ordered restrictions on the production of oil, in an effort to raise its price. There were no riots or violence; nor were any troops employed. Martial law was invoked simply to accomplish economic ends. The Supreme Court enjoined the Governor's action, reasoning that unless it did so "the fiat of a state Governor, and not the Constitution of the United States, would be the Supreme law of the land."

That is where the law stood on December 7, 1941 when the Japanese air force bombed Pearl Harbor, throwing Hawaii into turmoil and generating fear of attack in our West Coast cities. Within hours, the Governor of Hawaii, at the insistence of the Army, declared martial law, suspended *habeas corpus*, ordered the civil courts closed, and empowered military tribunals to try all criminal cases. The Governor handed the reins of government over to the military only after receiving assurances that civilian control would be restored as soon as the immediate emergency was over—within days or, at most, weeks. Relative calm returned quickly to the islands, as the threat of renewed attack dissipated; places of amusement and saloons were permitted to open in February of 1942; and life returned to near normalcy after our victory at Midway removed any realistic threat of invasion. But the military still insisted that the civil courts remain closed and the writ of *habeas corpus* remain suspended. A considerable battle ensued over the next years between the ousted civilian officials and the governing generals. It culminated in a contempt citation issued by a federal judge against the Commanding General, followed by an order issued by the General threatening to court-martial the judge if he persisted in issuing writs of *habeas corpus*. Not until after the war (and the restoration of *habeas corpus* by the President) did the Supreme Court decide that Congress, in authorizing martial law in Hawaii, had not intended to permit the "supplanting of courts by military tribunals." By that time, thousands of man days of illegal imprisonment had already been served.³

Martial law in Hawaii, with all its abuses, did not include the kind of mass detention on racial grounds, used on the West Coast from 1942 to 1944. The removal and confinement of 110,000 Japanese-Americans, though carried out by the Army, resulted from intense pressure brought by civilian officials (such as the then Attorney General of California, Earl Warren). This shameful episode is publicly defended today by almost no one, not even the House Internal Security Committee, which recently called the episode—"at least in hindsight"—"a dark day in our history."

It is important to recall that the Supreme Court, although it did approve the forced removal of Japanese-Americans from the

³ The main reason why this issue did not reach the Supreme Court earlier was that the Justice Department "mooted" prior cases by releasing the defendants as soon as they filed petitions in the Supreme Court.

An extreme—and absurd—example of the inclination of judges to defer decision until after the emergency has passed was provided by a case growing out of the Hawaiian martial rule. In 1944, a Circuit Court of Appeals had approved the military trial of civilians. Two years later Circuit Judge Stephens filed a belated dissenting opinion, saying he had been reluctant to file it while the war was still going on.

¹ The Constitution specifically authorizes suspension "when in cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public safety may require it," and the Civil War was, of course, a rebellion within the intended meaning of that term.

West Coast, did not sustain their long-term detention in the camps. The only detention case decided by the Court involved a woman who the government conceded was loyal. That case reached the Court near the end of the war, when plans were already in progress to return the detainees to their homes. It was easy for the Court, therefore, to order the woman's release on the ground that Congress had never explicitly authorized detention of a "citizen who is concededly loyal (and who) presents no problem of espionage or sabotage." "Loyalty is a matter of the mind," said Justice Douglas, "not of race, creed or color."

The Japanese-American cases are more important for what they legitimated than for what they disapproved. As Justice Jackson observed in his dissenting opinion in the *Korematsu* case: "The principle (of this case) lies about like a loaded weapon for the hand of any authority that can bring forward a plausible claim of an urgent need." Within a few years after the last of the Japanese detention camps had been dismantled, Congress picked up this loaded weapon and aimed it at another group. On the heels of the Communist invasion of South Korea, a number of liberal Senators—among them Kilgore, Douglas, Humphrey, Lehman, Graham, Kefauver and Benton—introduced the Emergency Detention Act of 1950. After devoting fifteen paragraphs to a recitation of the evils of the "world Communist movement," the statute empowers the attorney general to arrest and detain anyone "as to whom there is a reasonable ground to believe that such person probably will engage in, or probably will conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage or sabotage." The suspect may be kept in "a place of detention" for an indefinite time, and he is denied such basic constitutional safeguards as trial by jury, bail, confrontation of his accuser and proof beyond reasonable doubt. This extraordinary measure can be invoked in the event of a Presidential declaration of "Internal Security Emergency," but such an emergency cannot be declared unless our territory is invaded, Congress declares war, or there is an insurrection in aid of a foreign enemy.

Had Congress declared war against North Korea or North Vietnam, as many—including some liberals—urged it to do, the President could have invoked the Detention Act. He could have invoked it also had he agreed with some Congressmen that the urban riots were "insurrections in aid of a foreign enemy." But since there has, in fact, been no Presidential declaration of internal security emergency since the enactment of the law, the detention provisions have never been employed.⁴

There was a time, however, when serious thought was given to mass detention of potential saboteurs. No less a liberal than former Sen. Paul Douglas declared, in the course of the debate over the Detention Act:

Mr. Hoover says there are 12,000 ["hard core . . . potential saboteurs and spies"]. In my judgment, if we had a period of national emergency—and I think it is pretty close to being a period of national emergency now—the best thing the country could do would be to "put them on ice," so to speak, treating them nicely but to take them out of circulation so that they could not commit acts of treason.

⁴ We are now in a state of "national emergency" as a result of President Truman's proclamation of December 16, 1950. The existence of this state has been reaffirmed by subsequent Presidents. But we are not in a state of "internal security emergency" which carries very different powers. Other possible states include: "extreme emergency," "sufficient emergency," "war or similar emergency" and "public peril."

Following the passage of the Act, the Justice Department established six detention "camps" throughout the country. These camps remained unused and generated little concern, until a few years ago a writer named Charles R. Allen achieved some prominence by publishing a pamphlet, "Concentration Camps, U.S.A.," which alleged that the Justice Department had a plan—code-named "Operation Dragnet"—under which it could round up hundreds of thousands of dissidents "overnight." That unfortunate document was given considerable credence by the publication of a report by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, entitled "Guerrilla Warfare in the United States." Among the actions that the report said "could be taken" in the event of a ghetto riot is the invocation of the Emergency Detention Law:

Acts of overt violence by the guerrillas would mean that they had declared a "state of war" within the country and, therefore, would forfeit their rights as in wartime. The [Detention] Act provides for various detention centers to be operated throughout the country and these might well be utilized for the temporary imprisonment of warring guerrillas.

The report also stated that during a "guerrilla uprising most civil liberties would have to be suspended. . . ." It is not surprising therefore that mimeographed copies of this report were widely circulated in black areas and that a survey by *The Washington Post* found a "deep and abiding" belief in the black community that massive riots would lead the government to "make a vast indiscriminate sweep down the streets of black ghettos and hustle every man, woman and child off into a concentration camp."

Another incident that lent some credence to the concentration camp alarm was a reported interview in which Deputy Attorney General Kleindienst was quoted as saying that demonstrators who "interfered with others . . . should be rounded up and put in a detention camp." On the very day that this charge was categorically denied, Kleindienst wrote a letter to Senator Eastland stating the Administration's recommendation that the Detention Law be repealed, because such action would "ally the fears and suspicions—unfounded as they may be—of many of our citizens; and this benefit 'outweighs any potential advantage which the Act may provide in a time of internal security emergency.'" (My own discussions with Mr. Kleindienst convinced me that he did not—and does not—advocate the use of the detention law that was attributed to him.)

The Senate recently voted, by voice and without debate, to repeal the detention law, but the House sent the proposal to the newly named but familiar Committee on Internal Security. Its chairman, Mr. Ichord, is now trying, with apparent success, to persuade his colleagues in the House that retention of the Detention Act would be in the interests of civil liberties, since the Act would not permit a roundup on racial grounds such as were used against the Japanese.⁵ It is unlikely, therefore, that we shall see repeal of the Detention Act in the immediate future.

⁵ Ichord's Alice in Wonderland logic assumes that the President would have more power to detain without a Congressional act than he would with such an act. What he neglects to mention is that the Supreme Court specifically relied on Congressional ratification in sustaining certain aspects, and in disallowing other aspects, of the Japanese relocation. Moreover, the disingenuousness of Ichord's crocodile tears for civil liberties is established by the fact that when repeal was considered in Committee, he introduced an amendment explicitly saying that repeal should not be construed to limit the President's inherent powers to order detention.

Nor are we likely to see repeal of the many other statutes that authorize the President to employ extraordinary powers during periods of crisis—powers which include the closing or taking over of radio and television stations; the censorship of newspapers; the imposition of travel restrictions on citizens and aliens; the summoning of the *posse comitatus* (the old "posse" of the cowboy movies); the calling out of federal troops; and the expropriation of private property (subject to subsequent reimbursement). Moreover, the President has considerable inherent powers which are said to derive from the nature of his office, and which can be invoked without regard to Congressional authorization.

The power to declare martial law, for example, is not even mentioned in the Constitution. Nor is the scope of that power anywhere defined, as an opinion of the attorney general pointed out in 1857:

The common law authorities and commentators afford no clue to what martial law, as understood in England, really is. . . . In this country, it is still worse.

"And what was true [of martial law] in 1857 remains true today," observed Justice Black in a 1946 opinion. Some commentators have been content to cite Wellington's cynical apothegm that martial law is simply the will of the general; or the equally simple-minded aphorism that "necessity knows no law." The Supreme Court has recognized that "Civil liberty and this kind of martial law cannot endure together; the antagonism is irreconcilable."

While courts have delivered opinions that are full of promise and prose about their majestic role during crises and the "irrepealable" nature of our fundamental safeguards, they have acted far more cautiously. And experience teaches that what courts have in fact done in the past is a far better guide to what they will do in the future than is the rhetoric they have invoked.

What then could we reasonably expect from our courts if an American President during a period of dire emergency were once again to suspend important constitutional safeguards? Past experiences suggest the following outline: The courts—especially the Supreme Court—will generally not interfere with the Executive's handling of a genuine emergency while it still exists, but will employ every technique of judicial avoidance at their disposal to postpone decision. (Indeed, though thousands of persons have been unlawfully confined during the country's various periods of declared emergency, I am aware of no case where the Supreme Court has ever actually ordered anyone's release while the emergency persisted.)⁶ The likely exceptions to this rule of judicial postponement will be cases of clear abuse when no real emergency can be said to exist, and cases in which delay would result in irrevocable loss of rights, such as those involving the death penalty.⁷ Once the emergency has passed, the courts will generally not approve further punishment; they will order the release of all those sentenced to imprisonment or death in violation of ordinary constitutional safeguards. But they will not entertain damage suits for illegal confinement ordered during the course of the emergency.

When these strands are woven together there emerges an approach to the limits of

⁶ The Japanese detention case was decided while we were still at war with Japan but well after the danger of a Japanese invasion has ended. Some lower federal courts did order the release of individuals of German and Italian origin who were detained on the East Coast.

⁷ In *ex parte Quirin*, the Supreme Court held that German spies captured in the United States could be tried and sentenced to death by a military commission.

martial law which was encapsulated by Justice Holmes: Martial law is not "for punishment" but rather "by way of precaution, to prevent the exercise of hostile power." This distinction between "punitive" and "preventive" law runs through the cases and has been echoed by many commentators. But, as Blackstone recognized many years ago, there is no sharp line between punishment and prevention: "If we consider all human punishment in a large and extended view, we shall find them all rather calculated to prevent future crimes than to expiate the past." Practically speaking, the distinction means simply that the courts will tolerate preventive detention during an emergency, but will not approve the carrying out of any part of a sentence after the emergency has ended.

The prediction of what courts will do in fact may not prove entirely accurate. Important changes have occurred since World War II. The Warren Court entered "political thickets" into which previous Courts had been reluctant to venture, and its bold record of recognizing and enforcing basic rights can scarcely be undone by the Burger Court. Civil rights organizations have proliferated and are better—though probably not well enough—prepared to resist an emergency suspension of civil rights. And, most important, the war in Vietnam and other recent events may have divided the country beyond any possibility of full repair; short of a nuclear holocaust, we shall probably never again see an emergency that will bring the country together in a unanimous display of solidarity and patriotism such as followed the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

But historical experience—even when tempered by these recent developments—ought to warn us that we cannot place entire reliance upon judges to vindicate our liberties in the midst of great national crises. Judge Learned Hand recognized this when he said: "Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women; when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it." But just how deeply is liberty engrained in the hearts of American men and women? Can we rely on their "eternal vigilance" to resist suspension of fundamental safeguards during periods of crisis (especially those safeguards designed to protect a small minority)? History is disappointing in this respect. When the military assumed control in Hawaii, few protests were heard from the average citizen. Part of the reason, of course, was that it is in the nature of military rule to discourage dissent. In Hawaii, newspapers were allowed to print only what the generals wanted the people to read, and public criticism was punished by court-martial. But there is a subtle, and dangerous, sense in which people—even people whose traditions proclaim liberty—becomes comfortable with regimentation and authority. They do not necessarily welcome it, but neither are they willing to take risks in order to restore traditional rights. Many Hawaiian businessmen and store owners, for example, resisted the return of civilian authority and even wired the President to urge caution in the restoration of *habeas corpus*. As one businessman commented: [We] were a darned sight safer as American citizens under that kind of military control....

It has been indeed fortunate for the survival of our liberties that there have always been some Americans—often only a small group and sometimes not those directly affected—who have been willing to challenge governmental highhandedness, even during periods of crisis. Under our constitutional system, it takes only a single person challenging the government to create a case or controversy suitable for judicial resolution.

Even though the Supreme Court has been reluctant to decide such cases and controversies in the midst of the crisis, it has performed an important historical cleansing function by condemning illegal action after normality has been restored. But the courts should do more than issue retrospective *pronunciamientos*. This is not to suggest that justice should remain blind to the existence of a real emergency endangering the survival of the nation. As Justice Arthur Goldberg once wrote: "While the Constitution protects against the invasion of individual rights, it is not a suicide pact." But it is precisely during times of crisis—when the balance between momentary expediency and enduring safeguards often goes askew—that courts can perform their most critical function: to preserve or restore a sense of perspective.

Nor is there any sound reason why the courts should refuse to entertain declaratory actions challenging emergency powers before they are invoked. Legal issues can be "discussed and decided without passion" before a crisis as well as after it, and with considerably greater impact. But such anticipatory litigation has been generally rejected, on the ground that there will be ample opportunity for challenge when the emergency power is invoked. (A constitutional attack on the Emergency Detention Act, for example, was recently dismissed on this basis.) Given the course of avoidance consistently followed by courts during emergencies, this "wait for the crunch" argument is not persuasive.

Learned Hand is surely correct when he warns that courts alone cannot save liberty during times of crisis. But he is wrong when he suggests that "no court can even do much to help it." In the eternal struggle between liberty and security, we have come to expect the executive and legislative branches to champion the latter. The judiciary—with its lifetime tenure, its tradition of independence, and its unique stewardship over our irreplaceable rights—is the institution most able to resist the passing fears and passions of a dangerous moment.

But liberty, like life itself, needs many sources of nutriment to sustain it. It is not a commodity that can be obtained once and for all and then passively held on to. The difficult struggle must be endured by every new generation and in each new crisis. What Thomas Paine taught us on the eve of our own Revolution remains true today: "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

MASS MURDER IN THE SUDAN

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most cruel wars of extermination to cloud the annals of this century is going on today in the South Sudan.

A half million black Africans have been murdered by the armies of the Arab military dictatorship in Khartoum. As many more have perished from starvation and pestilence, and at least 300,000 others are in exile in adjoining African countries.

Yet, because the region is so far removed from ordinary news channels, very few Americans know anything about this genocidal war. Three years ago I

called it to the attention of the House, and quoted articles by a team of West German correspondents who had managed to penetrate that distant and troubled area. Their report, in the German newsweekly *Stern*, was headed "Here, Arabs May Murder Negroes—the Drama That Remains Unreported." This, and reports from other observers, appeared in an article from the magazine *Prevent World War III*, which I included in my remarks at the time.

Meanwhile, many months have passed; men, women, and children have been slain; churches have been burned, and all Catholic and Protestant missionaries have been forcibly expelled.

At the 1970 session of the United Nations General Assembly, a delegation representing the people of the South Sudan presented a formal petition, asking that a fact-finding body be sent to investigate conditions there. I quote one paragraph from this petition:

The crime of genocide has been committed against 4 million people of South Sudan because they are black, because they are African, and because they do not belong to the dominant religion of the North.

In this is summed up the tragedy: The Sudan, Africa's largest country, is governed by a minority of Arabs, committed to a program of close cooperation with the Soviets, and armed with Soviet-supplied weapons. The Africans of the south are mostly Christian or animistic—and they resist forced Moslemization and forced socialization. So they are being killed.

The petition of the South Sudanese was well received by the President of the General Assembly, who forwarded it to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights—where it was buried. Unfortunately, delegates of Arab and Communist countries comprise a dominant bloc in that Commission. Even more unfortunate, however, was the failure of our own Department of State to instruct the American delegates to raise their voices on the subject of genocide in the South Sudan.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to you an article entitled "Mass Murder in the Sudan," which appears in the spring, 1971, issue of *Prevent World War III*, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, 50 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. Written by Dr. James H. Sheldon, a well-known specialist on Middle Eastern and African affairs, it gives a full background of this war, which has been too long hidden from the eyes of the world and from the conscience of our own Nation.

I include this article in the RECORD, as part of my remarks:

MASS MURDER IN THE SUDAN

(By James H. Sheldon)

The struggle of millions of black Africans in the Sudan, to retain their freedom and their very lives against genocidal oppression by an Arab government, is one of the great tragedies of our times.

In the Southern Sudan, this conflict has already led to violent death for a half-million black people, widespread starvation and pestilence resulting in more deaths, and the forced exile of 300,000 men, women and children.

There is a sickening parallel to Hitler's campaign of extermination against the Jews of Germany, a generation ago. Yet, the story is mostly untold in the outside world, and the terrible facts have barely commenced to make an impression upon the conscience of humanity.

The huge Sudan lies just South of Egypt. In area, it is Africa's largest nation. Arabized Moslems living in the Northern section constitute only a minority of the population, but they control the left-leaning dictatorial government, headquartered in Khartoum. The black African majority find themselves dispossessed—especially the 4.5 million concentrated in the three Southern provinces, where an organized popular movement has been struggling for fifteen years to gain political and civil rights.

From the very beginning of Sudanese independence the black Africans have been restive under Khartoum rule, because they remember long centuries of the slave trade, during which the Arabs were the principal dealers in human merchandise.

Moreover, the Africans in the South are of a different culture and religion—Christian, in the towns and cities, and pagan in the countryside. There are also economic factors. The South contains most of the Sudan's water supply, and is a potentially rich agricultural area. As viewed by the politically dominant Arab North, it is a region ripe for colonization.

Not long after the end of British administration, the Arab government began an all-out campaign to destroy local institutions in the South, and to forcibly substitute Islam for other religions. Christian missionaries—231 Roman Catholic and 51 Protestant—were expelled. In some instances native priests were killed outright. Mission schools—usually the only source of local education—were ordered closed. Churches were destroyed, and mosques were erected at public expense. Non-Moslem leaders were driven out, or killed.

What happened next is graphically summed up in a petition which a delegation representing the Southern Sudanese people presented to the President of the United Nations General Assembly in December, 1970.* We quote from it:

"Since the year 1962 nearly one million South Sudanese men, women and children have perished either through deprivation, famine and disease, or they have been shot dead.

"About 300,000 others live as refugees in the neighboring countries of Uganda, Congo, Kenya, Ethiopia and the Central African Republic. Those left in South Sudan live equally as refugees, hiding in tropical forests and mountains. . . .

"The crime of genocide has been committed and is being committed against 4 million people of South Sudan because they are black, because they are African and because they do not belong to the dominant religion of the North."

The details of the struggle are of a kind that one usually finds only in horror movies.

The Khartoum regime, backed up by military manpower and equipment from Egypt and Libya, and with support from Algeria and other Arab states, sent into the South an army that now totals 25,000, with headquarters at the regional capital, Juba. Sophisticated arms, including MIG planes, were supplied by the Soviets, and Soviet advisors are reported in Juba. Finances came from outside, including an initial gift of \$5.5 million from the oil-rich sheikhdom of Kuwait.

The Southern inhabitants, unwilling to

submit, armed themselves with left-over weapons brought in from the Congo, with captured equipment, or with ancient tribal spears. Here are some incidents from the unequal contest:

In 1965, following the arrival of the first major forces from Khartoum, 1400 people were massacred in Juba. At the town of Torit, 150 were killed. At Yei-Yambio, 450 more; at Kapoeta, 87, and so on.

Soon native villages were emptied as their people fled into the jungles and marshes. Then a campaign was started against the herds of cattle on which the Africans depend principally for food and livelihood. In December of 1969, an air raid destroyed 800 cattle in the Ngok area—by that time mostly emptied of human beings, so only a few persons were injured. In January, 1970, a raid killed 500 more cattle in the Nasser district, with no human casualties; in February, at Akobo, 3000 animals were killed in a combined air and ground operation, and hundreds more driven away as loot.

With their major food source taken away, starvation came next—and a roving Newsweek photographer who had managed to get into the region was horrified by the crowds of starving children, with distended stomachs, whom he found in the aftermath.

PLANNED TERRORISM

Meanwhile, attacks on the towns continued. During November, 1970, Morta and Ido were bombed, attacked from armored cars and burned down, with 50 African corpses left behind. On August 20, 1970, Arab troops raided villages near Mogiri—murdering five people, but primarily concerned to make sure that the settlements were burned and their people forced into flight. For a continuous period of ten days in June the villages of the Torit district were raided from the air—and then burned. Even a leper colony (at Lokondo) was destroyed—and those too sick to escape into the forest were killed.

Many of the Africans who survived but did not manage to get away, were deported to forced labor centers, euphemistically called "peace villages."

As an example of planned terrorism, consider the case of a hamlet called Bamga, on the Congolese border, where on July 23, 1970, Khartoum troops found most of the people engaged in prayer, at the village church. As an Anglican priest reported the next events, 28 of these unfortunates were caught, roped together inside the church, and machine-gunned. Then the building was burned down, while the Arab soldiers jeered: "We shall kill you and your God will not come and save you."

In an earlier massacre at the town of Wau the victims were 76 persons attending a double wedding. The killing of this group meant the destruction of most of the educated (and Christian) leadership of the town.

Such incidents of deliberate horror can only be explained as part of a consciously planned campaign to destroy all vestiges of the native culture which had previously existed in the region.

It is Khartoum policy to build, at public expense, a mosque in every place of any size, and to decree that it shall be the only accepted place of religious worship. It is also the practice to "develop" areas from which the population has been forced to flee, by handing them over to favored Arabs moving in from the North.

"THE UNKNOWN WAR"

Unfortunately, the Sudan is so far removed from communication centers that these genocidal events have gone almost unnoticed. We have intentionally included in the above paragraphs the names of places that are not apt to be found on maps in European or American atlases, because this

helps to dramatize the isolation of the area. Journalists are forbidden to visit the South. To report the mass murder that goes on there, they must resort to dangerous and clandestine entries across remote borders with other African countries. Nevertheless, a few reporters have managed to penetrate the region—beginning with a team of two from the West German photo magazine Stern, which printed their findings in a series called "The Unknown War: Here, Arabs May Murder Negroes."

Last year David Robison, the Newsweek photographer quoted above, succeeded in making the dangerous trip. Within the last two or three months, a Norwegian Television team also visited the region. Among the "shocking" things with which the Norwegians returned, were pictures of the ruined church at Bamja.

In its drive to enforce absolute conformity, the Khartoum regime has extended its attack to include dissident religious and ethnic groups amongst the Moslems themselves. The Ansar followers of the Mahdi were the victims of such a campaign in March, 1969, when at least 1200 of these opponents of the Arab-leftist dictatorship were mercilessly destroyed, mostly in fighting at Aba. Again, Soviet MIG planes took part in the operation.

The open support which Moscow has given to the genocidal war against the South is apparent not only from the presence of MIG planes and Russian advisors at Juba, but also in official Soviet propaganda intended for foreign consumption. For example, on Nov. 16, 1970, just after the South Sudanese delegates had arrived at the United Nations, Radio Moscow (in a broadcast to the Arab world) castigated "the secessionists" as "a gang of criminals and thieves" and called them "tools in the hands of the imperialists." This is normal Soviet terminology for attacking any elements of democratic resistance, particularly in the critical Middle East region where the Kremlin is trying to establish a vast new sphere of influence.

Meanwhile, the South Sudan has developed a kind of rudimentary self-government, under the leadership of the Southern Sudan Liberation Front. Its military arm, the Anya-Nya, has somehow rounded up enough weapons to make the roads and the back country untenable for the Sudanese troops, in spite of the Soviet-made bombers and Soviet advisors. As of the present, the cities and towns—nearly depopulated, following the flight of most of the indigenous Africans—are controlled by forces from Khartoum, while the countryside is in the hands of the local people. A simple tax system has been worked out by the South Sudanese and wherever possible rudimentary schools are maintained by the local authorities.

The South Sudan did not initially ask for separate sovereignty, but preferred to seek its political and civil rights within a clearly defined federation. In fact, the outlines of such a federation had been prepared before withdrawal of the British administration. The central regime at Khartoum, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with the twin purposes of Islamization and communization. Of late, the erection of a new United Arab Republic—joining Sudan with Egypt, Libya and Syria—has also occupied much of Khartoum's attention. This evokes the spectre of grave new danger for the Africans of the South. Unless a fairly prompt solution can be secured, Southern support for the idea of a federated Sudan may give way to outright separatism, provided the inhabitants of the region have not been murdered or starved out in the meanwhile.

UN MUST ACT

In their petition to the United Nations, the delegates of the Southern Sudan Liberation Front ask that a fact-finding commis-

* Petition presented to Dr. Edvard Hambro, President of the General Assembly, by delegation of Southern Sudan Liberation Front, Dec. 15, 1970.

sion be created to investigate their charges, and to report back to the General Assembly. They also ask for immediate steps to prevent the supplying of arms and troops by outside nations, such as the Soviets, the Egyptians and the Libyans. They would like to see the creation of a UN peacekeeping force, to help put a stop to the bloodshed.

South Sudanese refugees in the neighboring African states already account for a major part of the burden of the UN's High Commissioner for Refugees, the distinguished Prince Sadruddin Aga Khan. The High Commissioner's office, although operating under grave budgetary stringencies, evidently considers that the problem of Sudanese refugees is not apt to be settled quickly, and has started a communal agricultural program for one group of 20,000 Sudanese, at M'Boki, in the Central African Republic.

The South Sudanese petition urgently asks that the International Red Cross be invited to supplement this assistance, particularly with medical and food aid to displaced people inside the Sudan, as well as those who have fled to neighboring countries.

Disquieting news of another kind meanwhile comes from the province of Ethiopia, immediately adjoining the Sudan, where a violent guerrilla operation supported by several Arab states is trying to gain control of the strategic area fronting on the Red Sea. Again, the arms being used are mostly Soviet. As in the South Sudan, black Africans—this time the Ethiopians—have suffered heavy casualties.

Taken in conjunction with the fighting in Southern Sudan, and the announcement of the impending federation of Egypt, Libya, Syria and Sudan, the Eritrean development compels one to wonder whether Arab leaders, with communist support, are still intent on realizing some of the late President Nasser's grandiose plans to take over all of Africa, "to the remotest depths of the jungle."

RE-COLONIZATION?

It is important to understand the South Sudan struggle in this context. When the British withdrew from both Egypt and the Sudan, most observers assumed that the area had been "decolonized." In actual fact, what followed was merely the substitution of a new colonial overlord; and the Arabized Moslems promptly set out to make themselves masters of the non-Moslem African majority, resorting to murder and plunder for accomplishing that purpose. As David McClintock writes in the current issue of *The Middle East Journal*, the conflict is not merely the product of an internal crisis, but "a confrontation between two major African peoples," so that "rather than being a direct product of Western decolonization, it is one result of a contest between two important peoples of the non-Western world."*

In other words, the colonial problem does not always involve Europeans versus non-Europeans; it can also involve, in even more brutal form, Arabs against black Africans.

The President of the UN General Assembly, Dr. Edvard Hambro, in the closing days of the 1970 session, referred the South Sudan petition to the Commission on Human Rights which meets at Geneva in late February. At that time, the unhappy people of the region will have their first opportunity to be heard in an international forum. Unfortunately, the 1971 membership of the Commission on Human Rights includes a large bloc of Arab and communist states. The people of the world will be watching to see whether these meetings are dominated by humanity or by political expediency.

*David Wm. McClintock, "The Southern Sudan Problem," *Middle East Journal*, Autumn, 1970, published by Middle East Institute, Washington, D.C.

THE RIGHT OF ENTRY TO DESTROY

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in the Supreme Court decision, *Communist Party against Subversive Activities Control Board*, 1961, it says:

When existing government is menaced by a world-wide integrated movement which employs every combination of possible means, peaceful and violent, domestic and foreign, overt and clandestine, to destroy the government itself—the legislative judgment as to how that threat may best be met consistently with the safeguarding of personal freedom is not to be set aside merely because the judgment of judges would, in the first instances, have chosen other methods.

Two recent cases involving the travel to the United States of noncitizens known to espouse Communist doctrines have attracted a great deal of attention. The most widely known was the case of Bernadette Devlin.

Miss Devlin is a self-professed "true Communist" who probably could have been denied admission to the United States under section 221(a)(2)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, better known as the McCarran Act. This section of the act states that aliens who are anarchists, or affiliated with any Communist Party, or who "advocate the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of World Communism or the establishment in the United States of a totalitarian dictatorship," are ineligible to receive visas to enter the United States.

During her stay in the United States, Miss Devlin railed against our way of life and threw whatever weight she has behind the causes of people such as Angela Davis. The Internal Revenue Service is now investigating the allegation that she left the country without paying income tax on the money she collected during her tour.

While Miss Devlin's activities were proving the worth of the alien exclusion provisions of the McCarran Act, a U.S. district court in New York was striking this section of the act down. This was the case of one Ernest Mandel against Attorney General Mitchell. Mandel is a Belgian Marxist of the Trotskyite school—revolution now—who had twice previously, in 1962 and 1968, been admitted to the United States under a waiver. His third application for entry to the United States in September of 1969 was denied. The Department of Justice stated that Mandel "was ineligible because of his subversive affiliations" and because "on his last visit in 1968 his activities went far beyond the stated purpose of his trip, on the basis of which his admission had been authorized, and represented a flagrant abuse of the opportunities afforded him to express his views in this country."

In a 2-to-1 decision, the three-judge district court decided that, while no one was contending that Mandel was not "an

advocate of the economic, international, and governmental doctrines of world communism," denying him entry to espouse these views was an abridgment of the first amendment rights of some of our citizens who might wish to hear him." Section 221(a)(2)(B) of the McCarran Act was declared to be unconstitutional.

Incredible decisions of this type are the reason why my latest districtwide questionnaire revealed that 69.8 percent of my constituents responding had decreasing or little or no confidence in our Federal courts.

The McCarran Act was based on the long established principle that the congressional power to exclude aliens is absolute and that the interests of national security make it necessary to give the Government the power to deny entry to those who advocate the destruction of our way of life. Previous landmark court decisions have upheld these principles.

The framers of our Constitution understood and continually affirmed the right and duty of the Government to protect the citizenry from foreign danger. James Madison in *Federalist Paper No. 41* stated:

Security against foreign danger is one of the primitive (first) objects of civil society. The means of security can only be regulated by the means and the danger of attack. They will, in fact, be ever determined by these rules, and by no others. It is vain to oppose constitutional barriers to the impulse of self-preservation. It is worse than in vain; because it plants in the Constitution itself necessary usurpations of power.

This wisdom of one of the Founding Fathers was recalled by Judge John Bartels in his dissenting opinion. Judge Bartels went on to add:

In the hierarchy of priorities the imperative of national security in dealing with aliens must prevail over limited restrictions upon First Amendment rights."

Most reasonable people will agree with this.

The Justice Department has until the middle of May to appeal this egregious decision. Attorney General Mitchell would probably welcome a show of citizen support for a reversal of the Mandel decision.

NATIONAL SECRETARIES WEEK

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the last full week in April has again been designated as Secretaries Week. In 1971, the week is April 18-24, Wednesday, April 21, being highlighted as Secretaries Day. The National Secretaries Association—International—in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Commerce originated the idea for Secretaries Week. The theme again will be, "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business."

Special committees are established throughout NSA to formulate programs to make Secretaries Week ever more

meaningful to secretaries and to the business community. In keeping with the professional objective of the association, chapters of NSA sponsor special educational activities such as seminars, workshops, and study groups available to members and nonmembers alike. Additional recognition is gained for the secretarial profession during the week through public appearances of NSA members at meetings of civic, educational, and professional groups, as well as through open meetings for all secretaries.

This then, for the 20th consecutive year, is Secretaries Week. Nineteen hundred and seventy-one—a time for secretaries to look back on past accomplishments and ahead to future progress.

TWO POEMS BY MARILYN KRANTZ

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, the poet's role frequently is to give expression to those sentiments many of us share, but with a style, precision, and talent for language that many of us do not command.

Mrs. Marilyn Krantz, who is the editor of the Northeast and Feltonville Weekly which serves part of my northeast Philadelphia district, is such a gifted poet.

Her poem "Not on a Silver Platter" describes what it has taken to build that tiny but indomitable state, Israel, on the eastern shore of the Mediterranean. The poem has been widely read in Philadelphia-area synagogues and before meetings of Philadelphia organizations. Mrs. Krantz says that she hopes the poem expresses Israel's worthiness of our continued support and the continued respect of peoples and nations all over the world. I think it does.

A second poem by Mrs. Krantz, "John F. Kennedy . . . His Message to the World," evokes the memory of our fallen President and acknowledges this Nation and this people's continuing debt to him. This poem won first prize in the poetry contest of the Philadelphia Regional Writers' Conference in June 1964.

With the unanimous consent of my colleagues, I place these two poems on the RECORD:

NOT ON A SILVER PLATTER

(By Marilyn Krantz)

Israel was not handed over
On a silver platter,
Yet isn't this the truth of all
Things that really matter?

The State of Israel has come
To the Jewish nation
On a platter beset with both
Sorrow and Elation.
Not one ounce of silver's in it,
Nor a single drop of gold,
Yet its value (beyond measure)
Only History can unfold.

It is made of fallen heroes . . .
Of wives' and mothers' tears . . .

Of the Maccabean spirit
Which dates back two thousand years . . .

Of a People's dauntless struggle
To uphold man's dignity . . .
Of willingness to live or die
For Peace, as the need may be . . .

Of moral strength and courage
Voiced in songs both sad and gay . . .
Of stubborn perseverance
Shining forth 'mid skies of gray.

Its blend of countless heartbreaks
And endless hours of toil . . .
Of blood and sweat, prayers and sighs,
All mingled with the soil . . .

Of many busy, vital hands
Moving in harmony:
Planning, working, building the land,
Fighting to keep it free . . .

Molded, too, from that same spirit
Which gave birth to Herzl's notion
Of a Jewish homeland—
And engraved with God's devotion.

No, Israel was not handed over
On a silver platter,
Yet isn't this the truth of all
Things that really matter!

JOHN F. KENNEDY . . . HIS MESSAGE TO THE
WORLD

He stood erect, with youthful smile—
Wise far beyond his years;
His words instilled in young and old
The strength to conquer fears.

He gave his heart and soul to aid
Mankind in time of strife,
And then, as if 'twas not enough,
He gave his only life!

Whisked from our arms, he left his mark
Upon the Nation's heart;
Heaven wept, also—tears and rain
Could scarce be told apart.

Of what great magnitude, his love,
That from lands far-and-wide
Came leaders, shedding differences
To stand, bowed, side by side!

All grieved alike, despite their creed
Or color of their skin;
He proved in death, his theme in life:
That all men are akin.

His voice, through stilled, can yet be heard
In freedom's vibrant song,
Echoing hope's eternal plea
That Right shall conquer Wrong.

For, like the sun which disappears
Behind the clouds at night,
Great men are never really gone
But only out of sight.

THE REVEREND FATHER JOSEPH F.
THORNING

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the House of Representatives on the occasion of Pan American Day was honored to be led in prayer by one of the most distinguished constituents of Maryland's Sixth District, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, of St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, Md. This marked the 28th annual appearance of Father Thorning before the House on Pan American Day.

Father Thorning, known as the Padre of the Americas, has been a personal friend for many years as well as a friend of both my parents. Father Thorning is one of America's eminent scholars in Latin American affairs and is known throughout the hemisphere and in Europe for his efforts on behalf of brotherhood and international understanding in the Americas. I commend his efforts as an example that others should try to emulate. I personally hope that he will return each year for many years to join the House of Representatives in marking Pan American Day.

VIETNAM

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter vacation my colleague from California, PAUL McCLOSKEY, and I visited Vietnam and visited Laos, and a series of reports will be forthcoming from that visit. Tonight will be the first report, involving a program that is a part of Vietnamization, as is apparently the case, a program designed, in my view, to suppress political dissent in that country at a time when the war is over, as well as the program that is presently in existence in Vietnam during this war period. It is a program that is called the Phung Hoang program, otherwise known as the Phoenix program.

My first introduction to the program occurred upon the initial briefing that was provided Congressman McCLOSKEY and I in Saigon by the CORDS people.

At that time they were giving what they called "neutralization" figures. They reported that in Military Region One in 1971 we had "neutralized" 5,380 members of the Vietcong infrastructure and political dissenters in that country.

The breakdown of the neutralization figures is as follows: "Kills," 2,000. They are obviously "neutralized," the briefing officer said, when they are killed. I suspect that is a fair assessment.

Rallied, 17,000. These are the Chieu Hoi ralliers to the flag of South Vietnam, as they become "neutralized" when they rally.

Sentenced, 1,680. These are people that were sentenced to more than 1 year for their offenses as being identified as part of the Vietcong infrastructure.

Captured, 4,000 people. These are not considered to be "neutralized" because they received sentences of less than 1 year and were not determined to be a part of the Vietcong infrastructure but were people that were determined to have been in opposition to the existing government in South Vietnam.

So of a total of over 9,000 people in Military Region One in five northern provinces 5,380 of them were considered to be neutralized whereas 4,000 of them were not considered to be "neutralized" because they were not given sentences up to 1 year in length.

The figure that startled us who were listening to the briefing was the fact that 2,000 people under the Phoenix program were killed and thereby considered to be neutralized.

We sought additional information on precisely what this particular program was, and one document that immediately came to our attention was a MACV—Military Assistance Command Vietnam—directive 525-36 dated 18 May 1970. It was entitled "Military Operations Phoenix—Phung Hoang—Operations" and it was a directive to all U.S. military personnel acting as advisers to the South Vietnamese in that program.

This is part of that statement and, Mr. Speaker, at this point I include this MACV directive in full with my remarks:

U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE
COMMAND, VIETNAM,
APO SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

May 18, 1970.

DIRECTIVE NUMBER 525-36—MILITARY
OPERATIONS

PHOENIX (PHUNG HOANG) OPERATIONS

1. *Purpose.* This directive establishes policy and responsibilities for all US personnel participating in, or supporting in any way, Phoenix (Phung Hoang) operations.

2. *Applicability.* This directive is applicable to all MACV staff agencies and subordinate commands.

3. Policy.

a. The Phoenix Program is one of advice, support, and assistance to the Government of Vietnam (GVN) Phung Hoang Program, aimed at reducing the influence and effectiveness of the Viet Cong Infrastructure (VCI) in the Republic of Vietnam (RVN). The VCI is an inherent part of the war effort being waged against the GVN by the Viet Cong (VC) and their North Vietnamese allies. The unlawful status of members of the VCI (as defined in the "Green Book" and in GVN official decrees) is well established in GVN law and is in full accord with the laws of land warfare followed by the US Army.

b. Operations against the VCI include: the collection of intelligence identifying these members, inducing them to abandon their allegiance to the VC and rally to the government, capturing or arresting them in order to bring them before province security committees for lawful sentencing, and as a final resort the use of military or police force against them (if no other way) of preventing them from carrying on their unlawful activities is possible. Our training emphasizes the desirability of obtaining these target individuals alive and of using intelligent and lawful methods of interrogation to obtain the truth of what they know about other aspects of the VCI. US personnel are under the same legal and moral constraints with respect to operations of a Phoenix character as they are with respect to regular military operations against enemy units in the field. Thus, they are specifically unauthorized to engage in assassinations or other violations of the rules of land warfare, but they are entitled to use such reasonable military force as is necessary to obtain the goals of rallying, capturing, or eliminating the VCI in the RVN.

c. If US personnel come in contact with activities conducted by Vietnamese which do not meet the standards of land warfare, they are:

- (1) Not to participate further in the activity.
- (2) Expected to make their objections to this kind of behavior known to the Vietnamese conducting them.

(3) Expected to report the circumstances to the next higher US authority for decision as to action to be taken with the GVN.

d. There are individuals who find normal police work or even military operations repugnant to them personally, despite the overall legality and morality of these activities. Arrangements exist whereby individuals having this feeling about military affairs can, according to law, receive specialized assignments or even exemption from military service. There is no similar legislation with respect to police type activities of the US military, but if an individual finds the police type activities of the Phoenix Program repugnant to him, on his application, he can be reassigned from the program without prejudice.

4. *Responsibilities.* Subordinate US commanders are to insure that the policies outlined above are strictly adhered to.

5. *Reports.* This directive requires no report.

W. G. DOLVIN,
Major General, U.S.A.,
Chief of Staff.

Part of the statement is:

POLICY

The PHOENIX Program is one of advice, support, and assistance to the Government of Vietnam (GVN) Phung Hoang Program, aimed at reducing the influence and effectiveness of the Viet Cong Infrastructure (VCI) in the Republic of Vietnam (RVN). The VCI is an inherent part of the war effort being waged against the GVN by the Viet Cong (VC) and their North Vietnamese allies. The unlawful status of members of the VCI (as defined in the "Green Book" and in GVN official decrees) is well established in GVN law and is in full accord with the laws of land warfare followed by the US Army.

I emphasize the latter sentence.

It continues:

Operations against the VCI include: the collection of intelligence identifying these members, inducing them to abandon their allegiance to the VC and rally to the government, capturing or arresting them in order to bring them before province security committees for lawful sentencing, and as a final resort the use of military or police force against them (if no other way) of preventing them from carrying on their unlawful activities is possible. Our training emphasizes the desirability of obtaining these target individuals alive and of using intelligent and lawful methods of interrogation to obtain the truth of what they know about other aspects of the VCI. US personnel are under the same legal and moral constraints with respect to operations of a PHOENIX character as they are with respect to regular military operations against enemy units in the field.

Please listen carefully to the next sentence:

Thus, they are specifically unauthorized to engage in assassinations.

I will read that sentence again, Mr. Speaker:

Thus, they are specifically unauthorized to engage in assassinations or other violations of the rules of land warfare, but they are entitled to use such reasonable military force as is necessary to obtain the goals of rallying, capturing, or eliminating the VCI in the RVN.

It seems to me to be a rather absurd requirement that a MACV directive to U.S. Army personnel cooperating with the Government of South Vietnam in the operation of the Phoenix program must state American military men are "spe-

cifically unauthorized to engage in assassinations."

The directive further says:

c. If US personnel come in contact with activities conducted by Vietnamese which do not meet the standards of land warfare, they are:

(1) Not to participate further in the activity.

(2) Expected to make their objections to this kind of behavior known to the Vietnamese conducting them.

(3) Expected to report the circumstances to the next higher US authority for decision as to action to be taken with the GVN.

d. There are individuals who find normal police work or even military operations repugnant to them personally, despite the overall legality and morality of these activities. Arrangements exist whereby individuals having this feeling about military affairs can, according to law, receive specialized assignments or even exemption from military service. There is no similar legislation with respect to police type activities of the US military, but if an individual finds the police type activities of the Phoenix Program repugnant to him, on his application, he can be reassigned from the program without prejudice.

The directive goes on, Mr. Speaker, but the words in the sentence "they are specifically unauthorized to engage in assassinations" is ominous in the extreme.

Mr. Speaker, looking further into the program we discovered a briefing paper that was provided us from the director of Military Region 1 in Danang, which was apparently a document prepared for the U.S. military advisers to the Phoenix program. The document is entitled "An Analysis of Province Security Committee." I will read just portions of the document and will request at the end of my reading from the document that the text be printed in its entirety following my analysis.

The document follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF PROVINCE SECURITY COMMITTEES BACKGROUND

Province Security Committees (PSC) were created in 1957 to provide the CVN with an administrative method of settling the status of political detainees considered threats to the national security. Their purpose is political; their method is administrative detention of those persons reasonably believed to endanger the national security, but against whom sufficient evidence for a trial is lacking.

PROCEDURE

Suspect detainees may appear before the committee but do not have the right to demand such appearance. Due to the administrative nature and political mission of the PSC, procedures are far less exacting than those of the courts.

DETENTION

Where evidence for trial is lacking, but it is apparent that the suspect is a threat to the national security, the committee may impose administrative ("an Tri") detention. This is a type of preventative detention to protect the state from a known threat to its security. There is the additional provision of continual extension of two year terms if the individual remains a threat to the national security. "An Tri" detention is non-judicial and administrative in nature. A violation of the national security laws need not be proven; all that must be demon-

strated is that a reasonable belief exists that the suspect threatens the national security. Once "an tri" detention is imposed there are no judicial remedies. The duration and place of detention are governed by GVN administrative regulations.

BASIS OF DETERMINATION

The purpose of the PSC is to protect the State from those persons threatening its existence. Thus its power goes beyond that of the courts into the area of emergency political detention necessitated by the need of the State to survive. There is no defined burden of proof, as utilized by courts, because the committees are not engaged with violators of law. The committee is concerned with those cases which, due to a lack of evidence, cannot be prosecuted under existing judicial standards. Rather than a judicial determination, these cases call for an administrative determination. The decision of the committee is based on a prosecution dossier. There is no rigid rule regarding the amount of evidence necessary for detention, and the criteria may vary significantly from province to province. Each committee determines the existing threat to national security based on conditions within the particular province, and the function of the detainee within the VCI. This process, because it is administrative and political in nature, reflects the political "facts-of-life" in the province. It is incumbent upon each PHOENIX Coordinator to determine these local variances and tailor his advice accordingly. The PSC does not need evidence of the type required by a court; on the other hand, a dossier which contains nothing but an interrogation report cannot be expected to convince the committee that a maximum detention is warranted. What is necessary is sufficient intelligence to reasonably indicate that the suspect is a threat to national security. Thus the test applied by the PSC is not one of proven guilt. This is the distinguishing factor between the PSC and a Military Court. The court is concerned with guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, or the existence of a proven violation of national security, whereas the PSC is concerned with preventing danger to the State by a suspect who appears to threaten the national security. The Military Court is punitive; the committee is preventative in nature.

And, finally, in this document prepared for the elucidation and information of American military advisers to this program there is a section called "Observations":

OBSERVATIONS

First. The PSC's are, by definition, political tools, and are governed from province to province by the political "facts-of-life".

Second. PSC existence is extra-constitutional and non-judicial, based upon the right of a State to survive.

Third. These committees, although in possession of power to administratively detain anyone reasonably believed to threaten the national security, have acted with remarkable restraint.

Fourth. The nature of these committees, and their strictly political function, dictate a "hands-off" policy by all U.S. personnel and agencies.

Fifth. U.S. advisors, specifically PHOENIX Coordinators, should direct their efforts to insure that their counterparts provide the PSC with the necessary evidence for the committee to reach an informed decision. This evidence should be in accordance with the minimum considered necessary for detention by the Chief of Internal Security. Additional emphasis should be placed upon providing the committee the type dossier specified by GVN MOI Circular #2212 and Phung Hoang SOP 3. If all available intelligence is in the dossier, an informed, intelli-

gent, and equitable decision can be rendered.

Sixth. The varying quality of dossiers presented to the committee has caused an imbalance in proof, resulting in reliance upon the interrogation report to the exclusion of the Phung Hoang dossier. In far too many cases, the quality of the dossiers provided to PSC's can only be described as poor and incomplete. It is advisable for both PHOENIX Coordinators and their counterparts to screen the dossiers before they leave the PLOCC, if this is accomplished regularly, a comparison can be made between the amount of evidence presented to the committee, and the relative decisions reached by the committee. Thus, by reviewing the decisions of the PSC, in conjunction with the dossiers presented to the PSC, the PHOENIX Coordinator and his counterpart can determine what type of dossier the committee considers to be sufficient for detention.

Seventh. Guidance had been provided to the PSC's in GVN MOI Circulars No. 757 and 2412. Utilization of this guidance, coupled with an understanding of the political realities of the province, will provide the coordinator with an understanding of dossier deficiencies. The critical official to satisfy is the Chief of Internal Security, the second most influential member (after the Province Chief) of the PSC. The Chief of Internal Security is the central figure in determining what burden of proof the committee adheres to, as it is his recommendation which usually determines the duration of detention. It is essential to determine what minimum content a dossier must contain to conform to his standards.

Mr. Speaker, I have described the advice given by the U.S. authorities, by the military advisers, to the South Vietnamese in the administration of a program concerning which our military people as of May 18, 1970 "are specifically unauthorized to engage in assassinations" and concerning which in military region 1, five provinces, 1970, 2,000 people were killed, 1,700 were sentenced and 4,000 were captured. All of these people were people that could not have been convicted in any court given the basis of the ANTRI detention law because "evidence was insufficient to convict them of a crime." These are people that, in fact, have not committed a crime but have been deemed to be by reasonable belief detrimental to the security of the state.

Mr. Speaker, those documents that I just read to you were the documents that prompted our interest in delving into this program in greater detail. In the process of doing so, we visited six provinces, five of which are located in military region 1 and one in military region 2.

We discovered some very interesting facts concerning this program, Mr. Speaker, that led me again to the conclusion with which I commenced this presentation, that we are leaving a structure that has been defined by American military authorities as a part of Vietnamization that produces a great possibility of political suppression in that government when we are no longer a part of it and, in its present operation, clearly presents an actual political suppression and, perhaps, of other dangers if our military people deem it necessary to "specifically unauthorized" American military people who are participating in this program from participating in assassinations.

The basic document governing the op-

eration of the Phoenix program is called SOP-3, which is the Government of Vietnam instructions to the Vietnamese who participate in this program as to how the program works, and what the burden of proof must be in determining whether a man is subject to administrative detention.

The SOP-3, though a Vietnamese document, has been translated into English, and is used by our military advisers at all stages of this program.

Let me read just a few standards and criteria set forth in SOP-3, so that you might have a general idea of the type of person and the type of objective that this program has.

In referring to intelligence that is sought to be obtained about citizens in Vietnam, or activities that are antithetical to the best interests of the South Vietnamese Government, SOP-3 states such intelligence "is not only of immediate value, but also will be needed in the future in any postwar political struggle with the Vietcong."

It further states:

It is most important to indoctrinate and impress upon local residents the duties of defending their villages and hamlets, and serving as the Government's eyes and ears.

In the area called information collection, this document describes the type of information they desire.

Information on a person, residents of the area who make suspicious utterances such as (1) expressions which distort Government of Vietnam policies and the action of Government of Vietnam cadres.

(2) False rumors which confuse and frighten the people.

(3) Creation of division and hatred among the populace and between the populace and Government of Vietnam cadres.

SOP-3 continues and describes how an informer can tell whether his neighbor should be reported through the Phoenix program for action by the Province Security Committee:

Those Who Act Suspiciously: (a) the hesitation or fearful attitude of a dishonest person; (b) contact with those whom we suspect; (c) regular secret colloquies of a certain group of people in the area.

Then they have a category called duties of the political subsection, or DIOCC.

DIOCC is a term I will go into in greater detail later, but it is called the District Intelligence Operation Coordinating Committee.

The duties of the political subsection of the DIOCC are, among others:

Maintain a district, village and hamlet picture album, the photos to be taken in front of the family residence, photos to be provided by the National Police.

And then how to prepare file cards upon people who will be entered into this special program.

One important category that they are cautioned to fill out is "marital status":

Is he single or married? What is the number of his children?

This can be useful in exploiting family sentiment to obtain his arrest or afterwards.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in the three documents I have just read I have described not an instrument of a reasonably free society, let alone a free society, but an instrument of a totalitarian society. I doubt seriously that the

documents describing a similar program of the North Vietnamese or in Communist China would be any different from the documents I have just read devised by the American advisers to the South Vietnamese Government, as an instrument of such government which we will leave them as part of Vietnamization.

We discovered that the way the system works is this: Each province is divided into villages, districts, and province capitals. Each village has a village intelligence operations coordination center wherein all of the information concerning your neighbor described in the general terms I read from the SOP-3 is fed into the village intelligence center—if he is using expressions which distort the Government of Vietnam policies; or if he is spreading false rumors which confuse and frighten the people; or if he is creating division and hatred among the populace and between the populace and the Government of Vietnam cadre and if he acts suspiciously by the hesitant or fearful attitudes of a dishonest person; then his name goes into the VIOCC in the village—and from the VIOCC it goes to the DIOCC and the DIOCC is the District Intelligence Coordinating Operation Center where all the information is gathered from the village and fed into the district and the district intelligence operation center.

They process the information further and they then start programing what are known as dossiers. A dossier is a file on a category A or B suspect in the Phoenix program.

The dossier of a category B suspect means that there is in his dossier intelligence from three sources. That they identify him as being a part of the Vietcong infrastructure. If he is of top level Vietcong infrastructure, according to the three intelligence sources in his dossier, he is listed as category A and he is then "targeted."

Now "targeted" means theoretically that he can be arrested or could be arrested so that he can be processed through the province security committee.

If he is a category B suspect and has three intelligence references in his dossier as to his connection with the Vietcong infrastructure, he is similarly "targeted" for arrest and process.

If he has no such references in the dossier identifying him as part of the Vietcong infrastructure, he is categorized as category C—a fellow who is just not quite right—he may have expressed some disagreement with the South Vietnamese government in Saigon—he is that kind of fellow—a troublemaker—and it might be better to let him know what the central government thinks about troublemakers. So he is picked up by the DIOCC and sent to the PIOCC, the province intelligence operation coordination center, at which time he is detained. Then he can be sentenced ultimately to up to 1 year. He is frequently released, but there is no man of whom I am aware who would believe any neighbor picked up for expressing disagreeable statements about the government and processed through one of these centers into a detention center would

thenceforth feel free in any way to criticize the central government of Saigon.

Then it is category C which is perhaps the most troublesome of all the categories. Although category A and category B afford equal concern because of failure to comply with a standard of evidence sufficient to convict in a court before imprisonment.

After information on a suspect has been processed through the PIOCC, the province intelligence operation coordinating center, and the dossier is prepared upon him, he is then arrested.

They can be arrested in a number of ways—in military operations by the regional and popular forces where they pick up a lot of people in enemy territory or in contested territory. Quite a number of these people have found their names listed in the "blacklists" or in the "greenlists" that they carry around and they trace them from those lists to the dossier on them and then they are arrested and taken to the PIC, the province interrogation center.

They can also be arrested by a process known as the cordon and search process, where the national police with the regional forces or the popular forces cordon off a village and send everybody in that village through a single file line where they are looked at and examined and searched by the national police and are checked against the "blacklist" or the "greenlist" and if they are identified as a part of an A or B category having a dossier in existence, they are arrested and sent to the province interrogation center.

The province interrogation center is the most remarkable instrument in this whole procedure. It was not until the second province we toured that we discovered an interesting fact about the province interrogation center.

You would assume that since CORDS and the military forces working through CORDS have the responsibility of advising the South Vietnamese Government concerning this program, that the American advisers in the province interrogation centers where the people who are arrested are taken for interrogation—an interrogation that can last up to 45 days—and that is their last step prior to going before the province security committee for judgment—you would assume that the American advisers of the province interrogation center would be military advisers, such as is the case at every other step or procedure in the Phoenix program. In fact, that is not so.

The way this was revealed to us is an interesting sidelight in the problems of a Congressman attempting to elicit facts in any trip that he makes in dealing with any bureaucracy—military or civilian.

Talking to one of the American advisers in one of the provinces, I asked that province adviser, who is a military man working for CORD, to show me the Province Interrogation Center. He said he had never been to the Province Interrogation Center. I asked him why this was so, inasmuch as he was the American adviser to the Phoenix program.

He said because the CIA operates the Province Interrogation Center. I said:

You must be kidding.

He said:

I only know that from rumor. No one has proven that to me as a fact, but I have been told not to go near the Province Interrogation Center, because that is not within the responsibility of CORD's or the military advisers. That is a CIA operation.

That evening I puzzled over his statement and concluded that he was suffering from delusions of a conspiracy that were not warranted by the briefing given us in Saigon as to who operates and advises this program and by all information given to us up to that point on the operation of this program.

The next day we visited another province. At that province, in the middle of the military briefings, I asked the briefing officer if he would excuse me from the military briefing and instruct his Phung Hoang Phoenix adviser to take me to the Province Interrogation Center, which he did. At the Province Interrogation Center I was met by two civilians, American civilians. I asked them by which agency they were employed. They told me the Pacification Security Coordination Division.

I said:

Is that a cover for the Central Intelligence Agency?

They both said:

Yes, it is.

I said:

Are you employees of the Central Intelligence Agency?

They both said:

Yes, we are.

From there on we were told that the Province Intelligence Centers were run by the Central Intelligence Agency, and that information and intelligence was confirmed when we got back to Saigon, after great anguish on the part of our briefing officers, who had been instructed not to reveal that fact to us, and who had been instructed that if we were to inquire of them, they were to respond that they were unable to answer that question.

What alarms me and disturbs me about the Central Intelligence Agency operating the Province Interrogation Centers is that this is the most sensitive part of the entire Phoenix program. This is where the civilian, who is not accused of a crime, because there is evidence insufficient to convict him of a crime, is taken in order to question him and to get a confession from him.

Our American military advisers, when they pick that suspect up again after he leaves the Province Interrogation Center and is taken before the Province Security Committee, are advised not to give too much weight to confessions that are obtained or declarations obtained in the Province Interrogation Center.

Now, I must suggest this, too, that we were given free access from that point on to all Province Interrogation Centers, and we were given that access on no notice whatsoever to those who were running the center or advising them, and I saw nothing in any of the centers to which I had access that led me to believe that abuses, in fact, did occur in

the Province Interrogation Centers—with one exception.

There was testimony from an American adviser who had gone to his particular Province Interrogation Center on other business that he had been a detainee being taken blindfolded into an interrogation room with a rubber hose in the hands of the South Vietnamese interrogator. He also said that when he saw the prisoner come out of the interrogation room, there was no sign of abuse of that prisoner.

We found out in another district, in a District Operations Coordination Center, that the American adviser to the DIOC had found a rubber hose on the desk of the district intelligence officer at the coordinating center and had advised that district official that a rubber hose should have no part in the district interrogations.

Beyond those indications that abuses did exist there was nothing I saw in the operation of the Province Intelligence Centers that would lead me to believe the abuses did in fact exist.

What disturbs me, then, is the necessity for a cover for the operation of the CIA in the operation of the Province Intelligence Center. If military advisers are going to advise the South Vietnamese at every step of this process up until the detainee enters the interrogation center, and then they close the door and shroud it in the secrecy of the CIA, and then pick up that detainee after he goes out the door of the Province Security Center, there is cause for concern as to what happens in that vacuum.

The CIA agents do not report to the Phung Hoang administrators. They report directly to the Ambassador in Saigon, Mr. Bunker. Mr. Bunker is not within the chain of command of the Phoenix program. It seems to me to be a mistake of great proportions to include the Central Intelligence Agency as advisers and operators of the Province Interrogation Centers.

Once the detainee has gone through all this process and has been interrogated for up to 45 days at the Province Interrogation Center he goes before the Province Security Committee. The Province Security Committee does not have the function of finding guilt or innocence. They only have the function of establishing the length of the sentence.

On the category C detainee, they can release him, and frequently do. He is the fellow, you recall, that is not identified as a part of the VCI, Vietcong infrastructure. He is the fellow who may have been spreading rumors about the Government, who was picked up and brought through this thing to cow him into refraining from that sort of action.

But the category A or B, who has been identified in his dossier by three separate intelligences as being a member of the VCI is brought before the Province Security Committee for sentencing.

The Province Security Committee consists of seven members: The Province Chief, the Chief of the Court of that province, a representative of the Province Council, the intelligence officer of the ARVN army, the National Police Chief of the province, the Military Se-

curity service chief, and the Political Service chief of Internal Security of the province.

These are the people who prepare the dossier, and who participate in the interrogation. These are the people who are sitting in judgment as to whether the dossier was adequately prepared to convict the detainee of this program.

I talked in one province to the only elected official on that particular security committee, who was the elected Chief of the Provincial Council, and he told me that this was a great concern to the members of the security committees throughout the nation, and they had met in a national meeting and expressed concern to Saigon on two bases:

First, there are too many policemen on this security committee making judgments as to whether or not the policemen did their work right.

Second, he said there are too many representatives of Saigon on this committee, and that opens this committee to great political abuse. I asked him if abuses had in fact occurred, and he said no, but he was afraid because abuses could occur; and I could not agree more.

We asked how many cases were heard by the Province Security Committee and how long was devoted to a case. They meet once a week, on Friday, generally between 9 and 12 in the morning. They average 40 to 50 cases between 9 and 12 in the morning in the Province Security Committee.

The defendant is not permitted to be present. There is no defense attorney. The public is not admitted to the hearings of the province security committee. Now, that does not seem to me to provide much opportunity for even vestigial due process. Neither does the Province Interrogation Center seem to me to provide much opportunity for even vestigial due process.

I think that this area or this program is subject to fantastic abuse.

Let me clarify one figure that was startling to us. In the neutralization figures for 1970 in these five provinces they listed with great pride a category of "kills" numbering 2,000. They had neutralized 2,000 members of the VCI, against whom, mind you, there was insufficient evidence to convict of a crime, by killing. It occurred to us that there was an area for possibility of abuse. This is an awful lot of "kills" occurring in view of the number of arrests made.

We inquired further and found out that of the number of 2,000 listed as "kills" and, therefore, as results of the Phoenix programs and credited to that program, that 99 percent of the 2,000 were in fact not attributable to the Phoenix program at all but were bodies found on the field of battle after a fire fight and after the clash and identified from papers on their bodies as being members of the Vietcong, which was a reasonable assumption since they were found in a battle fighting the Government soldiers. That is a reasonable assumption that they would be Vietcong. They were listed, however, as a result of a neutralization of the Phoenix program, which is a wildly erroneous and misleading figure.

I asked of the 2,000 that were found on the battlefield and identified as members of the Vietcong infrastructure how many of those men had dossiers in the PIOC or province intelligence center before their bodies were found; how many of them had been "targeted" as class A or class B Vietcong infrastructure. The answer was very few. Less than 20 or 30 out of the 2,000 probably had been identified by anybody as being a member of the Vietcong infrastructure.

So what happened here is that you have the traditional weakness of the American authority when they are trying to show progress in the war in Vietnam. They always show progress in the war in Vietnam by raising charts with statistics on them and an ever-increasing graph and thus they show "progress" in the neutralization program. The Phoenix program was shown by an increasing graph with 2,000 killed of the Vietcong infrastructure attributable to this program while they were not attributable at all to this program.

Mr. Speaker, I am recommending to the Secretary of State, who, in fact, has the primary administration of this program, that category C detainees—and you will recall of the 9,000 neutralization statistics attributable to Military Region I that 4,000 of them were category C detainees—people who were not identified as part of the Vietcong infrastructure but people who were nosy as far as their neighbors are concerned—I am recommending that these category C detainees not be a part of this program. If this is an American-constructed program, as reprehensible as the entire program might appear to be, category C is absolutely incomprehensible. It is incomprehensible that we would permit advise, and suggest to a government that their neighbors who happen to express opposition to the central government should be run through an interrogation process and sentenced for up to 6 months.

Mr. Speaker, I am also suggesting that we not put goals in each province as we now do. American advisers have goals. Next year they have to get so many "kills" and so many "sentences" and so many "neutralizations" in their provinces. That has this effect: Unless a man is sentenced to a year or 2 years he is not considered "neutralized." Anything less than a year in category B or less than 2 years in category A is not considered a neutralization. So we had a province adviser tell us that his great concern with the functioning of his Province Security Committee was that it was not attempting deliberately enough to bring in those maximum sentences so that he could take credit for a neutralization.

It is the incentive system that we have established in America that we have told our province advisers, you have got to better your program, you have got to get more "kills" next year, you have got to get more "sentencings" and you have got to get more "neutralization."

It does not seem to me to have the remotest semblance to justice.

There is not a word in this document

about justice being done to people picked up under this system.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that the Central Intelligence Agency be denied any further control of the Province Interrogation Centers, that they be placed in the chain of command of CORDS and that the chain of command and advice and monitoring not be interrupted at any point from the time the suspect is picked up until he is sentenced.

I am recommending further that the "kill" statistics be reported realistically; that the people who are found dead on the battlefield and where in their pockets there are found papers identifying them as a Vietcong, that they not be ascribed as a "success" of this program because they have nothing to do with this program and are not a part of this program.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, just one final comment. I can understand at a time when a nation is perhaps subjected to an onslaught from without and an onslaught from within that due process as we know it in this country and which, even here, has been an evolutionary thing that is continuing to evolve, may not have equal application to such a country. I recognize that this process under the conditions of war that exist in South Vietnam cannot be accorded to the extent that we accord them in this country. I also recognize that in making a determination in the interest of national security that you are going to deprive a man of some due process, you are going to permit his detention even though there is insufficient evidence to convict him of a crime, that you must monitor that program exceptionally carefully in order to see that abuses in sentencing, that abuses in detention and that abuses in interrogation do not occur. I am, personally, not convinced that abuses in sentencing, abuses in interrogation and abuses in detention do not occur.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that if we leave this remnant of American knowledge to the South Vietnamese as a part of their civil society, then we will do much to improve it. It is a terrible situation as it presently exists.

ARE EXTRA FUNDS FOR HISC NECESSARY?

HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my opposition against the current request of the House Internal Security Committee which asks the House to appropriate \$670,000 in addition to the approximately \$250,000 automatically granted to it as a standing committee. This sum seems to be rather disproportionate, especially when this committee's record of legislative activity is considered. During the years 1969-70, only three bills were reported out of committee and none became law.

I am on record as a sponsor of a resolution which proposes transferring the responsibilities of HISC to the Judiciary Committee, thereby abolishing HISC. Since the functions of the House Internal Security Committee are closely related to those of the Judiciary Committee, it would seem logical and probably in the long run, more economical to enlarge the jurisdiction of the House Judiciary Committee in this way.

Pending any action on this resolution, however, I would favor careful review of the needs of HISC before appropriating funds which represent a significant increase over last year's authorization. In the interest of curbing Government spending, it would also seem appropriate to examine closely the reasons for a budget increase as proposed by this committee this week.

RESOLUTION OF STATE OF IOWA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, 64th General Assembly of the State of Iowa is to be commended for the recent concurrent resolution of the house and senate opposing any plan to move the U.S. Department of Agriculture Veterinary Biologists Division Laboratory from Ames, Iowa. The value of this asset to education and industry in Iowa and the practical utility of its present location are cogently set forth in the text of the resolution, which follows in its entirety:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 34

Whereas, the United States Department of Agriculture Veterinary Biologists Division Laboratory situated at Ames, Iowa, is ideally located in the feed grains and livestock center of the United States and adjacent to the National Animal Disease Laboratory and the Veterinary College of Iowa State University; and

Whereas, the successful continuation and coordination of its work is vitally important to the basic industry of Iowa, and the loss of the employment of some one hundred persons with a payroll of one million dollars annually would be a severe economic depressant to the city of Ames and the state of Iowa; and

Whereas, recent news articles have reported on the possibility of transferring the laboratory from Ames, Iowa, to Fort Detrick, Maryland, which follows by only two years a proposal to move this facility to Lincoln, Nebraska, now therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate, the House concurring, That the General Assembly deplores and opposes any plan or proposal to move the United States Department of Agriculture, Veterinary Biologists Division Laboratory from its present location in Ames, Iowa; and

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Resolution be directed to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States; and that copies of this Resolution combined with the General Assembly's expression of appreciation for efforts in this regard be directed to the Iowa delegation in the United States Congress, and to the Governor of Iowa.

ROGER W. JEPSEN,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM H. HARBOR,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that this Resolution originated in the Senate and is known as Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, Sixty-fourth General Assembly, First Session.

CARROLL A. LANE,
Secretary of the Senate.

A meeting was subsequently held in my office which included Under Secretary of Agriculture J. Phil Campbell and USDA's Director of Science and Education, Ned D. Bayley. As a result of this meeting, the Department of Agriculture has agreed not to move the laboratory at this time. However, the Department may do so in the future if more adequate facilities are not made available in Ames.

A group of concerned citizens in Ames has begun negotiations with USDA to provide better facilities. As a member of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, I intend to follow the progress of these consultations closely. It is my hope that they will soon be brought to a successful conclusion.

SENATOR MCGOVERN CRITICIZES J. EDGAR HOOVER AND THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF "INTIMIDATION"

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, Senator McGovern recently delivered a speech in Lockport, Ill., in which he discussed the sorry state of the present administration of the FBI and related some disturbing new information. Senator McGovern's statement demonstrates the need to secure effective congressional review of FBI procedures, and effective Executive action. A transcript of the speech follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR GEORGE MCGOVERN

Some months ago I called for an investigation of the administration of the FBI. That call has been repeated in the House and the Senate, and various proposals have been made suggesting procedures for securing the needed review. But while all the consideration of review continues, so does the degeneration of the FBI under Mr. Hoover's failing leadership. In the light of evidence I am about to present, I urge that the President call for Mr. Hoover's resignation now.

How dangerous the situation has become was first clear to me when Mr. Hoover publicly slandered his former superiors Robert Kennedy and Ramsey Clark. I decried this outrage on the floor of the Senate on November 17, 1970. Then the control and coercion Mr. Hoover exercises over the lives of his employees became clear when I discovered that a loyal and competent agent, John F. Shaw, was cruelly persecuted by Mr. Hoover for critically appraising the FBI in a confidential letter to his professor.

I have become increasingly familiar with a situation concealed from the public, but known to many highly respected law enforcement officers across the nation. Behind the TV image of gang-busting and spy-catching, there is the true story, often sad and shocking, sometimes absurd.

For example, a longtime high-ranking former official of the FBI in whom I have

complete faith has told me that Mr. Hoover has long kept a record on every FBI agent which includes systematic notations of agents who fail to request an autographed picture of the Director, or who fail to remember the Director at Christmas time and on his birthday with appropriate gratitude. Agents have been called upon during government time to install automatic windows at the Director's private residence. Every year Mr. Hoover is provided with specially built limousines (the last cost taxpayers over \$27,000) which are kept in readiness throughout the country for the personal use of the Director. An elaborate public relations team carefully nurtures the image of the Director with a steady flow of ghosted articles, press releases, films and speeches. After careful work by local police forces, Mr. Hoover will place the name of a fugitive about to be captured on the "most wanted" list and then claim public credit for a capture that should be credited to a local police chief and his men.

Responsible to no one, Mr. Hoover has become irresponsible. Unchecked by Congress, unsupervised by the Executive, the Hoover regime has resulted in an American tragedy. It is an individual tragedy—that Mr. Hoover should diminish the institution to which he long dedicated his energies and talent. It is a tragedy for the American people that Mr. Hoover continues to weaken a most important federal law enforcement institution, and seems prepared to take the ship down with the Captain.

In response to the public outcry, the President and Attorney General Mitchell have continued to profess complete confidence in Mr. Hoover, and claim that each and every excess reported is in the service of law enforcement.

Was it in the service of law enforcement that Mr. Hoover declared, prior to any indictment or trial, the guilt of the Berrigans? Was it in the service of law enforcement that he has condemned other individuals who are not even under indictment—individuals who will never have the opportunity to prove their innocence?

Is it in the service of law enforcement that the FBI has intimidated the wives and mothers of POW's desperate for news of their loved ones, by telling them to have nothing to do with pacifist groups who may relay mail between POW's and their families?

Was it in the service of law enforcement that the FBI fired some young girls who served as clerks because they spent their evenings stuffing envelopes for a peace organization?

These activities are obviously not in the service of law enforcement, but rather a peculiar view of the nation's real values and problems combined with a self-centered effort to nurture the power and reputation of Mr. Hoover and his top associates.

Victim of its own mythmaking, the FBI has become ideological. Running the glory road created by Mr. Hoover's public relations department, Mr. Hoover's regime is now suffering from its own propaganda. The FBI is in danger of losing that most essential element of the policeman's role in a free society, absolute neutrality in the enforcement of the law.

For instance, because each year Mr. Hoover requires additional convictions from his Special Agents in Charge, convictions tend to be sought among minority groups where civil rights may not be well understood or protected. And then there is the current pursuit of political extremists, and their placement on the "Most Wanted List" though many other fugitives are often responsible for more serious crime and though the politically most wanted are without prior criminal records. It all shows once again Mr. Hoover's unerring penchant for whatever is box-office.

Six months just passed before anyone on the "Most Wanted List" was captured. Actu-

ally, the "Most Wanted List" is a phony public relations gimmick regarded with scorn by responsible law enforcement officials. It is unconstitutional in that it prejudices the possibilities for fair trial by judging in advance of trial and with widespread publicity the relative danger and guilt of alleged criminals. It is a gimmick which should be ended by the Executive or challenged in the courts, for it taints the whole process of federal law enforcement.

Does the President really have full confidence in the top federal policeman who says "you never have to bother about a President being shot by Puerto Ricans or Mexicans. They don't shoot very straight. But, if they come at you with a knife, beware."

Do the President and the Attorney General have complete confidence in Mr. Hoover's regime when it has repeatedly refused to carry out its responsibilities in the protection of civil rights, as documented in the story of the Orangeburg Massacre and innumerable other instances?

Do Mr. Nixon and Mr. Mitchell have complete confidence in an FBI regime which for decades chose to ignore organized crime, and only recently began to develop a coordinated attack?

What is the source of confidence? Mr. Hoover has carefully avoided jurisdiction in very difficult areas such as the drug traffic which hangs as a terrible curse over millions of people across our land.

Mr. Hoover arrogantly announced that he refused to speak to the late Robert Kennedy during the last six months of his service as Attorney General because Mr. Kennedy questioned why, when blacks compose 10% of the national population, only two-tenths of 1% of FBI agents were black. Mr. Hoover claimed that this would require the lowering of FBI standards for agents, which include the necessity for a degree in accounting or law. As late as 1970, in an article on the FBI which he wrote for Encyclopedia Britannica, Mr. Hoover repeated that a degree in either law or accounting was a requirement for service as an FBI agent. Yet it was recently revealed by Assistant Director of the FBI Mr. Thomas E. Bishop that only about one-third of FBI agents have such degrees. In the press there has been little if any look at the contradictory nature of these statements and their significance. They mean that Mr. Hoover was deceiving his own administrative supervisor about the reasons blacks were so poorly represented in the Bureau. Hoover refused to speak to Mr. Kennedy because the FBI Director knew he was practicing this deception. I bring it to your attention because I hope that it may serve to eradicate any measure of credence that may have been given to Mr. Hoover's unconscionable vilification of the late Robert Kennedy—a deeply compassionate and courageous human being.

What then is the President's source of confidence? The United States Capitol is bombed, and bombings occur throughout the land without indictments or convictions. In case after case fugitives elude Mr. Hoover, and all we see is a frantic reaction that results in the violation of civil liberties on a broad scale.

The obvious truth is that Mr. Hoover is retained in office not out of a sense of confidence, but out of fear. Out of political fear that the Administration cannot afford to remove this "sacred cow" from the public scene.

I submit that this situation has become so serious and so dangerous to the health of our society and the survival of the FBI, that in carrying out his constitutional responsibility to see that the laws are faithfully executed, the President of the United States is duty bound to end the Hoover regime.

If we were to ask what is the best society, I think the answer might be that it is that society most free from fear—a society where

the dignity and the privacy of each individual is carefully respected. Mr. Hoover heads an agency which was created to lessen our fears and increase our sense of well-being. When Attorney General Harlan Stone established the FBI in 1924 and made J. Edgar Hoover Director of it he declared,

"The Bureau of Investigation is not concerned with political or other opinions of individuals. It is concerned only with their conduct and then only with such as is forbidden by the laws of the United States. When a police system passes beyond these limits, it is dangerous to the proper administration of justice and to human liberty, which it should be our first concern to cherish."

These limits have now been exceeded and the worst fears confirmed. The documents stolen from the FBI and now published present clear evidence that the FBI is listening to the phone calls of college students and professors who are active in movements for peace and racial justice. They present clear evidence that the FBI uses paid informers, telephone switchboard operators, mail carriers, and neighborhood spies in recording the every move of citizens whose only crime seems to be a social conscience that moves them to social action.

There is now no doubt in my mind that virtually every political figure, every student activist, every leader for peace and social justice is under the surveillance of the FBI. I am convinced that paid informers are the rule rather than the exception on college campuses, within civil rights groups, and throughout the peace movement. I have no doubt that elaborate files are maintained on thousands of political figures across the land.

Mr. Hoover's regime has long called the statement of such fears paranoid. But now there is clear evidence in the published documents that it is the express policy of the FBI to encourage paranoia. In a memo entitled "New Left Notes—Philadelphia," agents were instructed, and I quote:

"To get more interviews with these subjects and hangers-on . . . for plenty of reasons, chief of which are it will enhance the paranoia endemic in these circles and will further serve to get the point across there is an FBI agent behind every mailbox. In addition, some will be overcome by the overwhelming personalities of the contacting agent and volunteer to tell all—perhaps on a continuing basis."

I don't know whether there is an FBI agent watching us from behind every mailbox, but what are we to say of a law enforcement agency that wants us to live in that kind of George Orwell 1984 "Big Brother is watching you" atmosphere. This is far more important than the question of whether and to what extent surveillance exists because, by such a policy, Mr. Hoover inflicts a clear and present denial of all our freedoms. It is a policy which is a direct assault on the First Amendment and completely subversive of its intention. It is a policy of deliberate intimidation and rule by fear.

For millions of decent and loyal Americans, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is now the Federal Bureau of Intimidation.

But still, and throughout the long history of the excesses of Mr. Hoover's regime it has always been said, even by critics, that granted the great and dangerous power available to Mr. Hoover, he has never used the resources of the FBI as an instrument of personal power and oppression outside his extraordinary policies for the control of the lives of FBI personnel.

Evidence has come to my attention which shows that there is no such limit to the danger, and that J. Edgar Hoover has in fact used the investigative resources of the FBI as an instrument of personal power and oppression against a United States citizen.

It may be recalled that on November 1, 1969, after a TWA jetliner was hijacked to Rome, the pilot of the plane complained

bitterly of a wild-west type FBI raid on the jetliner while it was refueling in New York, a raid which the pilot of the plane, Captain Donald J. Cook, Jr., criticized as unnecessary, irresponsible and reckless. He publicly stated that "the FBI plan was a prescription for getting the entire crew killed and the plane destroyed."

I have been told by former agents of the FBI that J. Edgar Hoover reacted personally to this criticism and launched an investigation of the private life of Captain Cook. In retribution for Captain Cook's criticism of the FBI, Mr. Hoover informed TWA that Captain Cook had experienced some personal difficulty in the Air Force prior to his employment with TWA. It is clear that Mr. Hoover was trying to destroy the career of Captain Cook. TWA responded that Captain Cook's record with the airline was excellent in every regard, and that TWA would stand by its employee.

This series of events has been substantiated by former agents of the FBI, and by Charles C. Tillinghast, Jr., Chairman of the Board of TWA, in a telephone conversation with my office.

It has also been reported to my office by former agents that subsequent to the failure of Mr. Hoover's attempt to undermine TWA's confidence in Captain Cook, Mr. Hoover sought to discourage FBI personnel from flying TWA, and that when the FBI was to supply a contingency force of air marshals to prevent hijackings, Mr. Hoover sought to prevent any service by FBI personnel on TWA flights. These latter allegations have been repeated to me by reliable sources and are quite consistent with the pattern of reaction to criticism for which the Hoover regime is famous among law enforcement officials.

This episode is an example of the outrage that I am sure has been repeated in various forms, but I believe this is the first instance to come to Congressional attention.

It demonstrates the immediate necessity for the end of the Hoover regime. Despite Mr. Nixon's words of last weekend, I cannot believe that he can any longer with a straight face profess his confidence in Mr. Hoover.

It is never easy to end a simple myth which provides false security for a nation. But that is the obligation of leadership.

As a child, I regarded J. Edgar Hoover as the great G-man, protector of all virtue, enemy of all vice. But I grew up and learned the truth. And the Nation can do no less. If we are ever to successfully engage the cancer of crime which continues to increase and strike at the vitals of our national life, we must put aside the mythmakers and then launch a real attack on the sources of crime.

"NATIONAL SECRETARIES WEEK"

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD today remarks in tribute to the observance of "National Secretaries Week."

NATIONAL SECRETARIES WEEK,
APRIL 18-24, 1971

For all Secretaries: The theme "Better Secretaries Mean Better Business" is stressed to promote the significance of teamwork throughout the business world.

Observance: The last full week in April...

since 1952. Wednesday of this week is highlighted as Secretaries Day.

Official proclamations are issued throughout the United States and Canadian governments designating Secretaries Week and Secretaries Day.

Purpose: Acknowledgement of the contributions of all Secretaries to the vital roles of business, industry, education, government, and the professions.

The National Secretaries Association (International), cooperating with the U. S. Department of Commerce, originated Secretaries Week. The involvement of all Secretaries for this observance reemphasizes the importance of continued loyalty of Secretaries to their employers and their responsibility to their profession.

I believe in the purposes of Secretaries Week. For that reason I have introduced H.J. Res. 131, which would authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the last full week of April as National Secretaries Week.

PORT—COMMUNITY REHABILITATION FOR LEGAL OFFENDERS

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I request permission to insert into the RECORD an article from Hospital & Community Psychiatry, a journal of the American Psychiatric Association, by Dr. Francis A. Tyce, medical director of the Rochester, Minn., State Hospital.

The article deals with a community-oriented approach for treating criminal offenders and juvenile delinquents centered in Olmsted County, Minn.

The approach employed stresses developing internal controls in offenders, not merely imposing external controls. Each client contributes toward his own rehabilitation through work programs. Some participants in the project work or go to school in the community, thus providing more meaningful social rehabilitation.

For those of us concerned with the quality of justice and the efficacy of rehabilitation, this Minnesota experience is a valuable development which can help redirect our emphasis in correctional policy.

PORT OF OLMDSTED COUNTY, MINNESOTA COMMUNITY REHABILITATION FOR LEGAL OFFENDERS

(By Francis A. Tyce, M.D.)

(NOTE.—This paper is based on a presentation at the 22nd Institute on Hospital & Community Psychiatry, held September 21-24, 1970, in Philadelphia.)

PORT stands for Probationed Offenders Rehabilitation and Training. It is a community-based, community-supported, community-directed treatment facility for criminal offenders and juvenile delinquents. We see it as an analogue in the corrections field to the mental health center in the field of psychiatry. Like the mental health center, the PORT program serves as an alternative to institutionalization. In addition, it also serves a specific catchment area, namely the three counties that fall under the jurisdiction of the two district courts in our area.

The PORT program, located on the campus of Rochester (Minn.) State Hospital, was

two years in the making before it accepted its first clients in October 1969. The idea grew out of my relationship with two district-court judges, the Hon. Russell O. Olson and the Hon. Donald T. Franke. As humane, thoughtful jurists, they were troubled by the unsatisfactory alternatives for handling a convicted offender: prison or probation. Prison bred recidivism, and often provided only graduate training in crime. Probation frequently consisted of irregular and inadequate supervision by an overworked probation officer; it also meant placing the offender back into the environment that had contributed to his delinquency, with no means to produce positive change in his behavior. Because of the dilemma, the judges often opted for the safer solution and committed the offender to prison.

Some nine years ago, the judges asked if our hospital could accept offenders for psychiatric study before sentencing. The judges wanted a report that would not only address itself to the particular behavior of the accused and attempt to explain it, but also would offer definite recommendations for psychiatric treatment, if indicated.

One of the early referrals was the son of a police chief. The father was a successful, honest cop; the son was a most successfully unsuccessful and dishonest 22-year-old whose antisocial behavior had embarrassed his father for years. The young man had just been convicted of burglary, but the sentence was stayed for psychiatric examination.

In the interview, he emerged as a highly intelligent young man with a compassionate understanding of his father's detestation of his behavior. He revealed a long-standing estrangement between him and his father, which was based on his ability to compete with an athletic and academically successful elder brother. Although the accused was physically large, he had never been athletic because he had lost an eye in an accident at the age of seven. Interestingly enough, his father had regarded the injury lightly at the time it occurred, and when medical help was sought a day or so later, it was not possible to save the eye. Estrangement grew over the years, and was intensified after the policeman father had to arrest his own son on several occasions.

Our recommendation to the court was to place the young man on probation. He was admitted to our day hospital and slept in the jail at night. After about six months he was placed in a vocational school for radio broadcasting. He was graduated at the top of his class and immediately obtained a job as a broadcaster in a neighboring state. After he had held the job successfully for several months, his father learned of his whereabouts, and on weekends he and his wife would drive some 50 miles to the state border, park their car, and listen to their son broadcast. Later the reconciliation was completed.

That case was particularly interesting because the court had acted in the face of the great hostility the local law enforcement agencies had for this young man. Success with his case did much to gain their support for new approaches to the treatment of criminal offenders. The courts referred a few other cases to us for rehabilitation, and although they were not many in number, the results were good—good enough to give birth to the concept of PORT.

About four years ago, the two district-court judges called a meeting of interested people to consider the possibility of a community-based facility to treat selected criminal offenders. Subsequent meetings were held, and the group was enlarged to include police and probation officers, attorneys, psychiatrists, and representatives of the sheriff's office, the city government, the press, the municipal court, and the county welfare department, as well as interested citizens. These

meetings began to prepare the community for the concept of PORT.

Surprisingly, there was little opposition from areas in which we most expected it. We had thought the police would not welcome the idea of a group of criminals living together in the community instead of being safely tucked away in prison. However, the police were unexpectedly receptive to the idea of a community facility. The probation officers also thought it would be infinitely better than the existing system of having a probationer live at home, with no one knowing where he was most of the time. They felt that a residential program of rehabilitation would make their work easier.

Gradually, as the concept of PORT was formulated, community awareness of it grew. There was little opposition or apprehension encountered among the local citizens. Instead, we found a great deal of positive support. I am sure that had something to do with the mounting anxiety felt by most citizens about the increase of violence in our society, in the streets and on the campuses, and about the general decline in social discipline.

Community support was more than vocal. When the decision was made to start the program, the community contributed almost half the first year's budget; the rest came from the Hill Foundation of Minnesota. Legislative approval was obtained for PORT to lease state buildings, and the program secured a building on the Rochester State Hospital campus. The director of PORT was hired from the administrative staff of the State Department of Corrections.

At present there are 23 residents in the PORT program, ranging in age from 13 to 32; their offenses range from repeated running away from home to arson and burglary. It must be clearly understood that PORT is not a sheltering home for wayward boys; all but one of the present clients would be in a reformatory or prison were it not for PORT. The exception is a preadjuvanted 16-year-old who was on the verge of adjudication.

Referrals to the program come from district, juvenile, or municipal courts. After a candidate spends a two-week evaluation period in residence at PORT, a recommendation about whether or not to admit him is sent to the court for final decision. If the court decides to offer him the opportunity to enter PORT, the offender must make the choice to do so. If he does, the court will place him on probation to PORT or sentence him and stay the execution of sentence with the stipulation that he enter the PORT program. All but one of those offered the opportunity have chosen PORT over a prison sentence. The exception was a man with a history of multiple admissions to reformatory and prison; he refused the chance to enter PORT, saying he did not think he could tolerate the freedom inherent in the program, and did not want to be the first to foul it up.

The paid staff of PORT consists of the director, the assistant director, and a secretary. There are also ten to 12 resident volunteers, young men who live in the PORT facility; most of them are junior-college students. In return for room and board, they assume certain responsibilities. The volunteers take turns as duty officer in charge of the facility on evenings and weekends, when the other staff are not there. Clients who demonstrate the ability to handle freedom and responsibility can advance to the status of client-volunteers, serving the same functions as the resident volunteers. At present, four are doing so.

During the two weeks that a prospective client is being evaluated, he is interviewed individually by members of a screening committee. It consists of all the clients and resident volunteers, the director, a probation officer, a local businessman, and a psychia-

trist. The groups of clients and resident volunteers each have one collective vote, and the other members have one vote apiece. The committee meets as a group only if any member casts a dissenting vote, to allow him to discuss his objections to the candidate. Interestingly, the psychiatrist member may be considered the professional expert on the committee, but he has been no more astute in his recommendations than the other members—which indicates to me that the program can function without a psychiatrist. The screening committee's report is transmitted to the court as its recommendation about admitting the candidate to PORT.

When a client is accepted, he is assigned to a resident volunteer, who acts as a peer model in a mirror-image fashion for the offender. A daily course of activities is outlined for the client. If he is a juvenile, he may attend junior or senior high school or junior college. If he has a job, he goes to work; if necessary, the state vocational rehabilitation agency will train him for a job.

Other than the group meetings described below, there are few formally planned activities in the PORT building. The volunteers and clients work together on the necessary housekeeping and minor maintenance chores and engage in informal social activities, and their interaction is felt to have therapeutic value. Clients who need psychotherapy arrange for it through the local mental health center, the Mayo Clinic, a private psychiatrist, or me.

The core of the PORT program is group process and the pressure it exerts on each member. The clients meet as a group three times a week with the assistant director, and the resident volunteers meet weekly with the director. Both groups meet together once a week. The meetings are frank, gut-level interchanges in which every attempt is made to help each member see himself and his behavior honestly. This has been a maturing process for the clients, the resident volunteers, and the staff.

Extra group meetings are called any time a crisis occurs. The object is to deal with deviant behavior immediately and in its present context. Deviant behavior must be expected to occur from time to time in a group of offenders; it represents the symptoms of their social pathology. As the group process in PORT has gained strength, actual acting-out behavior, such as using drugs or drinking, has decreased, and the underlying problems are expressed verbally instead.

Because the group deals with problems as they occur, the peer-group pressure begins to develop internal controls in the offender. That is in contrast to the practice in institutions of applying only external controls to modify behavior; the result is that the model prisoner (like the model patient) is one who is externally conforming, but too often has undergone no internal change whatever.

The total group makes all decisions about members, including the amount of freedom each may have. The group has developed a classification system with ratings from 0 to 5, each specifying a varying degree of freedom a client may have. Newly admitted clients must demonstrate through their behavior that they can be trusted before the group permits them more than minimal activity outside the building. When they demonstrate sufficiently responsible behavior, they are permitted to go home on overnight and weekend visits.

Clients are gradually weaned from PORT, spending an increasing amount of time in the community. When they move out of the building, they return for group meetings for as long as considered necessary. Throughout a client's stay in PORT, and for the duration of his probation, he maintains regular contact with a probation officer, who

advises him about such matters as buying a car, getting married, or locating a place to live. The probation officer is vitally involved with the PORT program and is kept advised of his clients' progress in it through regular reports.

Each client pays for his own room and board, except for juveniles, whose parents must pay the \$15 a week charged. Any client who is not working is extended credit until he obtains a job and can repay what he owes. In a sense, clients are paying for their own rehabilitation, quite the opposite of what would happen if they were imprisoned. Furthermore, if a client needs medical care, it is provided by local medical facilities; if he works, it is at a real job; if he is a student, he attends local schools. PORT's use of community facilities is in contrast to the necessity of replicating them within the walls of a correctional institution, always an inadequate arrangement.

Some of the juveniles in the PORT program have had truancy problems. Unfortunately schools tend to deal with the persistent truant by making him a permanent truant—that is, by throwing him out of school for good. The local school system has agreed to retain truant students who are in the PORT program. We had some episodes of truancy with three young clients, but it stopped when the group decided that three of the older clients would accompany the truants to school and sit in class with them. They did so, and the problem disappeared. That experience illustrates the healthy concern the adult clients have for the juvenile ones. Again, it is quite unlike the situation in correctional facilities, which have a fixed and necessary principle that you cannot and must not mix adult and juvenile offenders.

The cost of maintaining an offender in the PORT program is \$3000 a year, compared with \$11,000 in the state juvenile diagnostic center, \$7000 in the reformatory for adolescents, and \$5000 in the adult reformatory and the state prison. Furthermore, the PORT client not only pays for his own room and board; if he is married he supports his family, who would most likely be on welfare if he was in prison. He also pays his taxes—city, property, state, and federal—whereas in prison he would be supported by taxes.

One such client was a 28-year-old professional engineer, who was convicted of burglary. He was admitted to PORT in January 1970, rather than being sent to prison. Had he been imprisoned, he would have lost his job and would have found it extremely difficult to obtain a similar one after being released. Furthermore, his wife decided to divorce him if he went to prison. Instead, in PORT, he retained both his wife and his job; he worked steadily and continued to support his family and pay his taxes, as well as paying for his own rehabilitation. He received psychotherapy for the sexual hangup that was the cause of his burglarizing, and the cost of treatment was covered by the excellent comprehensive medical insurance provided by his employer. The client did well in the PORT program, became a client-volunteer, and was discharged in October. He was one of the six clients discharged to date whom we consider successfully rehabilitated; four others who left the program were sent to institutions for varying lengths of time, and three of them are expected to be readmitted to PORT later.

We anticipate that PORT will eventually become part of the Department of Corrections. At present it is a private nonprofit corporation, with a board of directors consisting of two district-court judges, an attorney, a local banker, a psychiatrist, the director of PORT, one of the clients, and one of the resident volunteers.

Providing support for the board is a citizens' advisory committee, a self-formed group of some 350 local residents who are interested in the program. They are sub-

divided into a number of working committees, dealing with such matters as education, employment, social rehabilitation, prevention, and new legislation. For example, the employment committee, which consists mostly of local employers, finds jobs for PORT clients, and the education committee works with the local school system concerning educational arrangements for juvenile clients. The education committee is also trying to work out some way that resident volunteers enrolled in college can get academic credit for the time they work in PORT.

The citizens' advisory group will eventually provide the local board of directors for PORT when it becomes supported by local and state matching funds. The PORT corporation is making plans to approach the state legislature during the current session for support to extend the program. It will seek two-year state funding of 75 per cent of the cost, after income from client fees is deducted, with the county supplying 25 per cent. After two years, PORT expects to develop sophisticated legislation, based on what is being done in the states of California and Washington, whereby the state would reimburse communities at the rate their admissions to various state institutions are reduced.

We expect in that way to build into the financing mechanism enough local concern that the community sees to it that PORT does what it says—keeps people out of prison. There is no better way to ensure that a community continues to be earnestly interested in a program than to nail the success or failure of the program to the community's tax dollar.

Thus if by some miracle the PORT program should be completely successful and there have been no admissions to the correctional institutions from the three counties, the state would assume the total cost of PORT. However, to be realistic, we recognize that certain offenders require greater security than PORT is designed for. Nevertheless, it is foreseeable that PORT can appreciably decrease the need to send offenders to reformatory or prisons, and may have considerable impact on reducing recidivism. During the last six months of 1970, one of the district courts committed no offenders to prison.

Our future plans for PORT include admitting female offenders; we expect that most would be juveniles, because few women appear before the courts on criminal charges. We also plan to have young women as resident volunteers, whether or not we have female clients; we believe they would add much to the program and can be expected to behave as maturely as their male counterparts. We also expect to make more use of PORT as a nonresidential program for probationers who have a healthy family situation and can live at home; these clients would attend PORT activities during the evenings and weekends.

The rationale for the creation of a program like PORT lies in a comparison of correctional and mental institutions. Historically, there was only one institution for persons with aberrant behavior, whether due to mental illness or to an inclination to thieving—and that was prison. Gradually, as the antisocial behavior of the mentally ill was accepted as a manifestation of disease, separate institutions called asylums were built to accommodate them.

The prisons and the mental hospitals developed separately but similarly. Whether an individual was sent to one or the other, he was removed from society by due process of law, and deprived of all his civil rights. Both institutions were given two charges by society: security and rehabilitation. However, money was made readily available only for the first charge, and some of the formidable fortresses built as prisons and mental hospitals still stand. Only lately have we in the mental health field been able to convince the

providers of funds that to neglect the second charge is uneconomic, both socially, biologically, and fiscally.

The institutions' attempts to carry out rehabilitation required them to try to replicate the community's educational, vocational, and recreational facilities, but they seldom had the resources to do an adequate job. It was perhaps some 15 years ago that the two types of institutions began to become less similar. With the advent of new drugs and new programs, the hospitals began to practice selective security as they found that fewer and fewer patients needed to be kept behind locked doors.

As the hospitals became more open, they began to interact more with the community. They found that they could use the community's resources to rehabilitate patients—the schools, employment opportunities, and medical, recreational, and vocational facilities. That has proved to be far more effective as well as more realistic and humane. It has also proved to be essential to the concept of continuity of care.

In contrast, the prisons still have security as their primary charge. In most cases they must provide total security for everyone in their keeping, whether it is necessary or not. Because of that emphasis on security, rehabilitation efforts are still carried on inadequately equipped and staffed, poorly replicated facilities within the institution. In addition, the correctional system has nothing resembling continuity of care. It lacks dispositional planning and community resources for rehabilitation. However, that is not the fault of the system itself; society gets the kind of correctional system it is willing to support.

My contention is that the correctional system in this country now stands where the mental hospital system stood some 15 years ago. I believe that it can profit by the hospitals' experience in changing from custodial, security-oriented institutions to active rehabilitation centers with community-based supportive facilities. The correctional system could adapt that course to its own goals and introduce changes that would be acceptable to society. By profiting from the hospitals' experience, I believe it could move ahead in far less time than it took them.

As a beginning, I suggest a program like PORT—a community-based, community-directed, community-supported domiciliary treatment facility for the criminal offender as an alternative to prison. We have in our communities many citizens who are concerned about the pressing social issues of our day—poverty, racial unrest, crime, and violence. They realize that the old solutions are no longer effective—if they ever were—and will accept the idea that institutionalization can be at least partially superseded by community care for the socially sick. We have a generation of youth searching for a cause who have a positive stake in the future; they can be brought into PORT programs as resident volunteers, where they can help bring about the social reforms they seek. As our experience in Minnesota has demonstrated, these citizens can provide strong, active support for programs like PORT.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 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?

I WORRY ABOUT MY LOYALTY RATING

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the antics of various agencies in the surveillance of American citizens would be humorous if they were less real and threatening. The ominous presence of governmental supersleuths complete with dossiers and wiretaps should be reserved for the realm of Mickey Spillane and James Bond. Instead, we find a complete spectrum of Americans, from U.S. Senators to housewives in Toledo to concerned conservationists, being appraised by the watchful eye of Government.

We are observed and recorded, cataloged and rated, photographed and fingerprinted, all in the name of American security and self-interest. Yet when a letter from a scoutmaster in Idaho arranging a tour of the Soviet Union for a troop of Explorer Scouts ends up in an FBI file or when some bungling Clousseau is so isolated from American society that he must send a spy to uncover the nature of Martin Luther King's dream, then we must ask whose security and whose self-interest.

The article which I now insert recounts one individual's attempts to master this labyrinth and uncover the existence and nature of such files. It is a chilling reminder to all of us and I recommend it to my colleagues:

I WORRY ABOUT MY LOYALTY RATING

(By Peter W. Roberts)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Peter W. Roberts of Coralville, associate editor of the University of Iowa News Service, has long waged a "commentary campaign"—usually with post cards—on various local and national issues. Here, he relates his most on-going project, this one "involving" the secretary of defense, the Department of the Army and others.)

On April 1 the Department of Army finally wrote and told me I was clean. I had been sweating out their answer for three months, after writing two letters to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, so I was relieved to read that a check of the Defense Central Index of Investigations showed that the military services are keeping neither a file nor a dossier on me.

This index covers the Army, Navy, and Air Force, but does not mention the Marines or the Coast Guard. Nor have I been able to figure out the difference between a file and a dossier.

I want to say there is no good reason why the Pentagon, or any other federal branch which does spying, should have a file on me. I am a parlor liberal, and all my political action has been within the system. But in the past year, a growing number of reports on how the military does spy on civilians made me afraid that the lack of a good reason might not deter the Pentagon. And I had decided to try the direct approach.

I first heard about military spying on

civilians during a primary campaign last year in the 1st Congressional District of Iowa, where I live. I was concerned about the totalitarian implications of such a policy, and my first postcard to the Pentagon on this subject ended with the question, "What is this, Russia?"

I got back a letter from Major Gen. J. A. McChristian, the assistant chief of staff for Army intelligence, assuring me that the informer, Capt. Christopher Pyle, had made a lot of mistakes, including the main charge that the Army was using undercover methods to collect information on people who might make trouble for the Army.

Six months later I really got upset after listening to Tom Pettit explain on the NBC television program "First Tuesday" how military spies had worked on the Poor People's Campaign and infiltrated the two political conventions in 1968. What bothered me most was the report that when one spy called his superior to say that Coretta King referred in a speech to the need to make her late husband's dream come true, the superior sent the spy back to the hall to find out what the dream was.

In a newspaper story about the same time, a former spy said, without sarcasm, that his superiors had ranked William F. Buckley Jr. to the left of center as they decided how to evaluate people's political positions. This meant to me that these patriots would not be able to distinguish Sen. Eugene McCarthy from Leon Trotsky. So I sent another card to the Pentagon, protesting against this military subversion of the political process and closing with my question, "What is this, Russia?"

But before Gen. McChristian could reply to this card, the newspaper came out with two more revelations: military spies had reportedly kept track of U.S. Sen. Adlai Stevenson, U.S. Rep. Abner Mikva, and former Gov. Otto Kerner, all of Illinois; and the Army was alleged to make routine investigations on everyone elected to Congress. One story quoted some intelligence guy as having said something like, "Just because a man is elected to office doesn't necessarily mean he's loyal."

Now, I have always considered myself a loyal citizen of the United States of America. I have in my possession a medal awarded to me by the Daughters of the American Revolution in 1955 or 1956, when as a senior at Hyde Park High School in Boston I had written a prize-winning essay on "What the Constitution Means to Me." I remember that the punchline of my essay was the quotation of a colloquial remark, "It's a free country, ain't it?", as illustration of the feeling of freedom the Constitution had made possible even in ungrammatical citizens.

But I started to wonder what status my own political activities might have in the minds of spies who had to be told what Martin Luther King's dream was.

Well, I had recently had a letter to the editor published in the Des Moines Sunday Register, charging that the display of the Confederate flag in Carl McIntire's Win-the-War parade was really more subversive, in view of past and present threats to our government, than the display of the Viet Cong flag in the Quit-the-War parades.

My picture had appeared in several newspapers as a participant in a weekly silent vigil for half an hour on Wednesday noons at an intersection in Iowa City, Iowa, to protest what we used to call the war in Vietnam and what we now call the war in Indochina. I've also marched in a moratorium parade and picketed a bus taking 18-year-old kids to the draft board.

I had given small amounts of money to various local and national groups engaged in protest and action against the war, racism, hunger, and other hateful things.

I was the author of an unending stream of snotty postcards and letters to Mr. Nixon, Mr. Agnew, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Laird, Mr.

Volpe, Mr. Hardin, and various congressmen, expressing positions no less "subversive" than Martin Luther King's dream.

In 1969, I had conducted a six-month-long campaign in private correspondence and in the pages of the Des Moines newspaper in an unsuccessful attempt to induce U.S. Sen. Jack Miller of Iowa to resign publicly from the Eagles Lodge, on grounds that a man with only 99 peers in the republic should not lend respectability to a whites-only club.

And, God help me, in 1964 while doing volunteer work for CORE, in Boston, I had written a postcard to J. Edgar Hoover pointing out the discrepancy between FBI agents' availability to arrest a 10 Most Wanted listee and their unavailability to protect the constitutional rights of American citizens in the Deep South.

And I started to think, I may consider myself an innocent employee of a Big Ten university and a loyal citizen, but Melvin Laird and J. Edgar Hoover may think I am a loathsome and dangerous character. So, I thought, I will write to Laird to seek my official "loyalty rating," and find out whether postcards ending "What is this, Russia?" eclipse high school essays ending "It's a free country, ain't it?" in the minds of the spies.

On Jan. 4, 1971, and again on Feb. 16, I sent certified letters to Melvin Laird, secretary of defense; in care of the Pentagon, confessing my political activity and dissent, and asking if he'd take a look and let me know if they had a spy-file on me. I concluded my letter: "I make these requests in the spirit of the Nixon Administration, which was conceived, gestated, and delivered under the slogan of Law and Order. What is this, Russia?"

In each case, the little green card proving that the letter had been delivered was returned to me in a week or so, but it took Mr. Laird's people three months to get around to answering. In the meantime, some more interesting things happened which kept my concern alive:

I got another letter from Gen. McChristian, answering my card about the "First Tuesday" show. He said the program had exaggerated and distorted the truth, and that the Army's real role in 1968 had been to help local authorities handle civil disturbances that got too big for them. "Despite the allegations of 'First Tuesday', the Army did not tap Sen. McCarthy's telephone in Chicago; it does not maintain a file on Sen. Fulbright; and it does not establish files on civilians solely because they have taken part in political activities," said the general. Also, in June, 1970, local units were ordered to destroy their civil disturbance information, he said.

Within a week or so after I got that letter, several former Army spies held a news conference to explain how they had spied at speeches given at the University of Minnesota by U.S. Sen. Walter Mondale and former Ambassador John Kenneth Galbraith. I wrote right back to Gen. McChristian, roughly as follows: "Every time you send me a letter denying domestic spying, five more of your agents give a public description of how they did it. Now it seems you were keeping an eye on John Kenneth Galbraith, a man who thinks the Democratic party is still an agent of change. If you clowns think he's dangerous, you must have files on half the population." I was thinking of myself.

Then I read a newspaper story describing some peace rally in Colorado attended by about 120 persons, more than 50 of whom were military and domestic spies for the federal government. One man who had been there supposedly said in disbelief, "Even the Navy had two people there." I wondered what kind of time those Navy men must've had rowing their canoe up the Colorado River against the current, to get to the rally.

Then Sen. Sam J. Ervin, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional

Rights, opened about a week of hearings on what he called "unwarranted governmental invasions of privacy and abuses of computerized and other data banks." I learned two things from them: among the organizations the spies thought were suspicious were three to which I was giving about \$100 a year, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Then when I sent him a complimentary postcard mentioning my unanswered letters to Laird, Ervin wrote back that his resources were too limited to let him intervene in individual cases.

Shortly afterward, newspaper stories about some files stolen from the FBI quoted the strategy of some agents to promote paranoia by encouraging citizens to believe that their phones are being tapped and their actions observed.

And I heard, by word of mouth, the figure 25,000,000 for the number of citizens listed in spy-files. The huge size of this figure, amounting to one citizen in every eight in the country, made me feel that if it was accurate, I must be in there.

But finally I got the letter April 1 from Robert E. Jordan III, general counsel of the Department of the Army, including the following sentence: "A check of the Defense Central Index of Investigations (DCII) indicates that the military services do not maintain a file or dossier on you at their central records repositories." The supporting information he included with the letter notes that the DCII contains about 25,000,000 index cards on personalities and 760,000 cards on organizations and incidents.

Among the categories considered fair game for the collection of information are "subversive and other organizations of intelligence interest to the Army, wherever located, and of whatever sponsorship, considered to constitute a threat to national security." As I ponder my government through the paranoid haze the FBI likes to cultivate, I'm wondering whether that definition can be applied to 11 citizens standing on the corner of Clinton and Washington Streets on a Wednesday noon when it's 3-below-zero to protest the war.

Anyway, the pressure's off now. One colleague at work says Life magazine says regional spy centers have a lot of information not listed in the central index. But I say, if one of Melvin Laird's general counsels says I'm clean, I'm clean. I've read that Gen. McChristian is going to retire earlier than he had intended, which may account for his failure to answer my last card about the Galbraith spy operation. I've told several people that I have neither file nor dossier in the DCII, and one said cheerfully, "You do now." I've mulled over the paradox of a country trying to preserve its freedom by destroying its freedom, like a man committing suicide to avoid being murdered.

Oh, and I saw on TV the other night that a letter written by a Scoutmaster in Idaho to the Soviet embassy, to arrange for a tour of the Soviet Union by a platoon of Explorer Scouts, ended up in an FBI file. So I wrote a snotty postcard to Atty. Gen. John Mitchell, asking him to explain to the American public how that letter could have got in that file, and I said to him, "What is this, Russia?"

A GIRL'S TRAGEDY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington

Post carried an article by Haynes Johnson which was a followup to an earlier story on Mary Vecchio, the young girl who became immortalized when her picture was taken next to a slain student at Kent State. The tragedy at Kent State in Ohio and Jackson State in Mississippi is a blot on our history that can never be forgotten. But Mr. Johnson has pointed to another tragedy, a personal tragedy which in many ways is even worse than what happened at these colleges. The tragedy is that of a young, confused girl who was caught up in circumstances beyond her control and was ostracized from society as a result and was finally committed to a juvenile home. Mr. Johnson is to be commended for his compassion and his insight into American life for he has shown us both the worst and the best in the American character. We should all take a lesson from the personal ordeal of Mary Vecchio and the response which it evoked from the American public and Mr. Johnson is to be congratulated for teaching us that lesson. Who can doubt that it was the intolerance, hatred, cruelty, and lack of compassion that sent Mary to that juvenile home? We can only hope that those who were moved to express their compassion for Mary, will save her.

The article follows:

RESPONSE TO A GIRL'S TRAGEDY: THE LETTERS
ON MARY VECCHIO
(By Haynes Johnson)

Scott Fitzgerald once said there are no second acts in American lives, and that may be true. He was expressing, in more literate fashion, the old cliché about how they never come back. No one can say whether Mary Vecchio will survive her personal ordeal and put her life back together, but I do know that the response of people across America to her tragedy has affected my own thinking about the country.

Mary, you may remember, was the teenage girl who ran away from home and wound up on the Kent State campus last spring where she was photographed, kneeling in horror, over the body of a slain student. A few weeks ago I wrote a story about what had happened to Mary since then—her tearful reunion with her parents in Opa Locka, Fla., the venomous hate mail she received, the abuse she endured in her own home town because she had become a symbol of wayward, rebellious youth, and finally how she ran away again and was committed to a juvenile home south of Miami.

Taken on its face, it expressed all the worst elements in American life: intolerance, hatred, cruelty, and, most chilling of all, the lack of compassion for one human being trapped in circumstances not of her making and beyond her capacity to handle. The first public response to Mary's story seemed to confirm that belief. A woman from Arlington, Va., wrote to say The Washington Post, Mary Vecchio and I deserved "a good paddling." "It would do you all a lot of good," she concluded.

Then the letters began pouring in, from all over the country and, indeed, overseas. In more years as a reporter than I care to count, I have never experienced such a spontaneous and overwhelming reaction to anything I have written. The letters are still coming, two or three a day—letters from children and housewives and old men, letters to Mary with such inscriptions on the envelopes as "Mary, this is not a hate letter" and "could you get this to her? It isn't a nasty letter at all." With only one exception—an anonymous writer from Seattle, Wash., who called Mary a "bum" and said I should be fired—they all expressed the same thought. They wanted Mary to know they cared.

"Dear Mary," a woman from Milwaukee wrote on a postcard, "we (many, many of us—mothers, teachers, etc.) sincerely love you, a fellow human being."

I like to think they are the voice of the true silent majority.

Here's what some of them had to say:

A housewife from Dayton, Ohio: "Dear Mary: Please accept my deepest apology for the whole human race, it's unbelievable how cruel they can become. Please don't blame God for all of this—His message is just the opposite—love. But this is not a sermon. I just had to let you know that there are an enormous number of people that wish you nothing but good—and we didn't write sooner because we had no more idea than you did what misery you would have to go through."

A 13-year-old boy from Teaneck, N.J.: "Dear Mary: I read the article and felt sick to my stomach, because anyone who shows even the slightest feeling for someone who gets senselessly shot down certainly is not a whore, prostitute, dirty hippie and the other disgusting names they called you. I just want you to know that I myself and my parents and sister and thousands of other people in the New York area and other places sympathize with you a great deal..."

A 19-year-old from Forest Hills, Long Island: "Dear Mary: Hi! My name is Stan. I'm 19 and I live in New York... I would like very much to be your friend. If it is possible, please write back."

A woman from Attleboro, Mass.: "There are thousands of people, I'm certain, who are deeply sympathetic with you—having been exposed to what is most tragic in life—suffering and ignorant cruelty. For every one unfortunate person whom the world has ill taught, there are hundreds of thousands of warm compassionate persons who would gather you into the haven and shelter of their hearts and homes."

A post-graduate student from Chicago: "I'm supposed to begin working on my Ph.D. in education in September and have been asking myself what for. Some of my friends have left the country, others have moved to communes, but the majority just work and pay taxes. Most young people, I believe, don't want to split, just be treated like human beings. Too many feel our parents don't practice what they preach."

A man from Wantagh, N.Y.: "I'm 80 years old and no bleeding heart. While I was, before my retirement, a probation officer and in that capacity had contact with some 3,000 male youngsters whose 'offenses' ranged from truancy to homicide, Mary's story still shocked me more than any case I had ever handled... The real horror of your story is not so much the account of Mary's confused (and socially unapproved) search for her own identity and place in society... it is the hateful, merciless reaction of countless pharisaic so-called distant Christian citizens whose deathwish for Mary is a projection of their own feelings of weakness and unworthiness."

Again and again, virtually the same phrases were repeated in the letters. One parent said it for all.

"My family and I would like her to know that the world is not an entirely hostile place, and that some people do care and sympathize with her more than words can say."

JEROLD HOFFBERGER HONORED

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 13, 1971, I had the pleasure of attending again this year, the

Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce annual luncheon when the Port and Industrial Development Committee of the Baltimore Junior Association of Commerce honored Jerold C. Hoffberger as the Outstanding Man of Industry of Baltimore for the past year.

Jerry Hoffberger has been a leading citizen in the Baltimore community for many years. He is president and director of the National Brewing Co., president of the world champion Baltimore Orioles, a trustee of Johns Hopkins and Mercy Hospitals, director of Sinai Hospital, trustee of Goucher College, and an active participant in numerous Jewish organizations.

The above accomplishments are only a few of the many outstanding contributions this man has made to the city of Baltimore and the State of Maryland. I cannot think of another individual who more justly deserves the award of the Outstanding Man of Industry of Baltimore.

As a past recipient of this award, I would like to share with my colleagues the remarks made by Jerry Hoffberger at the annual luncheon:

REMARKS BY JEROLD C. HOFFBERGER

Thank you Mr. Hopewell, fellow members of the Jaycees, and distinguished guests. It is an honor for me to accept the award which you are giving me today, not because I feel that I deserve it, but because I hope that in some small way, I can inspire the younger members of our community to put their brains, their muscle, and their initiative behind the great future which can be in store for us as individuals and as a community.

Walter Sondheim has so aptly recounted to you some of the latest steps which are being undertaken to make Baltimore one of the truly great metropolitan centers of the world. No one could have described this metamorphosis with more dedication and optimism for Baltimore, than Mr. Sondheim.

He has labored long and hard in the vineyards of community development, social betterment, and unstinting service to his fellow man. And now, even after he has retired, he still won't quit.

Walter and I were in at the beginning, I think I can say, when a group of businessmen in Baltimore, discouraged with the apathy of many citizens, discouraged with the deterioration of downtown and concerned about the future of our city, met and formed the Greater Baltimore Committee. Much that followed is history to you who are here today.

With few believers at its inception, the Charles Center started Baltimore up the long road toward rehabilitation. The results speak for themselves.

You have only to look around to see the vitality of a new city, the return of commerce and industry to downtown, and the beginning of an increase in the assessable tax base.

The benefits of the vision, the hard work, the boot-strap financing and the molding together of government and business for this project will eventually be yours and your children's.

As I reflect back to the beginning of the restoration of our downtown, I know that the most important ingredient was people—dedicated men who gave of their time, their knowledge, their vitality and their vision. But, the job is far from complete—the work must go on, and there is enough catch-up ball to keep everyone busy.

Most of you know that I have a soft spot in my heart for this great organization. It is a builder of men, of citizens, of doers and thinkers.

I don't think, *I know*, that this organization, if it decides to put its back to the task can, starting right today, make a significant contribution to this city.

Robert Kennedy used to say, "I would rather light one candle than curse the darkness."

How many of you have read this week's issue of *Sports Illustrated*? On page 78 there is an article called "Best Damn Team in Baseball". The article is highly complimentary about the Orioles and in particular the organization which runs it. All of us who are involved in management of the team thank the editors and Mr. Deford who wrote the piece.

It is very significant though, that while the article is extremely laudatory about the baseball team, some of the comments which are made about the support which Baltimore gives to a championship team should make all of our faces red. Let me quote a few classic comments . . . "The best damn team in the baseball world did not draw one million last year although it always pulls well at the free airport reception when the victorious team is welcomed home at the end of each season."

And again, "The citizens there are proficient at inertia. They have back up reasons for not doing the things they never intended doing anyway. Complaints about traffic, parking and memorial stadium are repeated ad infinitum. Crabtowners have the nerve to call up the Orioles and for some slight—a favorite player farmed out perhaps—threaten that they will stop listening to the game on Radio."

This is what people outside of Baltimore think of us. If it doesn't make you mad, it sure does me.

So what does that have to do with the jaycees . . . isn't this a job made to order for this great organization. Will this group . . . the present and future leaders of our community . . . stand idly back and be overcome with inertia. Are you going to let people believe Baltimore is a do nothing city, whose citizens don't care or who are content to "let George or Donald do it?"

Baltimore began to move again with the Charles Center. It will progress further with the new Metro center about which you hear today . . . an investment of almost a billion dollars by 1990 in public and private funds. That is a lot of money, but bricks and mortar are not always the only answer. It also takes people, dedicated people.

Today you have honored me and I return that honor by saying to you what finer or more appropriate organization of young men could be prepared to take up the torch at this most important period. The work has been commenced, but the "exhausted roosters" now look to you to carry out not only the completion of the Metro Center, but to dig deeply into the other problems of our urban areas which are so enormous as to defy description.

There are social problems, transportation problems, tax problems, municipal service problems to list a few. This can and must be solved if we, and this means your generation, are not to be destroyed in our own ruins and be continually criticized by outsiders as "bush."

The Charles Center very likely saved Baltimore from the fate which is overtaking other urban areas right at this moment. That same vigor is desperately needed again—right at this moment.

It was a bold and forthright step. It took vision and even more—it took guts. The continuance of what has been started is now up to you. You who are here today can accept this challenge and acquit yourselves as you have in the past.

I ask each and everyone of you not to walk away from the obligations to your community. You have the vision, the energy and the

guts. Let's light the candle—today—before it is too late.

Thank you for having me with you today and singling me out for this great honor. It is always good to be among friends.

THE UPPER MISSOURI BASIN WANTS A DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

HON. JOHN MELCHER

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of the public works bill, those of us in the Upper Missouri River Basin are going to get to work again to obtain establishment of an Economic Development Commission for Montana, Wyoming, Nebraska, and the Dakotas.

The Secretary of Commerce and the President have postponed action on the unanimous petition for creation of a commission filed by our five Governors and backed by all 10 Senators and all 10 Members of this House from the area.

The Senate has voted to extend the authority for such commissions previously. The House has now voted to continue them, instead of putting their funds in one of the President's revenue-sharing proposals.

Not only the officials in both parties in the area, but the press and the public feel that we need and are entitled to designation, along with the Northeast, Upper Great Lakes, Ozarks, Four Corners, and Southeastern areas.

I am placing in the RECORD two editorials on our development needs in Montana from the Billings Gazette which is representative of the feeling that such a commission offers us a regional approach to development which will prevent another lost generation in economic development.

The second editorial, which followed Senate action to extend the development commissions, concludes that the money should be released now and the commission established.

The editorial follows:

EAST MONTANA CAN CATCH UP

(By D. W. Bowler)

William Warne is a man with both memory and vision.

Warne says Eastern Montana and related areas missed the economic recovery boat 30 years ago—but another one can be built and launched now, if we will.

The internationally recognized consultant on water and power matters recalls that 30 years ago a presidential commission pointed to four areas of the nation that were going to go downhill unless proper measures were taken.

Appalachia was one of them. So was Eastern Montana and its adjacent areas of the Upper Great Plains.

The commission spent about \$250,000, a lot of money then, talking to people, surveying the needs. But little or nothing happened.

Trends that were detected and projected then have continued. Populations have dropped. There are fewer and fewer persons in rural, agricultural areas to support the schools, the hospitals, churches, libraries, the governments.

This is not to say there are not people in the area who are doing quite well. There are, many of them. But many are not, too.

The area is suffering from outmigration, caused by fewer job possibilities for the many as the few get larger and larger.

Vacant store buildings appear more and more in the smaller communities.

Community leaders recognize what is happening. Some, not all, realize the folly of their stands of a few decades ago when they knowingly or unwittingly opposed economic development of the area along more productive lines.

Warne, a former assistant secretary of the interior who now bases in California, recalls one such instance.

The Missouri Valley Authority plan, designed to bring Tennessee Valley Authority expansion and development to the area, was turned down by Congress.

It did result in a partial substitute, the Pick-Sloan Plan, described by one MVA supporter as a "shameless, loveless shotgun wedding" between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Some work was done on it, plenty of planning. One project on the Missouri River near Culbertson called for a diversion dam to irrigate 200,000 acres. The project even went to contract.

Then, Warne recalls, five major wheat growers of the area, organized to defeat the project. They carried their battle to Washington, D.C. Interior Secretary McKay, just in office under the Eisenhower Administration, let the project die.

Not only did the project die, but highly restrictive steps were taken to prevent development. As a result the region now labors under restricted rules.

However, Warne advises, they can be overcome by local, community action.

"Some of the same people who fought to prevent this (Culbertson) project from bearing fruit now see they were wrong," Warne says.

Warne returned to the area last year at the request of community leaders, those who have formed a council of leaders to strive for improved economic development.

His answer is the same: You can't reverse the trend without better use of your resources.

Those resources are 1) water for irrigation, 2) land to be irrigated and 3) the livestock industry.

The problem, says Warne, is to keep the cattle and the feed here longer, then sell a finished product whether it be fat cattle or slaughtered beef.

Even though the feeder business has grown, Montana still ships vast numbers of cattle and millions of bushels of feed out-of-state.

If more of it was kept here, the area would gain in people and the income people need to stay here to support the institutions every community desires.

Warne says it can be done, and we think he's right, if we will take advantage of available opportunities.

Leadership in the overall program probably will have to come from the Upper Missouri Basin Commission, suggested by U.S. Rep. John Melcher, proposed to the other governors by Gov. Forrest H. Anderson of Montana and endorsed by the ten senators, ten representatives and five governors of Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota and Nebraska.

It is a nonpolitical effort to change an economic picture in which the outlook is not bright.

Congress has funded \$300,000 for the Commission operations. Other funds, both loans and grants, have been made available when the need has been shown. All are designed to promote economic recovery for areas in need.

The efforts to be made to promote economic development will require the much-

heralded grass roots support that was missing or overpowered before.

Here's an opportunity to prevent another lost generation in the economic development of Eastern Montana.

It doesn't have to happen.

PLANNING GREEN LIGHT

Long-needed, legitimate plans for sensible regional economic development of the upper Missouri River states are back on the track again in Washington, D.C.

A week ago it appeared that the program would be sidetracked under President Nixon's proposed rural aid revenue sharing programs.

The President's proposed full-share program would have poured millions into local government setups of the five states without regard to regional planning.

It was made clear Thursday that the U.S. Senate wants the proposed Upper Missouri River Regional Planning Commission as well as the entire regional planning concept continued.

The Senate approved by 73 to 2 a measure to extend for four more years the life of the regional planning commissions now operating or in the proposed stage.

The Upper Missouri River Regional Planning Commission for Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota and Nebraska was mentioned by name to be continued.

Senators made it clear to the Nixon Administration that they want the concept continued. Congressman John Melcher sees assurance of its approval in the House as "one revenue sharing plan that has worked."

Now that Congress has spoken again, and quite clearly, in favor of the regional planning concept, it is time that the Office of Management and the Budget releases the \$300,000 Congress appropriated for the Upper Missouri project in 1969.

Money appropriated for the project has been held back despite the completely bipartisan pleas of governors and congressional delegations from the five states.

Political leaders of the five states involved realize they have problems in common, problems they should solve jointly. They realize the need to plan jointly to halt the outmigration of people, to develop water resources, protect the environment, improve transportation and develop common resources.

The Upper Missouri River states need more than money, which the revenue sharing plan would undoubtedly contribute. They needed planned use of the money to spend it wisely and for long-term benefit.

Other forces, for selfish economic reasons, blocked joint area development a few decades ago.

It will be sad indeed to see that same economic potential blocked again, this time because a well-meaning President doesn't see eye-to-eye with Congress.

The money should be released now and the project started.

REPRESENTATIVE MOORHEAD IS PRESENTED PLAQUE BY PITTSBURGH SCOUT TROOP 270

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that one attends a function with the intent of making a presentation and is in turn presented with a gift.

But such was the case recently in Pittsburgh when I arranged for a flag to

be presented to a Boy Scout troop from the Polish Hill section of Pittsburgh.

The boys and their scoutmaster, David Klotz, turned the tables and gave me a beautiful plaque.

In addition, Junior Assistant Scoutmaster Vincent Karpuska, read a short dedication speech, which he wrote. It was an inspiring piece and I am truly thankful for the Scout troop's salute.

I would like to put young Mr. Karpuska's words in the RECORD at this time for the edification of my colleagues:

SPEECH BY VINCENT KARPUSKA

To the Americans of 1776, liberty was a God given right. It was their belief that no power, political, economic, or any other could crush that right. The right to life, liberty, and equal justice could not be legally denied by the government. These early Americans, uneducated as many were, realized that the state was the servant of the people and not the people servants of the state. With this belief in their fellow man, their hope of equal justice, and their faith in God, a handful of revolutionists built a nation which was to become the greatest nation to ever rule in this world. The "watch-dog" of the free world, the United States of America.

Today, we Scouts of Troop 270 carry on this belief in our Boy Scout oath and law. This evening's candle lite ceremony is dedicated to a man who has helped strengthen this belief in our American way, Congressman William S. Moorhead.

FUNDS FOR NINDS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the work of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke has resulted in dramatic breakthroughs in the nature and treatment of neurological diseases. To cite just a few examples, important studies have been conducted on the effect German measles—rubella—produces on the nervous system during pregnancy.

Development of the miracle drug L-Dopa has dramatically improved the outlook of patients afflicted with Parkinson's disease. In addition, significant discoveries have been made in the entire area of genetic diseases. Because of the impetus that the Institute has provided, the development of idiocy and deafness will be effectively curtailed in the near future.

Thus the importance of the work of NINDS is self-evident. It has been estimated that the diseases covered by the Institute affect over 12 percent of the population. That is why I am most concerned about both the administration freeze on funds for the current fiscal year and the \$7.1 million reduction from last year's appropriation that it is requesting for fiscal 1972.

The reduction in funds for research, training, and direct operations is a mistake in my opinion. Dr. Paul C. Bucy, Chairman of the National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders has written a letter to Elliot Richardson, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, outlining the work of NINDS and describing the ef-

fect these budgetary cutbacks would have on its operations.

I now insert in the RECORD this thoughtful and perceptive letter and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

FEBRUARY 10, 1971.

HON. ELLIOT RICHARDSON, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY RICHARDSON: It was a pleasure to meet with you and your associates, Dr. Egeberg and Mr. Cardwell, on Tuesday, February 9, and to have the opportunity to discuss with you the problems of NINDS. You will recall that those who accompanied me were Mrs. Majorie Guthrie, Executive Secretary of the Committee to Combat Huntington's Disease; Dr. A. B. Baker, President of the American Neurological Association and Professor of Neurology at the University of Minnesota; Dr. Sidney Carter, President of the American Academy of Neurology and Professor of Pediatric Neurology, Columbia University; Dr. Collin S. MacCarty, President of the American Association of Neurological Surgeons and Head of the Department of Neurological Surgery at the Mayo Clinic; Dr. John Bordley, Executive Director of the American Council of Otolaryngology and Emeritus Professor of Otolaryngology, Johns Hopkins University. These leaders of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Otolaryngology met with you because they are concerned that the present policies of the Administration and of the Department of HEW are seriously endangering the delivery of health care in this country. I am writing you at this time for two reasons. First, I wish to place the principal points of our concern in writing for your consideration. Second, I wish to again request a reply from you as to what the Department of HEW proposes to do regarding these matters.

(1) The Congress appropriated for FY 1971 \$105,807,000 for NINDS. The Administration has indicated that it will release only \$103,022,000 of this inadequate appropriation for utilization by the Institute. This is a reduction of \$2,785,000. The reduction is both in funds for research grants and for training programs. Although it is a lesser amount, the reduction for training, \$672,000 is the more serious. We request that all of the funds appropriated for NINDS be released.

(2) The President's request for funds for NINDS for FY 1972 constitutes an even more serious curtailment of the activities of the Institute. The President's budget would result in a reduction in funds for research of \$1,310,000, for training of \$3,031,000, and for direct operations of \$3,185,000. It must be obvious to even the uninformed citizen that such a serious curtailment of funds for NINDS can only seriously impair the acquisition of new knowledge regarding the nature and treatment of neurological diseases, conditions which by and large paralyze and disable our children and young people. This curtailment in the areas of neurological and otolaryngological diseases is particularly serious. In the approximately 15 years that NINDS (formerly NINDB) has been in existence it has been a prime factor in transforming neurology from a medical specialty primarily interested only in the diagnosis of disease, to one with a very real potential so far as treatment of disease is concerned. It has transformed otolaryngology from a dying specialty concerned largely with infectious disorders which had been eliminated by antibiotics, to one which could cure many forms of deafness and cancer of the larynx. The Institute has only begun to achieve its goals. To curtail its activities at this time will result in losing much of what has been accomplished.

Let us look at the specific areas affected by the curtailment.

(a) Research—

Obviously you are familiar with the many outstanding research accomplishments of NINDS over the years. But for the record let me present a few of the more dramatic ones.

(i) German measles. Studies have shown the serious disabling disorders of the nervous system which occur when the mother suffers from German measles (Rubella). In addition, studies supported by the Institute have shown how to prevent the development of the idiocy, deafness, etc., which were so common in the past. In the future these will be as rare as infantile paralysis has become.

(ii) L-Dopa. The development of this drug has miraculously improved the outlook of the patient with Parkinson's disease (shaking palsy) and re-oriented our thinking about a multitude of other diseases of the nervous system.

(iii) The discovery of a method for detecting which child will develop amaurotic family idiocy—a condition which leads to idiocy, blindness, deafness and in a few years to death—will abolish that disease from our experience shortly. This has also been an outstanding break-through in the entire area of genetic diseases and will lead to their abolition also in the next few years if research is continued.

(iv) In the past few years we have learned how to cure choriocarcinoma of the brain. This is the first brain tumor which has been cured by other than surgical means. It is reasonable to expect that continued research will lead to similar favorable results with other brain tumors.

(v) Recently we have learned how to cure monkeys paralyzed by injury to their spinal cords. With the opportunity for continued study we can extend those results to man.

But there remain other diseases of the nervous system which still elude our research efforts—multiple sclerosis, epilepsy, Huntington's chorea, amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, and many others. The solutions of their problems are no more hopeless than diabetes, pernicious anemia, tuberculosis, pneumonia, meningitis, infantile paralysis, and many others once were. These unconquered diseases can only be mastered by more, certainly not by less research. The public demands that these researchers be continued and that more, not less, of their money be used for their benefits.

(b) Training—

The most serious criticism of the policies of the Administration and of the Department of HEW concern training. This is particularly true of the Training Programs of NINDS. When this Institute became active a little more than 15 years ago, both neurology and otolaryngology were dying medical specialties. Neurology was concerned largely with the diagnosis of diseases for which it had no treatment. Many medical schools had no department of neurology and there were few teachers. Today largely because of the activities of NINDS (formerly NINDB) neurology has become a very active specialty whose members are interested in treatment and have effective means of prevention and treatment. The training programs of NINDS have produced practically all of the teachers of neurology in our medical schools today but with the terrific increase in the number of medical students and medical schools many more teachers are needed. These can not be produced if our training programs are destroyed or seriously curtailed.

Otolaryngology was disappearing because the infectious diseases with which it was predominantly concerned were being prevented by antibiotics. The discovery of how to cure some forms of deafness and cancer of the larynx have restored it to greater vigor than ever before. The training programs in this specialty have been largely responsible for the teachers and investigators who have made this possible.

The training programs have another accomplishment to their credit. Although the direct support from NINDS has been to produce teachers and investigators, the strengthening of the training programs has also resulted in a greater output of specialists capable of the delivery of superior medical care. In considerable measure it is also these men who have the education and training which has enabled them to inform the general medical profession regarding the discoveries which have been made and how they can be used to deliver better health care. In the main these men have not been supported during their training by NINDS. They have been supported locally. However, the outstanding programs in which they were trained would not have been possible without NINDS support.

It is the opinion of this group of leaders in neurology, neurosurgery, and otolaryngology that the most serious error in the policies of the Administration has been its deliberate plan to reduce the training programs. This policy will ultimately result in making improved delivery of health care impossible.

(c) The plan to transfer funds from the NIH training programs to the deans of medical schools appears particularly ill-advised to these experts in neurology, neurosurgery, and otolaryngology. This exercise in bookkeeping evidences a very commendable interest on the part of the Administration in the serious state of the finances of our medical schools. They need financial help. This help should not be given by removing funds from the training programs. To do so will destroy the training programs. In the long run this will only damage the medical schools which will no longer find faculty available to them and will damage the delivery of health care. It is obvious that this transfer is designed to enable medical schools to pay faculty members outside the training programs. If it were only to permit the payment of salaries now being paid in training programs there would be no sense in making the change. If the salaries of men now involved in the training programs are not to be paid the programs will be destroyed.

(d) The reduction in funds for direct operation of NINDS by \$3,185,000 is primarily designed to abandon the perinatal program. This is a longterm program developed years ago, to learn why mothers bear children with defective brains. This requires study of the mothers and follow-up of the children for at least 12 years—the period in which the defects become obvious—and then a correlation of the findings in the mothers with what develops in the children. To date a great deal of information has been obtained at great cost. Now the Institute is prepared to analyze this information and to learn what it can in this important area of deformed, disabled children. If this program is not continued all the time, effort and money which have been invested will be lost. It is difficult to imagine more misdirected policy than this. In criticism it has been said that there have been so few worth while results from this program. It could not be otherwise. There can be no worth while results until the information regarding these thousands of pregnancies has been collected and finally analyzed.

The reduction in funds for direct operations will also seriously impair the research program of NINDS at the clinical research center in Bethesda, will impair the success of the head injury centers and prevent the development of the spinal cord injury centers.

This group of leaders in neurology, neurosurgery, and otolaryngology were very disturbed to learn that these important and devastating policy decisions relative to NINDS were made without the consultation and advice of knowledgeable experts in these fields of medical science. They again express their willingness to cooperate with the Administration in offering the benefit of their special knowledge and experience to aid the

Administration in achieving a better policy and arriving at wiser decisions concerning this Institute.

It is the considered opinion of this group of experts that the present Administrative policy if pursued will destroy neurology as it has been developed over the past 15 years. Neurosurgery and otolaryngology can survive this setback but not without serious damage. The most severe will be that the young men in training who have determined to devote their lives to a career in teaching and research will be disastrously discouraged and disillusioned, and will forsake careers which could be of great importance in teaching and research for ones restricted to private practice. The loss to the citizens of this country in what could be achieved in the further understanding and treatment of neurological disease cannot only be measured in human suffering but in the millions of dollars which will have to be spent upon the care of patients whose diseases might have been prevented or cured.

To restate our position we specifically request that the funds appropriated by Congress for NINDS for FY 1971 be released for utilization by the Institute.

We further request that the President's budget for NINDS for FY 1972 be reconsidered and increased in line with the demonstrable needs of that Institute. For the Institute to continue its present programs and to restore them to necessary levels of funding and for it to approve and fund those projects and programs which have already passed the careful review of their study sections and review committees and been approved by their Advisory Council will require \$144,000,000. This amount should be appropriated and released for use.

We also most strongly advise that the new policy of transferring funds from the training programs to the deans of medical schools be completely reversed. The medical schools should receive needed support, but not at the expense of the training programs. The training programs should be restored to their old levels of support and acceptable new programs should be added.

We on this committee await with great interest your letter regarding the withheld funds for FY 1971 and the budget for FY 1972. Your reply will also be of great interest to the neurologists, neurosurgeons and otolaryngologists that we represent and to the general public who have created the several voluntary health agencies which constituted the National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL C. BUCY, M.D.,

Chairman, National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders.

GOVERNOR SHAPP OFFERS VIEWS ON CLEAN WATER RESTORATION ACT OF 1966

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the recent November elections brought to office many men whose ability and intellect could mean the difference between winning and losing the constant fight public officials have to improve the character of life for the people of our Nation.

Milton Shapp, the Governor of Pennsylvania, is one of those men whose presence bodes well for the citizens of our

State. He is an outstanding administrator and indications are that he will be a fine Governor.

Recently, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) wrote to several Governors soliciting their views concerning the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 and how best this law can help the American people.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD at this time the enlightened response of Milton Shapp and Representative DINGELL's letter to me:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 5, 1971.

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: On January 20, 1971, I wrote to the Governors of the various States to request their views on the operations of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 and to ask for an indication of what they felt should be included in new legislation to replace this expiring Act.

Enclosed for your information is the response which I have received from Governor Milton J. Shapp.

With warmest regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member of Congress.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, March 31, 1971.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Member, U.S. House of Representatives,
Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DINGELL: Thank you for your letter of January 20, 1971, and the attached correspondence between yourself and Governor Milliken. We, too, are greatly concerned over the grant program under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. This program has had a substantial effect on the construction of municipal sewage treatment facilities in Pennsylvania. Even with this impact we feel that the program does have certain shortcomings.

The greatest shortcoming is the deficiency in the funds appropriated to enable the states to proceed with the greatly needed clean-up of our rivers and other surface waters. It has only been in the last two years that we have been able to extend our funding beyond the original 30 percent level in Pennsylvania. We have utilized State funding to increase the grants beyond 30 percent. Additional federal funds are needed to assure an on-going program for construction of municipal treatment facilities. Another shortcoming in the program is the lack of funds for sanitary sewer construction. Many municipalities are in need of sewage collection systems to eliminate health hazards and pollution from individual on-lot disposal facilities. The cost of sewer construction constitutes the major portion of the total cost of a comprehensive municipal project. The present Federal act does not provide funds for sewer construction. Funds for this purpose under other programs are limited.

As we reported to the Environmental Protection Agency in our program plan, the five-year need for sewage treatment construction in Pennsylvania has been estimated to be \$584,260,000. This, of course, must be upgraded as inflation further increases costs. We anticipate a need for the coming fiscal year of over \$120 million to fund those projects presently under consideration. This is over twice the amount allotted to Pennsylvania in Fiscal Year 1971.

The program can be improved, we feel, by the allocation of additional funds to the states for administration. This has become increasingly important in view of the expanded scope of work which must be per-

formed by the states to meet federal requirements. A good example is the adoption last July of the Federal Grant Regulations which require the states to develop statewide plans for comprehensive wastewater management and water pollution control. The states are expected to comply with these regulations, but the Federal government now provides no additional funds to the states for this purpose. Serious consideration must be given to increasing state water pollution control program grants if those program grant funds should be revised. More consideration should be given to those states who have developed legal and administrative ability to implement an effective water pollution control program but have been hampered by lack of sufficient funds to develop staff capabilities to do so.

Finally, we feel there is a need for providing funds to municipalities for the preparation of feasibility reports and final plans and specifications for projects. Although the present construction grant program now participates in these costs, the funds are not available until after the project construction has started. Often the lack of funds for design causes delays in project development and implementation.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts on the Clean Water Restoration Act program.

Sincerely,

MILTON J. SHAPP,
Governor.

DEMOCRATS ABANDON HONORABLE SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican National Committee's hard-hitting weekly publication, Monday, edited by John Lofton, Jr., often prints articles of interest to the general public. This week's issue contained two excellent stories: "Democrats Abandon Honorable Settlement in Vietnam" and "Majority of Youth Back President's Vietnam Policies, Poll Shows." The articles follow:

DEMOCRATS ABANDON HONORABLE SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

Back when they were in the White House and persons like Presidential advisor Larry O'Brien (now Democrat National Chairman) were out making speeches about Americans fighting in Vietnam to defend "Iowa . . . Massachusetts . . . all the Free World," there was talk among Democrats about an honorable settlement of that war. There was talk about the national interest, the need to prevent Communist aggression and things like that. For example: Sen. Hubert Humphrey spoke of America's honor and its relationship to Vietnam in an Aug. 6, 1964, speech on the Senate floor strongly backing the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. HHH said: "It is my view that the minute we back away from commitments we have made in the defense of freedom, where the Communist powers are guilty of outright subversion and aggression, on that day the strength, the freedom and the honor of the United States starts to be eroded."

Sen. Birch Bayh of Indiana was another Democrat worried about Communist expansionism in Southeast Asia. "If we are to turn tail and run, the entire Southeast Asia area . . . would come under Communist domination," said Bayh in the March 16, 1965,

Congressional Record. "Responsible Americans realize that giving in to aggressors cannot stop them," the Record of Sept. 13, 1966, quotes Bayh. "That . . . is why we are fighting in Vietnam."

In remarks before the Philadelphia Allied Jewish Appeal in February of 1966, Sen. Edmund Muskie said that to retreat from the objective of stopping Communist aggression in South Vietnam would be to "undermine the prospects for stability and peace. We believe that the credibility of our word and our purpose as a Nation is at stake," he declared, "and that its loss would be an enormous setback for the forces of freedom." That fall Muskie spoke to the Parliamentary Conference of the British Commonwealth about withdrawing from Vietnam: "If we make the decision to withdraw, we have to contemplate the implications, not as someone counseling another country but as someone responsible for the results."

Even S.D. Sen. George McGovern is quoted as saying in the Jan. 15, 1965, Congressional Record: "Actually North Vietnam cannot benefit any more than South Vietnam from a prolonged conflict. I would hope that we would be prepared to wage such a conflict rather than to surrender the area to Communism."

In 1968, in the section on Vietnam and Asia, the Democratic Party platform was explicit on the necessity for an honorable settlement in Vietnam: "Our most urgent task in Southeast Asia is to end the war in Vietnam by an honorable and lasting settlement which respects the rights of all the people of Vietnam . . . we have borne a heavy burden in helping South Vietnam to counter aggression and subversion from the North. We reject as unacceptable a unilateral withdrawal of our forces which would allow that aggression and subversion to succeed."

But times have changed. Virtually none of the Democrats running for President now talk about an honorable settlement. The Party has officially abandoned not only the concept but also the words. Last month's Democratic Policy Council statement on Vietnam contrasts sharply with the 1968 Democratic platform in its conspicuous omission of the phrase "honorable settlement." "There should be a firm, unequivocal declaration by the Government that all American forces will be withdrawn by the end of this year," said the DPC statement. There was no mention of honor, no mention of the possible consequences of such withdrawal.

Unlike the Democratic Presidential hopefuls, President Nixon is concerned about how we get out of Vietnam. In his April 7 talk he said: "Shall we leave Vietnam in a way that—by our own actions—consciously turns the country over to the Communists? Or shall we leave in a way that gives the South Vietnamese a reasonable chance to survive as a free people? My plan will end American involvement in a way that would provide that chance. The other plan (a publicly announced date for our withdrawal) would end it precipitately and give victory to the Communists . . . we have it in our power to close a difficult chapter in American history, not meanly, not nobly—so that each one of us can come out of this searing experience with a measure of pride in our Nation, confidence in our own character, and hope for the future of the spirit of America."

Why does the President put so much emphasis on how the war in Vietnam should end? Again, on April 7, he explained: "I know there are those who honestly believe that I should move to end this war without regard to what happens to South Vietnam. This way would abandon our friends. But even more important, we would abandon ourselves. We would plunge from the anguish of war into a nightmare of recrimination. We would lose the respect for this Nation, respect for one another, respect for ourselves."

Are the President's fears well-founded? Those who think so point to a 1969 statement by Democratic Sen. Fred Harris, then Democratic National Chairman: "We will hold Nixon responsible if he turns South Vietnam over to the Communists."

**MAJORITY OF YOUTH BACK PRESIDENT'S
VIETNAM POLICIES, POLL SHOWS**

A majority of America's young people, ages 14-24, support what is in essence President Nixon's Vietnamization policies, according to a national poll taken for the White House Conference on Youth. The data, collected by the Daniel Yankelovich firm from 1,049 young people nationwide during the latter part of last year and the first part of 1971, shows the following: 56 percent feel the U.S. should "withdraw steadily, and as promptly as possible, but with reasonable assurance the South Vietnamese will remain strong enough to be able to make their own political choices;" 23 percent feel "withdraw immediately, consistent with the safety of American troops," and 19 percent feel withdrawal, immediate or anticipated, is unacceptable at this time.

The preliminary survey further showed that the group most strongly favoring immediate withdrawal from Vietnam was college students, while the youngest respondents (14-16) are more likely than any other age group to endorse the use of all necessary force to win the war. This same solution is also more likely to be endorsed by males and by youth whose annual family income is less than \$10,000. According to the most recent data available (Census figures, Oct. 1969), only 36 percent of college aged young people (18-21) are enrolled in colleges or universities.

**PROTESTS AGAINST FREEZING OF
FUNDS**

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, protests from throughout the United States continue to mount in volume and intensity against the arbitrary and excessive impoundment by the Office of Management and Budget of funds appropriated by the Congress.

In this connection U.S. News & World Report in its current issue provides an excellent discussion of the overview and impact of funds frozen and withheld by the Bureau of the Budget.

As a result of the excessive volume of funds frozen and impounded and the challenge to the constitutional power of the purse by Congress, Senator SAM ERVIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, chairman of the Subcommittee on Separation of Powers of the Committee on the Judiciary, has introduced a resolution that would establish a Joint Congressional Oversight Committee on Executive Impoundment of Funds.

Representative CHARLES E. BENNETT, Democrat, of Florida, has announced he will introduce a similar resolution. Representative JOHN MOSS, Democrat, of California, has announced plans to sponsor legislation to create an oversight committee on the budget.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the Committee on

Banking and Currency, has conducted hearings on this matter and Senator ALLEN ELLENDER, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, has just announced that it is his view that Congress may have to withhold action on administration appropriations requests until frozen funds have been released.

Speaker CARL ALBERT, Democrat of Oklahoma, Majority Leader HALE BOGGS, Democrat of Louisiana, Representative EDWARD BOLAND, Democrat of Massachusetts, chairman of the Subcommittee on Space-Housing-Science Appropriations; Representative JAMIE WHITTEN, Democrat of Mississippi, chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Environmental, and Consumer Protection Appropriations, and Representative JOHN J. McFALL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Appropriations, participated in a nationally televised press conference, in which I was pleased to join, outlining the impact of these massive and excessive withholdings of funds appropriated by the Congress.

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat of Montana, Senate majority leader, has suggested a court suit to affirm the constitutional power over appropriations by the Congress.

Chairman GEORGE MAHON, Democrat of Texas, of the Committee on Appropriations of the House has challenged the excessive and extensive impoundment of funds appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations and Congress—as have Representatives WILLIAM HARSHA, Republican of Ohio, JOHN RHODES, Republican of Arizona, WENDELL WYATT, Republican of Oregon, and many others.

Mayors and other city officials throughout the country have denounced the withholding of more than \$1,300 million of funds for programs for our cities, large and small.

Mayor John Lindsay of New York City said recently that this arbitrary impoundment "is unacceptable" because of "the tremendous needs for these moneys in virtually every city."

Mayors Thomas J. D'Alesandro of Baltimore and Mayor Lee Alexander of Syracuse, N.Y., have added their voices to the protests in behalf of the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors. The National Housing Conference, through its president, Nathaniel S. Keith, has done an outstanding work in alerting its members throughout the country to the impact of \$942 million being withheld and frozen for public housing and other needed housing.

Because of the arbitrary action by OMB in withholding funds for vital and important programs for human needs, our people are being deprived of highway construction—communities are being deprived of safe and adequate water supplies and sanitation systems—families are being deprived of housing and modern community developments—children are being deprived of nutrition and milk assistance and important programs of education—medical centers are being deprived of assistance under the regional medical program—entire regions are

being deprived of needed water resource developments—and the tragic list goes on and on, cutting into the mainstream of many vital and essential Federal programs for human needs.

The Congress has responded to these needs.

The Bureau of the Budget is backing and filling in its effort to justify its flagrant disregard of the mandate of the Congress. Now the Bureau spokesmen are contending that earlier administrations impounded funds.

Certainly this is true—but in the main those were Department of Defense impoundments—for cancellation of military systems and projects that were outdated by progress in technology—the delay of a bomber, aircraft or battleship.

The apologists for OMB flit from argument like a ballet dancer—but with far less grace and to no applause.

The fact is that this administration has impounded more funds than any other administration—its "deep freeze" is chock-full of funds which could help and assist the people of the United States, programs to meet human needs and to provide full employment.

Major programs hit by this arbitrary action include \$91 million for public works and water resource projects throughout the Nation—\$6.3 billion for highway construction; \$862 million for airports; \$200 million for urban renewal; \$200 million for water and sewer grants; \$727 million for Model Cities; and \$191 million for the Appalachian Regional Development program, among others.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, many have suggested that the design of the political strategists is to withhold these funds now for release prior to the election of 1972 in an effort to "buy" the election.

I cannot believe this—even of the OMB.

As the impact of these withholdings and impoundments of funds appropriated by Congress builds in our local communities, the spontaneous protests from throughout the United States are serving notice on this administration that action is required to release these funds.

In this connection the article from U.S. News and World Report is placed in the RECORD herewith, because of the tremendous interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject.

The article follows:

**WHY NIXON REFUSES TO SPEND BILLIONS
VOTED BY CONGRESS**

Controversy is boiling up in Washington over who controls the Government purse strings.

President Nixon, Democrats charge, is freezing funds that Congress has voted and should be spent now for highways, urban renewal, public housing, irrigation projects and other public works.

Democratic leaders maintain that hundreds of communities and millions of people would benefit if the President would release more money to spur local economies and create jobs at a time when unemployment is a worry.

The White House makes no secret about the "frozen funds." Its Office of Management and Budget lists 12.8 billion dollars appropriated by Congress but still not committed to specific projects. Major categories of funds

withheld are shown in the chart on this page.

In addition, another 10 billion dollars in revolving funds for programs such as mass transit and urban renewal is uncommitted.

The White House has ordered delays in spending nearly 13 billion dollars of funds appropriated by Congress. Among major programs involved:

- Highway building, \$6.3 billion.
- Navy shipbuilding, \$957 million.
- Low-rent public housing, \$942 million.
- Airports, aviation facilities, \$862 million.
- Model cities, \$583 million.
- Foreign aid, military and economic, \$415 million.
- Military construction, \$370 million.
- Farm Credit Administration loans, \$260 million.
- Forest roads and trails, \$217 million.
- Highway safety, \$208 million.
- Water and sewage facilities, \$200 million.

Source: Office of Management and Budget. President Nixon's budget managers say that this money is not actually frozen, but rather that it is "budget authority reserved." Presidents, they say, have long followed this practice. They hold that the reserved funds are being released as fast as prudent fiscal management permits and that if the federal money spigot is opened too wide, it will feed the forces of inflation.

"EXECUTIVE FIAT" HIT

Top Democrats in Congress take issue with this. They say the amounts being withheld by President Nixon are unprecedented.

House Speaker Carl Albert has complained that the President is thwarting the will of Congress by "executive fiat" and that "the Administration should live up to its own rhetoric and release these important funds forthwith."

On April 5, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield said that the House, which initiates appropriations bills, should go to court to force President Nixon to release the impounded funds. Senator Mansfield stated that a "grave constitutional question" is involved.

The Democratic leaders are getting strong support from many Governors and big-city mayors.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors, meeting recently in Washington, charged that Administration withholding of about 1 billion dollars in money earmarked for urban areas is having a crippling effect on vital big-city projects.

In a joint statement to the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs early in March, Mayor Thomas J. D'Alesandro of Baltimore, and Mayor Lee Alexander of Syracuse, N.Y., said:

"Of the fiscal-year-1971 funds already made available by Congress, the following program amounts have been frozen: 192 million dollars in public-housing-contract authority, 200 million dollars in urban-renewal funds, and 200 million dollars for water and sewer grants—a total of nearly 600 million dollars in funds which could be utilized today."

At the same hearings, B. R. Stokes, general manager of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, said:

"The Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1970, authorized 3.1 billion dollars over five years. . . . The effect of reducing the first-year authorization to 269.7 million dollars [by the White House] is tragic for it virtually invalidates the contract-authority feature of the 1970 act."

"UNPRECEDENTED SIZE"

Complaints also poured in from private industries. Said John A. Stastny, president of the National Association of Home Builders:

"The number of programs affected and the amount of funds involved are of unprecedented size. Never before has HUD [Department of Housing and Urban Development] or its predecessor, the Housing and

Home Finance Agency, in terms of dollar amounts, failed to such an extent to use the funding authority granted to it by Congress."

Officials of the National Housing Conference said on April 8 that public-housing projects all across the country are being stopped by the White House hold-down on funds.

In San Antonio, Tex., for example, said Housing Conference officials, 987 housing units and apartments for low-income families, elderly people and handicapped persons are caught in the slowdown. Because the housing project is stalled, they say, a 2-million-dollar model-city plan cannot move ahead.

"It is impossible to explain to families awaiting these units that Congress has provided the money, but the Administration is holding it up," said an official of the Housing Conference.

Among other cities where housing or urban-renewal projects are stalled, according to the National Housing Conference, are Knoxville, Tenn.; Iowa City; Rochester, N.Y.; Houston, Tex.; San Francisco; and Los Angeles.

Senator Allen J. Ellender, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, on March 30, said the President was showing a "complete and utter disregard for the expressed will of Congress."

Senator Ellender also published in "The Congressional Record" a long list of projects from which he said President Nixon was withholding appropriated funds.

On the Ellender list was a hurricane protection project for New Orleans, with 3 million dollars withheld. Another was an irrigation project for California's Central Valley, with an appropriation of 10 million blocked. The Columbia Basin Project in Washington State, involving about 1.5 million in appropriations, also was on the Ellender list.

ADMINISTRATION STAND

Presenting the Administration viewpoint, HUD Secretary George Romney told the Senate Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs that money was being held back because it could not now be used effectively.

Mr. Romney said that about 1.3 billion dollars for urban programs was in budget reserves, but that much of this would be released in the last half of 1971. His explanation:

"I am not going to be a party to throwing federal funds around just because they happen to be available. We are also looking into the possibility of folding any unused funds into the special revenue-sharing pot."

Casper Weinberger, deputy director of the Office of Management and Budget in the White House, told Congress that it is the duty of the President to regulate the flow of money appropriated by Congress.

"A balance must be struck between bringing inflation under control and meeting other national needs," said Mr. Weinberger. "One way of doing this is by being selective in applying fiscal restraints."

The largest single category of money in the present budget reserve is 5.9 billion dollars in federal aid for highway construction. A White House aide says that releasing large amounts of this money now would be of little help to the States, because many do not have the matching funds on hand that are required to be eligible for federal highway grants.

ROOSEVELT QUOTED

Presidential withholding of funds is not new. It goes back at least to Franklin Roosevelt, according to Mr. Weinberger. He said that Mr. Roosevelt, in a 1942 letter to a congressional leader, said that "the mere fact that Congress by the appropriation process has made available specified sums for the various programs and functions of the Government is not a mandate that such funds must be fully expended."

The chart on this page shows that Presi-

dents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson impounded large amounts of appropriated funds. But the 11.5 billion dollars held back by President Nixon in 1970 was larger than the amount in any year under the three previous Presidents. The \$12.8 billion on hand as of February, 1971, probably will be drawn down to about the 1970 level by the end of June, budget officials say.

Mr. Nixon's withholding of funds, however, has been smaller when measured as a percentage of total spending than the sums impounded in some years of previous Administrations. The 1970 reserve was 5.8 per cent of Government outlays for the year.

The amount held back by President Johnson in 1967 was 6.7 per cent of the total spending in 1967 and President Eisenhower's withholding was 8.7 per cent of 1960 outlays.

Political implications of the dispute between President Nixon and Congress are seen as far-reaching. "The Washington Post" stated on April 5:

"Some critics . . . hint the Administration is holding back the money as bait for congressional enactment of revenue sharing or as a slush fund to pump up the economy in 1972 and help reelect Mr. Nixon on a wave of full employment."

HINTS OF LOOSENING

By the end of the first full week in April, there were indications that Democratic complaints probably would bring some thawing of frozen funds. A White House aide said that sizable amounts of the budget reserve probably would be turned loose in the weeks ahead.

This official said that the spending slowdown was making it more difficult for President Nixon to win approval of his program from a Congress controlled by Democrats.

But the basic issue of who controls the Government's purse strings remains unresolved, and many in Congress are determined to bring it to a showdown. Said a Republican Senator, Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland:

"The power of the purse—the power of Congress to determine the expenditure of public money . . . must be preserved if we are to preserve the fundamental balance between the legislative and executive branches."

THE PING-PONG CAPER

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, it was left for Bill Buckley to put into words what many of us had been thinking about the emergence of ping-pong as the national pastime.

I join with the President in the hope that tensions between these two major powers can soon be eased. At the same time, I recognize the fact that the goals of the Communist world remain unchanged and that every boost to the Chinese economy through American trade works to their advantage in this regard.

In any event, it is always good to have National Review around to bring us back into the real world after all the propaganda that emanates from the rest of the news media. Come to think of it, I take a great deal more comfort in the fact that the author of this article has a brother in the Senate than I do in the fact that 15 American ping-pong players spent a few hours in Communist China.

The article follows:

THE PING-PONG CAPER

If we read or hear one more time that this springtime tour of China by fifteen American ping-pong players is a "significant breakthrough," we'll throw up. Significant, yes; breakthrough, no way.

Consider. In Communist countries, sport—most particularly, international sport—serves primarily political purposes. The skill of the athlete, the enjoyment of the audience are strictly secondary. The chief end is the glorification of the People's Republic of Whatever in the eyes of the world, and the planting in credulous minds of the suggestion that any country can produce such able and sportsmanlike athletes and such friendly spectators must be okay in other respects as well. The free peoples, especially Americans with their traditional belief that sport is for its own sake, are sadly vulnerable to such psywar operations.

Thus when Mao invited our ping-pongers to paddle in his parlor, the kindly old gent who leads our team hastened to opine that the Chinese had no ulterior motives at all, that they "extended to us the invitation for goodwill and good sportsmanship." And so off our innocents flew to see the sights, tour a Potemkin Village or two, drop a few anti-American remarks (one mothminded teenager on the team announced that there's "more individuality here than in the United States" and that Chairman Mao is "the greatest moral and intellectual leader in the world today"). Three handpicked American newsmen were even allowed to accompany the group.

Whereupon the press had a field day, and the Significant Breakthrough pinged and poned its way up and down the Republic. Herblock sketched a rotund, jolly Chairman Mao jumping over a fortified tennis net. Dispatches emphasized the "warmth" and "friendliness" of the Chinaman-in-the-street. Everything, clearly, was hunky-dory. The news analysts, cheerfully conceding the point that the tour had a political purpose, hailed China's "move away from isolation," her effort to "advance the cause of understanding between the two countries." President Nixon, known to be reassessing our China policy, volleyed by lifting our twenty-year embargo on trade with China. By some accounts, diplomatic exchanges, unrestricted trade and tourism, and peace in our time are just around the corner, now that bilateral ping-pong is at last a reality.

That this new dawn is, of course, a carefully calculated diplomatic ploy. The masters of China hope to convince the American people that we should all be friends, that only the reactionary ruling circles in Washington stand in the way of an eternal friendly game of ping-pong between us and the jolly players across the water. If Americans believe what they read in the papers, Mao and his henchmen may already have won their point.

And the ping-pong team, they lost—but those nice Chinese let them keep a little face. "Chinese Tact Lets Us Lose Gracefully," said the *N.Y. Times*. Said the kindly old gent: "They provided entertainment for thousands of people rather than trying to destroy us with a quick victory." Obviously the State Department has been lying to us all these years.

TEN FEDERAL EMPLOYEES
HONORED IN CLEVELAND

HON. CLARENCE E. MILLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as one who attended the Greater Cleveland

Growth Association's Federal awards luncheon which was held on April 15, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the achievements of 10 Federal employees from the Cleveland area who have been honored for their contributions to their communities, their State, and to our national life. Those honored include:

ZREIDER E. AIKENS

Zreider E. Aikens, Department of Defense. Honored for maintaining superior productivity within her own section and for being a key leader in training agency personnel throughout the country in new techniques.

A graduate of John Hay High School in Cleveland, Mrs. Aikens began her Federal career as a key punch operator with the Internal Revenue Service in 1956. Later the same year she transferred to the Cleveland Procurement District of the U.S. Army Ordnance Corps as a clerk typist. She has moved steadily upwards in this organization which became part of the Defense Contracts Administration Services Region (DCASR) in 1965, holding jobs as an accounting technician and accounts maintenance clerk. In 1968 she was appointed a supervisor in the Contract and Review Branch, Office of Systems and Financial Management. Her unit is principally responsible for computer input of contractual data. Her unit of 25 clerks process more than 24,000 contracts and 24,000 contract modifications a year. Since late June 1970 she has been detailed to a Department of Defense-wide test program to determine the effectiveness of a new automated contract administration data system. In her assignments she has been responsible for training and supervising various groups of personnel from all 11 DCASRs in the United States. Always interested in self-improvement, Mrs. Aikens has attended Case Western Reserve University and Cleveland State University completing 42 hours of business administration courses. In addition she has completed a 16 hour correspondence course in financial accounting offered by the U.S. Air Force. Despite her heavy schedule and family obligations, she is also active in the Shaker Heights High School P.T.A., the Lomond Elementary School P.T.A., and the Women's Guild of St. Dominic's Church.

CHANNING C. CONGER

Channing C. Conger, National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Honored for his vision and technical leadership in preparing a new propulsion system which extends man's ability to explore space.

A native of Caldwell, Iowa, Mr. Conger earned his bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering from Iowa State College in 1948. Upon graduation he joined the staff of NASA's Lewis Research Center as an electronics engineer specializing in instrumentation and data systems. In 1963 Conger was promoted to assistant manager of the Agena launch vehicle project and in 1967 to his present position as Chief of the Spacecraft Technology Division. Under his direction the SERT II spacecraft was developed and flown providing the first conclusive demonstration of the practicability of electric propulsion systems. SERT II, which stands for Space Electric Rocket Test, carried two electron bombardment ion engines into Earth orbit. These thrusters, which were invented at Lewis, operated continuously for nearly 4,000 hours in space. In addition to his heavy work load and community activities, Conger continues his education through graduate study, managing to take one or two courses per semester. He is also the advisor and leader of the Aerospace Explorer Posts at Lewis devoted to electronics. In this capacity he is responsible for devising, organizing and conducting the activities of 42 young explorers.

MICHAEL L. HOLLORAN

Michael L. Holloran, Veterans Administration. Honored for effective leadership and outstanding management of the Veterans Administration Regional Office.

A native of Soldiers Grove, Wisconsin, Mr. Holloran graduated from the University of Wisconsin with a Doctor of Jurisprudence Degree in 1938. He began his Federal career in the Department of Justice in 1941. In 1942 he entered the U.S. Army Air Corps as an intelligence officer, serving with distinction until 1946. He has remained active in the Air Force Reserve since then and presently holds the rank of Colonel. Upon leaving active duty in 1946 he joined the Veterans Administration in San Francisco, California as an adjudicator. During his career he also served in V.A. Regional Offices in Los Angeles and San Diego, California, Denver, Colorado, Salt Lake City, Utah, and Kansas City, Missouri. In 1950, Holloran was recalled by the Air Force because of the Korean war. For the next three years he served as executive officer of the Foreign Claims Commission in Europe with headquarters in London, England. He continued his career with the Veterans Administration upon his return and was appointed assistant director of the Regional Office in San Francisco, Calif. in 1964. He was promoted to Director of the Milwaukee, Wisc. office in 1966 and in 1968 moved to Cleveland as Director of the VA Regional Office here. Under his direction the Cleveland office has jurisdiction over veterans benefits for the entire State of Ohio. The approximately 1,660,000 veterans and their families make up nearly a half of the state's total population. Significant programs include the G.I. Home Loan Program which has helped finance the construction of one out of every seven homes built in the state during the past twenty years. During his career, Holloran has received many awards including the Administrator's Commendation in 1970.

CARL F. HEITMEYER

Carl F. Heitmeyer, Department of the Navy. Honored for technical expertise and management skill to provide key methods for the centralized financial management services of the U. S. Navy.

Born in Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Heitmeyer graduated cum laude from Case Western Reserve University with a bachelor of business administration degree. He began his Federal service with the U. S. Navy as an enlisted man in 1944. Immediately following his discharge in 1946 he joined the Navy Finance Center as a Military Claims Examiner. His continuous outstanding service led to frequent promotion and in 1958 he was selected to direct the establishment of a computer system at the Finance Center and was named assistant director of the Data Processing Department. He was promoted to director of that department early this year when policy changes allowed the naming of a civilian director. One of the most important assignments undertaken by Heitmeyer was that of director of the Pay Systems Development Group for the Joint Uniform Military Pay System project. During the years he has received many awards and commendations including the Navy's Superior Accomplishment Award and Meritorious Civilian Service Award. He is active in many community projects and is presently serving as treasurer of St. James Lutheran Church. He has previously served his church as president and chairman of the Board of Elders.

ELEANOR M. JAKLITSCH

Eleanor M. Jaklitsch, Department of the Navy. Honored for improving the effectiveness of her office by providing fast and accurate correspondence control and by assuming responsibilities beyond her job requirements.

Born in Cleveland, Ohio, Miss Jaklitsch attended Holy Trinity Catholic High School and Dyke Spencerian Business College. She joined

the Navy Finance Center as a clerk when it was known as the Navy's Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. She began in the Family Allowance Division and later was assigned to her present position in the Mail Classification Branch of the Allotment Investigation Division. In this position she is responsible for the receipt, control and redirection of all mail coming through her department. Throughout her career with the Navy, Miss Jaklitsch has been commended repeatedly for excellence in her job field and voluntary efforts on behalf of others. She has received an "Outstanding" rating for superior job performance over a recent four year period and the Navy's Superior Accomplishment Award for the past six consecutive years, an attainment unmatched by any other Navy Finance Center employee.

ALBERT H. McCLELLAND

Albert H. McClelland, Department of Transportation. Honored for helping to preserve the natural beauty of our country through leadership and personal commitment.

The Coast Guard career of Senior Chief Petty Officer McClelland began in 1951 when he enlisted from his hometown of Tampa, Florida. Following boot camp at Cape May, N.J., he was assigned to the Coast Guard Cutter Chincoteague stationed at Norfolk, Va. He subsequently served on the Winter Quarter Light Ship, operating out of Chincoteague, Va., and the Cutter Winnebago stationed at Honolulu, Hawaii. In 1960 following assignment with the Captain of the Port Office in New York City, McClelland became an instructor in gunnery at the Coast Guard Training Station, Groton, Conn. In 1961 he was assigned to the Intelligence Unit in San Francisco, California. As part of his first five year tour of duty in intelligence he completed the U.S. Treasury Department's Law Enforcement School and rose to the rank of Chief Petty Officer. McClelland returned to sea duty in 1966 aboard the Cutter McCulloch operating out of Wilmington, North Carolina. Early in 1969 he began his present assignment with the Intelligence Unit of the Ninth Coast Guard District. Throughout his career McClelland has been interested in the preservation of this country's natural beauty and resources. He took an active part in the task force to save the Grand Canyon and organized the North and South Carolina group of the Sierra Club which has now grown into a full fledged chapter. When he was assigned to Cleveland, McClelland continued his conservation activities by organizing the Northeast Ohio Group of the Sierra Club which has now grown to more than 600 families.

ANTHONY MONTVILLE

Anthony Montville, Post Office Department. Honored for heroism in saving the life of a young child and for the exemplary performance of his job.

Mr. Montville was born in Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania but moved to Cleveland with his family in time to attend Cleveland schools. In 1937 he joined the U.S. Army Air Corps volunteering for service in Europe prior to the U.S. entry in World War II. Montville served as an aerial gunner, flight engineer and mechanic rising to the rank of Sergeant Major. He received an honorable discharge in 1945. In 1947, he joined the Post Office Department as a letter carrier, the position he has enjoyed up to the present. His positive attitude of "liking people" has earned him praise for doing an outstanding job on a very difficult mail route. This same attitude plus personal bravery led to his pursuing and stopping a runaway auto preventing serious injury and possibly death of the three-year old boy in the car. He received the Post Office Department's Special Achievement Award and a Bronze Medal and cash award from the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission.

CXVII—732—Part 9

EDWARD SHEA

Edward Shea, Department of the Navy. Honored for preventing the death of a fellow employee who was being stabbed repeatedly by a deranged intruder.

Although he was born in Chicago, Illinois, Mr. Shea moved to Cleveland in time to complete high school at Euclid Shore. In 1942 he joined the U.S. Army Air Corps, serving as a bombardier and navigator in the European Theatre. During his tour of duty he flew 71 missions winning the Distinguished Flying Cross and 12 Air Medals. Upon discharge in 1945 he became a file clerk in the Navy's Field Branch, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, which evolved into the Navy Finance Center. He was selected for the Navy's management intern program in 1951 and completed related courses at Cleveland College, George Washington and American Universities. In 1952 he was promoted to management analyst. He became assistant director of the Retired Pay Department in 1954 and was named director of that department in 1969. He has received many commendations for his work including the Navy's Meritorious Civilian Service Award in 1967. In February of this year his concern for others led him to attack and subdue a much larger man who burst into his work area and repeatedly stabbed a fellow worker. His action undoubtedly saved the life of the employee and perhaps prevented injury to other employees in the area.

MARYANN A. REVAY

MaryAnn A. Revay, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Honored for efficiency that has made a significant contribution to successful recruiting, maintenance of employee morale, and the advancement of careers within her agency.

Born in Cleveland, Ohio, Miss Revay graduated from West Technical High School and has taken courses at Cuyahoga Community College and Cleveland State University. She began her Federal career in 1962 as a stenographer with the Social Security Administration. Advancing steadily, she now provides technical assistance and secretarial support to the Senior Staff Assistant who is responsible for personnel and recruiting actions in the Cleveland Region of the Bureau of District Office Operations. In this position she prepares drafts of regional directives used as a basis for personnel actions in 68 district and branch offices. She prepares announcements of promotional vacancies, and, after applications are received, she reviews personnel records and prepares promotional rosters showing point scores assigned to each candidate. She also plays an important part in the Region's recruiting program for claims representative trainees. Her accomplishments and progress in the Social Security Administration have been recognized with two Superior Performance Awards.

PRESTON R. TWYMAN

Preston R. Twyman, Jr., Department of Transportation. Honored for public service both in controlling air traffic and in advancing the cause of equal opportunity in his agency and in his community.

A native of New York City, Mr. Twyman began his Federal service in 1951 when he enlisted in the U.S. Air Force. Trained as an air traffic control specialist in the service, he continued this career with the Federal Aviation Administration beginning in 1957. He was initially stationed at the control center located in the Cleveland Tank Plant and was transferred to the new center at Oberlin when it was opened in 1961. While serving as a radar controller, he earned "Outstanding" ratings and several commendations for his knowledge of equipment, control procedures and ability to handle complex control problems. In 1969 he was named Cleveland Area Equal Employment Opportunity Officer. In this position he has also earned "Out-

standing" ratings for his effective leadership, resourcefulness and dedication to his job. Twyman has continued his education whenever possible. He has completed courses in E. E. O. counseling sponsored by the Civil Service Commission and John Carroll University. He has taken courses in business administration at Lorain County Community College and is presently studying personnel management through correspondence courses sponsored by the Philadelphia Region Civil Service Commission. He has served as a Councilman-at-large on the Oberlin City Council, helped organize a branch of the Urban League in Lorain County and served as a representative of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

PENNSYLVANIA PRISON INMATES PUBLISH NEWSPAPER

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, one hears much about prison reform and the fact that recidivism is a result of the bad condition of America's jails. It is said that if one goes into prison not a criminal, he will be one when he leaves.

I am afraid that the prison situation in our country, generally, is poor. The possibility of rehabilitation in our prisons for numerous reasons remains meager.

But every now and then certain events occur, examples of cooperation and understanding, that bring a fresh wind and hope for change. I think one such situation is now occurring at Western State Penitentiary in Pittsburgh where the inmates have begun publishing a newspaper called Vibrations.

Vibrations, uncensored except by the prisoners themselves, is an effort by the inmates to put the bitterness of prison and the needs, demands, and feelings of prison life, in a context that might lead to better understanding by the public at-large and by prison officials.

The prisoners accept any and all articles written by the inmates themselves and they also request material from non-prisoners.

I think this effort to increase dialog and ultimately understanding augers well for those men who must spend a portion of their lives behind prison walls. In addition there is the possibility of these men developing news writing skills that can make job hunting after prison a bit easier.

One of the features in Vibrations is a "Most Wanted List."

It might surprise some to learn that chocolate cakes containing files and guns appear nowhere on the list. Instead the list asks for typing paper, printing ink, stencils and the rest of the material needed to publish a mimeographed newspaper.

I would like to introduce into the RECORD at this time a series of articles and poems that were in the most recent issue of Vibrations and an article that appeared in the Pittsburgh Press telling about the new experiment in journalism at the Western State Penitentiary:

MYSTERY

Among young people in America today the alienation process has worked so deeply and effectively that many youths see violent revolution as being the vehicle best suited to bring about badly needed changes in our present system. Parenthetically, it is indeed a sad commentary on a social system when those who have supposedly been the recipients of the best that the system has to offer are for the most part irreconcilably dissatisfied. At any rate, we are faced with a paradox that is unprecedented in the history of modern social change: The stratum of the community that is next in line to inherit the community not only rejects the inheritance but seems to favor its destruction.

At this stage in the alienation process that is separating young Americans from their elders, a number of factors are presently preventing another civil war from breaking out in our midst.

First off, the major role that economic deprivation ordinarily plays in a totally violent revolution has up to now been deprived of much of its revolutionary efficacy because the bountiful American economic system has not permitted any serious wrinkles to appear in the bellies of the majority of its young.

Secondly, the alienated youth of America have a deep seated, possibly genetic, fear of igniting a revolution that would ultimately be aimed directly at their parents.

Thirdly, the angry young white and the dissident Afro-Americans have thus far been unable to forge the kind of alliance that would be needed to execute a violent political revolution in America.

Fourthly, all of the sectors of American society that favor revolution have in common a strong fear of the U.S. collection of weapons and the technology that backs it.

Fifthly, many of the Western World's young are today floundering in an ideological quagmire that causes them to want Peace so fervently that they are being manipulated into placing their blessing of peace on the very people and agencies in the community that are directly responsible for the wholesale violence that surrounds us.

And finally, the heavy flow of narcotics, in some measure tolerated if not actually secretly encouraged by The Establishment, has so tranquilized and stupefied many of the angry young people that they presently find it impossible to generate the kind of concerted energy that is required to sustain a violent political revolt.

Query: While the aforementioned factors are standing in the way of the ignition of America's second civil war, before the so-called generation gap is transformed into a bloody battle field, can't the now famous American resourcefulness and ingenuity come up with a feasible way to save us?

UP AGAINST THE WALL . . . AGAIN!

(By "Yippee" Dan (The Glump) Klauck)

I'm not much of a writer, but there are a few thoughts I'd like to share with you. It's about prison and the mental anguish a convict must contend with each day, each hour and each minute of his incarceration. Did you ever stop to realize that prisoners are HUMAN too? We've all shared all the human emotions that you express and accept everyday. We were all once children. We all had mothers, fathers, brothers and sisters. And more important, many of us have had love, we've had our chicks and wives and lovers, and many of us have or have had children and enjoyed loving them and looking into their bright shining faces and hearing them say, "Daddy, I love you".

But now we're the bad guys, the misfits, the dirty-filthy no good cons, unfit for any type of civilized life. So we're treated as the scum of a nation, we're treated as though we've been that way all of our

lives. But we haven't! We've all shared and enjoyed life as humans, things that you take for granted, we no longer even have the privilege to think about. Just take for example something like mail. You go to your mail box in the morning to see what the postman has left. You'd really be shocked and uptight if all the mail was open and checked and censored before you received it.

Such a situation is, to us, a natural thing now. We're not privileged to get our mail unopened. Intimate thoughts and promises of love, meant only for our eyes, have already been read by someone else. And when we write we're all conscious that someone will read what we write before it reaches its intended destination. So when you write and tell your chick you love her, you know that the mail censor, and God knows who else, will read and probably snicker at our most personal, cherished intimacies.

We're too ashamed to tell our loved ones that we've cried for them in our cell last night. We're ashamed because we know that that loved one will only be one of a long list of people who will read it. How can you tell someone you love them more than all the words in all the world could ever possibly express, when you know that those personal thoughts will be read by many people and snickered upon by those same people? Is it fair that we must be treated as such?

We neglect what we really feel in order to save face, we don't want to share our love and thoughts with a mail censor and whoever he passes it on to when he finds something to scoff at. They say our mail isn't censored now, but we're not even permitted the privilege of putting our letters in an envelope as we were before. Hostile? If you choose to call me that, YES! But I view it as trying to hold on to the last particle of a relationship I have with my loved ones. A particle that just isn't meant for anyone! I never let a mail censor participate in my lovemaking, so why should he participate in my lovewriting?

MY IDEAL AMERICAN

(By Clifford P. Gaines)

My ideal American is neither the greatest lawmaker nor the greatest lawbreaker. Instead he tries to obey the law and has tried to make his own little corner a better place in which to live.

My ideal American went to graduate school and representing the American who realizes that a democracy can't survive on ignorance.

My ideal American helps young boys in the streets learn something, becoming a father to the fatherless, realizing that today's boys are tomorrow's men.

My ideal American enlisted in the service wanting to do something good for himself and his country, regardless if he believes in the war or not. He never did anything especially heroic while in the service, but he advised and befriended many men who did become outstanding.

My ideal American votes in the elections and votes for the man, not the party. He tries to help the Red Cross. This American has lived and worked in many places where he has been a goodwill ambassador. He was not appointed by the President, but by the people who have seen exemplified in him a concerned and dedicated American.

This American has raised children and taught them the fundamentals of democracy. He has taught them to have compassion for those less fortunate than themselves, because they too are children of God.

My ideal American is someone who hasn't done anything earthshaking but is loved by all those whom he has helped. To me the ideal American, regardless of color, race or creed, is one who loves his fellow Americans and goes out of his way to make the coun-

try a better place for them to live, and for all mankind—that is my Ideal American.

Who? . . . WHERE? . . . OH!

(By Hercules Butler)

Who is that . . . drug dealer,
That sells . . . that child dope,
Knowing from a dirty needle,
The germs can't be washed . . . with soap
Who is that . . . drug pusher,
Asking that child . . . to try a pill,
Knowing . . . he himself . . . is a hooker
And cannot stop at will.
Where is the child's parents,
Who love the child so dearly,
Knowing her child . . . is not on any errands,
But on drugs . . . and becoming weary.
Oh . . . no . . . not my child . . . said she.
We are the law . . . doctor . . . and society . . . said they:
And your child is dead . . . from an O.D.
And . . . I hope it's the last child!

THE SPEAKING CHAIR

(By Dominic Codispoti)

You've brought me the healthy, the weak and the strong
You've brought me the wise and those who went wrong
You've brought me the knave, the tyrant and fool
You've brought me the youth who was only a tool
You've brought me the soldier, sailor and marine
You've brought me the semile so naive and serene
You've brought me the bigamist with five wedding bands
You've brought me the convict with time on his hands
You've brought me the innocent with so vacant a stare
But you've brought me not ever, one millionaire!

EDUCATION IS KEY TO LIBERATION

(By Ron. Milma Lomax)

Many of our Black Brothers and Sisters have picked-up the revolutionary chant "Liberation by any means necessary." This would be beautiful not only in words, but in deeds too, if they take time to learn just what it takes to liberate oneself as a member of an oppressed ethnic group. A lot of us repeat various philosophy's of great liberation leaders such as Mao, Che, Fidel, Trotsky, Malcolm X, and Garvey. Yet we fail to try and seek the source which gave them insight to project philosophy's that people will live by for hundreds of years to come.

All these men were highly educated, even the colonial exploiter is highly educated. Should not this be a clear example that education is the "Key to Liberation", and in many cases, without it the Key to Suppression. The real struggle doesn't come before liberation, but after liberation, for this is when you have to build all that it takes to build a civilized and equal society for all.

When you say it is nation building time, you are in effect saying that you need all the professionals that it takes to master certain fields that constitute the building of a nation. The following are examples: engineers, architects, doctors, lawyers, judges, teachers, military commanders, economical advisers and controllers, and many others of professional caliber.

Getting an education is the way that directs you to become a professional. The price for an education is the willingness to give up negative ideas that use up positive energy. Instead of looking at schools and universities as institutions of indoctrination, look upon them as institutions of liberation. Don't look at the teacher as an indoctrinator, but as a liberator.

PRISONER'S PAPER AT WESTERN PEN

(By Eleanor Adamets)

Vibrations isn't just another prison newspaper—it's the beginning of a whole new process of communication with the "outside world" for inmates of Western Penitentiary.

Designed to "bridge the communications gap" between free society, prison administrators, and "residents" at the prison, the weekly newsletter represents the first attempt to establish a "free press" at Western Pen in almost a decade.

It is written and printed entirely by prisoners, and is intended to one day become a "doorstep delivery" community newspaper.

GREW FROM "RAPs"

"Though home delivery is still a grandiose plan for the future, the concept of this kind of communication through journalism means that someday our residents may play an active role in the resolution of the kinds of social problems that may have led to their incarceration," Charles Austin said.

It is not censored by penitentiary brass, and contains far fewer four-letter words than the average college newspaper.

Austin, director of training services at the prison, said the idea of a "tri-community" oriented newspaper grew out of open "rap" sessions he had with some inmates shortly after he assumed his new position.

"There was virtually no communication process here when I first arrived between the administration and the residents," he said. "So, I sat down with a group of 12 inmates, and as a group, we decided to get a newspaper started."

The same 12 men who voluntarily met with Austin now make up the editorial staff of Vibrations. All inmates are permitted and encouraged to write articles expressing their own views on topics of interest to both residents and members of free society.

MYTHS ARE TARGET

"We want to dispel a lot of the myths and prejudices that the free community associates with this institution," an inmate on the staff explained.

"But, we don't want the paper to degenerate into a traditional institutional 'gripe sheet,'" he added. "That's why people from all three communities are invited to submit material and we'll print it."

The men on the editorial staff spend much of their "free time" working on the newsletter in the small, old prison warehouse room they have converted into an office.

But, regardless of their enthusiasm, publishing even a weekly newsletter inside Western Penitentiary isn't an easy task.

The state provides no funds for the production of the paper, and the conditions under which it is published are somewhat less than ideal.

"At first, we didn't even have an office, and when we finally got this one, it was dirty and unheated," an inmate said.

The office was so cold early in January that an inmate wearing gloves and a coat typed one of the first editions of the newsletter—stopping occasionally to warm his hands on a hot plate the men had managed to get into the freezing room.

Since then, the men have done much to try to improve their "newsroom." The floor has been cleaned and scrubbed, and a collage made from old magazine pictures "brightens" the dingy walls.

The one radiator in the room is now functional, and the 12 men have been given five chairs, six and a "half" desks, and three typewriters (of which only one can be used to type the stencils used to print the newsletter).

"The only funds we have for production are what we are able to solicit ourselves from the community—and if the Copco people hadn't donated us the paper, we wouldn't

have a newsletter now," a staff member explained.

Copco Papers Inc., a local firm, has been giving the prisoners enough paper to publish their newsletter since the first issue came out on Christmas Day.

"Some other organizations like the American Civil Liberties Union and two or three others have also given us some supplies," another inmate said.

Sympathetic members of the administration at Western Pen, too, are trying to help the men as much as they can.

Besides Austin, who has been closely involved with the paper since its inception, Kostas J. Mastro and Mrs. Betty Godown, Austin's secretary, have been working with the men on the paper.

Mastro, the news staff adviser, has had 18 years experience as a case worker at the correctional institution. He finds the interaction and involvement of the men working on the paper have a positive rehabilitative aspect.

"I've known all these guys for years—and I know their good points and bad points. Seeing them working and interacting together is a kind of group therapy session, and it's extremely satisfying for me to watch," Mastro said.

A POLITE STAFF

Mrs. Godown, an "honorary member" of the news staff, serves as liaison between the prisoners and the administration. The men telephone her to discuss problems or obtain information pertaining to the paper.

"My role on the staff is a little therapeutic, too," Mrs. Godown explained. "After all, you can't expect to rehabilitate men without allowing them to have some social contact with women before sending them back to society."

She finds the prisoners are extremely courteous in their dealings with her, and is impressed both by their sincerity and by the favorable response of other inmates to the newsletter.

"The staff is deluged by articles from other inmates," Mrs. Godown said. "They also received hundreds of entries from inmates during the naming contest for the paper."

Vibrations, the name finally selected for the paper, was drawn by Mrs. Godown from a sealed envelope containing names the staff liked best.

The contest winner, who won a carton of cigarettes donated by Austin, had alone submitted more than 70 entries.

Both the men on the staff and other inmates at the prison share the excitement of at last having an "uncensored" paper through which they are free to communicate their views to each other, the administration and free society.

"We know people on the outside have just as many problems as we do, and we're concerned about all the problems of society—not just our own," a staff member said.

"We want our paper to let society know that we're not animals—we're human beings who need to communicate our ideas," he added before he and the others returned to their cells after the interview.

A BILL TO EXTEND VETERANS EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS FROM 36 TO 54 MONTHS

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today to extend the maximum educational benefits available

to veterans under the GI bill from 36 months to 54 months.

The GI bill of 1966 provided educational assistance for veterans at the rate of 1 month of benefits for each month of service, with a maximum of 36 months of benefits. Thus a draftee who served 2 years of active duty was entitled to 24 months of education benefits, while an enlistee who served for 3 years would be entitled to benefits for 36 months of schooling, or the equivalent of 4 full academic years.

Congress later realized that, under this provision, discharged draftees who entered college after completing their military service would be financially stranded after 2½ years of school. Therefore, in 1968 Congress passed Public Law 90-631, which increased the benefit rate to 1½ months of benefits for each month of service. This meant that draftees serving 24 months would be entitled to receive benefits for 36 months, long enough to enable them to complete 4 years of college. However, Congress failed to raise the maximum number of benefit months allowable, with the result that draftees and enlistees alike were both entitled to a maximum of 36 months of benefits.

Thus the differential between enlistees and draftees was erased, removing an incentive for enlistment and ending the earlier correspondence between length of time served in the military and extent of benefits afforded.

To cure these defects, the bill I have introduced would raise the ceiling on number of months of education benefits to 54. Both draftees and enlistees would be entitled to 1½ months of benefits for each month served, but enlistees would be eligible to receive benefits for a longer period than draftees based on their longer service in the military.

This extension is not retroactive, but is granted only to those servicemen discharged or released from active duty subsequent to enactment of the bill.

These additional educational benefits are well deserved by those veterans who voluntarily serve their country longer than they would otherwise be required, and I urge my colleagues to support such remedial legislation.

A CONSTITUENT ASKS QUESTIONS ABOUT OUR INCOME TAX LAWS

HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I include the following letter from Mr. J. B. Dawkins Jr., inquiring about certain provisions of our current tax laws:

PAN AMERICAN LIFE

INSURANCE Co.,

Monroe, La., Apr. 16, 1971.

HON. OTTO PASSMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PASSMAN: I am writing to you in the hope that you may be of help in answering some questions which have been troubling me since the 15th day of this month.

To begin with, it was necessary for me to write a check for the balance of some \$1,200 owed the government for roughly \$6,000 of taxable income earned in 1970. Now, it has entered my mind, after hearing some of the more liberal elements in the House and Senate espouse a minimum income of \$6,000 for all citizens because this is considered the border line of poverty, that I may be living in poverty and not know it. I have also been able to keep one of my children in college for two years and expect to have the second child there beginning this coming school year without any help from the federal government or anyone else. I understand that in certain areas of this country there are programs for the underprivileged, allowing them to attend college at no charge to them or their parents, even to the extent of attending Ivy League schools. However, I was not allowed a deduction on my tax schedule for even the tuition to a state school.

The other day I took a few minutes out of my work schedule, and this is an unusual thing for me to do because I work to make a living for my family during the day and to pay my dear Uncle half the night, to read the newspaper. The first article I saw said that Senator Kennedy wants the government to provide medical care for everyone and the cost will be only about \$70.00 a year for each worker. I don't really know, but he must be counting all those workers who have gone before and are now in the cemetery, as well as those who still earn a living, and if so, it will be difficult collecting. I had about \$300.00 of medical bills in 1970, but I couldn't deduct a penny, because it was less than three per cent of my adjusted gross income.

You know, I've lived in my present home since 1953, and I've had a lot of deferred maintenance since then, so my wife and I decided to remodel. We didn't have the money because we can't save anything with taxes what they are, so we refinanced the house. Well, we are in the process of remodeling now and trying to live in without any gas or water gets to be a little sticky at times. Thank goodness it will last only about a week. I wish I could get H. E. W. to put my wife, son and me up at the Holiday Inn, or if that's too expensive, I'll settle for the Quaker Motel till the carpenters get through. I understand that in New York the government has been putting poverty families up at the Waldorf, but I wouldn't want anything that fancy.

I'm an insurance man by profession and business hasn't been too good. Too many people want to buy term insurance and invest the difference in stocks in order to hedge against inflation, and I guess that's O.K., but I didn't realize that the government was doing the same thing until my tax man told me that I owed an additional fifty some odd dollars as a penalty for not guessing what my income would be for the year and sending it along to Washington and letting the government use it interest free during the year. Now the Internal Revenue Service is charging six per cent on the money I didn't let them use. But I guess I can't gripe about this if it will solve the inflation problem.

What I would like you to tell me is: Is everyone in Washington crazy or is it me. If you say it's me, I'll be satisfied. However, if it is me, would you let me know right away and enclose some information on how I can get on some of these poverty programs. Please send applications for any programs available. If there are none available to me, perhaps you could secure a membership application for me to the Blackstone Rangers. I understand they have some lucrative governmental programs going for themselves.

Sincerely,

J. B. DAWKINS, JR.

GENERALS WERE THE DOVES

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a column in the Philadelphia Inquirer, written by Roscoe Drummond, relates several important facts—facts that over the years have been forgotten by many and are probably unknown to many others. The column was entitled, "Generals Were the Doves." Mr. Drummond outlines circumstances and actions leading to eventual decisions by General Ridgway and former General Eisenhower not to deploy military troops in Vietnam. His writing is refreshing in this period when the so-called military mind is being blamed for this most unfortunate period in our Nation's long history. I commend this column to my colleagues and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 19, 1971]

GENERALS WERE THE DOVES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Beware—it may not be safe for extreme doves and many young people to read this column. It might spoil their fun.

The reason: This column takes aim at some currently popular oversimplifications and downright falsehoods.

It is the fashion view of extreme doves, including many students, that it is the military who are intent upon getting the nation into war and that there is a monolithic "military mind" to whom war is a joy and peace is a bore.

There are contrary facts.

In the short span of the past decade and a half it was two generals who kept us out of war in Vietnam and two civilian leaders—Presidents Kennedy and Johnson—who put us in.

It was Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, then chief of staff of the Army, whose alertness and influence countered successfully Secretary of State John Foster Dulles' effort to have the United States intervene in Vietnam while the French were fighting there in 1954.

It was Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, then President, who later refused to put American military forces in Vietnam and confined the American role to economic and arms aid.

I'm not saying that Presidents Kennedy and Johnson were wrong in going further. Emotions run too high today to judge objectively. I am saying that the two United States generals most directly concerned chose a different course.

The role of Gen. Ridgway: The French were losing in Vietnam and the decisive battle of Dien Bien Phu was imminent. Serious consideration was being given at the highest level for U.S. intervention and the wishful thought was dominant that all we would have to do was drop a few bombs and shoot off a few big naval guns.

Ridgway was horrified. He acted quickly. He knew that rhetoric wouldn't be enough to stop this intervention. He sent to Indochina a team of Army specialists in every field of ground warfare to get the hard answers to hard military questions. They flew back to Washington with a concrete and realistic

appraisal, and here is how Gen. Ridgway describes what happened next:

"In Korea we had learned that air and naval power alone cannot win a war and that inadequate ground forces cannot win one either. It was incredible to me that we had forgotten that bitter lesson so soon—that we were on the verge of making the same tragic error.

"That error, thank God, was not repeated. As soon as a full report was in, I lost no time in having it passed on up the chain of command. It reached President Eisenhower. To a man of his military experience its implications were immediately clear. The idea of intervening was abandoned, and it is my belief that the analysis which the Army made and presented to higher authority played a considerable, perhaps a decisive, part in persuading our government not to embark on that tragic adventure."

The role of Gen. Eisenhower: After the French were driven from Vietnam and the country was divided into two halves by the Geneva Conference, President Eisenhower was still faced with the creeping aggression of North Vietnam against South Vietnam. As a military man he opposed the commitment of U.S. ground troops in Indochina. As President he never sent Americans to fight in Vietnam.

There is another revealing sidelight to Gen. Eisenhower's "military mind." When he became chief of staff of the Army after World War II, Congress was just drafting the legislation creating the Atomic Energy Commission to be responsible for both military and nonmilitary nuclear development. Many leading congressmen wanted to put the commission under the Pentagon and were pleading with Gen. Eisenhower to advocate this course. They knew that if he did, his views would prevail. Eisenhower said "No." He believed that the AEC should be under civilian control. He prevailed.

Perhaps we should all take a new look at the "military mind." We may discover that it is as many-sided as the "civilian mind."

THE SENSELESS WAR ON SCIENCE

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I should like to invite the attention of the Congress to a timely and, in my opinion, perceptive article by Lawrence Lessing called "The Senseless War on Science." This article appeared in the March 1971 issue of *Fortune* and to me it suggests that the American public may be starting to part company with the anti-science forces which have been blaming all of our worldly ills upon science and technology. I was particularly heartened to note that the American space program is beginning to achieve the stature in history which it deserves—one of the great accomplishments of our age.

The article follows:

THE SENSELESS WAR ON SCIENCE

(By Lawrence Lessing)

That classic of science fiction, *A Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court*, might well serve as a parable of the present-day predicament of science and technology. Everyone will recall how the hero, superintendent of a small-arms plant in East Hart-

ford, whisked back into the sixth century, saves his own life and establishes his power over the sorcerer Merlin by using as a threat the handy occurrence of a solar eclipse. He then secretly teaches the serfs some rudiments of science and mechanics, and reinvents for them such amenities as the telephone, machine tools, movable type, safety matches, soap, and sanitation—of which they are in great need. And he places his aptest pupils in a factory, where he proposes, in his late-nineteenth-century innocence, "to turn groping and grubbing automata into men."

One day, after having restored the waters of a holy fountain that had run dry, by a simple application of hydraulics, he returns to find the monks and pilgrims piously agog over an itinerant magician from the East, who, "mowing, and mumbling, and gesticulating, and drawing mystical figures in the air," purports to be able to tell what any man is doing anywhere on the globe at any moment. When the rationalist from East Hartford suggests that this is a fraud, the assembly turns upon him in fear and distress. He manages to surmount the situation, but he is shaken. "Think of that!" he muses. "Observe how much a reputation was worth in such a country."

A GREAT ODYSSEY DISPARAGED

American scientists and technologists today are suffering a similar reversal and recession. At the precise moment when a new and more sensitive high level of science is needed, a great disenchantment has settled over the field, after a period of unparalleled accomplishments. Over the last quarter century, despite dips and lags, science and the U.S. economy together have had the longest period of sustained growth, discovery, innovation, and new industry in recent history. While none of this has brought on the millennium—indeed, science's very success has exacerbated some age-old problems and created new ones—still it has measurably widened the options and potentials of human life on earth. Perhaps the pinnacle of this period was reached when man stepped on the moon, a feat that will rank in history among the few clear, large, and positive achievements of the last decade, a great human feat that once would have swelled the lyrics of a Homer. Yet nothing is currently more disparaged or discounted, often by the most determined humanists, than the odyssey of man in space.

The assaults on science and technology have developed a variety of themes and come from many directions. Technology is pictured as a powerful juggernaut, with an internal momentum of its own, relentlessly pressing on with irresponsible developments, out of control. On the other hand, this juggernaut is also soon to be so weak that it is suffering all sorts of breakdowns—in power, transportation, and telephone services in our cities, for example. In one breath, science is said to be progressively more abstract and irrelevant to society; in the next, it is urged that this "irrelevant" activity is a threat that must be curbed. Almost as reflex, funds have been damagingly cut in such basic areas as the life and medical sciences, which could reduce costs and care, while a large amount of advanced but abstract technology, which could begin to solve the problems of overcrowding, energy, pollution, transportation, and waste that cloud men's sky and vision, is going neglected.

There is a new hostility to science and technology—though not closely coupled, the two cannot be separated—in many quarters that can only be loosely categorized. Many ordinary Americans, increasingly worried by science's growing complexity, cost, and accelerating change, think we might do with less science, and provide an opportunity for budget cutting. The prevalent attitude toward science, as Robert G. Loewy of the Uni-

versity of Rochester puts it, is, "What have you done for me lately?" This hostility has been made intellectually respectable by some thinkers of the New Left, who have embraced a glorified irrationality that is the antithesis of all science.

The attack comes even from within science itself. The last meetings of the American Association for the Advancement of Science were loudly and riotously disrupted by the now inevitable small band of young graduate-student activists, demanding, in that cabalistic catchword of the times, relevance.

CAST AS DR. STRANGELOVE

More serious and disturbing than these "revolutionaries" is a rumbling intellectual attack on science, seizing this troubled juncture to revive the old, false antagonisms between the arts and sciences. The latest, most prepossessing broadside in this ancient battle is *The Pentagon of Power* by the noted architectural and urban critic, Lewis Mumford. In this treatise the whole humanistic history of science is warped to the thesis that the evils of the modern world go back to Copernicus, Galileo, and Newton, whose earth-displacing view of the solar system was the beginning of that dehumanized, mechanistic world view that today has put at the center of the power system "the latest I.B.M. computer, zealously programmed by Dr. Strangelove and his associates." Other voices, ranging from the mystic to the nihilistic, have elaborated a whole new demonology of science and technology.

The most visible embodiment of these philosophies is in the new youth culture, or counterculture, which turns away from hard science to the softer, still forming social sciences, the arts and handicrafts, the primitive and a return-to-nature à la Rousseau—and raves out in astrology, drugs, and those Eastern mysticisms that for centuries have held whole continents impoverished. While this movement has brought a fresh, rebellious spirit into the nation, and represents a reaction to real social ills, a warm reassertion of some essential human values, it is a very mixed phenomenon. Avowedly anti-science, its culture rests squarely on those electrical sciences that power its amplifiers, electric guitars, and stereo rigs, and on the pharmacopoeia of chemical agents that give it instant visions. Its communes are never far from the supermarket, that base of modern food technology, and it does not eschew motorcycles or motorcars. It accepts, in other words, the science and technology that please it, but would destroy those that do not.

But science is indivisible, a seamless web of accumulated knowledge, and to destroy a part would rip the whole fabric. The beneficial and pleasing effects of science cannot really be separated from the potential harms. No drug to save lives can be secured, for instance, that is entirely without risks or side effects, for all drugs are by nature toxic agents and therefore subject to misuse. Every discovery or invention of man has this dual aspect. And it does no good to try to retreat to the nineteenth century or the sixth. Konrad Lorenz, the famed naturalist and animal behaviorist, has been going about warning hostile student audiences that if they tear down man's store of knowledge to start afresh, they will backslide not a few centuries but two hundred thousand years. "Watch out!" he says. "If you make a clean sweep of things, you won't go back to the Stone Age, because you're there already, but to well before the Stone Age."

This apocalyptic mood has been stirred, of course, by some very palpable social miscarriages of science and technology. The leading one is the continuing Indochina war. From the early selective saturation bombing of a peasant people to the later defoliation of a large part of their land, using vast quantities of advanced machines and chemical agents, it represents to more and more people

the biggest misuse of technology in recent history. A close second, which may yet be first, is the environmental crisis. Through carelessness, the mismanagement, misuse, or neglect of industrial-urban technology in an increasingly crowded world, the deteriorating air, earth, and water suddenly raise a threat to man's continuing life on earth. Together these crises have whipped up a wholly new conservationist attack on science. At its emotional extreme, it reduces itself to the proposition that America needs less growth, less knowledge, less skill, less progress.

Scientists and engineers are increasingly cast as the villains of this emotional drama. They are blamed by implication and transference, as epitomized in the cry of the French writer, Georges Bernanos, in the last great war: "You go on supplying the killing machines!" But it should be obvious that science by its nature and structure can offer society only options. Scientists do not sit in the seats of power or decision in matters of war, government, or industrial management. Traditionally, their role, if any, is advisory, and as often as not their advice is ignored. "Scientists can no more be blamed for the misuses to which their discoveries or devices are put," says Harvard's noted chemist George B. Kistiakowsky, former science adviser to President Eisenhower, "than artists and writers can be blamed for the misuses to which their arts are put on Madison Avenue."

The height of the new folly is the rising call upon scientists and technicians to foresee all the consequences of their actions and to make a moral commitment to suppress work on any discovery that might someday be dangerous, which is to demand that they be not only scientists but certified clairvoyants and saints. Too often, all this only tends to deflect blame from where it belongs. "I would put it this way," says the noted British immunologist Sir Peter Medawar, Nobel Prize winner in medicine, "that in the management of our affairs we have too often been bad workmen, and like all bad workmen we blame our tools."

INTO THE ECONOMIC BIND

As if this sociophilosophical tanglefoot were not enough, U.S. science also finds itself, as a direct consequence of prolonged war, inflation, and a now contracted economy, contending with a severe cutback in research and development. Since 1967, total federal expenditures in this field have declined in real dollars by more than 20 percent. This has lopped off whole programs, sharply curtailed others, and disrupted the feedlines to new developments. Many scientists believe this endangers the whole structure of science. "If we continue to cut down at 10 percent a year," says Dr. Philip Abelson, editor of *Science* and new head of the Carnegie Institution, "the U.S. is going to be a second-class nation in scientific enterprise."

In the Northeast and on the West Coast, where most of this enterprise is concentrated, newspapers are full of stories of engineers vainly seeking jobs and young physicists driving taxis. The exact extent of unemployment is unknown. But for a relatively small but vital profession—there are some 500,000 U.S. scientists in research and teaching, and about twice that many engineers—a 10 percent yearly decline in funds hits hard.

Scientists attempting to shore up the "crumbling" scientific enterprise, as Philip Handler, president of the National Academy of Sciences, characterizes it, have been attacked for their efforts. One leader of the attack is Daniel S. Greenberg, recently resigned news editor of *Science*, who has made a career out of finding that scientists play politics, seek grants, build small empires, occasionally stumble, or otherwise act human. He and others maintain that there is no serious crisis in U.S. science, only a wringing out of "fat," a transitory shift in

priorities. Scientists, they say, simply want more money.

It is true that this year's federal science and development budget still stands at a substantial \$15 billion. But this figure hides imbalances and a steady real decline, masked by inflation. If the decline continues, it will have a delayed, disastrous effect on the economy. Says the University of Rochester's Robert Loewy, dean of the College of Engineering and Applied Science and former chief scientist of the U.S. Air Force: "Despite our nation's purported lead in science, the U.S. is only coasting on an advantage we have had since World War II."

A RATHER DISORDERLY GROWTH

Out of World War II, in what has been called the greatest mobilization of scientists and technologists in history, came a great victory over a clearly evil tyranny, and a cornucopia of great technical developments to build and keep the peace. None of these developments could be economically "afforded" in the long lagging, depressed Thirties, but in war the men and wherewithal were quickly found to develop them, largely out of the banked-up store of European science. From these wartime projects in due time came the antibiotics, atomic power, cryogenics, computers, jet planes, rocket vehicles, radar, transistors, masers, lasers, and other products that became the new industrial face of the mid-century. More important, out of the war came the impetus to get the U.S. fully engaged in doing basic science of its own. From having won only a sparse dozen Nobel Prizes in the forty years up to 1940, U.S. scientists went on in the next thirty years to win forty-five, and take first place among the nations.

The feat was not accomplished without some typical disorder and conflict. At the end of the war there was no civilian agency to take over the support of basic science, and Congress lagged in adopting the proposal of Vannevar Bush, the Yankee M.I.T. engineer who had brilliantly headed the scientific war effort, that a National Science Foundation be set up to do the job. The Defense Department leaped in to support basic research, mainly in physics, across the board. At the same time, other departments moved in on their own fields of interest. And a spontaneous uprising of atomic scientists fought to get atomic development out of military control and into a civilian Atomic Energy Commission. When a National Science Foundation bill finally reached President Truman's desk in 1947, he vetoed it, contending that it lacked proper governmental control. Another three years passed before a compromise N.S.F. came into being with a minimum of politics in its make-up and minimal funds. It continued to be much easier to get large funds out of Congress for basic research marked for defense, much of it having little or no military relevance, than for purely civilian research.

This set the pattern through the Fifties, when, under cold-war pressures, the federal research and development budget began its exponential climb. Over three-fourths of the growing budget, however, went to the Defense Department and Atomic Energy Commission—whose charter required it to supply "free" nuclear weapons to the military. The 1957 launching of the Soviet Sputnik I into space set off another burst of growth, creating the new civilian National Aeronautics and Space Administration, formalizing the office of science adviser to the President, and generating a large effort to expand science education.

As the federal research and development budget passed \$12 billion in 1963, toward a peak of over \$17 billion, Congress nervously began to seek cuts. Trying to maintain defense spending, it fastened first on NASA. And NASA, in order to keep the Kennedy Administration's commitment of a manned lunar landing by 1970, was forced to cut back

its scientific and forward development programs.

With the ascendancy of Lyndon Johnson and the escalation of the Vietnam war, the U.S. federal science structure, never very well organized, took a turn for the worse. Wary of the northeastern "establishment" that had dominated Washington's scientific affairs since World War II, Johnson set in motion two populist currents, congenial to Congress, that had ultimately dubious effects. The first was designed to spread research funds more evenly over the country, particularly, to build up more midwestern university centers. The second involved a switch in emphasis to the "practical," away from the more tenuous regions of basic research, a policy that hit the National Institutes of Health with devastating effect. With money growing tighter, funds were spread thinner and thinner with fewer results.

APPOINTMENTS AT THE WHITE HOUSE

There had been some hope in scientific circles that when Richard M. Nixon took office things might change in the handling of science. He came into the White House with an earnest campaign pledge to reverse the downturn in basic science, and with an impeccable choice as his science adviser—Dr. Lee A. DuBridge, retiring president of California Institute of Technology and the distinguished World War II director of M.I.T.'s great radar-developing Radiation Laboratory. And, in fact, Nixon's fiscal 1971-72 budgets show a rise in basic research funds; however, the rise is not nearly enough to cancel out the effects of inflation and prior cuts. Unfortunately, Nixon's relations with the scientific community were somewhat poisoned by the sequence of events surrounding some appointments. First, there was the matter of naming Cornell University's Dr. Franklin A. Long, to head the N.S.F.; when it was discovered that he had written an article opposing the antiballistic missile, he was precipitously dropped. Then the appointment of Caltech's Dr. George S. Hammond to be N.S.F. deputy director was scotched when it was found he had made a speech critical of the Cambodian invasion. Later there was the unceremonious dumping of Dr. John Knowles, scheduled to be Assistant Secretary of Health and Scientific Affairs, when he drew the potent political opposition of the American Medical Association.

Suddenly, late last summer, Lee DuBridge resigned to enter retirement. In DuBridge's place, President Nixon named a younger, relatively unknown industrial scientist, Dr. Edward E. David Jr., who had been director of communication-systems research at Bell Laboratories. A brilliant worker in acoustics and electronics, but an unknown quantity in forming high federal science policy, David faces two hard tasks: reassessing national science priorities and establishing better communications between the scientific community and the White House.

David's job is not made easier by a prickly Congress, which has arbitrarily cut research funds in some instances, and late in 1969 enacted legislation that has wreaked some havoc. The damage was done by the so-called Mansfield Amendment, which ordered the Defense Department to cut off all research not related to specific military operations. Even most scientists opposed to the Vietnam war protested stripping the Pentagon of all basic research. Since the times of Archimedes and Leonardo da Vinci, scientists have aided military invention to protect their societies, and in a still dangerous world the military needs a reasonable amount of basic research, reasonably applied, to keep its technology from growing sterile.

One relatively minor result of the Mansfield Amendment was to cut some \$8 million in basic research out of the Defense Department's fiscal 1970 budget. But its more damaging effect was indirect: it induced other departments to cut back in like fashion, for

another net loss in basic research. Moreover, the defense cuts plus continuing large cuts in the NASA program combined to cripple the U.S. aerospace industry and begin the dismantling of the great space structure, which ranges from the promotion of basic science education to the development of the most advanced technology. All of which happened without any forethought as to the human employment problems associated with the cuts. Most of the thousands of unemployed aerospace engineers, says the National Academy of Engineering, are unlikely ever to find employment in their profession again.

WHERE THE LAGS ARE

While men and talent are thus going to waste, the things that need doing, which we are not doing or doing only insufficiently, keep piling up. All through the late Sixties the National Academy of Sciences was issuing a series of ponderous, largely ignored surveys, evaluating where we stand in the basic sciences—and finding that deficiencies were beginning to develop. Washington's repeatedly expressed view now is that we can't expect to be first in everything, which is true enough. But unless we try, we will soon be coming in second or third almost everywhere, and many in the sciences believe we are at or near that danger point.

Space does not permit a comprehensive list of the lacks and lags, but here are a few significant ones. They may suggest something about what is ultimately at stake in the war between U.S. science and those now mindlessly assailing it.

In high-energy physics, Europe in the late Sixties took the lead in developing so-called colliding-beam electron accelerators, the latest in Big Machines for investigating the subatomic properties of matter. From one of these machines in Italy late last year came the report of a discovery—now being excitedly tested by others in France, the Soviet Union, and Switzerland—of what may be a new phenomenon in the creation of matter from energy, which seems to go beyond present physical theory, and which may herald the tapping of the most powerful inner force in nature. The U.S. now has only one such machine near operation at Cambridge, Massachusetts, and its operating budget has been cut. Belatedly in development are two more powerful machines at Stanford University and in Weston, Illinois, expected to be started up within a year or so.

In radio astronomy, the U.S., after a strong surge to a leadership position in the late Fifties, is rapidly losing its place. For five years the radio astronomers have been unable to get funds to complete three big, advanced radio telescopes, all together estimated to cost some \$115 million. Meanwhile, some older installations have lost Air Force support under the Mansfield Amendment, and are being hard pressed to function fully. Abroad, however, large advanced radio arrays have been going up in England, Germany, Holland, Russia, and even India, to pursue investigations into two of the major discoveries of radio astronomy: the mysterious, high-energy quasars, starlike galaxies that may be the most distant bodies in the universe, and the more recently found pulsars, giving off huge bursts of radio waves at precise intervals.

In plasma physics, the latest breakthrough in the containment of thermonuclear power was made in 1968 in the Soviet Union's so-called Tokamak devices. Later there were confirming experiments in the U.S. and Britain, setting off the current optimism that the harnessing of this almost limitless, pollutionless source of energy may be nearer than was once expected. But the U.S. thermonuclear research effort is being funded at a level, cut back again this year, that could put off this development as much as twenty-five to fifty years. The Soviet authorities are spending about twice as much money and

employing about three times as many people in controlled fusion research as the U.S.

In conventional energy research, the Soviet Union this year is also starting up the first large-scale, prototype magneto-hydrodynamic or MHD electric plant, burning fossil fuels, but generating electricity directly and more efficiently than the old steam-turbine cycle, from a superionic stream of high-temperature ionized gases (see "New Ways to More Power with Less Pollution," *FORTUNE*, November, 1970). No such project is yet in sight in the U.S. Since much of our electric power will continue to come for a long time from conventional fuels, particularly the still large reserves of coal, we are neglecting basic research in this area at the expense of a cleaner environment. While a small program goes on in this direction in the U.S. Bureau of Mines, half a dozen promising, advanced methods of high-pressure coal distillation and gasification are being widely developed in Europe. In combination with gas turbines or MHD, such systems could produce the clean, more economic hybrid chemical-and-power plant complex of the future.

In space science, our present position was tersely put by Dr. George M. Low, NASA's acting administrator since Thomas O. Paine quit six months ago to return to General Electric: "The U.S. leads today, but we are rapidly losing the capability that made us first." With two of the later, more scientifically oriented Apollo moon flights canceled, though the equipment is long bought and paid for, work on NASA's forward-looking space station, nuclear-powered rocket, and unmanned planetary exploration vehicles has been so cut back that after 1975 almost nothing will be scheduled.

In transportation, while U.S. road vehicles continue to increase in numbers twice as fast as the human population, the creation of new mass transportation systems to relieve our choking roads lags far behind—though not for lack of abundant new technology. Japan's sleek high-speed Tokaido train system is expanding; Europe's fast new train networks are multiplying, with the future already appearing in advanced prototype gas-turbine and air-cushion vehicles; and even Mexico City has built a new subway system that is both a great feat of engineering, smooth, noiseless, and computer-controlled, and a work of art. But in the U.S. only a token part remains of the ambitious 1965 Northeast Corridor Project to revitalize the rails (see "The 400-Mph Passenger Train," *FORTUNE*, April, 1965).

In the life sciences, reports the latest survey of the National Academy, research funds are still lagging some 20 percent, or at least \$250 million per year, behind research capacity. This is happening in an area which is in a tremendous stage of growth, similar to that in atomic physics in the Thirties, and which, with reasonable support, could bring forth a host of epochal developments. The range of the revolution in molecular biology is especially wide. It includes such items as insect hormones, whose isolation and synthesis in many analogue compounds promise much safer biological insecticides—which are now being developed rapidly enough to replace toxic products. The biological revolution, through its now complete decoding of the genetic code of life, also promises a way to the genetic repair of congenital defects, and to a basic attack on those little understood degenerative ills, such as cancer and heart diseases, that whittle away men's lives.

TOWARD TECHNOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

Over much of the last decade, a plethora of studies and reports on how the tangled structure of U.S. science might be better balanced and organized has flowed out of Washington's scientific hierarchy, executive agencies and offices, and congressional committees. Proposals have ranged from one to put all science in a single huge Federal department to more modest reorganizations built around the

National Science Foundation. But most scientists, are wary of any more centralization than we already have, and United Nations in-depth studies of national science organizations have in general found the U.S.'s pluralism and sometimes wasteful and untidy freedom its major source of strength.

The organization problem, it should be noted, is quite different in basic science from the problems in technology. Basic science, while intellectually quite orderly, is often disorderly in its operations; it is extremely difficult for researchers in basic science to set priorities or scales of relevance. In technological research, however, there is an urgent need, recognized in a dozen studies, for some means of technological assessment before development. The assessment would make possible democratic control over the excesses and misuses of rapidly advancing technologies.

Proposals for setting up technological assessment operations range from some that involve a separate agency, attached to Congress, to some others creating a kind of high court, without legal trappings, that would hear different contentions and render a balanced report of the available operations. But many scientists fear that this would only add another layer of bureaucracy to the problem. Carroll Wilson, professor of management at M.I.T. and once right-hand aide to Vannevar Bush, favors a more ad hoc arrangement that would pull together multidisciplinary conferences on a given problem. He organized a prototype last summer in a large international meeting that in one month developed a hardheaded report on major global pollutants.

Rational assessment programs right, then, take a variety of forms. In the last analysis, the organizational form is probably less important than the spirit in which any such undertaking is launched. On the record of recent years, it is hard to be optimistic about the spirit. We can only hope the strange and irrational assaults on U.S. science end soon.

THE ROLE OF THE VFW

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the April 1971 issue of the "Veterans of Foreign Wars," magazine there appeared an article entitled "Protect Benefits of Veterans."

Commander-in-chief of the VFW, H. R. Rainwater, spoke before the first session of the newly created Senate Veterans Affairs Committee. Mr. Rainwater expressed his pleasure over the creation of this committee and the VFW's desire to have a productive and successful relationship with the Veterans Affairs Committee.

Mr. Rainwater points out the remarkable history of growth this organization has enjoyed. This growth has led to the VFW's present membership of over 1,600,000. The objective of this organization is to "Honor the Dead by Helping the Living." In furtherance of this goal, the VFW has created many programs and activities such as their National Home for Widows and Orphans and their National Rehabilitation Service. This outstanding organization deserves the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Protect

Benefits of Veterans," which appeared in the April 1971 issue of the *Veterans of Foreign Wars* magazine be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

PROTECT BENEFITS OF VETERANS

For the V.F.W. March 9 was an historic occasion. On that date the newly created Senate Veterans Affairs Committee held its first session.

Recognizing the vigorous effort the V.F.W. has made over the past quarter century to achieve the establishment of this Committee, the senators invited Commander-in-Chief H. R. Rainwater to appear at its initial meeting. More than 500 representatives of the V.F.W. crowded into the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building for Rainwater's presentation.

Each member of the Committee in attendance (five of nine), including Sen. Vance Hartke (Ind.), its chairman, and Sen. Strom Thurmond (S.C.), its ranking minority member, pledged his support for the V.F.W. goals.

Earlier in the day Rainwater presented similar recommendations to the House Veterans Affairs Committee. Following are excerpts from his Senate testimony:

Permit me to express my deep appreciation as well as that of my fellow officers and all of the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States for this opportunity to appear before your Committee. This is indeed an historic occasion. It marks for us, I am sure, what will be the beginning of a productive and successful relationship.

You will notice that I am accompanied by a large number of Veterans of Foreign Wars members. These gentlemen are the top leaders of our organization. All are serving in a leadership capacity on our national or state level in either elected or appointed capacities. Most of the men with me today are moving toward the top. Some have already held high positions in our organization but continue to give our organization their time and energy in an unofficial way.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the Veterans of Foreign Wars officers who are with me, there are another 1,000 who are attending our Washington Conference who could not be here because of the size of the hearing room. They are extremely disappointed to have missed the opportunity to attend our first meeting with this distinguished Committee. It is hoped that on similar occasions in future years all will have the privilege of seeing our Senate Veterans Committee in action and how it functions with respect to veterans legislation and programs.

Since this is my first appearance before this Committee, permit me to take a few moments to review the history and functions of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

It was founded in 1899 by a small group of veterans who had just returned from combat in the Spanish-American War. Some had fought in Cuba, some in the Philippine Islands. This group agreed to limit membership to those men who had served overseas in engagements for which a campaign badge or medal was authorized.

This has continued to be the prerequisite for membership and from the slim ranks of that humble beginning, the organization's membership roster has grown to over 1,600,000. These members are distributed throughout 10,000 Posts, the majority of which are in the United States, but located also in territories and foreign countries from Okinawa in the Far East to Paris, France, in Europe. Aiding these Posts are their Ladies Auxiliaries with a total membership of approximately 500,000.

The common purpose of our organization is to "Honor the Dead by Helping the Living." To achieve this objective, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States over the

years has initiated many activities and programs. High on this list is our National Home for widows and orphans, in Eaton Rapids, Mich. This Home founded in 1926 is a model in the care of young people.

It is a matter of great pride, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, to point out that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has enjoyed an increase in membership for 19 successive years. I believe that this testifies to the high worth of our objectives and the effectiveness of our methods of achieving them. On this date we are about 110,000 members ahead of the number we had last year at this time and we are expecting to close out this current year with an all-time high of 1,750,000 members.

One program of which the Veterans of Foreign Wars is especially proud is our National Rehabilitation Service. For many years it has furnished without charge counsel and assistance to millions of veterans and their dependents eligible for benefits provided by Congress. This service has been made available to all veterans regardless of whether or not they were Veterans of Foreign Wars members or even eligible for membership. It is this kind of activity that sets our veterans organizations apart and makes us unique.

Another is our Voice of Democracy program. This program is a broadcast script-writing contest for all high school students, whose theme this year is "Freedom—Our Heritage." We believe this particular program is an outstanding example of furthering the great purpose of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to maintain and extend the institutions of American Freedom upon which this great nation was founded and has been preserved. Tonight at our Annual Dinner honoring members of Congress the National Voice of Democracy winner will receive a \$10,000 scholarship award, second place winner a \$5,000 scholarship award, third place winner a \$3,500 scholarship award, fourth place winner a \$2,500 scholarship award and the fifth place winner a \$1,500 scholarship award. We will have the privilege of hearing the first place winner deliver his or her winning script at the dinner tonight.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is determined by the delegates to our annual National Convention. At our most recent Convention, which was held in Miami Beach last August, almost 300 separate resolutions in the field of veterans rights and benefits, national security and Americanism projects were adopted.

TEXTILE IMPORTS

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the flood of textile imports now coming into our country from Japan and elsewhere is causing extremely serious problems in my State and in many others.

Jobs by the thousands have been lost, and textile mills by the dozens have been forced to close down. A vital segment of the economy is suffering badly.

America is faced with a problem her present technology cannot overcome—a problem of low Asian wages. It is not a question of better machinery or the need for better management in order to meet competition from Japan and elsewhere. It is simply a case where American

wages and the American standard of living are too high to produce textiles in competition with people who work for so little.

I support in general the concept of free trade, but there must be limits. Trade is a two-way street. We must not cripple an American industry of importance to millions of our citizens and taxpayers. We must not allow the destruction of the economy of vast sections of our country.

The time has long since come for the brakes to be put on cheap textile imports. Certainly, a reasonable and proper amount of textile imports should be permitted, but never in such vast quantities as today, never at the expense of American jobs and investments.

With this situation plainly before it, the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina recently expressed its deep concern over this growing problem.

On April 13, 1971 the General Assembly passed the following resolution:

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA 1971
SESSION RATIFIED BILL

RESOLUTION 46—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 574

A Joint Resolution Memorializing the President and the Congress to Take Steps Necessary to Restore Order to International Trade in Textiles and Apparel and Commending the President for his Rejecting the Unsatisfactory Japanese Proposal to Unilaterally Restrain Textile Exports to the United States

Whereas, the importation of textiles and apparel from foreign nations is seriously undermining the whole economic structure of the State of North Carolina, and

Whereas, thousands of North Carolinians have lost their jobs or, because of short-time operations, are earning below their normal wages, and

Whereas, the revenues of the State are seriously jeopardized, which may result in a decrease of services, thereby affecting all citizens in the State, and

Whereas, foreign competition markets its textiles and apparel in this country under conditions which are illegal in the State of North Carolina and the United States, and

Whereas, the Japanese have offered a most unsatisfactory proposal to restrain, unilaterally, its textile and apparel exports to the United States, and

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

Whereas, the textile markets of the United States are virtually wide open to foreign imports while many of the governments representing the major textile exporters to this country rigidly protect their own markets against American textile exports, and

Whereas, in the United States we have numerous laws and regulations which affect the cost of American textiles while our foreign competitors are not subject to any such regulations by their governments, and

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

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

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

Whereas, the Japanese proposal would undercut the long-term arrangements of cotton textiles that have been in effect for ten years, and

Whereas, the wages in the American textile industry are approximately two dollars an hour more than they are in the Japanese textile industry, with the difference being considerably more in some other Asian nations, and

Whereas, the General Assembly and the people of North Carolina are not willing to see these most unfair conditions continue to weaken their largest industry which, together with its numerous suppliers and related industries, have been good responsible corporate citizens over the years, and

Whereas, these unfair conditions have largely been created by a combination of policies of our Federal Government; Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

Section 1. That the General Assembly of North Carolina respectfully memorializes the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to do all in their power, through legislative and administrative action, to see that order is restored to the chaotic textile and apparel import situation; and

Sec. 2. That the General Assembly of North Carolina express to the President of the United States its appreciation for his forthright statement in which he rejected the recent Japanese proposal and gave strong support to the textile quota legislation (H.R. 20) now pending before the Congress, and, also express to the Members of the North Carolina Congressional Delegation, and other Members of the Congress who continue to work for a solution to this problem, its deep appreciation for their dedication to this vital effort; and

Sec. 3. That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States to each United States Senator, and each Member of the House of Representatives from North Carolina, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of State of the United States, the Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Clerk of the United States Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Sec. 4. This resolution shall be effective upon its ratification.

In the General Assembly read three times and ratified, this the 13th day of April 1971

H. P. TAYLOR, Jr.,
President of the Senate.

PHILIP P. GODWIN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ORGANIZATIONS USING THE NAMES
OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS MUST
BE CAREFUL

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) duPONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. DuPONT. Mr. Speaker, it was called to my attention late yesterday that my name appeared on a publication of the Concerned Officers Movement listing me as one of the "Congressmen Supporting Memorial Service" to be held April 23, 1971, at the Washington Cathedral.

My support for this memorial service was never requested, nor was it given by me. It is misleading and irresponsible for any organization to suggest that a Member of Congress is a "supporter" of its

purposes or programs without ever asking for or receiving such support.

I would hope that in the future, any organization using the name of a Member of Congress as a supporter, will be careful to insure that it does so only with the personal approval of the Member.

EARTH DAY

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I was privileged recently to address the Fourth Annual National Pollution Control Conference held in Detroit.

Being mindful of the fact that today is Earth Day, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

AN ACTION PROGRAM FOR POLLUTION CONTROL IN THE GREAT LAKES

(By U.S. Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN)

Distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen: Along with others you have already heard from, I am delighted to welcome President Mike Walker, the Houston Jaycees and the many others who have been active in arranging this Fourth National Pollution Control Conference and Exposition. I hope you are enjoying the hospitality of our great state and the great city of Detroit.

I was pleased that Vice President Agnew came here yesterday to deliver the keynote address at your Conference.

Not too long ago, people like those of you gathered at this Conference—those concerned about the environment—were scorned and viewed as extremists. In many quarters, you were just dismissed as bird-watchers and eccentrics.

Indeed, as recently as 1962, when Rachel Carson wrote *The Silent Spring*, most Americans were still blithely unconcerned—or oblivious—to the environmental dangers confronting our nation.

To be sure, the situation is much different now. And much credit for the public awareness and recognition of pollution problems should go to groups like the Jaycees, and to leaders like those participating in this Conference—spokesmen who have been important voices calling, pleading, encouraging, arguing, pressing for a necessary national dialogue.

It's a pity, but it's a fact that most Americans have awakened to the threat of pollution only in the last few years.

Before that, they viewed the air and water as belonging to everyone. At the same time, they seemed content with an attitude that what belongs to every one needs to be cared for by no one.

Now, the situation is different. Perhaps you are aware of two studies made by the pollster, Louis Harris—one in 1967 and another in April of 1970. They indicate that the number of Americans concerned about air pollution in their home communities rose from 56 to 70 per cent during those three years. The most notable increase in concern, incidentally, was *not* in the major metropolitan areas—as one might expect—but in smaller cities and towns. In those areas, the percentage of people indicating serious concern about air pollution rose from 38 to 60 per cent.

More significant, I suggest, is the fact that

Americans today are even willing to pay more out of their pockets to clean up the environment. Harris compared the attitudes of Americans on this point in 1967, and again in 1970. He found a dramatic turnabout.

In 1967, the public was narrowly divided; 46 per cent opposed any additional taxes for such a purpose, while only 44 per cent were willing to pay something for pollution controls. But by 1970, the margin was reversed; 54 per cent of the people registered a willingness to pay "\$15 a year more in taxes" for programs to improve the environment, while only 34 per cent said "no."

When one considers the economic climate which prevailed last April—and today for that matter—those results are very interesting. At that time, you will recall, unemployment was higher than anticipated, and many feared the Nation was sliding into a recession. The economy is moving up these days—but then as now there was a general mood of protest against high taxes and federal spending for space exploration, Vietnam and foreign aid. Bond issues for education were among the most convenient targets for this protest. So, given the economic times, the indication that a majority would back up their convictions with a willingness to pay for improving the environment was nothing less than a political phenomenon.

Because you have chosen to meet in the midst of the Great Lakes area, I thought it would be particularly appropriate for me this evening to focus on some of the pollution dangers which threaten these priceless national and international resources.

When a large fire threatens a national forest, we don't hesitate—we mobilize every available means to bring it under control. Yet, the precious Great Lakes are being threatened on a greater scale—and, as a nation, we are doing almost nothing about it.

Last year the State of Michigan began implementing a law requiring vessels to have holding tanks for sewage. Holding tanks to prevent pollution are just fine. But it is very disturbing to realize that the Great Lakes themselves are fast becoming a holding tank for the wastes of society.

The time for action was yesterday. But action now would give the Lakes at least a chance to survive.

Of course, I recognize that there are some general Federal programs which incidentally benefit the Great Lakes. One such program provides assistance for the construction of municipal waste-treatment facilities.

Unfortunately, in the past, the level of funding for this program has not kept pace with either the Nation's needs or the unique requirements of the Great Lakes.

For instance, total Federal expenditures in Fiscal Year 1970 for such facilities in the seven states comprising the Great Lakes Basin amounted to only \$33 million. That is less than the Federal share needed to finance waste-treatment facilities for the city of Detroit alone. According to the International Joint Commission, over \$1.3 billion is required to build adequate treatment facilities along just two of the Great Lakes—Lake Erie and Lake Ontario.

Given this background, it should be clear that greater emphasis must be directed toward the Great Lakes. We must begin eliminating pollution of the Great Lakes—not as if we were occasionally answering a fire alarm or chasing an ambulance—but rather on a comprehensive basis. Tonight I propose a six-point action program as part of an overall attack which must be launched against pollution in the Great Lakes.

First, I believe adequate personnel must be provided to monitor all polluters along the entire United States shoreline of the Great Lakes.

With the manpower presently available, we are only reacting to emergencies—to situations where the pollution is particularly severe. This is only one of the reasons why some 1600 municipalities and industries along the five Great Lakes are not likely to meet Federal-State water quality standards by 1975. We need to hasten compliance with these standards; we need to prod the municipalities, and industries that are behind schedule. We need city-by-city, industry-by-industry inspection of waste discharges along the entire United States shoreline of the Great Lakes.

Significant action could and must be taken immediately in connection with the Refuse Act of 1899—a law of ancient vintage that has been brought to life and modernized by Bill Ruckelshaus, the impressive new administrator of the new Environmental Protection Agency. I've discovered that EPA has enough funds right now to hire an additional 400 personnel to inspect and monitor industrial pollution of navigable waters—like the Great Lakes. Of course, the fact that I represent a Great Lakes state may have something to do with it; but I submit that by any reasonable assessment, the Great Lakes pollution problems are severe enough to justify the assignment of a significant portion of those positions to the Great Lakes area.

As it stands now, however, authority under the Refuse Act limits federal inspection of water pollution to industrial sources—so that municipalities are subject to less scrutiny. This gap in jurisdiction could and would be closed if legislation submitted to the Congress by President Nixon were enacted. In the last session Congress did *not* complete action on that or on a number of other important requests by President Nixon relating to pollution.

As a second point in this action program, I call for a halt to the raw-sewage overflows that now foul our Great Lakes beaches.

Congress will have to provide funds to help cope with the problem of "combined sewers."

At the present time many waste treatment facilities simply cannot handle the volume of both sewage and runoff from storms. As a result, sewage and storm runoff are often routed around treatment plants and dumped directly into the Lake or they back up, overflow and escape into the water.

As a result, some beaches in Michigan, in Illinois, in Indiana and in Ohio have been closed by the onslaught of filth released by combined sewers. Experts estimate, however, that an aggressive program to prevent such dumping—if instituted soon—would mean that some of the beaches could be clean enough to reopen within the next few years.

Third, I propose that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency be empowered through legislation to set deadlines for phasing phosphates out of detergents.

As you know, phosphates are causing such rapid growth of algae and other plant life that they may eventually choke the life out of the Lakes.

It is true that waste treatment facilities can be designed to substantially reduce the phosphates entering the water from all sources. And a program to provide funds for the construction of such facilities, to reduce phosphorus discharges up to 80 per cent by 1975, is part of the Administration's \$12 billion water pollution control bill.

But even this is not sufficient. A more satisfactory solution is to attack the source of half the phosphates that flow into the Great Lakes—I refer to the phosphates in detergents.

Canada already has a program to eliminate phosphates from detergents. And last week the Indiana legislature passed a law to reduce sharply the maximum phosphate level allowed in detergents. I can report to this national conference that Michigan is also considering strong measures to phase phosphates out of detergents.

Once again, Canada is setting a good example for its neighbor to the south. States such as Indiana and Michigan are pointing in the right direction. But, surely, it would make more sense to have uniform Federal legislation, authorizing the EPA Administrator to set deadlines phasing phosphates out of detergents.

As a fourth point, I believe the EPA should start a pilot project now to work out solutions to the problems of air pollution and solid waste which are generated in the attack on water pollution.

As you know, environmental problems often overlap. Nowhere is there a greater need to develop an integrated environmental program than in the Great Lakes area.

Vast amounts of polluted sludge, generated in the process of cleaning our waters, create new disposal problems. Should this sludge be spread over the soil? Should it be burned or should it be disposed of in some other way.

One imaginative approach for disposing of municipal wastes is being put into operation in Muskegon County here in Michigan. After initial treatment, wastes will be piped to rural areas and sprayed on surrounding farmlands. Federal water pollution control officials are watching this project very closely—and it's potential may be far reaching.

Larger problems face metropolitan areas, such as Chicago, Detroit and Cleveland, and they require the same kind of imagination and innovation demonstrated in Muskegon.

Funding must be available for pilot projects to show the way. So far \$815,000 has actually been appropriated by Congress to fund such projects. Much more must be provided.

For a fifth point, I propose, as part of a "Save the Great Lakes Program" that the Administrator of EPA make available in this area a substantial portion of about \$450 million in discretionary funds which he can allocate for waste treatment facilities—discretionary funds that will be available at the end of this fiscal year.

In addition, another \$600 million is likely to be available over the next three years for the EPA Administrator to apply against "severe" water pollution problems. I submit that the Great Lakes certainly qualify as a "severe" pollution problem—and a good share of those funds should be channeled in this direction.

As a sixth point in this action program, I call for establishment and operation of the long-awaited Great Lakes Water Laboratory—which has been under discussion since 1961.

It's high time that the Great Lakes have a laboratory and research facility equal to the breadth and urgency of the pollution problems that are overtaking the Great Lakes.

Finally, any discussion about cleaning up the Great Lakes must include important reference to our international partner to the North—Canada.

Some of the experts say that, as a nation, we have violated the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty with Canada by our neglect of pollution of the Great Lakes. So action now to clean up the Lakes is essential, not only for selfish reasons but it is called for to comply with our solemn international obligations.

The six points I have outlined are not a cure-all for the environmental ills of the Great Lakes. But I suggest that they do provide a framework for beginning—and pushing.

In a sense, it is a sad state of affairs when new frontiers must necessarily be frontiers of restoration and preservation.

But restoration and preservation of the Great Lakes is an environmental frontier of the highest national importance.

Indeed the Great Lakes should be made an environmental showcase for the Nation and the world.

A great American once said:

"To waste, to destroy, our natural resources, to skin and exhaust the land instead of using it to increase its usefulness, will result in undermining, in the days of our children, the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them, amplified and developed."

The words, of course, were those of President Teddy Roosevelt; he used them in a message to Congress more than 63 years ago.

One can only imagine what would have been Teddy Roosevelt's indignation if he were alive and aware of the pollution in our lakes and in the air today.

Many of you who have visited the Capitol Building in Washington have seen a beautiful chandelier hanging in the Vice President's formal office. There is a delightful, true story about that chandelier. It was not always in the Vice President's office. For many years it hung in the President's oval room in the White House.

But when Teddy Roosevelt became President, he wanted the windows wide open so the invigorating fresh air could rush in. President Teddy enjoyed the fresh air; but the breezes kept up a constant tinkling of the crystals of the chandelier—and the noise disturbed and bothered the President's concentration at his desk.

Finally, he ordered his secretary to take the chandelier down, and move it to the Vice President's office. "Maybe it will keep him awake," were Teddy's parting words.

I don't know about Charles Fairbanks, who was Vice President then—but I do know that the Vice President we have now is awake to the problems of pollution—as his presence at this conference yesterday indicated. Fortunately, when he spoke here he spoke for an Administration in Washington that is providing the most vigorous and enlightened leadership since Teddy Roosevelt in the constant battle of the ages to protect our environment.

We shall succeed, I am confident, in extricating ourselves from a distant, tragic war; we may yet solve the problems of urban blight, discrimination and poverty. But even if we solve all of those problems—we shall fail—unless we can save our environment.

Because you are here at this national pollution control conference, there is hope—I salute you, and I thank you very much.

ASIAN STUDIES VITAL

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the major concerns of our foreign policy is that of our relationships, past, present, and future, with the countries of Asia.

Recently, in my city of Los Angeles, the Honorable PATSY MINK delivered an address to the First National Conference on Asian American Studies at the University of Southern California. As a representative of the beautiful island State of Hawaii and one of the most articulate Members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Mrs. MINK is not only distinguished for her brilliant, legal mind, but has forged an ambassadorial

link between our friends in Asia and the United States.

Her thoughtful and illuminating remarks should be read by all of us who strive for understanding of worlds and culture other than our own and who seek, in her words, "a more rational foreign policy than has been demonstrated by our involvement in Vietnam."

I am pleased and honored to have the opportunity to bring this significant address to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE PATSY T. MINK

My credentials to address this distinguished body are obvious, as well as inalienable. What you see, or think you see in my person is, however, only skin-deep. I am basically no different than any typical person of my generation whose education was totally devoid of all reference to the understanding of any world other than the Western civilization. The color of my skin, however, did give me a sensitivity and a curiosity about the other world which was not studied or taught in the regular school system.

It is, therefore, with a myopic egotistical mentality that our country has persisted in this educational direction which fails to recognize that the history, culture and politics of Asia are equally important as the study of Europe, its history, culture and politics. And thus we have deliberately stultified our ability to comprehend the Asian. If America is to reach full bloom as a nation which fulfills the ideal of a democracy, it must develop an attitude in its people which accepts an Asian life as being equal to that of other human beings, and accords it full dignity.

The deeply imbued prejudice which is harbored by most Americans against those of Asian blood, citizen and alien alike, was revealed by the unchallenged actions of our government against all peoples of Japanese descent during World War II. Over a hundred thousand persons were taken from their homes and placed behind barbed wires as a protection to the rest of the country against presumed hostility and potential sabotage. The basis of this outrageous act was fear brought about by the belief that the "Inscrutable" Oriental could not be trusted. This decision did not produce any public outcry. The entire population of one national origin overnight became the enemy, stripped of property, rights of citizenship, human dignity and due process of law, without so much as even a stifled voice of conscience among our leading scholars or civil libertarians.

The war in Vietnam has hardened this view. All Vietnamese stooping in the rice fields are pictured as the enemy, sub-human without emotions and for whom life is less valuable than for us.

During the Calley trial, we were told about "MGR", the "Mere Gook Rule" which was the underlying basis for Calley's assertion that the slaughter of women and children, our prisoners of war, was "no big thing."

The "Mere Gook Rule" says that life is less important, less valuable to an Oriental. Laws that protect other human beings do not apply to "Gooks". In a sense as William Greider of the Washington Post said before the verdict became known, the essence of the Calley case was to determine the validity of this rule. He described it as the "unspoken issue" at the trial.

The issue was not as unspoken as most would still prefer to believe. The indictment drawn up by the Army against Lieutenant Calley stated in six separate charges that he did at My Lai murder four Oriental human beings . . . murder not less than 30 Oriental human beings . . . murder three Ori-

tal human beings . . . murder an unknown number of Oriental human beings not less than seventy . . . and so on numbering 102.

The indictment made clear to me that the murder of "Mere Gooks" was the issue, else why the special description of the victims as "Oriental human beings"?

The public reaction after the verdict further verifies the condition of our society. No one likes to believe that our country is so lacking of understanding and reason as to be incapable of appreciating the enormous importance of the verdict in the Calley case.

Are the vast majority of voices being sounded against the verdict really conscious of the implications of their protest? Are they saying that Calley should be freed even though he was found guilty of murdering 22 human beings? or was it because it was 22 Oriental human beings? and that the Geneva Law regarding treatment of prisoners did not apply to "Mere Gooks"? These are the questions which should never have to be asked in a free society.

How do we put into proper perspective Dean Rusk's vision of the "yellow peril" expressed as justification for building an antiballistic missile system on the one hand, and improved relations with the ping-pong experts in Peking?

A third generation American, why must I continue to be asked how I enjoy living in this country as though it could never really be mine as it is yours. Why must I explain that my father does not own a restaurant or a laundry?

These are gnawing pains of those who yearn the full enjoyment of our citizenship yet who realize that there are invisible and visible barriers to its attainment.

Your obligations as scholars cannot be overlooked. The intellectual segment of our society has been derelict in its influence. It has failed to equip the general public with adequate knowledge upon which to refute prejudice and with which to base wholesome and genuine conclusions. The collection of artifacts in the museums and libraries of the wealthy do not influence public policy.

We must become aggressive. We must insist upon the study of Asian culture and history in the earliest years of our schooling. Oriental studies must not only be a fetish for a few wise scholars at universities but it must become a standard part of our school curriculum, both elementary and secondary. This is an obligation which you must not further delay, lest we fall again into a second Vietnam.

When all our men are home safely and the war yet rages on in Vietnam and our bombs continue to kill Asians, it will be too late to begin our understanding of Vietnamization.

If our foreign policy were not intertwined with the fate of the world, I would not be so anxious or disturbed, for our own failings would suffer no consequence except to ourselves. But in the realm of world politics every act we do or fail to do out of ignorance or lack of perception reflects upon the next step.

With instant media and mass communication the need for greater attention to the interpretative capacity of our citizens is self-evident. We cannot be satisfied with a few scholars with knowledge and expertise. We must rather have a nation fully conversant with the history of the East as well as the West.

Dr. Margaret Mead has said that, "The United States has always been afraid of foreigners . . . the last foreigners to come have always upset the previous foreigners who had just settled down." She says that this fear is based on a feeling that "our internal integration is weak, and it is weak." This is the point to which education must be directed, to build our national stability by overcoming false fears and prejudice. Asian American studies therefore has the important task of instructing non-Asians in the ways of those of Asian descent.

All too often, the American concept of international studies has seemed to be that we would bring Asian scholars to our shores to study the "advanced" culture of this nation. There was no thought or expectation that, we, too, had much to learn from such contacts. The concept of Americans studying Asia from the standpoint of themselves attempting to learn something better was all but ignored. As a result, when the Vietnam War broke out, according to a study by Education and World Affairs, there were only ten American scholars engaged in research on that country. Perhaps the staggering cost of more than 250,000 Americans dead or wounded and some 125 billion dollars expended in a futile quest for "victory" over an ill-defined aggressor has convinced us of the need for far more attention to the political, social and cultural character of these countries of Asia.

The turbulent politics of a region where millions are crying for change and a better life underscores the need for a more positive and enlightened American role. As we have seen, even the smallest misunderstanding has potential for disastrous results. Indeed, the ravages of the Vietnam war on the American spirit may yet prove to be the most damaging result of all.

If education be the answer, let us move forward then to an expanded program of research and study, and bring this knowledge to bear on public understanding. To forestall future Vietnams and My Lais, it will be necessary to imbue in our national consciousness the certain knowledge that it is no more right or just to slaughter millions of Asians and destroy whole Asian countries than it is to exterminate equal numbers of Europeans.

Obviously, you—the scholars engaged in this vital field—will have a key role in this most important undertaking. You can inform America about how to understand the many facets of Asia, from the intentions of the People's Republic of China, to the reasons for the racial hostility in Malaysia.

Anthropologists have often talked of the "cultural distance" factor, which increases our difficulty to deal with people around the world, as their own traditions differ radically from ours. As the distance increases, more skill and knowledge are necessary for real communication. Insights developed in cross-cultural studies are in turn essential aids to understanding the way in which our own national events respond to, are stimulated by, and contribute to events in other countries. Can Asian scholars better comprehend the adverse reaction of the American body politic to the sentence of Lieutenant Calley? Perhaps not, but I believe that they are more equipped to realize the magnitude of the ethical problem confronting us that is demonstrated by the Calley episode. And I am sure that they will agree on the need for our intensive effort and understanding to overcome the prejudice that the Calley reaction suggests.

It is not going too far to state that the very future of America as we have known it depends largely on our future relationships with Asia. Unless we can surmount outdated notions of superiority and inferiority, conflicts arising from such attitudes will continue to plague us.

As a Member of Congress from the State of Hawaii, I have felt a special obligation to help bring Hawaii's experience to the attention of the rest of our country. The very admission of Hawaii as the 50th State was a large step forward acknowledging American growth towards the Pacific. That same year we saw the establishment of the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii. Over the years since its origin, the East-West Center has compiled an outstanding record of bringing together students and scholars from Asia and America.

While the accomplishments of the Center

have been exemplary, I feel that its administration under the "umbrella" of the Department of State and Agency for International Development has not provided a framework for the Center's greatest and most important achievement. State and AID are concerned primarily with carrying out and implementing American foreign policy, and they are not as concerned with educating Americans towards a greater understanding of Asians. It is true that we have much to offer Asians in the way of technical knowledge and expertise. And we should provide it. And State and AID are the proper vehicles for this kind of program. However, we need something more than this in our national program.

The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is the agency of our government most concerned with education for its own sake. Accordingly, it is my hope that either the East-West Center be transferred to the jurisdiction of this Department, or that a new cross-cultural Asian Studies program be augmented under HEW to run parallel to the East-West Center's programmatic goals. Congress will this year take up an extension of the International Education Act, and I will strive for consideration of my bill at that time. Hopefully, we will be able to secure a more meaningful implementation of the International Education Act, perhaps focusing on an expanded role for the East-West Center which would place more stress on cultural studies. Again, I do not scorn the problem-oriented approach of AID with its emphasis on population, food, and similar areas. I do feel, however, on a long-range basis we must begin to give similar recognition to the broader dimensions of Asian studies which bear on the important issues of understanding and trust, and which demonstrate a real equality.

To implement my strong belief that Asian studies should be a component part of our entire educational system beginning in the elementary grades, I am supporting other legislation currently under consideration in Congress. This bill, the Ethnic Heritage Studies Act of 1971, would amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 by adding a broad new Federal program of aid to school systems in affording our students an opportunity to learn of the background and contributions of those ethnic minorities which are now part of America.

Under this program, we envision the development of curriculum materials for use in elementary and secondary schools which deal with the history, geography, society, economy, literature, art, music, drama, language, and general culture of these various ethnic groups. These curriculum materials would be distributed throughout our school systems, and educators trained to utilize them in daily classroom instruction.

We would draw on such resources as research facilities and personnel of colleges, universities, and museums, as well as the special knowledge of ethnic groups in local communities. Thus, the expertise of Asian scholars could be employed to the benefit of the schoolchildren of this country in giving them a far better understanding than their parents had of life in Asia and other non-Caucasian areas. I believe this knowledge is imperative if we are to equip our people with the means of seeking, through the democratic process, a more rational foreign policy than has been demonstrated by our involvement in Vietnam.

It will be a grass-roots effort, if you will, starting at the very base of our society in educating future generations to provide better leadership than we have shown to date. As I have said, Asian scholars will have a vital role in this task, taking themselves out of the realm of academic isolation and dusty research journals. They will dedicate themselves to transforming our entire society through active involvement.

The ethnic studies bill has recently been approved by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor. I will do all I can to obtain its final adoption this session so that we can at least begin to meet this great challenge.

Extension of the International Education Act, which would also accomplish these objectives of ethnic instruction in our grade school as well as other purposes, is also on the Congressional agenda. The Act, which held immense promise, has never been funded, a situation which I feel can be attributed to the lack of sufficient lobbying by Asian scholars. Adoption of the basic authorizing framework was only half the task, but I am sorry to say that after this was accomplished those involved seem to return to their professorial duties and assume that the money to implement the Act would be forthcoming automatically.

By now, I hope, the realization has struck that it will take an even greater amount of effort to pursue the matter to a conclusion. This year we have to start all over again in securing extension of the authorizing law. Then, we will be concerned with appropriations. This time we have the additional obstacles of lack of the momentum that was built up with passage of the original Act, and a budget stringency which has seen cut-backs rather than additions in most areas of education. We now have to explain why the Act was not funded the first time around, a logical question by those holding the Congressional purse-strings. These are some of the problems faced by those members of Congress who are sincerely interested in furthering the cause of Asian and other international studies through the International Education Act. As you can see, Asian scholars have their work out not if they expect to succeed. Victory will not be attained except through a concerted drive employing all the legislative lobbying strategies that many academicians have hesitated to concern themselves with in the past.

I hope that all those who want to see the International Education Act become the effective, dynamic program it should be, will take an active part in rallying the support of their Members of Congress to make certain that the extension legislation is considered this year.

Somebody is going to have to take the lead if our country is to get off dead center in its attitudes toward and knowledge of Asia. I am encouraged by the interest in this conference, which I hope presages a renewed bid for attention to this important field.

How else are we to pass on to our children, and to the new generation of leaders, the knowledge that Asian life is just as precious as any other? We have to show that yellow-skinned people, too, have their arts and their cultures and their accomplishments, knowledge that can only be gleaned by studying these subjects in detail.

I trust that someday, America will be able to look back and wonder how there could have been a Vietnam war, in which our country helped one group of Vietnamese kill other groups of Vietnamese. We will know that the ultimate folly was to pursue continued killing long after acknowledging that there could be no military victory. Our only purpose in continuing this awful war then, was to save "face"—a fault usually attributed to Asians—by turning over the fighting to others instead of ending it. But in so doing, we have contributed to the destruction of our own humanity and respect for fellow beings. Indeed as one writer put it, the success of Vietnamization means only that the color of corpses are to be yellow.

Lieutenant Calley, so much the "typical" American that he stirred pangs of sympathy from his countrymen, exemplifies the horror of a nation that has lost the ability to tell right from wrong. The American reaction

shows at once that there can be no "crime" whatever is done to Asians, yet we know that the entire war is a crime in all its aspects.

If there is a glimmer of hope in all of this, it is that the brutal truth of our own shortcomings has been made absolutely clear, and that there can be no doubt that we have far to go to achieve a true dedication to our own exalted ideals and traditions of human value. When we see the First Lady leading a crusade to help earthquake victims in South America but our country ignoring the deaths of hundreds of thousands in a similar disaster in East Pakistan, we realize the enormity of the challenge with which we are faced.

Realization that something is wrong is the first step toward correcting it. Dedication toward change is the next. Asian scholars, I feel, are in a special position to know what must and should be done. I call on this conference to help lead our nation to a greater appreciation of the values and humanity of Asia, so that we will not again stumble in the pursuit of greatness but will humbly seek the more fundamental goal of progress for all mankind.

HAITI

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the President-for-life of Haiti, our tiny black neighbor to the south, is dead. It is to be doubted that he will be greatly mourned except by the very few people whom he benefited. Certainly the mass of the population of Haiti, ground into poverty, and totally at the mercy of their Papa Doc and his Tonton Macoute, have very little in their recent history to look back upon with pleasure, and only the terrible condition of their country for which to thank their now-departed tyrant.

Time was when we in this country entertained high hopes for the little black republic occupying what was once one of the most fertile lands of the blessed Caribbean Sea. After all they were one of the first—perhaps the very first—to throw off the yoke of their Old World imperialist masters. Proud in their history are names like Toussaint L'Ouverture, Dessalines, Christophe—blacks all, slaves all—who in the early 19th century rose in rebellion and defeated the disciplined military power of Napoleon Bonaparte, then Emperor of France. Haiti became independent of France approximately one generation after we of the United States threw off the yoke of our own English masters.

But there the similarity stopped. Democracy took permanent root in our country. The tyranny of Napoleon was replaced by another tyranny—a home-grown one—in theirs. Ruins of the fortress-like castles of Dessalines and Christophe can still be seen in Haiti, built by slave labor under the lash of a black master.

Ultimately, the forms of democratic institutions were established in Haiti, with an elected legislature and an elected chief executive, but even these were quickly perverted. For the presidency of Haiti became a prize to be gained by

armed revolution, this office a vehicle for corrupt acquisition of wealth.

It was into these conditions that the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Marine Corps came in 1915 at the height of riots in the capital city of Port-au-Prince. For a period of 19 years until 1934 the people of Haiti, their government supported by a military authority imposed from without, enjoyed the only time of peace and prosperity they have had since their French masters were overthrown.

Then, in 1934 our Marines were removed from Haiti and the little nation was once again on its own. We have seen the results. The future holds nothing but foreboding.

It is axiomatic that a people cannot rise if their faintest hopes are always crushed to earth the moment they arise. The human condition, like a lovely spring flower, can only blossom in receptive soil, tended by skilled gardeners.

In the past perhaps unwisely, we have tried to help the people of Haiti. There has been criticism of our intervention on the grounds that it stifled the political activities of the people themselves. No doubt such criticisms had some justice. We have, however, seen what the political activities of the Haitian leaders were before our Navy and Marines came, and we have also seen to what they degenerated after we left. One should also recognize that the true meaning of freedom relates to freedom on the part of the individual: freedom from fear, freedom to grow and develop, freedom to work and benefit from the results of one's work. Political freedom alone, if it becomes a license for tyranny, is not to be praised but to be condemned.

Mr. President, I do not advocate U.S. intervention into the affairs of Haiti. But it is only natural that we should feel sympathy for the people of that pathetic little land and extend to them, in whatever way we can, such help as our wisest men can devise to be of real benefit to the people, the victims of nearly two centuries of incredible exploitation and misrule.

SENATOR DOLE SPEAKS

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the Record the address delivered by the Honorable BOB DOLE, U.S. Senator and Republican National Chairman, to the annual banquet of the Newspaper Farm Editors of America at the National Press Club on April 19, 1971.

While I do not agree with Senator DOLE in certain of his views concerning the Federal Government's relations with the industry of agriculture, especially proposed Government reorganization which would apparently splinter and proliferate the Department of Agriculture, I know of the long and earnest service the Senator has given in Congress to American agriculture.

Senator DOLE's address to the editors follows:

I wish to thank the Newspaper Farm Editors of America for the invitation to speak this evening about farm issues and the Nixon Administration.

It seemed significant to me that when your vice president and my good friend Don Kenedall wrote me about the banquet, he addressed the letter to the Republican National Chairman. I have to assume from this that he expects me to be at least partially partisan in my remarks.

The fact that President Nixon chose for the top GOP post a man from a Western Kansas wheat town with ten years in Congress and a membership on both the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, is a strong indication of his interest in American agriculture.

It has been many years since the Chairman of either the Republican or Democrat party has had such clear agricultural credentials. It should be obvious that the Republican Party and President Nixon care about the farmer—and not just at election time.

And just as Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin represents our farmers in the councils of government, this GOP Chairman is prepared to fight for farming interests both on the Senate floor and in the political arena.

AGRICULTURE'S CONSUMER STORY

On several occasions you have been exhorted by Secretaries of Agriculture that food is a good buy—thanks to the productive genius of the American farmer wedded to a superlative processing and distributive system. You have been told that Americans pay a smaller share of their income for food than anyone else: about 16.5 per cent of disposable income is used for food. (In Canada, the figure is about 20 per cent; Western Europe and Japan, about 37 per cent; Russia up to 50 per cent, and not to mention the developing countries.)

Speaking in terms of per capita incomes, between 1960 and 1970, per capita disposable incomes increased from \$1,937 to \$3,333, while per capita food expenditures rose only from \$388 to \$558. In other words, per capita food expenditures increased only about one-eighth as much as per capita income, and notably, during a decade when meat consumption showed a marked increase.

This is truly a remarkable record of production, especially considering the shrinking number of farm men and women—a story that I hope the press will help to make clear to all Americans.

We know that in terms of income, working time and in comparison with other countries, food in America is a great buy, but not all of the 95 per cent of the American people who do not live on farms know agriculture's consumer story. Perhaps you and I, and your editors, need to do a better job of conveying both sides of the farm picture to the general public.

I hope my remarks this evening tell a little of both the consumer and producer stories of agriculture.

PAST AND NET FARM INCOME

First, I will review briefly the past.

From 1961 to 1968 (during Democrat Administrations), American farmers posted a realized net farm income level that averaged \$13.8 billion. From 1969 to 1970, however, during the Nixon-Hardin period, farm income averaged \$16.0 billion—up 16 per cent (for a cumulative total increase of \$4.4 billion.)

Farmers must get incomes commensurate to their work, as do most workers in other segments of the economy. Secretary Hardin has told President Nixon he will do everything economically feasible to meet this need. We intend to do even better with the new farm programs. Last year farmers received only 78 per cent as much per capita

income as the non-farm people. That was an increase compared with the 55 per cent level in 1960, but far from our plans for further increase by 1976.

The Republican party knows that in 1972 it will have to run on its record. We will have a successful story to tell about this Administration's work for American agriculture. I know that you good people will tell it like it is—both its strengths and weaknesses.

NEW FARM PROGRAM

Never before in history has a new departure in farm programs been developed with such a truly bipartisan approach. You are familiar with the night sessions that Secretary Hardin and his staff spent with Chairman Poage trying to hammer out an acceptable program. I think it can be honestly stated that a true spirit of compromise carried this matter to legislative victory.

The Agricultural Act of 1970 is a break with the past by enabling farmers to employ their land and capital resources in planting the crops they can best produce. At the same time, the Act continues the protection of farm income through payments and loans. The 1971 programs give farmers a much wider choice in using their acreages without losing program benefits.

The new provisions place greater emphasis on market needs as the guide for producers' planting decisions. The acreage provisions are designed primarily to keep the overall excess of productive capacity in check to prevent surpluses.

The Act is encouraging shifts in crop acreages from farm to farm that will make each a more successful financial operation.

The basic factor in the new approach is that it enables farmers to devote a much larger portion of their acreage to the market as they determine and continue to participate. As a result, the interplay of market needs and farmers' plans will play a much greater role in price determination than for some time.

Now there are still a few—albeit a few—snipers at this program. But, let none of the political carpers overlook the fact that this program is more popular than any program in years—as demonstrated by the number of grain farmers enrolling in the program during the current sign-up period.

AGRICULTURAL EXPORT

We are on the threshold of a "triple" record for U.S. agricultural exports in the current fiscal year.

First: The value of total shipments will approximate \$7.5 billion—an all-time high record by a margin of \$700 million.

Second: Sales for dollars will be a record \$6.5 billion. This means that agriculture, on the dollar account, could earn a favorable balance of about \$800 million. That's the amount by which sales for dollars should exceed the value of agricultural imports.

Third: The volume of these exports will be about 6 per cent above the volume of the previous record export year.

In the 1970 crop year, almost one cropland acre out of every four is produced for the export market. In soybeans, we are exporting well over one-half the 1970 crop. We are exporting well over one-half of our wheat crop, two-thirds of the rice crop, and one-third of the cotton crop.

The growth in farm exports this year came because the market is working. An unfettered market can move farm products from the people who produce to the people who consume. That is the real underlying meaning of this year's trade figures: The international market—while not obstacle free—is working. It is working to the benefit of our farmers.

American producers of grains and other feedstuffs are returning as a part of the world economy—where the market works to favor the efficient producer and reward the holder of comparative economic advantage.

The Republican Administration is alert to defend agriculture's trading rights. We have been concerned about the growth of restrictionist thinking in many countries in recent years. We have been particularly uneasy about the growth of trade-restrictive policies of the European Community—and concerned that these policies might be extended at such times as the Community may be enlarged.

Assistant Secretary Palmby said recently: "We have made it plain both to the United Kingdom and the Community that we are determined to use all appropriate means to safeguard our trade rights and interests in grains, soybeans, and other agricultural commodities. With this in mind, we intend to exercise fully our rights under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), including retaliatory trade measures should that be necessary. This applies both during and after the period of U.K. negotiation with the Community, whether or not the United Kingdom becomes a member of the Community."

Our programs look to overseas markets, and we intend to compete for maximum utilization of our products throughout the world.

If U.S. farm exports are to reach our \$10 billion goal by the next decade—a necessary objective—they must move competitively in the world markets. It will be our policy to do everything feasible in our discussions with foreign governments to stimulate export markets for U.S. farm families. We are not satisfied with the results of the Kennedy round of trade negotiations. We know now that in that round agriculture was treated as a poor relative.

For example, the International Grains Arrangement was an international economic disaster especially to U.S. wheat growers. It is regrettable that the then President Johnson in the signing on behalf of the United States, should state:

"The new arrangement thus will prove new price insurance to U.S. wheat farmers."

It proved to be low price insurance and losing market insurance. Other countries undersold us and we were left "holding the bag" full of unexported wheat.

Australian Minister for Primary Industry, the Honorable J. D. Anthony expressed it perfectly when he said:

"What has happened is that France has increased her sales at the expense of Canada and the United States. At the same time, the Australian Wheat Board has taken full advantage of its favorable position under the I.G.A. and has been very vigorous and successful in its marketing. As a result—and there is no doubt about this—Australia has gained more than her traditional share of the world market. While this has been happening, countries who are not parties to the I.G.A.—particularly the Soviet Union and East European countries—have been expanding their sales at prices out of line with I.G.A. prices."

A new agreement has been negotiated which enables U.S. wheat growers to prosper from expanding markets. The machinery of the International Wheat Council for consultation and the collection of detailed information about prices, commercial and concessional sales and freight rates will be maintained. During the life of the new agreement, wheat trading prices are determined by the ordinary play of market forces.

It is the intention of this Administration to obtain our fair share of the world wheat markets. Wheat growers deserve every consideration, and we intend to see that they get it.

RESPONSIVE TO FARMERS

Perfection is seldom seen in Government or any organization or individual. This Administration has on occasion demonstrated its human frailty, but more important, it has proved itself responsive to the citizens of this nation.

For instance, there was the ASCS regulation requiring production from all set-aside

acreage in one of the past three years. It didn't take long to learn that while this might accomplish the ASC's desire to make historical yields more accurate, it was undesirable to require farmers to plow up land that has been out of production for 10 years or more, just to maintain the land's proven yield record. The years of good conservation practices would have been destroyed with the turning of the earth by the plow.

The Administration promptly rescinded the regulation.

Over the past few years, hog prices stabilized fairly well, and we saw the growth of sophisticated hog feeding operations. I use the word sophisticated to emphasize the change in well designed feedlots from what we knew as hog pens a few years back. The improvements and efficiencies gained by these new methods spread rapidly until last October when the USDA's hog population figures indicated an increase in hog population of 18 per cent over the year earlier. Hog prices plummeted. This was not the result of any USDA action, but the Department took positive steps to respond in behalf of the farmer by purchasing pork for the Department's food distribution and school lunch programs to help stabilize falling pork prices. So far this fiscal year USDA has purchased over 145 million pounds of pork... the highest level of pork purchases by the Department since 1956.

The Administration is responsive to the needs of the farmers. Farmers have responded also, by indicating a sharp downturn in their intended farrowings.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

(a) Farm labor

You have heard the rumors about the bill the Department of Labor plans to recommend to place agricultural workers under the National Labor Relations Act.

As far as I know, this legislation is not in final form, and I assure you this Administration will consider the need further before it recommends farm labor legislation.

As you know, under present labor law, agricultural workers are exempt from NLRB regulations. With this exemption, Cesar Chavez started the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee (UFWOC) in Southern California. The farmers who produced grapes in that area had no choice. If they wanted to sell their grapes, they had to sign the UFWOC contract. The farm workers did not even get to vote. The farmer just started deducting dues from their pay for the UFWOC.

In this regard, I have written Secretary Hodgson urging that any farm labor legislation provides for:

- 1) Secret Vote by the worker.
- 2) Prohibition of Retail Boycott tactics.
- 3) Prevention of strike at harvest time.
- 4) A separate administrative entity established to arbitrate disputes and administer the program, completely separate of the National Labor Relations Board.

(b) Pesticides

Legislative hearings on the use of pesticides have been conducted by the Agriculture Committees of both Houses of Congress.

As a result of these hearings it becomes apparent:

- 1) Some form of regulatory Agricultural chemical legislation will be passed by this Congress.
- 2) Agricultural chemicals are basically very important and useful both to farmers and to city dwellers.

Reason—not emotion must become the means to compare and evaluate the risks and the benefits of using these chemicals.

Proposed legislation is too broad without some means to evaluate and compare different chemicals as to their toxicity and pollutive capacity. Some common standard must be established before such judgments can be made.

With such a standard, it seems reasonable that regulations for these valuable "tools" can be written that would assure a clean healthy environment.

(c) Farm credit

The Federal Farm Credit Board has planned legislation that would extensively revise and expand the service of the Farm Credit Banks.

This agricultural credit system is over 50 years old. As you know, it was started to assist and maintain farm credit in a time when farmers could not obtain credit from other sources. The system has been so successful that the "seed" money from the Federal government has been repaid and the system operates independent of government supervision within the provisions of the Farm Credit legislation.

The proposed credit legislation has not been appraised by the Executive branch of government. It is generally believed, however, that the bill contains some provisions the Farm Credit system does not hope to attain, but were included to serve as "trading stock" when the bill is considered by Congress.

I can assure you this Administration is aware of the importance of credit to the operation of a farm in today's economy. As agriculture changes, its financial sources should also change, and this will be the basis on which this legislation will be considered.

(d) Rural development

Rural development legislation will be implemented in this session of Congress and in the next. The Rural Development Subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, of which I am a member, will be conducting hearings throughout the nation. The first of these will be in Sioux City, Iowa on May 3 and 4. The Subcommittee plans to call in farmers and small businessmen from rural communities in the four-state area around Sioux City (Iowa, South Dakota, Minnesota and Nebraska) the first day. The second day will be devoted to field trips throughout the area talking with the people in their rural environment.

By these hearings we hope to get some new ideas from which to develop legislation to aid rural American. It may require revenue sharing, it may require government reorganization.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

I do not believe any of you would disagree that a drastic reform of our Federal government structure is long overdue. Your ideas of where the revamping should begin, however, probably differ greatly from those of your financial and managing editors, and with officials faced with excruciating problems in the cities. But, if we are to achieve progress, all of us must be willing to see the other guy's side, and give a little to gain a lot.

When the President assessed our present position in his State of the Union message I think he stated the case for all of us. He said, "Most Americans today are simply fed up with government at all levels." The President followed this with a further expansion of the idea in his message to the Congress March 25 when he recalled, "There was some surprise that such a sweeping indictment of government would come from within the government itself, yet it is precisely there, within the government itself that frustration with government is often most deeply experienced. A president and his associates often feel that frustration as they try to fulfill their promises to the people. Legislators feel that frustration as they work to carry out the hopes of their constituents. And dedicated civil servants feel that frustration as they strive to achieve in action the goals which have been established in law."

The President summed up succinctly a real problem of agriculture—that of frustration all the way from the farm level to the highest administrative offices.

It is necessary at this point in time that all of us acknowledge that government bureaucracy has become too heavy and far removed from the people.

I am not inferring that reorganization is the ultimate solution to all farm problems, but proper reorganization of the Federal government could go a long way in removing agriculture as a whipping boy of urban influences.

Past administrations have struggled under the existing maze of uncoordinated departments and agencies of government, each adding patch upon patch and providing only temporary or negligible regional achievement. This Administration has valiantly attempted to tighten up procedures; to coordinate departments and agencies.

Out of all this effort, I have reached but one conclusion: Future opportunity for America can and must be met with changes that will permit more rapid and flexible inter-agency action, plus more freedom for individual initiative. This can only be brought about by grouping areas of responsibility having common characteristics.

The time is here for a thorough evaluation of agricultural trends and practices, to attempt to project farm needs for the future. We have not always done this successfully in the past. The fact up to 100,000 farmers are dropping out of the family farm system each year ought to be proof enough of our present inadequacy in retaining the family farm system. What we all thought were good farm programs from time to time, provided only a precarious partial security for about 40 per cent of our agricultural people; and these programs have failed dismally to keep our farmers and their sons in the farming business. I know we agree on that point.

Congress and the Executive branch need to look in the future toward permanent solutions—ways to stabilize a now declining farm population, and to improve the income for those remaining farmers. I am hopeful that Rural Development legislation will be passed this session and begin to alleviate these problems.

In some areas, farmers are making great strides in helping themselves. This is good. Farmers have found that they can often help themselves through bargaining and commodity groups. But, they cannot do it all alone.

We need your help in generating the kind of public support that is absolutely essential to obtain and implement the kinds of programs needed by farmers. In past years, we have not sold the true image of agriculture to city dwellers and their representatives in Congress. This particular failure is part of the reason unsatisfactory farm programs have been compromised in the past.

The farmer must be given the legislative means to help himself toward a better life. Such means would require equitable programs passed by an agriculturally-attuned Congress, encouraged and supported by informed constituencies. As agricultural writers, your role in assisting this nation's backbone industry is self-evident—and unquestionably, an important one—as communicating the needs of the farmer—is communicating the needs of the country.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS HOLDING COMMISSIONS IN THE ARMY RESERVE OR NATIONAL GUARD SERVICES

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the April 7, 1971, issue of the State news-

paper there appeared a very relevant article entitled "Congress, Court, and the Constitution."

Federal District Judge Gerhard A. Gesell in his recent decision barring Members of Congress from holding Reserve or National Guard commissions, has created an immediate problem. In writing this article, Mr. W. D. Workman, Jr., points out that Judge Gesell relied on section 6, article I of the Constitution. Section 6 of the Constitution bars Congressmen from also "holding any civil office under the authority of the United States."

This is a safeguard that shows the intention of the drafters of the Constitution. These safeguards were created to establish a balance between the different components of the Federal Government. Further, these drafters wanted a balance between enough military strength and the danger of a large active army. To this end, militia were established, and the appointment of militia officers was reserved to the States. Thus, the Constitution clearly contrasts militia officers with those of the Regular services as State officials rather than national officials. These important comments deserve the consideration of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Congress, Court, and the Constitution," which appeared in the April 7, 1971, issue of the State newspaper be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

CONGRESS, COURT, AND THE CONSTITUTION

(By W. D. Workman, Jr.)

The language of the U.S. Constitution seems specific enough through the provisions of Section 6 of Article I in banning congressmen from dual office-holding:

"No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office."

This was the section relied upon by Federal District Judge Gerhard A. Gesell last week when he handed down a decision barring members of Congress from holding commissions in the Reserve or National Guard components of the armed services.

But the judge may have overlooked the intent of those who drafted the Constitution at the Philadelphia convention of 1787. To be sure, they were concerned lest the contemplated new central government be granted too much power. And to that end, they erected several barriers (including the one cited above) to prevent the United States from acquiring greater powers through influencing either the functioning or the composition of Congress.

Nevertheless, the prohibition against membership in Congress by persons holding U.S. office could not have envisioned the ban's being applied against officers of the militia—which is what the controversy is all about.

The drafters sought a balance between the need for adequate military strength and the danger of a large standing army by mandating Congress to provide "for organizing, arming and disciplining the militia." At the same time, and upon motion of James Madison, they agreed that the appointment of the militia officers should be reserved to the states.

Thus, it was the clear intention that officers of the militia, as contrasted with those of the regular services, should be state rather than national officials. In the years since then, both the Reserves and the National Guard have taken on far greater identification with the central government, especially so with respect to the Reserves.

These subsequent developments, however, do not in themselves overthrow the 1787 premise (still in the Constitution) that officers of the militia should be appointed within the several states. The question is one of sufficient magnitude to be carried to the U.S. Supreme Court, as Judge Gesell himself hinted.

Furthermore, Congress itself should give thought to the possibility of revising the Constitution so as to more clearly spell out the conditions under which Reserve and National Guard officers might serve in the national legislature.

Most of the states, South Carolina among them, traditionally have excepted such military officers from restrictions applicable to civil officers. Our own Constitution of 1895, for example, prohibits dual office-holding within state government but adds this pertinent exclusion:

"Provided, That any person holding another office may at the same time be an officer in the Militia or a Notary Public."

The issue is a legitimate and important one, for there are 119 members of Congress directly affected by its outcome. The functioning of that body could well be impaired if all those legislators were called to active duty in a critical national emergency. So, too, could military operations be hampered to some degree by the absence of so many officers if the individuals stayed on congressional duty.

The matter needs more thought than it has been given up to this time. However it comes out, the nation may wind up owing a vote of thanks to Judge Gesell for facing the issue squarely—whether or not his ruling is sustained.

THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RELATIONS ACT

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, nearly four decades ago the Congress passed the National Labor Relations Act and set this Nation on a constant course of action to guarantee certain rights and protections to working men and women of America. Under that act American industrial production boomed, corporate growth outreached even the wildest projections, and the era of the sweatshop and human agony was supplanted by a new prosperity and security for wage earners.

Unfortunately, that farsighted act exempted two crucial sectors of our national economy—agricultural workers and public employees. Both were deemed at the time to have special needs and responsibilities which set them apart from the general labor body.

Since passage of that act employment in the public sector has soared to embrace nearly 13 million men and women. The public sector continues to grow more rapidly than any other part of our economy—and yet most of those employees do not enjoy the rights and protections afforded their counterparts all these years in private employment.

The Public Employee Relations Act which several of my colleagues and I are promoting in this session would declare as a national policy that all public employees be allowed to organize and bargain collectively with public management. This is no new notion; rather, it is a long overdue extension of rights which most workers have enjoyed for a generation, to Government employees.

Higher wages, job security, overtime pay, holidays and vacations, medical and hospitalization protection and grievance resolution—these are the benefits afforded employees in the private sector through negotiated agreements with their employers. Government workers continue to depend upon the benevolence of politicians and administrators; however, in too many cases, their needs have fallen low on the priorities lists.

Many public employees today find that their counterparts in private industry enjoy far higher salaries and considerably greater freedom and dignity on the job. This sort of injustice must be overcome and the enactment of the Public Employees Relations Act is a logical first step.

The bill would define the rights of public employees, establish a procedure for choosing labor representatives through elections and provide procedures for resolving management and employee complaints. It creates a collective bargaining framework and contemplates the possible need for binding agreements and the arbitration of unresolved conflicts. Finally, the bill provides for administration of its procedures by a five-man National Public Employees Relations Commission. This Commission is patterned after the National Labor Relations Board but takes note of the legitimate differences in function and decisionmaking processes in the public sector.

Many labor relations authorities insist that a uniform system of employee relations is essential if Government services are to continue to function efficiently. The collective bargaining process has, in the private sector, proven itself to be a dependable mechanism and a fine expression of the free enterprise system. There is no reason to believe that it will not work with equal reliability in protecting the rights of public employees and preserving the high standards of Government operation which Americans have come to expect.

THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN OUR COMMITMENT IN VIETNAM AND IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. ALAN CRANSTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, on April 13, 1971, it was my privilege to address the Los Angeles World Affairs Council on the subject of the U.S. commitment to achieving a lasting peace in the Middle East. I am deeply concerned that the frustration and disillusionment resulting from our involvement in Vietnam could cause us to turn away from

the active role we must play in the Middle East. In the course of my remarks I discussed the differences between our commitment in Vietnam and in the Middle East.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH OF SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON

Disaster could strike us in the Middle East if the U.S. turns away from its world responsibilities because of the frustrations and agonies of the Vietnam war.

The situations in the two areas are totally different, and disillusionment over the way things have turned out in Southeast Asia must not blind us to the fact that Israel's survival and world peace depend on our standing by our commitments.

Vietnam was a bad case of giving commitments in the name of national interests which never existed.

In contrast, we have sound, proper, long-standing commitments to Israel, and our national interests are integrally tied to peace in the area.

There are at least seven fundamental differences between the situation in Southeast Asia and the situation in the Middle East.

1. Our moral obligation to Israel dates back to pre-World War II days when we did far less than we should have to try to stop the Nazi persecution of the Jews, and when we shut our doors to those who fled the slaughter, and forced them to find sanctuary in Palestine. We have no such moral obligations to South Vietnam.

2. The present cease-fire came about largely because of our initiative. We are therefore especially obligated to see that it ends satisfactorily—particularly since the Arabs, with Russian assistance, violated it to Israel's disadvantage by moving SAM anti-aircraft missiles to the Suez Canal.

3. Israel is a Democracy, and one of the few truly free societies in her part of the world.

The South Vietnamese Government, in contrast, is a corrupt military dictatorship.

While it may, unfortunately, be in the recent American tradition to support military dictatorships, doing so is not, in my opinion, in the best interest of the U.S.

4. We are militarily entangled in a foreign civil war in Vietnam.

There is no similar situation in the case of Israel.

5. Israel asks only military equipment from us; the Israelis do their own fighting.

Defending the Government of South Vietnam has cost us 45,000 American lives—and more than a quarter of a million wounded and maimed—and we continue to pay in blood and misery day after day after day.

6. Supporting the South Vietnamese military struggle with as much as \$28.8 billion a year in outright gifts of American taxpayers' money has threatened the value of the dollar, drained our economy, brought us rampant inflation and with it, under present administration policies, a business recession and increased unemployment.

Israel, in contrast, pays for the material we send her.

7. Vital American national interests are not involved in the Indochina war.

If American interests were, in fact, at stake in Southeast Asia we would not be pulling our men out.

On the other hand, America historically has had vital strategic interest in the Middle East.

World War II with the Nazi and Fascist thrusts around the Mediterranean revealed how important that area is.

Today, Russia is moving into the area with

a vast naval fleet, above and below the water, and arms support to the Arabs.

We cannot abandon the nations of the Middle East to the Russians and this includes the Arabs too.

In a very real sense, the U.S. is a truer friend of the Arabs than is the Soviet Union.

And the Arabs need peace above all to make the social and economic progress that their proud people need and deserve.

There is no doubt about our need and desire for peace in the Middle East.

There is grave doubt that the Soviet Union shares our need and desire.

I believe that peace in the Middle East can be brought about—and eventually made permanent—only if it is the result of direct negotiations between the Arabs and the Israelis, and only if Israel winds up with recognized borders that are as geographically defensible as borders can be—and with the means with which to defend them.

Israel cannot achieve proper borders without America's full diplomatic backing.

And to defend her borders against a possible Soviet-supported Arab invasion, she will need continued American economic aid and military weapons until a sound and secure peace is established.

All in all, I think the Nixon Administration has handled an incredibly difficult situation in the Middle East with considerable skill.

It is perhaps its best performance in foreign policy. But I do not believe that the Administration has fully realized the implications of its recent public and private pressures on Israel to accept, either in fact or in principle, a territorial solution before substantive negotiations take place.

Asking the Israelis to draw up a territorial map in advance of direct peace talks is like asking a poker dealer to deal his cards face up.

This, again, is not analogous to the Vietnam situation.

There are no signs that any significant negotiations will ever be possible in Indochina.

This is not true in the Middle East.

Quite understandably, the Israelis refuse to accept oral or written guarantees of security from the United States or anyone else.

The promises of the past quarter century have taught them that, in our violent world of power politics, arms races, and war, they can rely only on security built on armed strength bolstered by an advantageous territorial position.

At numerous times in the past, the United States has been quick to assure Israel of its full diplomatic support—but slow to back up its oral and written guarantees.

Secretary Rogers gave the impression in his news conference on March 16, that the U.S. was minimizing Israel's need for territory as security.

He said:

"Now we don't think geography is solely responsible for security, or even to a large extent responsible for security."

"Certainly in modern-day world situations, geography is ordinarily not important."

The next day, the American press carried headlines like the following, which appeared in California, over stories reporting the Secretary's statements:

"Rogers Urges Israeli Land Concessions"
"Rogers Urges Israel To Concede Conquered Land"

Contrary to the statements made by the Secretary of State, "Geographical considerations" are crucial to any political settlement in this part of the world. In my opinion, they are the critical factor in establishing permanent peace in the Middle East.

Our Government knows that Israel will not accept any settlement that leaves its territorial needs unmet. When these needs are ignored or when we pretend that they can

be compromised, our diplomatic initiatives are blunted because of our apparent inability to understand the unconditional nature of Israel's security requirements.

On March 25, I attended a rather unprecedented closed meeting Secretary Rogers held with 67 Senators to clarify the State Department's position concerning an Arab-Israeli peace settlement.

At this meeting the Secretary assured us that there were no preconditions on the part of the United States that would require the Israelis to withdraw to the Pre-1967 borders before negotiations occur, or to agree in advance to such a withdrawal.

This was the central point which he discussed.

He amply cleared up the misunderstandings that many of us had concerning the American diplomatic position.

I know that the majority of those present were satisfied with his clarifications.

But the Secretary knows how every word of his every public utterance is studied for its open and hidden meaning.

He knows that if the American press interpreted his March 16 remarks as calling on Israel to agree in advance to a territorial settlement, the Arabs and the Russians would interpret it that way, too.

If Secretary Rogers felt that he could explain the American diplomatic position on the Middle East to 67 members of the Senate why hasn't he also told the American public—and the world—that we are not asking the Israelis to agree to the principle of withdrawal before negotiations begin?

Secretary Rogers should provide publicly the same explanation of U.S. policies that he gave privately to Senators. The exact intent of the American policies—both at home and abroad—will be unclear until there is public clarification of the Nixon Administration's policies in the Middle East.

At the heart of this matter is American support of Israel's diplomatic position.

No one is asking that we blindly follow the dictates of any nation.

But our commitment to peace in the Middle East must be a commitment to obtain a stable and lasting peace.

All parties must feel secure.

All must be relatively satisfied.

The leaders of both Israel and the Arab states must be able to come before their people with a politically acceptable settlement.

An American diplomatic position which is weak and ambivalent in regard to Israel's legitimate territorial needs threatens the possibility of achieving true peace in the middle East.

Perhaps we have privately—in official and unofficial circles—taken diplomatic steps to demonstrate support for Israel's territorial needs.

But the credibility of such a private position is jeopardized by the Secretary of State's public silence.

The nature of what Israel deems its proper and vital territorial needs are no secret.

A few days before the closed session of Senators with Secretary Rogers, I attended a similar closed meeting of Senators with Israel's Foreign Secretary, Abba Eban.

At that private meeting, as elsewhere publicly, Israel has made it abundantly clear that she believes she has three basic security needs:

1. A demilitarized Sinai Peninsula to serve as a buffer between Israel and Egypt.

Israel has also made it plain, however, that she has no desire to hold forever the Great Sinai Desert she presently occupies.

2. An Israel presence at Sharm El Shiek—at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba—with a connecting link to Ellat, the port of entry for most of Israel's oil imports.

The Israelis do not demand permanent possession of Sharm El Shiek—but they feel they must be there for the foreseeable future.

Abba Eban suggested that a 99-year Israeli lease of Sharm El Sheikh would be an acceptable alternative to actual sovereignty.

3. Possession of the Golan Heights.

Taken from Syria in 1967, the Israelis are firm in the belief that the Heights must remain in their hands to insure that they cannot be used by Syrian artillery forces to fire on Israeli agricultural settlements in the Golan.

Finally, the Israelis have never indicated a desire to hold the territory they presently occupy on the West bank of the Jordan. They have declared, however, that they will not again divide the City of Jerusalem, for religious, historic, and symbolic reasons.

For the U.S. to act as if these territorial needs deemed absolutely essential by Israel are, to use Secretary Rogers' March 16 phrase, "not important" has put Israel in the untenable position of having to publicly disagree with her strongest ally.

This has encouraged the Arab states, and their Soviet allies to become increasingly intransigent on the issue of negotiations and territorial adjustments.

Furthermore, the continued American focus on ways to guarantee the peace in the absence of any real move toward direct peace negotiations seems to be based on the illusion that peace can be had if only we can find someone to enforce it.

Enforcing a peace between bitter enemies is, of course, important. But the Horse has been placed before the cart.

A settlement needs many things before it needs an army to enforce it.

Needed now—before direct negotiations—are specific steps which will dissipate the atmosphere of Israeli-Arab mistrust.

The Suez Canal could be reopened with Israeli right of passage.

A discussion of the future status of refugees could be begun.

Prisoners of war could be exchanged before peace negotiations take place.

I do not believe that the United States can play the role of neutral mediator in the Middle East.

We are morally and historically committed to Israel's survival.

The Arab nations rightly question our impartiality.

The Nixon administration has failed to realize that when we diplomatically stray from reasonable support of Israeli territorial needs we neither gain friends in the Arab world nor move the parties closer to peace.

Our role must be to do everything to bring both sides to direct negotiations.

The chances for an Arab-Israeli peace conference are directly related to the support Israel receives from the United States.

As long as President Sadat feels that Israel lacks complete American diplomatic support he will set unreasonable preconditions on direct Egyptian participation in a Middle East settlement with Israel.

TORRANCE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a significant increase in the quality of medical care available to the residents of Torrance, Calif., and surrounding cities in the 17th Congressional District, will be recognized on May 1 of this year when the new Torrance Memorial Hospital is dedicated.

This seven-story, 250-bed structure will be one of the most modern medical

facilities in the South Bay area. It was built at the cost of \$9 million, with \$3.2 million in Federal funds provided under the Hill-Burton Act and the remainder coming from industry and citizens served by the hospital. Its area of service includes all of the cities west of the Harbor Freeway and south of Rosecrans Avenue.

Torrance Memorial is a nonprofit community hospital created by combining the former Jared Sydney Torrance Memorial Hospital and Riviera Community Hospital. It is fully accredited by the Joint Commission on Accreditation.

With the population in the hospital's service area doubling in the past decade, it became apparent that expanded medical facilities would be needed. A 10-acre site was acquired at 3330 Lomita Boulevard in the heart of a 53-acre medical complex that is now being developed north of the Torrance Airport.

The new hospital will provide complete acute general hospital care and is also equipped with a six-bed coronary care unit with sophisticated monitoring equipment, a six-bed intensive care unit for medical or surgical patients, and a large area devoted to the rapidly developing field of nuclear medicine.

Built on the Friesen architectural plan, the completely soundproofed building utilizes a central core for supply, processing and distributions systems. The food service makes use of mass-production techniques including microwave cooking equipment. A complete electrical generator is on constant standby status in the event of a power failure. A giant disposal system grinds all wastes, reducing its bulk by 80 percent and expelling it as a fine powder.

Other specialized medical departments include its well-equipped laboratory which will conduct extensive serology tests for parasitic diseases, the only laboratory of its type in the United States offering direct service to the physician.

Its emergency department is specifically designed to meet the needs of the surrounding industrial community. Surgeries, blood bank and X-ray departments, located on the first floor, assure patients of complete attention within minutes of arrival at the hospital in emergency conditions.

Torrance Memorial Hospital has been designated as the West Coast headquarters for the International Eye Foundation based here in Washington, D.C. The hospital will collect transplant material from eye banks in California and surrounding Western States. If not required locally within 20 hours, these eye tissues will be sent abroad for use within the critical 48-hour period after their donation.

After the opening of the modern new hospital, the board of directors plans to dispose of the existing facilities in Torrance—the old Torrance Memorial Hospital which has been in service since 1925 and the present Riviera Community Hospital which was built in 1957. One proposal which is still under consideration is the conversion of Riviera Community Hospital to a psychiatric clinic.

The well-being of the patient has always been the prime concern of the staffs of the present hospitals, and I am certain this will continue to be true in the new facility which will provide the

very finest of modern medical and surgical techniques and equipment.

Mr. Speaker, as with any project of this magnitude, it was completed as a result of the dreams and dedicated hard work of many people.

Among those who should be honored for their efforts to bring the new Torrance Memorial Hospital to reality are its administrator, Ron Harper; Margaret Wooley, president of the board of directors; Dr. John Steward, chief of staff and a member of the board; and Judy Miller, president of the woman's auxiliary and wife of Mayor Ken Miller.

Equal recognition is deserved by the other members of the board: Vice President John Barrington, Secretary Dean Sears, Treasurer Philip Halloran, J. Robert Bloomfield, M.D.; Jack R. Brocken, M.D.; William G. Davis, Vernon Hughes, Kenneth Marsden, Mrs. John D. Melville, John Nursall, M.D.; George W. Post, C. Nelson Rucker, Maurice D. Schwartz, Mrs. John A. Shidler, Ray B. Slaney, Samuel C. Steward, Mrs. Grover Whyte, George Wing, and a longtime friend, our colleague, the Honorable CHARLES H. WILSON.

MINERVA S. BUERK HONORED BY
GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE AS ONE
OF SIX DISTINGUISHED AMERICAN WOMEN

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a well-known doctor from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has been highly honored by the Government of France.

Minerva S. Buerk, M.D., from Bryn Mawr, Pa., who is President of the American Medical Women's Association, has been honored as one of six "distinguished American women" by the Government of France. She will be the guest of the French Government from April 23 to May 6, 1971, on a 2-week tour of France which will include visits to places the French Government believes will be of interest to the women as representatives of American women.

Dr. Buerk and the other visiting "distinguished American women" will be honored at a luncheon on Thursday, April 22, given by the Honorable Charles Lucet, Ambassador from France, and Mme. Lucet, at the French Embassy in Washington, D.C., prior to their departure from Washington. Upon arrival they will be greeted by a welcoming ceremony extended by the French Foreign Office.

Dr. Buerk served as chief of dermatology at the Bryn Mawr Hospital from 1958 to 1969 and became consultant in dermatology at the hospital in 1970. She is on the teaching staff at the University of Pennsylvania, and at the Medical College of Pennsylvania. She conducts a private practice in dermatology.

Dr. Buerk believes the medical profession is in a state of flux now which could mean more opportunities for women in the future. She has stated that:

The medical profession is changing its image and is making the changes fast because we need doctors.

Dr. Buerk said:

The American Medical Women's Association relies on counselling to get more women into the medical field.

She listed pediatrics, general medicine, gynecology, psychiatry, and anesthesiology as good medical fields for women. "Dermatology is another ideal field for women," she added. She also said:

Medicine is a very demanding career, but it's also one of the most gratifying, both intellectually and emotionally. That's why it's a natural for women.

JOBS FOR THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, as we have been debating the accelerated public works bill, H.R. 5376, during the last 2 days I have pointed out why it is so 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 opposed the attempt yesterday by the ranking minority Member, Mr. HARSHA, to strike title I of the bill which is the part that provides the authorization for the accelerated public works. I am pleased we were able to keep the bill intact.

I. STATUS OF EMPLOYMENT IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST IN 1971

The unemployment chart which has been available to Members as they enter the House Chamber shows 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 the 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:

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Streets and sewers..... | \$16,810,000 |
| Parks and recreation..... | 1,322,500 |
| Fire..... | 2,623,000 |
| Water..... | 3,245,000 |
| Building (Engineering Personnel Building, and purchase and conversion of Armory in Seattle Center)..... | 5,050,000 |
| 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 of the bill directly provides the necessary authorization to help our area because of our sharp rise in unemployment.

III. OTHER EMERGENCY RELIEF

First. 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.

Second. 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. Unfortunately, President Nixon 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. I am strongly committed to providing these working opportunities for the unemployed, including those on public assistance.

Third. 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 to \$40 million to aid in fire protection; to increase the cooperative forest management account from \$5 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 manufactured 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. This will mean the purchase of new equipment attractive to business. 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 Seattle 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 is part of what can be an overall program to make jobs available to our people.

IT IS ONLY FITTING

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the April 1971 issue of Army magazine had a stirring and touching article which requires no comment. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

IT IS ONLY FITTING

(NOTE.—The following "obituary" was written before his death last 7 July by Maj. John A. Hottell III, 27, who was aide to Maj. Gen. George W. Casey when the general's helicopter crashed into a mountain in Vietnam, killing all six aboard. Maj. Hottell—the holder of two Silver Stars, a former Rhodes scholar and No. 10 in his 1964 West Point class—was an excellent writer who authored two articles for Army. The last, "Motivation in Combat," appeared in the February 1970 issue. The son of Col. John A. Hottell, USA, retired, Maj. Hottell wrote this moving description of what Army life meant to him for The Assembly, which is published by the Association of Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy.)

I am taking the somewhat macabre step of writing my own obituary for several reasons, and I hope none of them are too trite. First, I would like to spare my friends, who may happen to read this, the usual clichés about being a good soldier, etc. They were all kind enough to me, and I not enough to them. Second, I would not want to be a party to perpetuation of an image that is harmful and inaccurate; "glory" is the most meaningless of concepts, and I feel that in some cases it is doubly damaging. And third, I am quite simply the last authority on my own death.

I loved the Army; it reared me, it nurtured me, and it gave me the most satisfying years of my life. Thanks to it, I have lived an entire lifetime in 27 years. It is only fitting that I should die in its service. We all have but one death to spend, and insofar as it can have any meaning, it finds it in the service of comrades-in-arms.

And yet, I deny that I died for anything: not my country, not my Army, not my fellow man, none of these things. I lived for these things, and the manner in which I chose to do it involved the very real chance that I would die in the execution of my duties. I knew this, and accepted it, but my love for West Point and the Army was great enough—and the promise that I would some day be able to serve all the ideals that meant anything to me through it was great enough—for me to accept this possibility as a part of a price which must be paid for all things of great value. If there is nothing worth dying for—in this sense—there is nothing worth living for.

The Army has let me live in Japan, Germany and England with experiences in all of these places that others only dream about. I have killed a scorpion in my tent camping in Turkey, climbed Mount Fuji, visited the ruins of Athens, Ephesus and Rome, seen the town of Gordius where another Alexander challenged his destiny, gone to the opera in Munich and plays in the West End of London, seen the Oxford-Cambridge rugby match, gone for pub crawls through the Cotswolds, seen the night life of Hamburg, danced to the Rolling Stones, and earned a master's degree in a foreign university [Magdalen College, Oxford, England, as a Rhodes scholar].

I have known what it is like to be married to a fine and wonderful woman and to love her beyond bearing with the sure knowledge that she loves me; I have commanded a company [in combat] and been father, priest, income-tax advisor, confessor and judge for 200 men at one time; I have played college football and rugby, won the British national diving championship two years in a row, boxed for Oxford against Cambridge only to be knocked out in the first round, played handball to distraction—and all of these sports I loved I learned at West Point. They gave me hours of intense happiness.

I have been an exchange student at the German Military Academy, and gone to the German jumpmaster school. I have made 30 parachute jumps from everything from a balloon in England to a jet at Fort Bragg. I have written articles that were published in Army magazine, and I have studied philosophy. I have skied in the Alps and lived on a racehorse farm in Kentucky for two years. I have experienced all these things because I was in the Army and was an Army brat.

The Army is my life; it is such a part of what I was that what happened is the logical outcome of the life I lived. I never knew what it is to fail; I never knew what it is to be too old and too tired to do anything. I lived a full life in the Army, and it has exacted the price. It is only just.

KANSAS CITY KEEPS THE WOLF AWAY FROM THE DOOR

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable pride that I insert the following editorial concerning Kansas City, Mo., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. At a time when most major cities are near desperation in terms of mounting problems, the following Kansas City Star

editorial of April 18 finds our city "a conspicuous exception" in terms of progress and financial stability:

KANSAS CITY KEEPS THE WOLF AWAY FROM THE DOOR

This spring Kansas City stands out as a conspicuous exception among American cities. While the leaders of many other large communities are grinding their teeth in near desperation, not knowing whether they can meet the next payroll or not, the finances of this municipality have finally been put in order—at least temporarily.

Mayor Charles B. Wheeler, Jr., and the new council can turn their attention to other problems, assured that revenue will not be the dominant concern of the next four years. Many other mayors have not been so fortunate. Here is a sampling, made recently in Washington, which suggests how grave conditions are elsewhere:

Mayor Moon Landrieu of New Orleans: "We are virtually at the border of decay. We have taxed everything that moves and everything that it moves in."

Mayor Carl Stokes of Cleveland: "I can't even add a policeman or a fireman. We can't even do the basic, fundamental thing of filling chukholes in the streets." Stokes has had to fire 1,500 city employees because the money wasn't there to pay them.

Mayor Ken Gibson of Newark: "We are broke and bankrupt. We have the highest of everything—infant mortality, tuberculosis, crime. Wherever American cities are going, Newark is going to get there first."

Mayor Wes Ullman of Seattle: Americans "have lost their love for cities." Although mayors have cried "wolf" before, "the wolf is here."

These observations do not highlight the unusual. They are typical of what most American mayors are saying in 1971 to describe the plight of the city. To suggest that they are exaggerating would be to ignore the most dangerous domestic problem facing the nation.

CRISIS THAT OVERWHELMS

So far the American solution to the urban crisis has been likened to "nailing a two-by-four across a chasm caused by an earthquake." And short of massive revenue sharing from Washington there are few hopeful indications that the quality of life can be substantially improved in most of the great cities of this nation.

Kansas City has its share of problems in 1971. They are very real and some of them are very large. The critical financial position of the public schools, the transit system and the Philharmonic orchestra are only three that come immediately to mind. But those difficulties, as serious as they are, should not be allowed to obscure the brighter side.

Today Kansas City is one of the few major communities in the United States that is on a sound financial footing. It took a sustained effort spanning eight years, but by the time Mayor Ilius W. Davis and the old council left office April 10 the basic tax structure of this community had been realigned to meet the crushing demands of inflation and the need for expanded services.

This is not to suggest that Mayor Ullman's "wolf" has been permanently shooved from the Kansas City door. If costs and wages continue to spiral in the years ahead, this city could again face the choice of higher taxes or a retrenchment of municipal services. But those alternatives do not confront the new administration today.

They don't because of two essential ingredients: Leadership at City hall and a willingness of the voters to respond to genuine needs. If the people of Kansas City had refused to increase their own taxes to finance an adequate level of services, by necessity Mayor Wheeler would now be joining the lamentations of Mayors Landrieu, Stokes, Gibson, Ullman and many others.

Although the events of the last eight years

are well-known, they merit a brief review in this period of transition at City hall. In 1963, when the Davis administration took over, the city was virtually bankrupt. A concerted effort in the Missouri Legislature that spring won authorization for an earnings tax of one-half per cent, subject to approval at the polls. On December 17, 1963, by a majority of 64 per cent, the voters agreed to levy a new tax on themselves.

After a short period of municipal solvency, inflation devoured most of those revenue gains. Again the city turned to Jefferson City, but to no avail. By the summer of 1968 Kansas City was desperate. An increase in the utilities tax offered the only way out. But a proposal to hike that levy from 6 to 10 per cent was turned down 12 to 1 by the council. After he cast the only affirmative vote, Mayor Davis said:

"It is inconceivable in this prosperous year that this city should be faced with getting rid of . . . policemen and cutting 100 beds for the poor at General hospital."

By September six councilmen had changed their minds and the increase was approved on a 7-to-6 vote. However, the higher collections on utilities provided no more than stop-gap relief, as wages and all other costs continued to soar. In 1969, the Legislature permitted Kansas City to double the E-tax to 1 per cent, if the voters would go along at the polls. Last December 17—exactly seven years to the day after the first successful E-tax election—the people of Kansas City agreed to dip deeper into their pocketbooks. This time the majority was 64.9 per cent.

IMPROVEMENTS, NOT CUTBACKS

As a direct result Kansas City is strengthening municipal services, rather than laying off employees as Mayor Stokes is doing in Cleveland. The police department has already begun to hire more patrolmen in order to reach the goal of 1,300 men by May 1, 1972. The crime rate, which dropped here in 1970, has continued to decline this year. Municipal trash collection has become a reality at last. More street lights are being installed. Chuckholes are being patched.

Instead of succumbing to paralysis and retrenchment across the board, which is the prospect for most American cities, this community is moving ahead. After a long and sometimes agonizing struggle, City hall has finally obtained a financial base that many other cities must envy.

While his remarkable success offers little immediate comfort to the public schools, the transit system and the orchestra, it does suggest that the people of Kansas City are willing to respond to unified, constructive leadership in times of genuine crisis. Now the challenge is to apply this same pattern, or still another formula, to the difficulties that persist.

The accomplishments of the last eight years at City hall demonstrate that responsive and determined leaders can find solutions to even the most baffling problems. When they do, the Kansas City record proves that the people have the foresight and the courage to follow through at the polls.

CATFISH FARMING CONTINUES TO GAIN

HON. DAVID PRYOR

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, Leland DuVall, staff writer of the Arkansas Gazette, has written an article on "Catfish Farming," which has become one of the important industries in my State during the past few years.

Lincoln, Ashley, and Desha Counties in my district are the three leading catfish producers in Arkansas. Catfish is grown on approximately 13,850 acres in the State and the crop value has been estimated at about \$6.9 million.

I commend this interesting article, which appeared in the April 6 issue of the Gazette, to the attention of my colleagues and include it in the appendix of the RECORD:

CATFISH FARMING CONTINUES TO GAIN

(By Leland DuVall)

The bottom-lurking, stout jawed, glut-shaped denizen of the muddy lakes and sluggish streams—known simply as the catfish to every lad who ever shouldered a fishing pole—is gradually and stubbornly yielding to domestication and commercialization. Preliminary figures have been compiled on Arkansas production last year and they indicate that the industry experienced significant growth, but at a slower rate than the previous year.

(For the benefit of those who worry about such matters, the word "glut" in this context is used to mean the wooden wedge that was a standard tool of the railsplitters.)

Dr. Roy Grizzell, biologist with the Soil Conservation Service, has estimated that catfish were grown last year on about 14,850 acres in Arkansas, compared with 10,950 acres in 1969, and 5,950 acres in 1968. He placed crop value at about \$6.9 million.

The catfish food crop is only a part of the fish farming activities in Arkansas. Grizzell said catfish fingerlings were produced on 2,173 acres last year, compared with 1,611 acres the previous year, and 1,025 acres in 1966. He estimated the yield at 41 million fingerlings, but said the producers might not sell all of them this spring. Some fingerlings may be "carried over" until next year, when they will be larger and when, presumably, the value will be greater.

While channel catfish accounted for most of the sales, Grizzell said some growers were producing blue catfish, albino channel catfish and white catfish.

Lincoln County, with 2,725 acres, was the leading producer followed by Ashley, 999 acres; Desha, 954 acres; Greene, 763 acres; Lawrence, 729 acres, and Lonoke, 648 acres.

Food fish comprised only one segment of the fish farming business. The other and better-established bait minnow industry had gross sales of almost \$6.6 million and required 18,733 acres of Arkansas land. The bait minnow production showed relatively little change from the 18,241 acres used in 1969, but was somewhat larger than the 16,844 acres in 1968.

Lonoke County continued to lead in the production of minnows with 10,530 acres. It was followed by Prairie County (2,460 acres), Monroe (925), Woodruff (915), Desha (913) and Drew (761 acres).

Catfish production, as an agricultural crop, is relatively new in this part of the world. (Domestic fish culture in some countries is an ancient business.) Apparently, farmers in the South began to consider it as a serious business about 1960. Since that time, persons familiar with the industry have drawn rough parallels between catfish farming and broiler production and have predicted that the business would experience sensational growth within a few years. Despite the optimistic outlook, realists recognize that many problems will have to be overcome if catfish are to approach broilers in the matter of volume and value.

At the moment, the more serious growing pains seem to be somewhat similar to those experienced by the pioneers in the broiler business. One of the major tasks is to move all segments of the industry at approximately the same speed.

When production expands faster than processing facilities, farmers end up with

ponds full of fish that cannot be moved. In too many processing plants are built, the facilities stay idle too much of the time and the operators cannot show a profit. The key to the success of the business probably is at the retail level where customer demand must expand at least as rapidly as production and processing in order to avoid a market glut. (Note the marvelous flexibility of the English language. The word here has an entirely different meaning.)

In the past, the demand for catfish has been limited by several factors:

In extreme cases, people were not even aware that the catfish was edible.

Many who knew that catfish were caught and consumed or sold believed the quality of the meat was inferior. They regarded the catfish as a scavenger that inhabited only the muddy or contaminated waters that would not support other species and, heretofore, they reasoned that he was not an attractive table fish.

At the other side of the spectrum was a group—ranging from the rural gourmand to the sophisticated gourmet—who knew that the catfish ranked with the best of the fresh-water fish.

The growth rate of the industry likely will be determined more by the success of its promoters in convincing potential consumers to "try" their product than in the limiting factors associated with production and processing. Despite the fact that research and experiments with commercial production of catfish are in their early stages, the producers and processors almost certainly will be able to meet growing demands with only an occasional lag.

The growth potential in Arkansas appears to be relatively good. A recently published review of research into catfish farming, compiled by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the Department of the Interior, reported that catfish farming was practiced on a commercial scale in 15 states, but it said that about 80 per cent of the total production of pond-raised catfish was concentrated in "the Central Mississippi Delta Region, embracing parts of Arkansas, Mississippi and Louisiana."

The report said:

"This region has several characteristics that lend themselves to fish production. These include a temperate climate, an abundant water supply, many impervious soils and large, well-financed farming enterprises."

Given this basic foundation of favorable factors, coupled with a growing body of technical knowledge related to production and marketing, catfish farming in the region may continue to expand. At any rate there is a good chance that if those who are in the business can detect an opportunity for a profit they will find a way to produce the fish.

RURAL ELECTRIC CO-OPS

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the President's new approaches to foreign aid in the seventies, I would like to relate his proposals to a particular aspect of these programs which has long been of interest to me. I refer to the contribution the United States is making to a brighter tomorrow in the developing countries by helping to bring the benefits of light and power to rural towns and villages.

Our foreign aid program has over the years done much to encourage the growth of rural electricity cooperatives in the

poorer nations. These are the same organizations which did so much to improve the lives of our own farmers back in the thirties. As an example, the Agency for International Development is currently cooperating with India's Rural Electric Corp., and with Indian state electricity boards in developing five large pilot cooperatives designed to serve some 85,000 families and power about 18,000 irrigation pumps. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association—the NRECA—is providing the advisory services of American specialists for the project under an AID contract.

A \$3.1-million loan also is helping the Republic of the Philippines to establish two pilot cooperatives which will bring light and power to an estimated 15,000 families during the first year of the service scheduled to start in September. American specialists provided by NRECA are advising the cooperatives on model distribution systems, and a \$5-million AID grant has helped the South Vietnamese organize three pilot cooperatives serving almost 250,000 people—many of them farmers—in the northern highlands at Da Lat, at Ho Nai just north of Saigon, and at Long Xuyen in the Delta. American specialists recruited by NRECA also provided advisory assistance in Vietnam.

For farmers, rural electricity cooperatives mean the opportunity to use new, improved tilling techniques—such as tubewell irrigation powered by electric pumps which can bring in more crops and income on terms farmers can afford. For governments, rural electricity means the opportunity to promote rural economic growth by way of greater agricultural productivity and small, mechanized industries. And rural economic growth, in turn, means more demand for labor and less incentive for village people to join the rural exodus to overcrowded cities.

The proposals by their emphasis on utilizing the talents of the American private sector in international development, will further the use of cooperatives and other expert American organizations in bringing the benefits of modern technology to the rural areas of the developing countries. Such encouragement of rural electricity cooperatives is an excellent example of the concept of a shared partnership with the developing world.

THE TROUBLE AHEAD

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following column by Joseph Alsop deals with the deteriorating state of the U.S. strategic force capability in the face of a growing Soviet threat.

Writing from Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr., the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command, Mr. Alsop states that—

Leaders of our Strategic Air Command are not merely convinced that the huge former

American margin of power has now been lost. They are further convinced that the Soviets today probably enjoy a favorable margin of nuclear strategic power that is now on the order of five-to-three.

And that—

The Laird claim of "parity" is squarely based on optimistic rejection of important evidence.

In a recent prepared testimony before the Senate Committee on the Armed Forces, Gen. John D. Ryan, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, gave this appraisal of the fiscal year 1972 resources which the Air Force has been allotted to counter the growing Soviet threat:

Despite our best efforts to maintain optimum forces and to achieve a measure of near and long term modernization. I see our Air Force capability continuing to decline relative to its possible adversaries. Even with the leveling off of the severity of our reductions over the past 2 years, I can support this (budget request) as a tenable position on the assumption that concrete improvements are made in three areas: First, that the growing nuclear capability of the Soviet Union is checked by enforceable agreements resulting from the strategic arms limitation talks. Second, that free world self-defense capabilities are increased in line with the Nixon doctrine. And third, that we continue to reduce our commitments in Southeast Asia. Unless progress can be achieved in these endeavors, the budget which we are presenting to you today will fall short of the Air Force capability we need.

In other words, if the Soviets do not stop their strategic buildup voluntarily by agreeing to enforceable arms limitation at SALT, or if our allies do not dramatically increase their own spending for defense, or if we cannot continue to reduce our commitments in Southeast Asia, a commitment, I might add, which could be rapidly reduced by destroying the enemy's capability to continue the war, then the capability of our Air Force will be below what General Ryan sees as necessary.

This is a startling statement which clearly reveals the highly dubious basis of the new U.S. strategy which the administration refers to as "Realistic Deterrence." As far as many people are concerned there is nothing whatsoever realistic about gearing the concrete capabilities of our Armed Forces around a possible agreement with the Soviet Union. In fact it becomes positively disadvantageous for the Soviets to make an agreement when they know that by not making one they can assure their own superiority.

Mr. Alsop concludes this article with the statement:

The Soviets are clearly aiming for what the Pentagon calls a first strike capability.

A first strike capability is being able to reduce the enemy's retaliatory power below some acceptable threshold through the use of counterforce, strategic weapons which have the capability of destroying our strategic forces before launch, such as the SS-9 25-megaton weapon which could be used against our Minuteman force or the Soviet SLBM which could be used against our B-52 force, and ballistic missile defense. Ballistic missile defense—BMD—includes both active defenses, such as the Soviet ABM complexes

now operational around Moscow, and passive defense measures such as the civil defense programs on which the Soviets are placing such heavy emphasis.

The presidentially appointed Blue Ribbon Defense Panel's supplemental report makes the point that the Soviets are structuring their strategic offensive forces in a manner consistent only with the needs of a first strike. The report states:

Our planners in the 60's assumed that if both super-powers had an adequate survivable retaliatory capability neither would risk a first strike. They further assumed that the Soviet leadership would be content with this "balance of deterrence," especially if—by freezing our own program—we permitted the Soviet Union to attain a rough parity of strength. Little consideration appears to have been given to the possibility that the Soviets would not "buy" such a rational program, but rather would seek a capability to neutralize the effectiveness of our retaliatory response.

It now appears that the Soviet Union is developing just such a capability. It is producing and deploying offensive nuclear weapons with the capability, when sufficient are deployed, to destroy the ICBM and bomber elements of our retaliatory forces. At the same time, the Soviet Union is pressing ahead with an anti-ballistic missile system designed to provide a strategic defense against such U.S. retaliatory missiles as might survive a first strike.

It is to be remembered that, with the possible exception of our obsolete B-52 force, our strategic weapons are designed primarily for retaliation against enemy centers of population. They are not designed as counterforce weapons and with their limited warheads are not an effective weapon for destroying Soviet ICBM's in hardened silos. This is in accord with America's irreversible commitment never to make a first strike, and to rely—as a deterrent—on having enough operational missiles after an enemy strike to destroy its population centers.

This entire theory becomes untenable if the enemy develops (1) an offensive first-strike capability against our means of delivering retaliatory missiles and (2) a defensive capability of protecting much of its heartland from such U.S. missiles (e.g., Polaris) as survive the preemptive strike.

The evidence is reasonably conclusive that the Soviet Union is planning precisely these capabilities. This is not to say that a preemptive first strike is intended, but rather that weapons systems which are needed only for such a purpose are being deployed:

Mr. Alsop's column follows:

THE TROUBLE AHEAD

(By Joseph Alsop)

OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE, OMAHA.—When you come out here to the rather unpretentious headquarters of American deterrent power, you find yourself endlessly reliving the Cuban missile crisis of the autumn of 1962.

At that time, the United States enjoyed a margin of nuclear-strategic power that was at least five-to-one; and it may have been as high as ten to one. Despite this huge margin of superiority, and despite the wisdom and courage of President Kennedy, it is not too much to say that the leaders of the U.S. government were breathless with fear until the Cuban missile crisis ended successfully.

You find yourself haunted by these facts, out here at Offutt nearly nine years later, for two very simple reasons. To begin with, the leaders of our Strategic Air Command are not merely convinced that the huge former American margin of power has now been lost.

They are further convinced that the Soviets today probably enjoy a favorable margin of nuclear-strategic power that is now on the order of five-to-three. This is not the view of those like Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, who say that there is now "parity" between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.

But the Laird claim of "parity" is squarely based on optimistic rejection of important evidence. Notably, there is the evidence, firmly believed by the SAC analysts, that the Soviets already possess an extensive ABM defense system disguised as a system of anti-aircraft defense. The balance of power, and therefore the margin of either side, of course includes defensive strength as well as offensive strength.

As to the second reason, the power of the American deterrent has remained absolutely stable, or has even declined, for a period of years. Small advances have been, and are being made, here and there. But SAC's B-52 force, for example, has declined from 600 to 452 aircraft. Many items of SAC's equipment, including many of the strategic missiles, have reached the stage of obsolescence. Overall, in sum, the American deterrent has been complacently neglected for years on end.

In contrast, Soviet nuclear power has been built up, continuously, remorselessly and often with surprising advances, ever since the period just after the Cuban missile crisis. The technical components of this Soviet power do not matter as much as the over-all balance. That is probably five-to-three in the Soviets' favor at present, as stated above. By 1974, or thereabouts, the balance should be at least two-to-one in the Soviets' favor. And it just could be much worse than that!

To see the dreadful meaning of this dreadful forecast, it is only necessary to think of two things. First, think of the fear (and in some quarters, the plain weakness and uncertainty) that could be seen in the U.S. government in the 1962 Cuban crisis, when this country had a five-to-one margin over the Soviets.

Second, think of Israel. For Israel is confronted nowadays, not just by her surrounding Arab enemies, but by Soviet airmen and other soldiers ready to fight side by side with the Arabs. The Middle Eastern situation has again deteriorated gravely. The wisest men in Washington are again talking of "war breaking out again this summer."

That is no sure prediction. But one prediction is absolutely sure. If the Soviets finally push forward their Arab clients against Israel, they will never tolerate another great defeat in the Middle East. They will stop at nothing; they will do anything that is required, to avert such defeat—if they ever take the road of renewed war. And averting defeat for the Arabs necessarily means defeat, if not destruction, for Israel.

In these circumstances, empty-headed people in the U.S. government still prate about this country "never letting Israel be destroyed." But because of the factors above-described, they are lying. The "never" is what makes them liars. Suppose there is no way to prevent Israel's destruction except a nuclear confrontation, with all the advantages on the side of the Soviets. In that horrible event, the American attempt to save Israel will not go beyond hand-wringing, empty gestures, and United Nations twaddle.

Such are the cruel realities of the changing nuclear-strategic balance. The Soviets are clearly aiming for what the Pentagon calls a first strike capability. For various technical reasons, however, there is little need to fear a Soviet first strike against the U.S., at any rate in the years just ahead.

But there is every reason to fear U.S. impotence in the face of the most terrible future developments, of which a Soviet-supported attack on Israel is only one example. And U.S. impotence is sure, if the nuclear-strategic balance goes on being neglected.

AN AMERICAN BUSINESSMAN'S CONCERN FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

HON. JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. McCOLLISTER. Mr. Speaker, George Barrie, president of Faberge, Inc., recently addressed executives of Tip Top Products at the 16th and Cuming Street plant in Omaha, Nebr. Faberge is the parent corporation to Tip Top and other companies engaged in the manufacture and distribution of fragrance and beauty products.

As a director of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, I was impressed by Mr. Barrie's concern both for business and the environment. He directed his employees' attention to the great obligation they must have for the preservation of our natural resources.

While I take great pride with my constituents in the Omaha company's success, the responsibility Mr. Barrie enunciated for his executives and employees contributing to environmental protection was most enlightening. He stated in part:

Your company has chosen for its core—discipline and innovation. This choice reflects management's dedication to growth as the most effective corporate strategy in a world of accelerating change. . . . In addition to our basic marketing job, we feel a serious responsibility in making a better world in which to live . . . for all peoples. We have been pioneers in movements to create action in doing something about pollution control, our environmental protection, an understanding of the ecological problems we face . . . and the necessity to do something about them. We have never had any attitude towards discrimination in any form or manner except that discrimination towards our fellow man is wasteful, destructive and beneath the dignity of mankind.

For a large corporation whose chief purpose must be profit, I find this attitude by their chief executive officer enlightening and commendable.

Our State of Nebraska has long been known for its wealth of natural resources and the pride our citizens have in it. Therefore, it is gratifying to hear an industrialist of a profitmaking organization volunteer "that industry has a great stake in the entire environmental protection movement in our country."

Mr. Barrie made this analogy:

Good grooming and beauty go hand in hand. Our cities, towns and countryside require protection of their natural beauty just as a glamorous woman who, in analysis, appears elegant and chic because of her attention to her best features and because she takes consistent care of them. We cannot expect beauty to be legislated alone as it is the personal responsibility of each of us, regardless of the assistance we may enjoy from government.

It is more than concern for the esoteric, this initiation of institutional and personal pride in the American environment we will be passing to our children and their children's children. It is simply good for all businesses and all forms of industry.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you are aware that the U.S. Government will spend nearly \$225 billion this fiscal year on the

business of this country. It is, therefore, gratifying to note that industry such as Mr. Barrie's is ready, willing and currently involved in spending its energy and dollars to support the worthy efforts for environmental protection in Nebraska and throughout the entire United States of America, as insurance for a better life for us now and in the future.

QUEEN ISABELLA OF SPAIN: THE 520TH ANNIVERSARY OF HER BIRTH

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 520th anniversary of the birth of a woman regarded by many historians as the most able and illustrious sovereign ever to occupy the Spanish throne, Isabella de Castilla. The preeminence of Spain during the end of the 15th century and for most of the 16th century is attributable in large measure to the strength of the policy Isabella fostered and developed during her brief reign. Of particular significance was her influence on the lives and achievements of Columbus; of the great general, Gonzalo de Cordova; and of her royal consort, Fernando de Aragon.

Born on April 22, 1451, at Madrigal, Castile, Spain, Isabella was the daughter of Juan II of Castile by his second wife, Isabella, and the granddaughter of Juan I of Portugal. Through both of her parents she was a descendant of the famous John of Gaunt of England. On October 19, 1469, she married Fernando de Aragon at Valladolid and, upon the death of her brother, Enrique IV, she was proclaimed Queen of Castile and Leon on December 13, 1474.

Much of the greatness which Spain achieved under "Los Reyes Catolicos" is due to Queen Isabella's clear intellect, great energy, and unselfish patriotism. Isabella's conquest of the Moorish kingdom of Granada gave to Castile and all of Spain an importance which it never before possessed. One country, one faith, and one monarchy were achieved under Isabella's tireless labors.

By uniting the crowns of Castile and Aragon, Isabella essentially founded the Spanish monarchy. By her encouragement of and impetus to trade and industry, she increased the national wealth and prosperity of her country. By sponsoring and supporting Columbus in his great discovery of the New World, she achieved lasting world renown and gratitude—not to mention the greatly expanded economic, political, and diplomatic opportunities available to Spain in the 16th century. On November 24, 1504—after a 30-year reign—Isabella died at Medina del Campo.

Isabella's legacy continues to thrive today, not only in Spain but in the Americas as well. Those of us of Latin American background have been directly affected by her contributions. It would be a fitting tribute—not only to honor the memory of this great woman

but to also highlight the contributions and accomplishments of the Spanish-speaking world—by having the President issue a special proclamation declaring April 22 of each year as Queen Isabella Day. I am today introducing a resolution, the text of which follows, authorizing the President to issue such a proclamation:

Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 22d day of April of each year as Queen Isabella Day

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is hereby authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating the 22d day of April of each year as Queen Isabella Day in recognition of Queen Isabella I of Spain and her contribution to Columbus' voyages to the New World, and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such birthday with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN EARL BURGER

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, following Tuesday's biased Supreme Court ruling on the Southern busing cases, more and more Americans are searching the background of the replacement of Earl Warren—Warren Earl Burger.

One documented report on Chief Justice Burger's background was contained in the Review of the News on March 17, 1971.

I include it in the RECORD at this point:

WARREN BURGER: THE CHIEF JUSTICE WHO USED TO BE HAROLD STASSEN'S CAMPAIGN MANAGER

(By Frank A. Capell)

When President Nixon announced the name of Warren Earl Burger, Judge of the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals in Washington, D.C., as his choice to be Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, cautious optimism shaded all hues of political opinion. Conservatives were worried because the "Liberals" liked him, and "Liberals" felt he couldn't be all good if Conservatives weren't opposing his selection. Judge Burger was said to be a Conservative on "law and order," a "Liberal" on "Civil Rights," and a "strict constructionist." No one remembered a speech he had made in 1967, proposing treatment of all criminals by swarms of public "psychiatrists," in which he had declared: "Neither the laws nor the Constitution are too sacred to change. . . ."

Mayor John Lindsay called Burger "an excellent choice" and recalled him as a good friend with whom he had worked closely while employed in the Department of Justice under President Eisenhower. Thomas E. Dewey said it was "a perfect appointment." Others to add their immediate endorsement were Ramsey Clark, ———, and Earl Warren. James Reston wrote in the *New York Times* that Burger is "experienced, industrious, . . . Presbyterian, orderly, and handsome." Civil Rights attorney Anthony Amsterdam called him a "first-rate legal craftsman." Burger was, in short, endorsed by every son of the Establishment to have ever dreamed of membership in the Eleanor Roosevelt League For The Mystified.

Warren Earl Burger was born in St. Paul, Minnesota, on September 17, 1907. The son of Charles Joseph Burger and the former Katharine Schnitger, he was the fourth of seven children. His father, who was never very successful, worked off and on as a railroad cargo inspector and a traveling salesman of patent medicine and jimmies. *Current Biography* says young Burger was "not an outstanding student," but that he took a few extension courses given by the University of Minnesota from 1925 to 1927 and was awarded a L.L.B. in 1931 after attending some night classes at something called the St. Paul College of Law. During the day he worked as a clerk for the Mutual Life Insurance Company.

On November 8, 1933, Burger married Elvera Stromberg, with whom he had taken extension courses. They now have two children, Wade Allen (33), who is in the real estate business in Arlington, Virginia, and Margaret Elizabeth (23), who teaches in a Montessori school.

Warren Earl Burger was admitted to the Minnesota bar in 1931 and took a job as a clerk with the St. Paul law firm of Boyesen, Otis & Farley. He soon began to make friends with some of the state's leading radicals, and in 1934 helped organize the Minnesota Young Republicans as a political holding company for his radical friends. In 1935, Burger was named a partner in the law firm of Farley, Burger, Moore & Costello, where he remained until 1953, when he went to Washington to work in the Eisenhower Administration.

In 1938, Warren Earl Burger played an important role in the election of Harold Stassen as Governor of Minnesota. Both were thirty-one, and they remained personally and ideologically very close. When Stassen went to war, Burger developed "back trouble" and was thus available to run the "Draft Stassen" campaign at the 1944 Republican National Convention. When Harold Stassen made plans for his more serious try for the Presidency in 1948, he chose Warren Burger as his chief of staff and "idea man," and Burger ran the Stassen national headquarters in Minneapolis. Unsuccessful in 1948, Stassen moved out of the state to become President of the University of Pennsylvania. Even so, with an eye to 1952, Harold Stassen reached back to Minnesota to appoint Burger as Vice President of the Stassen-for-President National Organization.

It is thus hardly surprising that Warren Earl Burger has characterized himself as a "Stassen Progressive." A "Liberal" friend is quoted in the *New York Times* magazine of October 5, 1969, as putting it this way: "Remember that Warren Burger is a liberal Minnesota Republican, and that's a fairly liberal beast." It certainly is! Harold Stassen, Burger's closets political associate, had not only been floor manager for Wendell Willkie at the 1940 Convention, he was a radical well to the left of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and remains so even to this day.

Burger early showed his interest in "human relations," in "inter-racial activities," and in other "Liberal" causes. He was the first president of the St. Paul Council on Human Relations and was responsible for hiring "experts" to "improve" relations between the police and the few Negroes and Mexican-Americans in that city.* In 1948 he was appointed to the Governor's Interracial

* And in 1964, at the height of the Communist push for "Civilian Review Boards" to harass our local police, Judge Warren E. Burger wrote an article which appeared in *American University Law Review* 1-2; 9-23 (1964). He spent fourteen pages presenting the same radical arguments for the Review Boards as the Communist People's World. To call so vigorous an advocate of Civilian Review Boards a "law and order" judge is simply ludicrous.

Commission as a result of his interest in the "Civil Rights struggle."

But it was, as we noted, at that 1948 Republican National Convention in Philadelphia that Warren Earl Burger had come into his own. He was floor manager for Harold Stassen's near-successful campaign for the Presidential nomination—and got a good, hard look at how the world is run when the nomination went to Thomas E. Dewey. Four years later, with Eisenhower, Taft, and MacArthur interested in the nomination, Burger was again at the Republican Convention as Stassen's campaign manager. He was also a delegate to the credentials committee, where he threw his support to Eisenhower in the maneuver which eventually sealed the nomination for the General. Even so, the first ballot was close between Taft and Eisenhower. When Ike fell short, Burger sent word to the platform that Minnesota was switching its votes to Ike. Having thus assured General Eisenhower's nomination, Warren Earl Burger was subsequently rewarded by being named Assistant Attorney General in the Eisenhower Administration.

Burger was soon on his way to Geneva as a U.S. delegate to the subversive International Labor Organization, described by George Meany in the *New York Times* as "an instrument for transmitting Communist propaganda." Even last year the Senate refused it funds, noting that its Assistant Director (Pavel E. Astapenko) is a Soviet agent.

When not advising the Marxist I.L.O., Warren Burger was head of the Civil Division of the Department of Justice in charge of more than 180 lawyers, and worked under both Attorneys General Herbert Brownell and (now Secretary of State) William Rogers. Things went well for Burger for awhile. Then something very strange happened.

Although he had no previous experience in admiralty matters, Assistant Attorney General Burger was selected to initiate the U.S. suits to recover surplus victory ships sold illegally to certain foreign owners. During the period between March 1953 and September 1955 the Department of Justice instituted twenty-one separate forfeiture proceedings against twenty-one vessels. These ships had been sold between 1945 and 1949 to Victory Carriers, United States Petroleum Carriers, and Trafalgar and Western. The Department of Justice knew that those corporations were controlled by one Aristotle Onassis, not a U.S. citizen, and that the sales were therefore in violation of our shipping laws.

When Onassis learned that our government intended to bring criminal conspiracy charges against him he contacted the man in charge of the matter, Warren E. Burger, who quickly worked out a deal with Onassis and his lawyer. The *New York Times* of May 25, 1969, quotes Onassis as having asked Burger, "What's the ransom?" To which Burger is said to have replied: "Twenty million dollars." Burger then arranged a sweetheart deal, letting Onassis off the hook for \$7 million—and sending the Congress into a rage. Shortly thereafter, Warren Earl Burger accepted the opportunity to become a Federal Circuit Court Judge in Washington, D.C. The heat was on and the federal judiciary provided a safe hiding place.

A series of Congressional Hearings were soon held concerning the "Trade-Out And Build Activities Of Onassis Companies," revealing much doubledealing and bad faith on the part of Onassis, who never even bothered to fulfill his part of the shabby agreement reached with Burger on December 21, 1955. But Aristotle Onassis was nonetheless allowed to retain his ships and to escape criminal prosecution.

Had Burger not eased off, Onassis would have forfeited his ships and faced serious charges under the law which stated: "Any such vessel, or any interest therein, char-

tered, sold, transferred, or mortgaged to a person not a citizen of the United States or placed under a foreign registry or flag, or operated in violation of any provision of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of not more than \$5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than five years, or both." For reasons of a sufficiently suspicious nature to force his removal from the Justice Department to the security of the federal bench, Warren Burger simply did not apply the law—and Onassis is still riding high to brag, as he did recently, that he will remain a millionaire even if the Communists conquer the world.

Warren Earl Burger was sworn as Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit on April 13, 1956. There was more trouble with his confirmation to this lower post than with the later confirmation as Chief Justice. The necessary confirmation was delayed for months by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

During his thirteen years as a U.S. Circuit Court Judge, Mr. Burger clashed repeatedly with such of his "Liberal" colleagues as J. Skelly Wright and David L. Bazelon—especially in cases involving criminal law. How much of a "Conservative" Mr. Burger is, however, is still open to serious question. Such experts on radicalism as Robert M. Hutchins and Harry S. Ashmore of the Marxist Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions know better. They engaged him as a Consultant to the Center during the autumn before his appointment as Chief Justice. In fact, Hutchins and Ashmore held a special conference on "criminal justice" at the Center—a conference which Judge Burger not only attended, but which he personally conceived. After that conference, Ashmore stated that by current American judicial standards some of Judge Burger's views are "radical," and Hutchins chuckled that if Mr. Nixon thought Burger a Conservative he might be in for a surprise.

The seminar in question was part of a Center project the purpose of which is to rewrite the Constitution of the United States. In charge of this operation has been former F.D.R. brain-truster Rexford Guy Tugwell, a Marxist of long standing. But Judge Warren Earl Burger, says the *New York Times* of September 9, 1970, was the Center Fellow who acted as consultant on the Judiciary section of this outrage—persuading the group to omit the guarantee of an adversary trial, trial by jury, and the presumption of the innocence of the accused.

The Center's proposed constitution is, in fact, a plan for a Marxist dictatorship in America—a plan for which the *Times* says Warren Earl Burger has been an important architect. It calls for an all-powerful central government, abolition of the states, government by a vast Planning Branch, six-year development plans, a Gestapo-like Office of "Intendant" to maintain "national security," abolition of a general guarantee of civil liberties, etc.

This is serious business. Professor Tugwell explains in its preface how the Center constitution—on which Warren Earl Burger was judiciary advisor—might be instituted. As you read it, keep in mind the reputation created for Chief Justice Burger as a "law and order" man. Here is Dr. Tugwell's introduction:

A President, approaching the end of his term, provoked by his inability to move the Congress, determined to check the government's hardening into bureaucratic stolidity, fearful of the accumulating consequences of obsolescence, and conscious of his inability to carry all his responsibilities, concludes that he must appeal for a new constitution. . . .

It seems to the President that some new effort . . . must be made. If it must be made in unorthodox fashion, it still could have the consent of the ultimate authority in a democracy—the people. If they demand a new

constitution, who could say that the demand ought to be denied? He decides to give them that opportunity and he announces what he intends.

There is the expected uproar from those who fear the loss of privileges. But there is louder commendation from those who agree with him, and he is able to persuade a hundred concerned citizens of acknowledged prominence [including, no doubt, the Chief Justice] to join in the new reconsiderations. They undertake to draft a new constitution. By the time he has to campaign for reelection something like the following document has been produced and agreed to by eighty of the hundred. . . .

The President assumes, he says, that since he is wholly identified with it, his election by a considerable majority would signal approval of the new constitution. They are engaged, he tells the voters, in a referendum of sovereign persons who stand above all the institutions of the government created by their ancestors and too little changed since that time. He puts the ratifying majority at sixty percent of those voting. . . .

He pledges that if his proposal is approved, he will proceed by interim arrangement until the new constitution can be implemented; then he will retire to become a member of the new Senate provided for in the constitution.

Thus the issue is joined.

Can it be that Warren Earl Burger is a "law and order" man because he favors the sort of Marxist dictatorship promoted by the radical Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions? If not, why has he not repudiated the role he played in creating a new constitution for just such a dictatorship? And why has he repeatedly attacked the American judicial system? Consider the following Burger proposals as reported in the *Chicago Daily News* for June 3, 1969:

Among the "techniques, devices and mechanisms" Burger questioned were: The jury system, the presumption that a defendant is innocent until proved guilty, the right of a defendant to remain silent and putting the burden of proof on the prosecution. . . . Burger suggested that defendants ought to be required to testify in a courtroom. And, he said: "If we would eliminate the jury we would save a lot of time."

No doubt the shades of Lenin and Stalin cheered.

Little wonder that John Cogley, writing about Judge Burger's visit to the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, observed in a recent issue of *The Center Magazine*: "It comes as a kind of shock to hear Judge Warren E. Burger . . . widely described as a conservative jurist. . . . The dominant impression he left on me . . . was that there was something paradoxical about a gentleman of such conservative mien expressing radical views about the American system of jurisprudence. . . . If words means anything, I don't think that Judge Burger's views can be called conservative." A long time associate of such super-radicals as Michael Harrington, Chairman of the Socialist Party, John Cogley knows a radical when he sees one.

Certainly Judge Burger's last decision as a Circuit Court Judge came as a shock to those who looked upon him as a Conservative. In this ruling, written by Warren Burger but a few days before he was sworn as Chief Justice, the premise of the accused being presumed innocent until proved guilty went down the drain in a decision regarding the license renewal of WLBT-TV, a Mississippi television station operated at Jackson by Lamar Life Insurance Company. The U.S. Court of Appeals, with Burger not only taking part but writing the opinion, ordered the Federal Communications Commission to set aside its award of a license renewal to the station because it was accused of all sorts of dreadful things—including locally introducing National network news broadcasts by announce-

ing: "What you are about to see is an example of biased, managed, northern news." The station was also accused of favoring segregation, being anti-union, and disliking Martin Luther King.

Disregarding whether any of this is the F.C.C.'s business, none of it was proved. The F.C.C. had thus renewed the license of WLBT-TV. But the Burger Court of Appeals was furious—it reprimanded the F.C.C. for placing the burden of proof on the citizens who made the accusations, thus setting the dangerous precedent of a presumption of guilt on the part of the accused.

The accusers were organized television "watchdogs" who make a practice of challenging the TV-license renewals of those few channels owned or operated by Conservatives. The Reverend Everett C. Parker of the United Church of Christ has organized groups of local "Liberals" all across the country to force stations to take a "Liberal" course or face complaints when license renewal time rolls around. (Parker was an official of the National Council of Churches from 1961 to 1965.) In the instant case, it was the United Church of Christ which made the accusations against television station WLBT.

The decision cancelling the station's license was written by Justice Burger himself, who said that the court considered the F.C.C. handling of the case so improper that it would "serve no useful purpose" to send the issue of the license renewal back to the agency for a new hearing. Usurping the powers of the F.C.C., Mr. Burger cancelled the license and instructed the F.C.C. to devise a plan for interim operation of the station—possibly impounding the profits—until a more "Liberal" licensee is chosen.

Having shown the F.C.C. that it had better keep a wary eye on Conservatives, Warren Earl Burger was sworn as the fifteenth Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court on June 23, 1969.

There was much speculation as to how the "Burger Court" would compare with the "Warren Court." The answer came suddenly in the field of "Civil Rights." Early in November the Burger Court ruled that not ten minutes more could be given over to racial problem-solving in the schools and that any school segregation still practiced in fourteen Mississippi districts (and anywhere else in the nation) must now cease "at once." On October 29, 1969, Congressman John Rarick, himself a former judge, commented on this decision of the Supreme Court as follows:

"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. . . . If the 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 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. . . ."

Chief Justice Burger has been working almost feverishly to bring about other far-

reaching changes in the judicial and penal systems of the United States. Within twenty-four hours after he took office on June 23, 1969, he met with a small group seeking to revolutionize court administration, and within two months he had made specific proposals to the American Bar Association at its convention in Dallas. He asked for the establishment of a special institute to train court manager-executives, and he called for a "re-examination" of the penal systems with special emphasis on "rehabilitation" facilities.

In less than six months the new institute, located at the University of Denver Law School, was established. It is supported by both private grants and government financing.

To take care of the second proposal, the A.B.A. created a special penal commission headed by Richard Hughes, the weakling "Liberal" Governor of New Jersey at the time of the Newark riots. Among those working with him on the project are such "Liberals" as Dr. Karl Menninger, George Meany, and Robert Strange McNamara.

The third Burger proposal was also acted upon with the creation of an A.B.A. committee to suggest "new approaches" to legal education. The Chief Justice has spent many summers in England and Western Europe studying judicial systems there and feels that in most ways they are superior to ours. The British system of training some lawyers for courtroom work (barristers) and others for only office work (solicitors) impressed him as producing the sort of "dignified professionals" that young American lawyers should emulate. He has given at least a dozen speeches while Chief Justice calling on lawyers to be more "dignified" in the courtroom.

Does he mean it? Apparently it is just part of Mr. Burger's white-shocked image. The following report on the Burger Court's efforts to reduce dignity in the courtroom is from *Time* magazine for February 1, 1971:

The Supreme Court generally gives trial judges wide latitude in running their courtrooms—even to permitting the shackling, gagging or removal of obstreperous defendants. But last week the Justices unanimously curbed a judge's power to hand out contempt sentences for courtroom misbehavior. Using carefully uncritical language, the court held that a judge may cite a defendant at the moment of his contemptuous action, but that if the judge chooses to wait until the end of the trial, "it is generally wise where the makers of the unseemly conduct have left personal stings to ask a fellow judge to take his place." The decision reversed an eleven-to-two contempt sentence imposed by Pittsburgh Judge Albert Flook on a defendant who had called him a "dirty — of a —" and a "dirty tyrannical old dog."

It also seemed to apply squarely to last year's trial of the Chicago Seven. In that raucous proceeding, Judge Julius Hoffman waited until after the jury began deliberations, then declared the defendants and their lawyers in contempt and imposed sentences of as much as four years and 13 days. Under last week's ruling, it seems quite possible that those contempt sentences will now be reversed and that another judge will have the Seven back in court to consider whether they were in contempt and, if so, what the penalties should be.

So much for the courtroom "dignity" about which the Chief Justice speaks when not writing opinions.

Barring unforeseen circumstances, Warren Earl Burger will be Chief Justice of the United States for a long time, and most Americans had hoped that he would help to repair some of the damage done by the Warren Court. There have been far too few

signs that this is happening, and many to indicate that Burger has no intention of attacking the Warren precedents. Although Chief Justice Burger has shown himself to be in charge, he has yet to produce that major reversal of the Leftward course plotted by Earl Warren which Republican Conservatives claimed was President Nixon's purpose in appointing Burger. Don't hold your breath waiting for it to happen!

A DECADE OF SPACE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the *Chicago Today* magazine of March 28, 1971, Peter Reich, one of the Nation's most distinguished aerospace writers, reviews the accomplishments of our national space program in the 1960's. As we approach the most crucial decisions on the future of our national space program, I think it is worth while to recall the achievements outlined in Peter Reich's outstanding article. I commend this significant editorial to your reading:

A DECADE OF SPACE

(By Peter Reich)

Ten years ago, a lot of "experts" insisted it couldn't be done.

Man, they declared, could not survive the terrible stresses of a journey beyond the sheltering atmosphere of his home planet. He would be deafened by the roar of his rocket, shaken to jelly by its vibration, crushed by acceleration on takeoff and deceleration on landing, riddled by radiation, hopelessly confused by zero gravity, and driven mad by the fear of being lost in space.

All this would happen, they warned, even if scientists could find a way to protect a man against the deadly vacuum of space, the broiling heat of an unfiltered sun, the frigid cold of the cosmos, and the blast-furnace temperatures associated with a plunge back into the atmosphere.

On April 12, 1961, a Russian steelworker's son proved them wrong.

His name was Yuri Gagarin. He blasted off inside a 5-ton spaceship called Vostok [East], atop a 20-engine launch rocket, from a place named Tyuratam.

He circled the globe once, traveling higher [203 miles up] and faster [17,400 miles an hour—5 miles every second] than any human being before him. And when he landed safely, on a collective farm, less than two hours after takeoff, he had ushered the world into a new era—the era of space flight.

He also had given the Soviet Union a commanding lead in the fabled race for space. Four months later, a second Russian cosmonaut, Gherman Titov, circled the globe 17 times, remaining aloft a whole day.

The best the United States could do the same year was send two astronauts on 15-minute sub-orbital [up-down] space flights—and put a chimpanzee named Enos into orbit.

The first American to travel beyond the atmosphere was Alan B. Shepard Jr. On May 5, 1961, a slim white Chrysler Redstone rocket hurled him 115 miles high and 302 miles downrange from Cape Canaveral [later to be renamed Cape Kennedy]. His first words from space were:

"What a beautiful view!"

On his return, he told this reporter he wanted very much to fly to the moon some day. Last month [February, 1971], he got his wish. On Feb. 5, he became the fifth human being of all time to set foot on the lunar surface. His companion, Ed Mitchell, was the sixth.

The rocket that launched Shepard on his second space flight showed how far we had progressed in the intervening years. The rocket—a 36-story-tall Saturn 5—developed 7.6 million pounds of thrust, 100 times as much as Shepard's original 8-story-tall Redstone had put out.

Between Shepard's two flights, the United States launched 22 other manned space missions, for a total of 24 manned space flights during man's first decade in space. The first two, as noted, were sub-orbital flights—rehearsals, really, for the orbital missions to come.

Then came four one-man orbital missions, and 10 two-man orbital flights, and, finally, two three-man orbital missions, and six three-man moon flights, including Shepard's. Many of the flights were pioneering flights—missions which saw men venturing into the unknown, doing things no human beings before them had done.

On Feb. 20, 1962, Marine Col. John Glenn became the first American to circle the Earth. His three-orbit flight culminated in "a fireball of a re-entry," as Glenn put it. Glenn's flight was not the first manned orbital flight of course—Cosmonauts Gagarin and Titov had preceded him. But it was the first manned orbital flight the public was permitted to share, with newsmen from all over the world on hand for the launch.

Air Force Maj. Virgil I. [Gus] Grissom—who also had flown our second sub-orbital flight and whose capsule sank after landing in the ocean after a hatch blew open inadvertently—carried out our first two-man flight, Gemini 3, with Navy Lt. Comdr. John Young, on March 23, 1965. It was historic for yet another reason: For the first time, a spacecraft was maneuvered into a different orbit by its crew. That set the stage for all sorts of space spectacles.

On the following mission, Gemini 4, June 3 to 7, 1965, Air Force Maj. Edward H. White II became the first American to walk in space. Cosmonaut Aleksi Leonov had turned the trick three months earlier, but he had floated helplessly outside his Voskhod 2 spacecraft.

White, by contrast, had an oxygen squirter gun that enabled him to control his position as he floated for 21 minutes [more than twice as long as Leonov] outside his Gemini, 160 miles up, himself a satellite of Earth.

Every Gemini flight set a new record. With Gemini 5 [eight days], the United States wrested the time-in-space record from the Russians. Gemini 6 achieved history's first rendezvous in space between two manned spacecrafts [with Gemini 7].

Gemini 7 kept its two astronauts, Frank Borman and James Lovell, aloft for a record two weeks. Gemini 8, piloted by Neil A. Armstrong and David Scott, achieved history's first linkup in orbit with an unmanned satellite—a station wagon sized Agena.

On Gemini 9, Bellwood, Ill. Astronaut Gene Cernan circled the Earth while outside his spaceship—the first man to "walk around the world" in space. On Gemini 10, Astronaut Michael Collins became the first human being to "walk" to another satellite in orbit. And Gemini 10 soared a record 475 miles above the Earth.

Gemini 11, commanded by Charles Conrad, stretched the altitude record to 853 miles. And Gemini 12 saw an astronaut named Edwin [Buzz] Aldrin walk in space for a record 2 hours, 6 minutes, and stand

up in his hatch, exposed to the space vacuum, for 2½ hours more.

By this time, the Russians had set some impressive space records of their own.

In 1962, they had accomplished history's first tandem space flight. It involved two simultaneously orbiting one-man spacecrafts, Vostok 3 and 4, that came within three miles of one another at one point.

In 1963, they put history's first woman in space—Valentina Tereshkova, aboard the Vostok 6. She circled the Earth 48 times—more than all American astronauts up to that time put together.

And in 1964, they orbited history's first three-man spaceship, the Voskhod I.

Not until February, 1967, was the United States prepared to launch its first three-man spaceship, the Apollo.

And then disaster struck.

On Jan. 27, 1967, a week before the scheduled flight, Astronauts Grissom, White and Roger Chaffee were involved in a ground test inside their spaceship as it stood on the launch pad. For the test, the craft was filled with 100 per cent oxygen at triple the pressure normal for a space flight, and all hatches were sealed.

Suddenly, there was a shout of "Fire! Fire in the spacecraft!"

A small electrical fire (determined later) erupted into a holocaust in the pressurized-oxygen environment. Before rescuers could get to them, the three men were dead.

They were the first Americans to perish in a spaceship, the three others, Elliott See, Charles Bassett and Theodore Freeman, had died in plane crashes. Clifton Williams was to lose his life that way the following October, and Edward Givens was to die in an auto accident the same year.

The Russians, presumably, had suffered similar accidents. Rumors of cosmonaut casualties persisted. But the Russians apparently hushed up any such disasters, if they occurred.

However, they could not hush up the death of Cosmonaut Vladimir Komarov. He perished on April 22, 1967, when the parachutes of his new Soyuz spaceship tangled prior to landing. Komarov had been the command pilot of the first three-man spaceship, the Voskhod I, in 1964, and with Soyuz had become the first Russian to make two flights into space.

Nor could the Russians hide the death, some time later, of their pioneer cosmonaut, Yuri Gagarin. He perished in a plane crash.

For the Russians as well as the Americans, during the first decade of manned space flight, the big target was the moon.

The Russians, because of their early lead in manned space flight [until 1965, they were decidedly ahead of us], were presumed to have the inside track for both the first around-the-moon flight and the first moon landing.

The respected British astronomer, Sir Bernard Lovell, as late as Sept. 23, 1968, predicted that the Russians would make history's first around-the-moon flight "within months." Sir Bernard had made similar predictions for several preceding years, and some enthusiastic [if technically naive] observers had predicted a manned Russian moon flight as early as 1962.

Life magazine predicted in the early 1960s that the Russians would celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Red Revolution on the moon, in 1967.

Others—including this writer—were convinced the first men around, and on, the moon would be Americans. This writer said so in print as early as 1962, and many times thereafter.

As it turned out, the latter group was correct. With a revamped, more fire-resistant Apollo, the United States flew a 10-day test

flight in October, 1968. Two months later, we sent history's first men around the moon.

The crew of the Apollo 8—Frank Borman, James Lovell, and William Anders—became the first to break the gravitational bonds of Earth, to see the moon up close, to view the mysterious backside of the moon, to be caught in a gravity not that of Earth, and to see their home planet as a beautiful blue ball floating serenely in the black velvet expanse of space. Splashdown date was Dec. 27, 1968.

Apollo 9 was a rehearsal of a moon landing in Earth orbit, with the lunar landing module carried along for the first time. Apollo 10 was a similar rehearsal in moon orbit, with the lunar module, "Snoopy," dipping to within just nine miles of the lunar surface.

And then came Apollo 11.

Astronauts Neil Armstrong, Edwin Aldrin and Michael Collins were selected for the historic mission. Blastoff came on July 16, 1969. At 3:17 p. m., on Sunday, July 20, the lunar module, "Eagle," with Armstrong and Aldrin at the controls, settled gently into the lunar dust of the moon's dry Sea of Tranquility, and the electrifying words crackled across a quarter million miles of space:

"Tranquility base here. The Eagle has landed."

Men were on the moon. Man had ceased being an Earthbound creature. Late that Sunday night, Armstrong and Aldrin set foot on the moon.

Walking in the strange one-sixth of Earth gravity of the moon, they explored the lunar surface for 3½ hours, planted an American flag, set out instruments, and collected rock samples.

A safe return to Earth was made on July 24, and the goal set by President Kennedy in 1961—to put an American on the moon and return him safely before the end of the decade—had been accomplished. It was the greatest achievement of the Space Age and, quite likely, any age.

Four months later, Apollo 12 astronauts Charles [Pete] Conrad and Alan Bean walked on the moon for a total of 7½ hours during two separate lunar excursions.

Apollo 13, in April 1970, had a narrow brush with death when a service module oxygen tank blew up, causing an electrical failure. A scheduled moon landing had to be abandoned, but the crew—James Lovell, Fred Haise, and John Swigert—returned safely.

That July, two Russians—Andrian Nikolayev and Vitaly Sevastyanov—remained in Earth orbit for 17 days, shattering the 14-day endurance record our Gemini 7 had set back in 1965. But it was anti-climactic, as was an orbital mission involving three Russian spacecraft in October, 1969, and a link-up of two manned Russian craft earlier that year.

In the first decade of man-in-space, history would record that six human beings walked on the moon, 11 others flew around it [Lovell twice]—and all of them were Americans.

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 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?

COTTER PRAISES SCHOOL DRUG EDUCATION PROGRAMS

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues and the readers of this RECORD a story about an eighth grader which demonstrates the effectiveness of drug education programs that approach drug abuse in a factual and adult manner:

YOUTH WRITES ANTI-DRUG POEM

(By William Grava)

"No, I definitely will never take drugs," Paul Secker said. "But a lot of kids will take them without knowing about the stuff and what it will do—they've never had a drug program."

Paul Secker is a budding poet. He's 13 (but will be 14 in November) and in the eighth grade at East Hartford's Center School.

He wrote a poem about drugs that was recently published in a local paper.

"Scars on the body, scars on the mind./ Destroying themselves, destroying mankind," the poem reads in part, "Held within a dream-like world/Until their minds become unfurled."

But Paul's mind seems very much together, at least as far as drugs are concerned.

He enjoys reading and likes "to write a lot," he said—"but only two or three poems."

His poem, "Theme of Death: Drugs," was written from what he learned about drugs in school, from the police and from the town, he said.

Last year he read about drugs a little bit, he said, but wasn't really interested in learning about them. He saw "a lot of scary movies in school," he said, but they weren't good.

But this year the schools' new drug education program is "real good," Paul said. Now the movies (including interviews with former drug abusers, he said) are much more interesting.

The school program uses simple terms, he said, and is easy to understand.

Besides the school drug program, he went to the Police Department open house in mid-February. "That was real good, too," he said. "I saw the different drugs and drug implements, and a policeman explained them all."

All his interest was channelled into the poem after he read the drug brochure that was distributed with the town's annual report.

The brochure, recommended by the Mayors Committee to Study Drug Abuse and distributed by the East Hartford Jaycees, is considered one of the best of its type, according to Youth Services Director Fred N. Balet.

"After I read the drug pamphlet," Paul said, "I just had to write a poem."

"All their lives have gone to waste, all for drugs, all in haste," the poem reads.

But that doesn't apply to Paul, or any of his friends, he said. "Kids who starting taking drugs are kinda dumb," he concluded.

MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY'S INAUGURAL MESSAGE FOR HIS UNPRECEDENTED FIFTH TERM

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last night Mayor Richard J. Daley took his oath of office for an unprecedented fifth term as chief executive of the city of Chicago.

Mayor Daley has been reelected to his fifth term by a staggering majority of 424,000 votes.

This tremendous margin of victory shows how deeply the people of Chicago respect, admire, and desire him and his continued leadership.

Mayor Daley stands today as the most highly respected and the most thoroughly successful mayor of a large city in the entire world.

While urban areas throughout the Nation stand on the brink of bankruptcy, Chicago under Mayor Daley's leadership continues to flourish and prosper.

It was an inspiring occasion last night in Chicago's city council to see Mayor Daley sworn in for a fifth term.

The council chamber was packed to the rafters and the ovation given Mayor Daley shall ring for a long time to come.

The council chamber was alive with a spirit of expectation, confident hope, and dedication, as Mayor Daley enunciated his great dreams and hopes for the next 4 years.

I am proud to present in the RECORD today Mayor Daley's inspiring message. It can serve as a message of hope for all of us as Americans.

I am also proud of the men and women who were sworn in as members of the city council last night. I extend my best wishes to the mayor, to the city clerk, John Marcin, to newly elected city treasurer, Joseph G. Bertrand, and to the members of city council. May their service be an inspiration to all of us.

Mayor Daley's inaugural message follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY MAYOR RICHARD J. DALEY

In my first Inaugural Address, and in every one since, I made one commitment that has priority over all others, that as Mayor of Chicago "My employer is all the people of Chicago, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents, of every economic group, of every neighborhood."

The result of the April 6th election was especially gratifying because it demonstrated that the voters not only approved our record in office, but more importantly, agreed we have kept our pledge to serve all the people of Chicago. It is in this spirit that I have taken this Oath of Office and pledge to you my total dedication and my unstinting labor to serve the people of Chicago.

It is difficult to single out priorities in an urban society, for almost every activity of government is related to, and affected by, another. We do have a measure however, our priorities should attempt to meet those needs which most people have in common.

In a real sense this is what makes a community, a gathering of people who have com-

mon interests, goals and desires. This City Council serves two kinds of communities, two constituencies, the city and the neighborhoods. We hold the belief in a democracy that what is good for most of the people is good for all the neighborhoods. We also believe that in order to have a good city, we must have good neighborhoods.

From this community viewpoint we arrive at fundamental priorities. We must have neighborhoods that have sufficient order and safety to allow freedom of movement, we must have communities in which people can work, shop, attend school and church and enjoy leisure, and in which we can associate with our fellow men to achieve those objectives that serve all of us.

To that end, we must constantly improve our police and fire departments and expand patrol duty in every neighborhood. We cannot tolerate children being intimidated in any neighborhood. Foot patrols in all areas of the city will be expanded by the use of portable radios carried by policemen. Two hundred and seventy five recruits were graduated last week, after seven months of intensive training, and will be equipped with this latest design in personal radios for use in foot patrol.

The police have recently instituted a pilot program in two districts in which beat patrolmen work on a team under the direction of a team sergeant. This system will provide several more unified squads working in coordination on each watch.

Another important program to be undertaken this year will enable police officers to issue citations for court appearances in lieu of arrest for minor offenses such as disorderly conduct. In a large number of cases this will eliminate physical arrest, prisoner transportation, detention and report writing. This will relieve police officers of time consuming tasks and make more time available for the primary mission of preventing serious crimes.

The additional personnel, the increased sophistication of radio technology, the team police concept and the use of the court citation will make it possible to provide more extensive coverage and increase safety for our citizens on the streets of our city.

The police alone, however, cannot bring safety to any community. Essential is the direct participation of every citizen to assist and help the police in making every neighborhood a good place in which to live.

We must seek to reduce poverty and the effects of poverty by supplying health care to all who need it.

In recent years the Chicago Board of Health has expanded its services to meet the needs of those families who do not have their own physicians, nor the resources to pay the high costs of private hospital or clinical care. The private medical sector has not been able to meet these needs.

The infant mortality rate in Chicago has dropped from 33.6 deaths per thousand live births in 1965, to 27.7 in 1970. This is a city-wide average. Among blacks, the reduction has been even more dramatic, with a drop from 44.8 in 1966 to 35.9 in 1970. This infant mortality rate will continue to be reduced through a number of programs.

Seven new comprehensive medical care centers will be built. New programs, public and private, will make it possible for more doctors to be available in the areas where they are most needed. Currently fourteen of Chicago's leading hospitals are participating in Board of Health programs for high risk mothers and infants. The infant mortality rate in this program is 17.1 percent per thousand live births, much better than the nation-wide average for all patients, this program will be expanded.

We must eliminate slums and provide housing to both low and moderate income families. We will continue to build housing for senior citizens. This year ten neighborhood not-for-profit corporations will build

2300 units for moderates and low income families. A typical neighborhood corporation consists of a dozen neighborhood organizations including church groups. The city is now working with other community organizations to sponsor similar projects and we look forward to a genuine increase in the housing supply through this community participation.

More than five hundred scattered vacant sites, which have been acquired by the city through its program of removing hazardous buildings, will be made available to community groups and to the Chicago Dwellings Association for housing.

We will explore new methods of rehabilitation and expand our programs of supplying large four and five bedroom apartments which are needed urgently. We will undertake to launch programs to encourage better tenant-landlord responsibility and to provide greater opportunity for home ownership.

In longer range plans, the City Department of Development and Planning has been analyzing sites for new townhouses in town which will provide thousands of new housing units with virtually no relocation.

The housing shortage of Chicago and other cities, particularly for the low income family which cannot find accommodations in the private market, will not be solved until the Federal Government makes the same kind of effort it has made in other areas, in developing atomic weapons or placing a man on the moon.

We have not seen that kind of national commitment from Washington but I am confident that public opinion will make it happen, and soon. With national and city resources we will lead the nation in providing a decent home for every Chicago family in a suitable living environment.

We must give our total support to improving the quality of education in every neighborhood. We must call for the allocation of additional resources to those communities which need it the most.

We must reduce and prevent the pollution of our environment. We are now making real progress and to further improve our environmental control program, I recommend that the council hold hearings for the preparation of an up-dated industrial waste ordinance.

We must preserve and improve our mass transportation system. This is a responsibility not only for Chicago and other municipalities but for the state. Legislation to provide operating subsidies to the CTA is essential for the economy and welfare of the entire metropolitan area.

We must maintain our excellent economic growth, our high employment rate, and expand job opportunities to everyone who wants to work. These, for the most part, are the basic priorities. They are not new. They arise from the common needs of people. They are functions of government which make the city viable, a place in which people can enjoy living.

This administration and this city council, with the support of the people, have carried on programs that have laid a foundation for us to move forward to achieving these goals. The performance of the city's basic housekeeping services have reached high standards. We have underway programs, such as model cities, urban opportunity, comprehensive health care and consumer protection. These seek to meet the personal needs of people. We have a well-balanced public works program. Our financial structure is on a sound basis.

The record has demonstrated that this administration and the city council, with public support, have taken positive action to meet the problems of urban life. We have made progress, but we are not satisfied. There is much to be done. There are areas in which we have made a great deal of progress, in others our success has only been

moderate, and in some, our experience has been disappointing.

Many of the programs were new and carried on during times of social stress. But each year, all of us have learned a little more, and from our experiences those of us in government and the people in the communities have become wiser.

The city's greatest resource is its people and without their active participation there can be no real progress. There are many kinds of participation. There are those who cry out against injustice and hold before us ideal goals. Certainly it is important to focus on goals and define problems but their continual repetition alone cannot bring about their accomplishment. They mean little unless they are accompanied by action, programs and plans.

There is another kind of participation. This is the participation of responsibility, which calls upon people and government to act constructively, to bring their convictions, their goals to reality. They are willing, after debate and discussion, to accept alternative realistic solutions.

Examples of this forward looking of responsible participation is where neighborhood not-for-profit organizations are building urgently needed housing in cooperation with government. We have the same spirit of responsible participation by the residents and their leaders in the model cities program, the conservation boards, and urban opportunity councils.

Chicago has more community organizations with trained staffs and well planned activities than any other city.

From these and other experiences we have developed a greater understanding and a new strength. We now share a clearer recognition of our common goals, a better understanding that we can work together, a common recognition of the magnitude of the problems and the magnitude of the challenges that face us.

I am convinced that we will make far greater progress in the next four years because there has developed an atmosphere of genuine cooperation, an atmosphere of mutual responsibility.

We also begin this new administration with a new State Constitution. It has broadened our home-rule powers and provides us with opportunities for better government that we have sought for many years. It is our responsibility, a responsibility we welcome, to use these new powers to make a better city, and better neighborhoods.

Chicago always has been a testing laboratory for new programs and for new approaches to urban living. We expect to continue proving our methods to answer the problems we face, recognizing that these are not local problems alone, but national in scope. Poverty, ignorance, disease, and discrimination require a national commitment with Federal and State funds.

I have confidence in the future of Chicago. No city in America is as strong as Chicago. No city has the spirit that Chicago has. No city has more skilled labor. No city has more enlightened management. No city has more aggressive and dynamic neighborhood organizations. No people have demonstrated that they have as much vision and determination to do those things which need doing, to put into practice the motto of Chicago "I Will."

Whatever success, whatever progress, we have made has only been possible because Chicago is all these things. We must have the continued responsible participation of the people in all the neighborhoods. There is so much to be done and it can only be done with the active support and help of every citizen.

Tonight, as I look back upon sixteen years as Chief Executive of this great city, I feel just as I did when I first took office. I knew then that the Mayor's office was no ivory tower. Its problems could not be solved with a slide rule, that there were no miracles,

there were no bargains in government as in anything else.

But I had faith in the city and its people. Because I live in a community and work with my neighbors, I knew their dreams, hopes and aspirations, that their determination to make a better life for themselves and their children were shared by the residents of all neighborhoods. Sixteen years ago, nothing meant so much to me as to serve the city I love, and nothing means so much to me today.

Tonight I rededicate myself to maintaining the fabric of urban life in Chicago and to make our city a rewarding place in which to live and work.

And now, I want to thank the membership of the City Council for their help in making the record of our administration. I know full well the contributions of the people in the neighborhoods, and of the many private agencies as well as public bodies, who have worked with us. I thank the city employees, and all other citizens, who have given of their own time and their full support so that this city could make progress, so that we can expect an even better city tomorrow for ourselves and our children.

I think it is appropriate on this occasion to reflect on the words of Sir Thomas More. He was writing in the 16th Century, but his advice has deep significance today, he wrote:

"Suppose wrong opinions cannot be plucked up by the roots, and you cannot cure as you would wish, vices of long standing, yet you must not on that account abandon ship of state and desert it in a storm, because you cannot control the winds. But neither must you impress upon them new and strange language, which you know will carry no weight with those of opposite conviction, but rather you must endeavor and strive to the best of your power to handle all well, and what you cannot turn to good you must make as little bad as you can. For it is impossible that all should be well, unless all men are good, which I do not expect for a great many years to come."

In the words of Sir Thomas, I pledge that I will strive to the best of my power to handle all well.

RESOLUTION ON PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF OPERATION KEELHAUL

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on November 23, 1970, a Lithuanian seaman, Simas Kudirka, attempted to defect to the United States by jumping from a Soviet vessel to the U.S. Coast Guard cutter *Vigilant*. After incredible bungling by both the Coast Guard and the State Department Kudirka was returned to the Soviet vessel. Here is how the House Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations described his return:

Five Soviet crew members boarded the *Vigilant* bringing with them a blanket, rope, and a ball of material that they intended to stuff in Kudirka's mouth. Kudirka prepared to fight and gave to Commander Eustis the few personal effects he had brought with him. Included in these were his identification card and a photo of his wife. Action moved over the *Vigilant* as Kudirka tried to elude his pursuers. Finally cornered, he was beaten by his captors, tied up in the blanket, and by 11:15 p.m. was under the control of the Soviet sailors.

Further detailing this outrageous incident the subcommittee's report stated:

During the excitement the two ships had been unmoored. Kudirka could only be transferred to the Soviet ship by small boat. Whose small boat? When Captain Brown was advised of the situation, he authorized the use of the *Vigilant's*. Bound in the blanket, Kudirka was thrown into the small boat. One of the Soviet crew sat on his head while another beat him. From the boat he was thrown into a net lowered from the Soviet ship. His bid for freedom was over.

This tragic incident in which U.S. officials played such a disgusting part caused a storm of protest across the Nation. Letters poured into congressional offices, newspapers covered it with banner headlines, President Nixon ordered an immediate report and both the Departments of State and Transportation submitted such reports. The commandant of the Coast Guard appointed a Board of Investigation which produced a report of more than 900 pages. All in all, the Kudirka case, after the public learned the facts, resulted in the official action which it so fully deserved.

Contrast this with another case of forced repatriation which involved an estimated several million people, the Operation Keelhaul case during and at the end of World War II. Had the facts of this unbelievable episode been given the publicity at that time which accompanied the Kudirka case, doubtlessly widespread protest resulting in official action would have resulted. Unfortunately, to this very day, the full story of this tragic case has never been brought to public attention.

Briefly, beginning in 1944 and continuing into 1947, civilians and prisoners of war held by the allied authorities were given over to the Soviets, against their wishes, to be transported back to Communist territories. These included Russians, Ukrainians, Poles, Hungarians, and natives of the Baltic countries who feared for their safety or survival if returned to Communist custody. Some committed suicide rather than face Soviet "justice." As in the Kudirka case, the State Department played a questionable role. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 116, part 20, page 25505, provides some revealing information on the involvement of the State Department in this miserable page of American history. Other references to Operation Keelhaul appear in the RECORD in 1970 on July 22, September 24 and 30, and December 30. In 1971 further references appear in the RECORD issues of January 2 and 26 and on March 25.

For those acquainted with the story of Operation Keelhaul the name of Mr. Julius Epstein is a familiar one. Now with the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace at Stanford University, Mr. Epstein, as far back as 1956, tried to call public attention to this case before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate. Through his efforts it was learned that the U.S. Army possessed a file titled "Operation Keelhaul" which detailed pertinent information but which had been a security classification which denied the public access to it. To have the given information made public, Mr. Epstein went all the way to the Supreme Court where he was denied

certiorari. He appealed to the White House and was successful in having the national security and foreign policy arguments for the secret classification removed. There now remains but one objection to having the information released—the coauthorship of some of this information by our British allies, whose approval the Department of Army and the White House contend are necessary before release of the Operation Keelhaul file.

Back in the 1940's Mr. Epstein's tenacity played a major role in the establishment of a select committee to investigate the Katyn Forest massacre, resulting in the finding that the Soviets had slaughtered thousands of Poles in the Katyn Forest area. Because I believe that the American public is entitled, as in the Kudirka case, to all the information relevant to Operation Keelhaul, I have today submitted a House resolution calling for a similar select committee to be established which will hopefully set the record straight as did the committee in the Katyn Forest massacre case.

The text of the resolution follows:

TO ESTABLISH A HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE FORCED REPATRIATION BY THE UNITED STATES OF PRISONERS OF WAR AND CIVILIANS TO THE SOVIET UNION DURING AND AFTER WORLD WAR II

Whereas Operation Keelhaul (the forced repatriation to Soviet-controlled countries of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians by American military and civilian authorities in the years 1944-1947 in Germany and in other countries) brought death and misery to untold millions of these anti-Communists before Soviet firing squads, on Soviet gallows, and in the Siberian slave labor camps; and

Whereas Operation Keelhaul cannot be justified by the agreement on the exchange of prisoners of war and civilians signed at Yalta on February 11, 1945; and

Whereas Operation Keelhaul was in violation of the rulings in implementation of the Yalta agreement on prisoners of war and displaced persons, made public by the Department of State on March 8, 1946; and

Whereas the forced repatriation of prisoners of war who had enlisted in the enemy's army was in contradiction to the opinions of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, as expressed during the last fifty-five years; and

Whereas the forced repatriation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians represents an indelible blot on the American tradition of ready asylum for political exiles; and

Whereas the forced repatriation and annihilation of millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians of Russian, Ukrainian, Polish, Hungarian, Baltic and other origin is still poisoning our spiritual relations with the vigorously anti-Communist peoples behind the Iron Curtain, and is therefore impeding our foreign policy; and

Whereas the Operation Keelhaul files assembled by the Combined Chiefs of Staff twenty-three years ago are still classified and therefore cannot be released to the American people; and

Whereas the legal action "Epstein v. Resor" based upon the Freedom of Information Act and instituted to bring about the declassification and the release of the Operation Keelhaul file did not succeed; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States denied plaintiff's petition for a writ of certiorari, thereby, in effect, negating the Freedom of Information Act a dead letter; and

Whereas the President of the United States has removed the main obstacle to the declassification of the Operation Keelhaul files by declaring that "The U.S. Government has

absolutely no objection (based on the contents of the files) to the declassification of the 'Operation Keelhaul' files, however, given the joint origin of the documents, British concurrence has not been received. Thus, we have no alternative but to deny your request,"; and

Whereas the Operation Keelhaul files consist to a large extent of American documents, classified by American military authorities; and

Whereas no foreign government should have the power to deprive the American people of the opportunity to learn their own history based upon documentary evidence concerning events which occurred more than twenty-five years ago: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman, and no more than four members of the committee shall be selected from the majority party. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

SEC. 2(a). The committee is authorized and directed (1) to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and extenuating circumstances of the forced repatriation program, carried out by our military and civilian authorities in Germany and other countries in the years 1944-1947, under which millions of anti-Communist prisoners of war and civilians were forcibly repatriated to Soviet-controlled countries, and (2) to fix the responsibility for such program.

(b). The investigation by the committee shall further include the circumstances under which the documentary evidence of that forced repatriation was compiled in a dossier known as the Operation Keelhaul file. The investigation of the committee shall establish the circumstances under which the Operation Keelhaul file was classified Top Secret and later downgraded to Secret as well as the aspects under which the documents of purely American origin should be released to the American people.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, its territories, and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

RETURN OF POW'S AND MIA'S

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, as proclaimed by Robert Abrams, president of the Borough of the Bronx, New York

City, April 28, 1971, is Prisoner of War Day in the Bronx. We of the Congress, as well as all Americans should join with the citizens of the Bronx in their concern and their prayers for the captured and missing soldiers in Vietnam. My sympathies are thus extended to the families of all captive and missing soldiers, and particularly on this day, to the families of Capt. Gary A. Chavez, Lt. Col. Brendan P. Foley, Capt. Eugene M. Pabst, Capt. Peter J. Russel, and SFC Donald J. Rander, residents of the Bronx. It is my strong hope that we will soon see the speedy and safe return of them all.

The status of the American prisoners of war currently held captive in North Vietnam presents an agonizing dilemma both for the families of the POW's and MIA's, who must endure the grief and heartache of their captivity, and to our Government, whose withdrawal program is threatened and menaced by their continuing detention.

The North Vietnamese have consistently violated all tenets of international law dealing with prisoners of war. They have denied inspection rights to the International Red Cross, restricted and in many cases denied mail and information rights, and have in general neglected the care and welfare of our men which is their responsibility. Our soldiers have been subjected to physical abuse and many are suffering from injuries months and years after capture.

I have cosponsored, and vigorously support efforts to end our involvement in this war by December 31, 1971, and will continue to do so. It is to save the lives of the prisoners of war and the very spirit of this Nation that we seek early termination of this tragic conflict. If these efforts fail, we must find alternatives to secure the freedom and security of the men imprisoned in North Vietnam.

The North Vietnamese have stated that release of American prisoners will begin upon withdrawal of the United States from Vietnam. President Nixon has declared that as long as there are prisoners in North Vietnam, United States forces must remain in Vietnam. This stalemate does little to lessen the plight of over 1,600 Americans now suffering in captivity in North Vietnam. We must take action to aid these men even as we seek to end this war.

With this in mind, I have introduced the following resolution:

The material follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Urging the President to initiate action with respect to a plan to secure the release of American prisoners of war from captivity by North Vietnam

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That because 1600 Americans are currently held captive in North Vietnam without genuine hope of being soon returned, it is the sense of the Congress that since Article 12 of Part II of the 1949 Geneva Convention authorizes the transfer of prisoners by a detaining power to another party to the convention, the President is strongly urged to request the Secretary-General of the United Nations (1) to ask the Government of North Vietnam to accept the tenets of such Article 12, and (2) if the North Vietnamese government so accepts, to offer an arrangement whereby—

(A) the Government of North Vietnam will agree to the internment of the American prisoners of war in a neutral nation to be chosen by the Secretary-General and mutually agreeable to the concerned parties, for release upon the withdrawal of the United States forces from Vietnam; and

(B) in exchange for such internment, the United States Government will—

(i) guarantee that the South Vietnamese Government will reciprocate by placing North Vietnamese prisoners in a neutral nation, mutually agreeable to all parties, to be released upon the withdrawal of all United States forces from Vietnam; and

(ii) agree to undertake all costs of the internment; and

(iii) agree not to invade North Vietnam, nor to in any way support or aid an invasion of North Vietnam.

The implementation of this resolution will eliminate a major impasse in efforts to end this war. It will also alleviate the pain and hardship of soldiers and citizens who have suffered too hard and too long. Our actions must now reflect our concern for those who are imprisoned and for those who shoulder the daily burden of an unending, senseless war.

The American people have clearly said "No More" to the anguish, and the bloodshed of a struggle that has no rightful place in the scope of American events. I urge my colleagues to unite behind a resolution which affords a clear opportunity to make the wishes of a broad-based consensus of the American people a reality: to end this war and return to their homes the sons and brothers of the United States.

SECOND-BEST IN THE WASTELAND

HON. JAMES R. MANN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, as T. S. Eliot told us in his famous poem "The Wasteland," April is the cruellest month. It has certainly been so for the SST and the future of American technology, receiving their cruellest jolt to date on April Fools' Day of this year when the Congress foreclosed the American chance to be first in aviation. What the reason for this so-called triumph for "enlightened liberalism" was now escapes me, as it was never fully stated. However, the emotional overtones behind its various rationales led me to believe that those who voted against the SST did so out of a concern for America's underdogs, under the mistaken belief that the funds might be diverted to help those on welfare. This was extremely short-sighted, in my opinion, because a country which is not first in technology, which every day is finding more and more of its workers going on unemployment due to foreign competition which it either cannot or refuses to protect itself from and which sees its economy rapidly shifting from production of its own goods to distribution of the goods of foreign countries geared to slave-wages—such a country, such a wasteland of warehouses and distribut-

ing centers will not long be able to support either those on welfare or those still grimly holding onto their very threatened jobs. It would seem, then, that a vote against the SST was also a long-range vote against those whom the SST's opponents maintained they were trying to help on April Fools' Day of this year.

Yes, April is the cruellest month—cruel for the SST and for American technology, but cruellest of all in this fast-becoming economic wasteland for those already on welfare. Of interest along these lines, I believe is the following editorial from the April 1971, issue of Government Executive:

WHAT'S SO BAD ABOUT SECOND-BEST?

(By C. W. Borklund)

The U.S. House's and Senate's decision—after six years of voting the other way—not to fund final development of two Supersonic Transport prototypes is a classic in dumbness. Out of \$1.009 billion already invested in SST's development, \$864 million has come from the taxpayers via Congress. Cancellation costs will run the final Government tab up about \$140 million more.

The approximately two-year estimated development cost to complete is some \$400 million. Probably \$200 million of that is the result of Congress, mainly, having foisted stop-start, on-off, up-down delays on the program since it started in 1961. If the taxpayer really believes the liberal Congressmen who say they voted "no" because the "funds are needed for more pressing human needs," then the taxpayer is gullible indeed. And if he believes the Conservative justification that "the SST cost too much," he's too naive to cope with his own grocery bill.

However, there seems little point now in rehashing all that. Only God, as far as we know, can kick a dead horse and bring it to life. But, Congressmen do not make stupid decisions, do they? Do they? So there must be some logical explanation for what is, on the face of it, such an illogical and unsubstantiated decision.

Trying, with as much calm as we can muster, to search the big picture for underlying causes, we think we see a couple. One is a significant lesson for the aerospace industry. The other adds up to an ominous trend for all of us.

Regarding the first, Boeing, among others, now readily (if privately) admits, it didn't know all it thought it knew about marketing to Government, especially non-Defense Government and particularly at Government's highest levels, e.g. the Congress. Aerospace is a technologically, as compared to a marketing, intense industry. As is evident in Defense and NASA, a huge chunk of the "selling" effort on a new product development amounts to Government technical experts negotiating with industry engineers over the nature of the problem and how to solve it.

Whatever "marketing," in the classic sense, goes on is in support of the engineer in the home office who is really doing the firing-line "selling." As witness to that, most aerospace industry Washington office personnel are actually intelligence gatherers, not hard-sell marketers, at least not as more standard, marketing-intense industries (office equipment, automobiles, consumer goods, much of electronics, et al) would define them. In the latter, the engineer tends to support the salesman.

But the industry is quickly learning how "to get the pig to market." Most notable is the growing list of aerospace firms which have made a serious, and not a lip-service, commitment to selling their problem-solving capability not just to Defense and NASA but

to other Government as well. And the high-technology companies most successful in this market-diversification effort have long since learned most of their non-Defense NASA customers aren't too interested in why the black-box lights have to wink and blink. All he wants to know is if the black box will solve his problem.

And, in our judgment, it may well end up a boon to preserving this Nation's greatness that the engineer is learning how necessary it has become for him to sell the importance of what he does and can do in language a non-technical buyer will understand. For an ominous philosophy seems to be creeping through the land—prevalent enough already to scare a few people like Dr. John Foster in the Pentagon—that in a very affluent Nation like the U.S. there's nothing particularly bad about being second-best.

Along with a host of smaller ones, this country faces two large intellectual challenges: One in the air-and-space environment and the other in the oceans. The program for facing up to the latter one languishes; and, at least on Capitol Hill, a majority of the lawyers and bankers in charge of big-picture decision-making seem intent on backing away from the former one.

Indeed, many experts think the Nation's wealth of technological brainpower has even now been clobbered by budget cuts close to the point of no recovery. And history records show consistently it's become a politico-economic truism that the civilization which does not face up to these technological challenges sooner or later becomes captive of the civilization which does.

Aware of all this, and of the fact that it's not loved much anymore like it was a decade ago, the scientific community faces one monumental frustration in trying to rebuild its image. That is that those afflicted with the second-best syndrome (the proponents of more funding for social needs, i.e. welfare) consider the technology community a competitor for the Nation's limited resources.

And their attention span isn't much greater than a pre-school child's. Else they wouldn't have forgotten so quickly what the rest of the world learned, largely just from watching us. The lesson: What falls out of investment in technology is not just, or even primarily, the ego-inflating reward of being first in something. The payoff from technological development is economic development, an expansion of wealth and resources which in turn means larger aid, more help and greater opportunity for the poor and underprivileged.

The Government which invests in technology has a program of national growth in mind. The Government which takes away from technology and taxes the present "haves" to give to the present "have nots" is defeatist. It gives a poor man a couple of dollars today and expects him to be grateful when in fact even he recognizes it has foreclosed on his future.

HONOR AMERICA DAY

HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, in these hectic days of demonstrations, strife, and antiestablishment activity, it is refreshing to note, from time to time, instances of constructive and positive action on the part of community minded and patriotic citizens and organizations.

The American Legion is one of these forming a bulwark to safeguard our heritage, and the Archie McCord Post No. 86 of the American Legion of Bethpage, N.Y. is to be complimented for the fine example of active Americanism in recognizing the work of Willard Marriott, evangelist Billy Graham, and Bob Hope in the spectacular "Honor America Day" on Independence Day, July 4, 1970, at Washington, D.C.

The Archie McCord Post No. 94 has adopted a resolution sponsored by Charles J. Sinning urging that "Honor America Day" be a yearly event and that these three outstanding Americans be remembered and associated on their own respective birthdays with "Honor America Day."

I am pleased to comply with the personal request of Post Commander Bob King to memorialize in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this commendable action by Conrad Sinning and the post members.

A PROPER INQUIRY

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, recently the Investigations Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee issued a subpoena to the CBS network to provide certain materials related to its documentary "The Selling of the Pentagon." This action resulted in an immediate and hostile reaction from many segments of the print and electronic news media who saw, or professed to see, a threat to the first amendment in the subcommittee's action.

To those who have taken the trouble to consider this matter before speaking out, it is clear that the subcommittee is engaging in a legitimate inquiry into the adequacy of the present laws governing broadcasting. An editorial from the Martinsburg Journal places the issue in its proper perspective. The great power conferred upon the broadcast news media carries with it some responsibilities to the public. An inquiry into how these responsibilities are being met does no violence to the first amendment. Rather, the failure of the Congress to concern itself with such matters would be a dereliction of our own responsibilities for which we would be properly called to account by the people we represent.

The editorial follows:

[From the Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal, Apr. 15, 1971]

A PROPER INQUIRY

Congressman Harley O. Staggers, of our own district, chairman of the U.S. House of Representatives Commerce Committee, has ordered officials of the Columbia Broadcasting System to appear before his group and present information concerning the recent controversial CBS program, "The Selling of the Pentagon."

This has really put the liberals on edge and their pack, led by The Washington Post, is now in full cry against Mr. Staggers charg-

ing that he is threatenng freedom of the press.

This writer, as a lifelong newspaper type, is certainly in accordance with the principle of freedom of the press in the nation but we also adhere to the seemingly old-fashioned and overlooked idea of the liberals that freedom of the press also involves responsibility.

For years we have noticed, particularly among young newspapermen and those who run college newspapers, a tendency to be completely enthralled and overcome by the power granted through freedom of the press. As a result, these young reporters take off in all directions and on any subject, acting under the cover of "freedom of the press" but taking no heed to the basic fact that freedom also entails responsibility.

Now we come to freedom of the press as it relates to the major television broadcasting networks.

The Washington Post editorialized at length last Sunday on Staggers' effort to control activities of CBS and to investigate its methods. In defense of the network, The Post blurted out the usual clichés and even went back to invoke the words of James Madison some century and a half ago.

Mr. Madison was certainly one of the pillars and founding fathers of our system but even he could not visualize the power which would one day be given to such a giant as CBS.

It should be remembered that the TV networks operate under federal license. In other words, they are given more or less monopoly rights just as power companies and telephone companies are given monopoly franchises. Because public utilities do not operate under the free enterprise system and have no direct competition, the federal government has to regulate them as to their rates and matters of service to customers. If these giant monopolies were not regulated, they could run roughshod over the people.

The same thing is more or less true of the television network monopolies which are a far cry from the comparatively small newspapers of both the past and the present.

Television networks today have the means of monopolizing the dissemination of news to many millions of people. Newspapers have to operate in the open market of competition. In other words, no one is restricted from starting his own newspaper if he can get the financial backing. It is not so with television networks. No one can move in on the networks because they are given monopoly status by the government.

Thus it is that the networks, by the very nature of their monopoly status, must be regulated.

CBS, which can come into practically every home in the nation, ran and then re-ran a highly propagandistic program attacking the defense establishment of the United States of America. Why is it wrong then for a committee of the U.S. House of Representatives to inquire into the program and to require CBS to explain its motives and methods?

It needs to be established that television networks, as powerful as they are, are not yet running the nation.

THE POSTAL SERVICE VERSUS ORGANIZED CRIME

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Evening Star of Friday, April 16, 1971, carried a most interesting

article relative to the new Postal Service's plans to fight organized crime. The recent strengthening of laws dealing with mail fraud will aid the Postal Service in its fight against "racketeering activity" and Postmaster General Blount and his postal inspectors are to be congratulated and encouraged in their efforts in this direction. I commend the following article to my colleagues attention:

POSTAL SERVICE TO STEP UP CRIME FIGHT

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Postmaster General Winton M. Blount said today that postal inspectors will step up their fight against organized crime when the Post Office Department becomes the Postal Service on July 1.

He made the statement in an interview after a closed-door session with postal inspectors assigned to strike forces against organized crime in 16 cities.

"The effort will be strengthened," he said, "because we will be able to add inspectors to our investigative forces where necessary without having to take the time to go to Congress. We'll have more flexibility in applying our resources."

MUST PROTECT PRODUCT

There's a matter of self-interest involved, he added. Since the new public corporation will have a mandate to become self-supporting as soon as possible, "It's far more to our interest to protect our product—the mail."

He said all existing postal laws against crime will remain on the books for the new corporation—and the most sweeping one, the one dealing with mail fraud, has been strengthened. For the first time, Congress has listed a mail fraud as a "racketeering activity."

Under the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, if mail fraud is committed in connection with a business and the offender is convicted of a pattern of racketeering activity, the government can move to take over the business.

The implications of the new law were explained to postal inspectors assigned to strike forces on organized crime during a two-day conference of inspectors here.

INFILTRATION EXTENSIVE

Blount said during the interview that organized crime's infiltration of legitimate business is far more extensive than anyone realizes. But somewhere along the line, the criminals have to use the mails and that's where the mail-fraud statute comes into play.

The postmaster general reported that of the 396 organized crime figures now under indictment for postal crimes, most were trapped through enforcement of the mail-fraud law.

Fencing of stolen and counterfeit credit cards, for example, has become increasingly common within organized crime. When someone is caught, the charge is mail fraud.

Other frequent mail-fraud offenses are advanced-fee swindles where businessmen pay big fees in advance to get multi-million dollar loans which never materialize, and the looting of assets of banks and insurance companies by organized criminals well-versed in financial matters.

SEEKS CONSISTENCY

Blount said that in the past the federal effort on organized crime hasn't been consistent. The thrust of the Nixon administration, he said, is to make the fight more effective over a longer period of time.

He has assigned postal inspectors to the inter-agency strike forces for the first time.

He said he is particularly pleased with recent successes against professional post office

burglary rings and well organized fences who dispose of stolen stamps. Six major burglary gangs have been substantially wiped out, with nearly 50 members caught, he said.

Losses of stamps and money through post office burglaries has dropped by close to 60 percent.

He also noted that organized crime's assault on securities moving through the registered mail system at New York's Kennedy airport has been eliminated after \$70 million in securities had been stolen since 1967.

CONVOYS USED

And a convoy securities system devised by Chief Postal Inspector William J. Cotter to insure that registered mail is no longer accessible to criminals while being transported to and from airplanes has put an end to theft of registered mail securities at 20 major airports, he said.

The postal system's growing attack on organized crime, Blount reported, has resulted in 142 major investigations now being under way.

An indication that anti-crime efforts are having effect is the fact that in the past few months, three organized crime figures under postal-crime indictment have been murdered gangland style, Blount said.

DELAYS HIT

Blount was asked his view of sentencing in organized crime cases related to the postal system. (In a recent case, organized crime figures received fines of \$100. In another, the fine was \$1 on each of two mail-fraud charges.)

"I think the courts should definitely consider whether the offender is part of an organized group," said Blount, who serves on the National Council on Organized Crime. "I think most courts do take that into consideration because certainly these people, who conduct themselves in an organized way, are a far different problem from the boy who gets into trouble for the first time."

"One of our big problems, though, is the criminal out on bail who continues his criminal operations. The delay in getting him to trial because of clogged court dockets is one of the things we must get straightened out," he said.

SSBN'S ON STATION

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Cuba has been aptly described by some as a 900 mile long Soviet launching platform. The following article from the March issue of Navy magazine details some of the many implications of a Soviet presence in the Caribbean.

The author of this piece, Mr. James D. Theberge, director of Latin American Studies for the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University, points out that:

By January, 1971, it was evident that extensive repair and servicing facilities for nuclear-powered submarines had been built and two barges anchored in the harbor to receive nuclear reactor effluents. These facilities can be made fully operational almost immediately. In fact, according to reliable sources the Cienfuegos facilities were in use during January, 1971, by a Soviet diesel-powered submarine that called many times in Cienfuegos, and a Soviet submarine tender, another submarine and two other ships

were reported heading towards Cuba in early February.

In one of late chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Hon. L. Mendel Rivers, last speeches before the House, he pointed out the advantages gained by the Soviet Union through having access to a nuclear submarine base in Cuba:

I am including as a part of my remarks a chart which illustrates the great advantage of a base in Cuba by showing the comparative transit time and days on station for submarines operating out of the Soviet North Fleet area and operating out of Cuba. It will be seen that in a 2-month patrol the on-station time for a ballistic missile submarine in the middle Atlantic is 32 days when operating from the North Fleet and 50 days when operating from Cuba. For a Gulf of Mexico station, it is 20 days on station when operating from the North Fleet and 56 days when operating from Cuba. In addition, as I mentioned, during transit time the subs based in Cuba are within range of targets in the United States. The chart also shows that for attack submarines the days on station are at least doubled if the subs can operate out of Cuba.

The chart follows:

DEPLOYMENT COMPARISON: NORTH FLEET VERSUS CUBA

| Station | Transit Time ¹ (days) | | Days on station | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|------|-----------------|------|
| | North Fleet | Cuba | North Fleet | Cuba |
| SSBN: | | | | |
| Middle Atlantic..... | 14 | 5 | 32 | 50 |
| Vicinity Bermuda..... | 15 | 4 | 30 | 52 |
| Gulf of Mexico..... | 20 | 2 | 20 | 56 |
| SSN: | | | | |
| Panama Canal..... | 19 | 2 | 22 | 56 |
| Florida Str..... | 18 | 2 | 24 | 56 |
| Windward Pass..... | 16 | 2 | 28 | 56 |
| Mona Pass..... | 16 | 3 | 28 | 56 |

¹ Assumes 12 kt.

Note: This great increase in the military effectiveness of this strategic force must certainly be appealing to Soviet leaders.

This increased advantage of a Soviet base, approximately contiguous to the continental United States, must now be viewed in the light of a continually expanding Soviet operational force of Y-class Polaris type ballistic nuclear submarines. Dr. John S. Foster, director of Defense Research and Engineering has reported on April 19, 1971, in prepared testimony before the Senate Committee on Armed Services that:

By mid-1971 the Soviets are expected to have MORE (emp. added) than 20 Y-class submarines operational. In addition the Soviets have G-class diesel powered and H-class nuclear powered submarines carrying submerged launched 650 mile nautical mile range SLBM's. The Soviets have also been actively testing a new SLBM, with a much longer range than the Y-class missile.

The increased on station time of an expanding number of Soviet nuclear ballistic submarines as a result of a base in Cuba is becoming a very real threat to the prelaunch survivability of our CONUS based B-52 force. At this time we are attempting to disperse this increment of our strategic retaliatory force, which incidentally represents 55 percent of the total megatonnage assigned to all U.S. strategic systems, through a satellite basing program which will give our bombers additional warning time to get off the

ground in case of a Soviet SLBM strike at our SAC bases.

An article in the Washington Star of April 16 this year quoted Col. Vergil Bates, chief of the strategic division in the Air Force directorate of operations to the effect that:

As it (the threat) increases, we improve. We plan to stay a few months ahead of them.

This was in connection with the satellite basing program. This would seem to me to be a very thin edge of security, especially in light of our continuous intelligence underestimation of Soviet deployment capabilities and also in light of a recent statement of Dr. John S. Foster's that:

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

A technological surprise, that is the deployment of a new weapons system which we did not expect—possibly of the type Senator Jackson brought to our attention in March and the existence of which was confirmed yesterday by Secretary of Defense Laird—a new ICBM missile at least equal and perhaps superior in megatonnage to the currently deployed Soviet SS-9 25 megaton intercontinental missile—or the employment of an existing system in an unexpected fashion by dint of a small but significant technological improvement, is something which can only be planned for in advance by having a posture of relative strategic superiority.

It is obvious that the current administration has no intention of attempting to regain superiority over the Soviet Union, thus radically decreasing our chances of survival in the event that one of the technological surprises which Dr. Foster predicts we can reasonably expect gives the Soviets the capability to overwhelm our limited forces.

Although Secretary Laird thinks the American people will accept parity, that is loss of American strategic superiority with no attempt to regain it, it is doubtful that they would do so if they understood the highly unstable nature of this posture and were fully aware of the increasing Soviet momentum in the strategic weapons field which is fast turning an uncertain parity into total U.S. inferiority all across the board.

As the Presidential Blue Ribbon Defense Panel Supplemental Report pointed out:

The most ominous danger of being second rate in the nuclear age is that it multiplies the chances—not of peace—but of nuclear war. Soviet or Red Chinese overconfidence or miscalculation in the employment of, or threat to use, their power may trigger such a war inadvertently or place the United States in a posture from which there could be no retreat.

The road to peace has never been through appeasement, unilateral disarmament or negotiation from weakness. The entire recorded history of mankind is precisely to the contrary. Among the great nations, only the strong survive.

Weakness of the U.S.—of its military capability and its will—would be the gravest threat to the peace of the world.

The article from Navy magazine as well as the story from the Washington Star of April 16, 1971, follows:

THE DOORSTEP CHALLENGE

(By James D. Theberge)

(James D. Theberge is the Director of Latin American Studies for the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University. A former foreign service reserve officer, Theberge served in Argentina as an economist. He also served as advisor to the Inter-American Development Bank. A graduate of Columbia he also holds two masters degrees, one from Oxford and one from Harvard.)

There are very few unchanging principles governing the relations between nations. Some, however, do exist, and for Americans the Monroe Doctrine is one of the most enduring of them all.

Promulgated almost one hundred and fifty years ago in President Monroe's State of the Union message, the Doctrine aimed at thwarting the territorial and ideological pretensions of the Great Powers in the New World. It declared any attempt to colonize, oppress or control the independent states of the Western Hemisphere would be considered an "unfriendly act" and a threat to U.S. "peace and safety." The Monroe Doctrine has been and continues to be accepted without question both by policy-makers and the vast majority of Americans as a fundamental tenet of U.S. foreign policy.

That this remains so is understandable but perhaps surprising for since the 1962 confrontation over strategic missiles in Cuba, Russia has made it clear that she is actively challenging the United States' unquestioned position of predominance in the Hemisphere. The modern era in which Great Powers from outside the Hemisphere could be expected to willingly abide by the Monroe Doctrine may be coming to an end. The Caribbean is the latest testing ground of the Doctrine with Cuba as the vortex of conflict. It is there that Soviet intentions and the vital importance of sea power are being clarified.

Since the end of World War II, the Soviet challenge to the United States and its allies has been largely restricted to areas around the periphery of Eurasia. Latin America has been, until recently, free from the direct threat or influence of Soviet military power. In large measure this flows from the fact that the Soviets traditionally have been primarily a land power.

PROCESS OF CHANGE

All this is in the process of change, however, due to the Soviet ambitions to become a global naval power backed by a large Soviet shipbuilding program. The Soviets have begun to grasp the possibilities of employing their naval power politically to reorient a country's economic and foreign policies as can be seen in their actions in areas adjacent to their own borders. (See NAVY November and December, 1970, and Page 8 this issue.) While not claiming that Soviet naval power is the only causal factor, it clearly has influenced the policies of Turkey and Iran—both nations have adopted a more neutral stance toward the United States.

The Soviets appear now to be striving to repeat this process by maintaining a naval presence in the Indian Ocean east and south of Suez. The Soviet presence in these areas is believed to be related to the natural Russian interest in areas close to its borders. It now seems clear, however, that whatever may have been the initial Soviet motivation in the Middle East, success has encouraged her to employ naval power for the achievement of political aims in other areas as well.

It is not too early to begin considering the possibility that Russia through her navy may be able to influence the policies of nations in the Caribbean and ultimately in other areas of the Hemisphere as well. It is also important to see this in the context of growing anti-military feeling in the United

States, and the relative decline in the size and quality of the U.S. Navy; all this at a time when the USSR is rapidly developing the world's most modern naval force.

As her naval capabilities grow, the Soviet Union will be increasingly able to preoccupy the United States in more than one area at a time. Just such a situation developed recently in Jordan where U.S. naval forces reportedly had to be redeployed from the Caribbean to the Mediterranean at a time when the Soviet Union was drawing attention to that very area by developing submarine facilities in Cuba. There simply were not enough U.S. warships to go around any longer.

This is not an isolated incident. The United States Navy is no longer able to maintain a reinforced amphibious Marine battalion permanently on station in the Caribbean because of requirements elsewhere. Tuna fishermen on the West Coast whose vessels were seized illegally by the Ecuadorian Navy at the end of January, 1971, wonder if the United States Navy is too over-committed to protect them or was prevented from acting by State Department policy.

Like the Middle East, the Caribbean area is characterized by great physical weakness on the part of the riparian and insular states, and recent history suggests that the Soviets are unable to resist temptations to make gains wherever weakness prevails. This is a tendency not likely to diminish as the Soviet Navy grows in strength; and the U.S. fleet suffers from further cutbacks and constraints.

Soviet naval forces have been operating with increasing frequency in the Caribbean since July, 1969, when the first Soviet flotilla intruded into the area, and there is evidence that the Soviet Union now is intent on developing some form of permanent naval presence in the Caribbean, whether based on Cuba or not.

Russia also is active on the Pacific Coast of South America. Discussions are now underway with Chile's Marxist government for the Soviets to build port facilities at Valparaiso for the Chilean fishing fleet as the first step in gaining base rights for the Soviet navy.

STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF CARIBBEAN

The strategic importance of the Caribbean archipelago and surrounding land masses may be considered from three points of view: (1) as sources of war materials, (2) as bases for offensive and subversive operations, and (3) as a lifeline of commerce and logistic supply.

Most U.S. imports of bauxite are supplied from Jamaica, Guyana, and Surinam, (they also account for over 40 per cent of world production); the Caribbean supplies about one-fifth of U.S. imports of iron ore and concentrates, almost entirely from Venezuela, and over one-third of U.S. crude oil imports from Venezuela, with small amounts from Colombia. Significant shares of total U.S. imports of graphite, sulphur, barium, fluorspar, sodium chloride and zinc also originate in Mexico and other Caribbean states. While some of these raw materials are not, strictly speaking, a "vital" necessity to the United States they are of value in conserving U.S. resources and diversifying her sources of supply.

The proximity of the area to the United States makes it of paramount importance to the continental defense. In the event that the mainland or any of the islands came under the control of a major enemy power, Hanson Baldwin, writing in his latest book, "Strategy For Tomorrow," (Harper and Row), has warned that "the continental ramparts would be breached, and, under certain conditions, as the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 demonstrated, a deadly, indeed a vital, danger to the security of the United States might develop."

The establishment of another expansionist Communist-dominated nation in the Caribbean would also, as Cuba demonstrated, pose a threat of guerrilla and terrorist type attacks on neighboring Caribbean states, and, if violent revolutionary activity is unsuccessful, the support of "united front" or "coalition" tactics to further expand the area of Communist imperialism. The existence of Communist-controlled territory in the Caribbean (Cuba) already confronts the United States with a major political problem, requires constant surveillance, and diverts part of the U.S. military and intelligence forces.

Finally, the Caribbean (including the Panama Canal), has major military value as a lifeline of seaborne commerce and communication, the area of convergence of inter-oceanic trade routes and as a logistic and supply route for the United States. Major sea routes crisscross the area carrying troops and military supplies to crisis areas such as Southeast Asia and bulk cargo (mainly coarse grains, coal, crude oil, and petroleum, lumber) and general cargo between the production and consumption centers in the Western Hemisphere, Europe and the Far East.

SOVIET NAVAL INTRUSION

Soviet construction of nuclear submarine support facilities in Cuba during the last half of 1970 demonstrated that Soviet interest in the Caribbean went beyond the protection of "Socialist" Cuba and the large Russian investment there. Furthermore, reports from reliable underground sources indicate that a substantial naval construction program is underway in Cuba to provide the Soviet Union with the facilities required to support a sustained naval presence.

The seven-ship Soviet flotilla that entered the Caribbean and visited Cuba for the first time on July 20, 1969, consisted of a KYDNA class guided-missile cruiser (from the Black Sea fleet) accompanied by two guided missile destroyers, two diesel powered submarines, a submarine tender, and a tanker. In Castro's address aboard the guided missile cruiser GROSNY, the flagship of the flotilla, he described the Soviet visit as an "historic event" marking the first time since the Cuban revolution of 1959 that the Soviet Navy had called on Cuban ports. In November of the same year, Marshal Grechko, Soviet Minister of defense, visited Cuba for the first time. Several months later in February of 1970, Raul Castro, Minister of the Armed Forces of Cuba, returned the visit and probably negotiated an increase in Soviet military aid to Cuba. On April 22, 1970, Fidel Castro, speaking in Havana on the 100th anniversary of Lenin's birthday, declared Cuba's military connections with the Soviet Union were "unbreakable."

Then in May, a second Soviet naval task force visited Cuba for two weeks after a cruise in the Caribbean stopping off in the port of Cienfuegos. The task force this time included three submarines (two diesel and one nuclear-powered), a submarine tender, guided missile cruiser, a missile-equipped destroyer, and an oil tanker.

A NUCLEAR SUB BASE

During the late spring and summer of 1970 increased Soviet military activity was evident in Cuba and in August details of Soviet naval construction in Cienfuegos was brought to the attention of the U.S. intelligence community by agents and Cuban refugees. The evidence pointed to the strong possibility that the Soviets were installing a permanent nuclear submarine facility.

The third arrival in less than 15 months of a USSR flotilla (a guided missile destroyer, guided missile cruiser, tanker, submarine tender and ALLIGATOR-class amphibious landing craft carrying three barges on her deck) in Cienfuegos on September 9th aroused U.S. interest in Soviet intentions as new evidence accumulated that the Russians

were preparing Cienfuegos to support and service nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines.

It is worth noting that earlier in 1968, the Russians had installed facilities for servicing 130 medium-sized ships, a floating dock, repair shops and a long-range communications center in Havana. Therefore, ample facilities already were available to surface ships and submarines for port calls and "flag showing" expeditions into the Caribbean. Soviet warships berthed in Havana on their first visit to Cuba and the Russians have no need for a secluded, well-protected deep-water facility at Cienfuegos, unless, as the London Economist noted, "They want to stockpile large amounts of strategic equipment," and, it should be added, unless they intend to establish a strategic submarine support facility.

THE CIENFUEGOS INCIDENT

By the end of September, 1970, reports from Cuban underground sources and U-2 photo reconnaissance flights over Cuba, which had been stepped up earlier in the month, indicated that apart from the submarine tender and barges anchored in Cienfuegos there was considerable Soviet supervised construction activity in the port. On September 25th, the Nixon Administration warned the Soviet Union against establishing a strategic submarine base in the Caribbean and reminded Soviet leaders of Khrushchev's promise to President Kennedy to keep offensive weapons out of Cuba and the Hemisphere. The Pentagon declared that it was not sure about Soviet intentions and whether the Soviet Union was building a submarine support facility although there were some indications that was what they were doing.

While the Soviets did not deny they might be building submarine support facilities at Cienfuegos, Pravda accused the Nixon Administration of fanning war hysteria to "artificially aggravate the international situation and create an atmosphere of military psychosis." It was not until October 9th that the Soviet Union rejected reports that it was planning a strategic submarine base in Cuba. Izvestia declared that the Soviet Government was honoring its part of the 1962 agreement with President Kennedy. On October 13th, the Soviet Government made a stronger denial and charged, as reported in the New York Times, that U.S. suggestions that it was constructing a naval base in Cuba were a "concoction" and that "the Soviet Union has not built and is not building its own military base in Cuba." (Italic added)

The Nixon Administration appeared anxious to accept the Soviet Union's reaffirmation of the 1962 Kennedy-Khrushchev understandings and clearly did not want a crisis over Cienfuegos in view of the upcoming Congressional elections, the SALT negotiations and the desire to make a success of the "era of negotiations" into which United States-Soviet relations were supposed to be entering. On October 10th the Soviet withdrawal of the submarine tender from Cienfuegos harbor temporarily cleared the air of growing suspicion and distrust of Soviet intentions. However, the barges designed to receive radioactive effluents from Soviet nuclear-powered submarines, remained anchored in the harbor and the construction of facilities for the Soviet Navy on Cayo Alcatraz within Cienfuegos continued until completed in early January, 1971. On October 15th, five days after steaming out to sea, the submarine tender returned to Cuba, entering the harbor of Mariel, 25 miles east of Havana. She returned to Cienfuegos on October 31st and remained there until January 4th or 5th.

Since the Soviet submarine tender presumably was equipped to service nuclear-

powered missile submarines, the Nixon Administration appeared relieved to announce that the tender (along with a diesel-powered submarine, a guided missile frigate and an oiler) had left Cienfuegos and apparently was on its way home and hoped that the incident finally was closed. However, by January, 1971, it was evident that extensive repair and servicing facilities for nuclear-powered submarines had been built and two barges anchored in the harbor to receive reactor effluents. These facilities can be made fully operational almost immediately. In fact, according to reliable sources the Cienfuegos facilities were in use during January, 1971, by a Soviet diesel-powered submarine that called many times in Cienfuegos, and a Soviet submarine tender, another submarine and two other ships were reported heading towards Cuba in early February.

Soviet naval activities in the Caribbean during the period from mid-September in 1970 to early January, 1971, can be viewed as an assertion of the Soviet right to send ships to the area and as a test of U.S. determination to prevent the Soviet Union from basing or servicing nuclear missile submarines in Cuba or elsewhere in the Caribbean. President Nixon made it quite clear in a television interview on January 4, 1971, that the United States would consider it a violation of its "understanding" with the Soviet Union if the latter serviced nuclear submarines "either in or from Cuba."

SOVIET STRATEGY

Three elements of the Soviet Union's strategy in the Caribbean can be summarized briefly: (1) intrusion into the United States sphere of influence through military alliance with Cuba and deployment of Soviet naval power in the Caribbean; (2) protection of Cuba's "socialist" regime as an extension of the Brezhnev Doctrine—the right of Soviet intervention in Communist regimes to protect Soviet-defined "socialism"; and (3) promotion of "peaceful" Communist accession to power through "united front" and "coalition" tactics along the lines of the Chilean model.

What does the Soviet Union hope to gain from the deployment of its naval power in the Caribbean? The Soviets may be trying to capitalize on the crisis in the relations between the United States and a growing number of Latin American and Caribbean states in recent years as a result of resurgent nationalism, the striving for an independent foreign policy and the desire to reduce economic dependence on the United States.

Soviet naval activity in the Caribbean strengthens the image of the Soviet Union as a rising power contrasted with the apparent decline of the United States' power and nerve. At present, their presence is less a military than a political threat to U.S. predominance in the Caribbean and the Western Hemisphere. By undermining U.S. prestige, the Soviets hope to enhance their image as the expanding power of the future.

The United States cannot afford to permit the Soviet Union to undermine the U.S. position in the Caribbean, or any other area of vital importance to U.S. security, to the point where, as Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., put it, "free world nations and uncommitted nations around the globe will begin to back away from their commitments to the U.S. and seek accommodations in other directions."

This will happen if our allies and neighbors in the Caribbean begin to believe the Soviet Union is considerably more powerful than the United States.

The political costs of the failure of socialism in Cuba are considered sufficiently high to compel the Soviet Union to support Castro's regime in spite of differences. The Soviet Union has used the "friendship visits"

to Cuba by the Soviet Navy since July, 1969, to demonstrate Soviet-Cuban solidarity and Soviet commitment to the survival of Cuba. As Fleet Admiral Kasatonov declared in 1967: "Ships' visits facilitate the development and strengthening of friendly relations between the Soviet people and the peoples of foreign countries, and they strengthen the authority and influence of our homeland in the international arena."

As a member of the "socialist camp" the defense of Cuba occupies a relatively high priority in Soviet world-wide policy, but at the same time, the Soviet Union would like to reduce the heavy economic burden of subsidizing Cuba. Since 1966, the Soviet Union has launched an offensive in Latin America which combines flexible economic aid and trade policy with non-revolutionary reform-type politics on the part of local Communist parties. The ultimate aim is to end the U.S.-sponsored economic blockade and political isolation of Cuba so that Cuba can become more self-sufficient and less of an economic political, and military burden.

The major Moscow-oriented Communist parties in the Caribbean have sought coalitions or "fronts" with anti-U.S. nationalist groups and generally eschewed revolutionary violence. The Soviet Union's primary aim has been to undermine the U.S. position in Latin America and the Caribbean while carefully avoiding the risk of direct confrontation with the United States. Particular attention has been given to harnessing the forces of middle class nationalism to the cause of international communism.

Soviet specialists consider the nationalistic sectors of the middle class to be the decisive force behind the "national liberation" movements in Latin America and the Caribbean. A coalition of Communist, left-wing and nationalistic middle-class forces, united by their hostility to growing U.S. economic power and frustrated at the pace of social progress, will gain in peaceful political competition. In time, it is believed that the nationalistic middle-class will come to power, nationalize U.S. property and break with the United States. Foreign investment, by provoking nationalist reaction, becomes then a powerful agent of its own destruction.

The 1970 Chilean presidential election demonstrated that Soviet policy may succeed under special circumstances. The victory of Marxist Salvador Allende's Unidad Popular Party, an alliance of Communists, Socialists, Radicals, and radical Christian Democrats, suggests that power may be within the grasp of those local Communist parties capable of enlisting the cooperation of the "anti-imperialist" national and petit bourgeois parties and groups.

SOVIET PROSPECTS

What are the prospects for the success of Soviet strategy in the Caribbean? The intense anti-United States feeling from which the USSR has been the chief beneficiary in many Arab states has made limited headway in the Caribbean aside from Cuba. Nevertheless, anti-United States feeling is strong in the Dominican Republic, Panama, Guatemala and other states, where memories of U.S. intervention are still fresh. Some Caribbean political leaders show signs of moving towards a more independent foreign policy and are beginning to place restrictions on foreign investment, but they have not yet fallen into the trap of a negative anti-Americanism or reduced their traditional pro-Western orientation.

As long as the USSR has acquired few interests, aside from Cuba, worth protecting in the Caribbean, it can afford to favor local forces whose aim is to alter the status quo. The USSR has more to gain than the United States from instability in the area, although it cannot carry these tactics too far without risking a strong local or U.S. response.

ESTABLISHED FOOTHOLD

We must not forget that the Soviet Union has established a foothold in the Western Hemisphere and successfully challenged the Monroe Doctrine as a result of the unimpeded arming of Cuba and the establishment of Soviet controlled military facilities on the island. The United States allowed this to happen in the early 1960's when she was the most powerful industrial and military nation in the world. In the 1970's the strategic and naval balance will be less favorable to the United States. Soviet surface ships will be capable of influencing political-military affairs in the Caribbean, thereby introducing a new element of instability into one of the most politically unstable and socially tense areas in the world.

During the century and a half since President Monroe's historic message of 1823, the Monroe Doctrine has been the subject of perennial controversy and often pronounced dead by its enemies. In 1962, Premier Khrushchev flatly declared, "The Monroe Doctrine is dead," and should be buried. The current Soviet build-up in the Caribbean, with the Soviet navy playing a leading role, presents the most formidable challenge to the Doctrine and to the U.S. interests in modern history. Only timely and resolute counter-action by the United States, preferably with the cooperative support of the Organization of American States' members can persuade the Soviet Union in the 1970's that the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine—that of keeping hostile powers and ideologies out of the Western Hemisphere—is far from dead.

[From the Washington Star, Apr., 16, 1971]
REDS OFF U.S. COASTS: SUBS FORCE A-JETS
INLAND

(By Orr Kelly)

The United States is gradually pulling back its bomber force from the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts to protect the planes from possible attack by a growing fleet of Soviet missile-firing submarines.

More than 1,100 bombers and tankers eventually may be involved in the redeployment.

The change in bomber locations is based on maps showing, minute-by-minute, the areas that could be reached by missiles fired from off-shore, according to Col. Vergil Bates, chief of the strategic division in the Air Force directorate of operations.

It is assumed that the submarine-launched missiles would be used first against the bomber bases, rather than cities, if the Soviet Union were to attempt a surprise attack on this country, while intercontinental missiles would be aimed at the U.S. Minuteman missiles.

"Our program is in line with the threat. As it increases, we improve. We plan to stay a few months ahead of them," he said during an interview in his office deep in the Pentagon.

According to Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Soviet Union is expected to have 20 Yankee Class ballistic missile submarines in operation by mid-year. Each sub carries 16 missiles capable of flying more than 1,000 miles.

Some of the subs reportedly are on station off the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, but not yet in sufficient numbers to pose a major threat to the bomber force.

But as the number of subs on station increases, Bates said, more and more of the bombers will be pulled back to satellite bases farther from the coasts.

The satellite-basing program will, within the next two years, involve the use of 17 more bases where bombers and tankers can be placed on alert. Most of these are bases formerly used by bombers. They will be in

addition to the 30 bomber and tanker home bases in use now.

Spreading the planes over more bases and moving them away from the coasts not only will create more targets, but also will make it possible for the planes to get into the air more quickly, Bates said.

As an example, he said there now are 30 bombers and 30 tankers assigned to March Air Force Base in California. Twelve of each may be on alert. Since it takes 15 seconds for each plane to get off the ground, it would take at least six minutes to launch the 24 planes. Because March is close to the coast, this might not be enough time to get them all into the air.

So, six bombers now have been sent to a satellite base at Ellsworth AFB, South Dakota. Since Ellsworth is much farther from the coast than March, more planes could get off the ground if a warning were received in both places at the same time. The planes remain on alert at Ellsworth for 28 days and then return to March for servicing. The crews are rotated every seven days.

Eventually, some bases near the coast may have as few as four planes on alert, while inland bases may have as many as 20.

The satellite basing program, which is expected to involve about \$20.5 million in construction costs, involves a major realignment of the way the bomber force is deployed.

In the past, the major threat was thought to come from intercontinental missiles launched from Russia. Planes along the northern U.S. border were closest to their potential targets but they also were the most vulnerable to attack. So other planes were based far to the south, in Southern California and Florida.

Now, the planes along the coasts are thought to be vulnerable to the submarine-launched missiles, which provide much less warning time than ICBMs, and the planes based inland are considered relatively safe.

CRITICS OF PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the column by William F. Buckley, Jr., which appeared in the April 21 edition of the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. Buckley has given us some new ideas to consider as we assess the tremendous job of the President at this time.

THE CRITICS OF RICHARD M. NIXON

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

Richard M. Nixon is in for a very very rough time during the next period. He does things to people, causing even, very decent folk to behave quite incomprehensibly. Joe McCarthy had the same knack. I used to point out that I never knew anything McCarthy had said that could equal in vileness some of the things that were said about him.

Take, for instance, Allard Lowenstein. He is a civilized man, of incontinent idealism, who will be remembered as the person who launched the program to retire Lyndon Johnson in 1968 by fielding an opponent in the Democratic primary in New Hampshire. Subsequently, he served a term in the House of Representatives, and now he is back on the road, organizing to beat Nixon in 1972.

He stopped by recently at the John F. Kennedy Center at Harvard, where he delivered a paean on the memory of Robert F. Kennedy. Then he announced his plans,

making the remark that "Nixon is making Johnson look retroactively very credible, which is an extraordinary achievement when you think about it."

Now we are all used to the hurly-burly of polemics, but when you stop to think of it, in what significant way has Nixon let the liberals down? Or, more exactly stated, in what significant way has he deceived them?

He never said that he would have American troops out of Vietnam within 6 months or 16 months of taking office. He said he would wind down the war, and he has done so. He said he would pull out of Cambodia by the end of June, and did; said that American foot soldiers would not fight in Laos, and they haven't.

What is Lowenstein, so excited about? It is mysterious. It is partly what Nixon does to Lowenstein, and partly what Lowenstein does to Lowenstein, because Al Baby is going to be looking pensive and sad about the state of the world before the New Hampshire primary of 1996, when he will announce that the world cannot survive a second term by John-John.

Then there is the columnist and author Garry Wills who, did one not know that he is capable of making distinctions only Bertrand Russell and Alfred North Whitehead could follow, is beginning to sound like a slogan-writer for the John Birch Society.

For instance, there were those (myself included) who commented that Nixon's recent refusal to give a date when all American troops would be out of Vietnam was a sign of courage, given the clear indication that the overwhelming majority of the American people desire to be given such a date. Wills' comment? "I prefer heroes who are not 'brave' with other men's lives." At an intellectual level, that comment is the equal of, "If you don't like our foreign policy, why don't you go live in Russia."

Wills, if he would permit himself to reflect on the matter, would recognize that we are called upon, in our lifetime, to be courageous in different ways. As soldiers, we are asked to show courage on the firing line, and it is reported that, when Nixon was a soldier, he did so. Later in life, courage is needed in many different situations, in facing personal and public crisis. Is Wills saying that it is improper to consider the courage of Julius Caesar, or Alexander the Great, or Napoleon Bonaparte, or Winston Churchill, because more often than not they were engaged not in exposing their own lives to the enemies' weapons, but the lives of the soldiers whom destiny put them in command of?

Wills then takes offense at Billy Graham who, commenting on the fate of Lt. Calley, said, "Perhaps it is a good time for each of us to reevaluate our life. We have all had our My Lai in one way or another, perhaps not with guns, but we have hurt others with a thoughtless word, an arrogant act or a selfish deed." Observes Wills: "To equate My Lai—multiple cold-blooded murder of women and children—with a thoughtless word does not so much diminish My Lai's importance as destroy any claim Graham has to speak seriously about morality."

Really, it requires the Nixonization of the spleen, so to affect a critic's reasoning powers. Graham did not equate My Lai with "a thoughtless word," he observed merely that many men are tempted by special circumstances to quite hideous lengths. The objective harm done differs: Perhaps it is the killing of helpless children, as at My Lai. Perhaps it is the psychological castration of the human being, as in Albee's "Virginia Wolfe." Sadism, hysteria, and thoughtlessness, in different mixes, are generically responsible for My Lai, and for some of the criticisms made of public figures. Garry Wills has written imploring me please to learn to distinguish between Fathers Daniel and Philip Berrigan, and I am writing back today

promising to make the effort, in return for which I ask that he learn to distinguish between Nixon and Satan.

WILLARD EDWARDS PUTS PEACE ACTIONS IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, in today's Chicago Tribune the distinguished journalist, Willard Edwards, makes a comparison between those who are parading about our Nation's Capitol in a variety of odd costumes in behalf of immediate withdrawal from Vietnam—and those who are considering an improved defense system against possible enemy nuclear attack.

A responsibility of the Congress is to provide thoughtful and long-range measures intended to provide for the national security. Reenacting the flight to Dunkirk with the expectation that this would induce other nations—including those controlled by tyrannical dictators—to lay down their arms, would seem to be the height of human folly.

While it may not be possible to effectively defend against sophisticated enemy nuclear weapons, neither would it seem wise to fail to provide some substantial measure of defense against such weapons.

Willard Edwards' cogent observations are worth pondering by those in and out of Congress—particularly those like myself who yearn for the reestablishment of an early and durable peace:

HEARINGS ON ABM OUTWEIGH PROTEST (By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, April 21.—Outside, in the spring sunshine flooding the grassy expanse of the Capitol Plaza, groups of young men in faded green jungle fatigues clamored for an immediate end to the war in Viet Nam.

Inside, in the calm and quiet of a Senate committee hearing room, attention was focused on the very real threat of a future war and defenses against it. The issue here was not how to hasten the end of a fading war but how to prevent conditions which might bring on a dreadful new one.

In the mood of the times, the antiwar demonstrators captured the front pages and the prime network time. The committee hearings, just as legitimately antiwar in their objective, went almost unnoticed.

Nobody knows the eventual outcome of the mass protests which began here this week and will continue into May with a climactic effort to paralyze the government. If violence is averted, it will be a miracle.

In the end, the energies of tens, perhaps hundreds of thousands will have been poured into attempts to pressure President Nixon into a precipitate pullout from a conflict which he has already diminished far beyond expectations and is committed to terminate.

The spectacle of the United States government under siege may give comfort in Moscow, Peking and Hanoi. They, however, will recognize the Senate committee hearings as far more crucial to future relations between the East and the West.

For, once again, the battle was being joined over development of an antiballistic missile system to provide at least partial protection to the nation from a devastating nuclear attack.

The Armed Services Committee began considering an administration request for \$1.3 billion to continue construction of Safeguard ABM sites around Minuteman intercontinental missile bases in North Dakota and Montana, start a new one in Missouri and prepare for a fourth site in Wyoming or at Washington, D.C.

Dr. John S. Foster Jr., director of defense engineering and research, put the case simply. Russia, with its own defense against intercontinental missiles, was continuing a surge toward nuclear predominance.

Russia will have 1,500 ICBM's by mid-year, he said, compared to 1,054 operational missiles in the U.S.

It has started a new ICBM silo construction program of unknown but menacing nature; developed a new version of its huge SS-9 missile; and is continuing at full speed its production of new submarines, each with 16 submerged-launch missiles of 1,000 nautical mile range.

Under these circumstances, it might be expected that the modest ABM program [now reduced to four sites from the 17 originally proposed in 1969], would encounter little opposition. In its present form, it can no more than blunt a first strike by Russia, permitting some retaliation.

But the ABM has always been a center of controversy. It was almost killed by the Senate in 1969 and was saved by a one-vote margin. The opponents have not given up hope.

Why "expand" the system, they ask, when Russia proposed a limitation on ABM systems at the strategic arms limitation talks? Why, retorted Foster, give away a bargaining incentive? This argument will continue thru the session.

The decision finally reached, it is suggested, will have a greater impact on the world's hopes for peace than the fixing of a date for withdrawal of troops from Viet Nam—the subject of storm and fury here in the next two weeks.

THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, of the various types of foreign assistance that have been provided by the United States over the past two decades, none has had more personal impact than the type we call technical assistance. "Point IV" still rings around the world as an expression of imaginative, creative, and selfless assistance to others.

The American adviser and technician, often a rugged, salty type who would wade in the rice paddies and sweat in the shops alongside the farmers and workmen of the less-developed countries, became a symbol of American energy and ingenuity. The clasped hand emblem, most closely associated with technical assistance, is one of the best known insignia in the world.

I was pleased to note recently a typical example of this type of assistance. Floyd Moon, a 62-year-old native of Colorado, went to a remote village of Kenya and showed, with a great deal of imagination, hard work and ingenuity, and very little money, how to install a pump, form a cooperative and harvest more rice.

Through the introduction of bees, he brought greater production of food to the coastal region of that East African country.

This type of assistance has made an outstanding record. It expanded the skills and knowledge of farmers and the rural facilities that permitted India, Pakistan, the Philippines and other countries to take full advantage of the "Green Revolution." It helped develop educational, health and vocational institutions, and financed training in the United States for 150,000 participants.

Technical assistance, if it is to have long-lasting effects, however, must meet the changing conditions of the 1970's. The President has therefore proposed the establishment of an International Development Institute as a part of the new proposed foreign assistance legislation. This suggested institute will be designed to make the greatest possible use of our U.S. science and technology. It will also seek to make greater use of other government, institutional and private resources.

The aim will be to better help the people of developing countries improve the quality of their lives; to help them enjoy better education and health, expand job opportunities, and in general to share more fully in the benefits of technological, economic and social progress.

It is important to note that the burden of responsibility by technical assistance programs will be on the countries themselves. The Institute will advise, consult and help determine the problems and the methods of solving them. It will rely heavily on research—here in the United States and in fostering the capabilities of the assisted countries.

I have confidence that the Institute will function in a spirit of partnership keyed to the needs of the 1970's and will be in line with the American spirit and a tradition of seeking to help all people along the pathway to a safer, healthier and happier life.

TELEVISION AND TRUTH

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1971

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, we all know that nobody has a monopoly on truth; we all know that any reporter, however able and however diligent, may make mistakes. We know also that television news documentaries may contain errors of omission—and what is worse, errors and distortions that may be deliberate.

I do not believe that any one of us wants to have Government imposed censorship over the news media. But I know from sober experience that at least one television news network, CBS, has not only made errors, but refused to admit that it did.

I believe that responsibility involves

not only telling the truth, but admitting mistakes.

But when I asked CBS 2 years ago to admit their error in the famous "dying baby" episode in their "Hunger in America" show, they refused to do it. They refused to confess error even after three separate independent investigations proved the facts.

This was not responsibility; it was arrogance personified—they were saying that they were too big, too good to either make or confess error. And so they went ahead with their original version of the show, unaltered, uncorrected, even to this very day—and that show is still being used.

It is that kind of arrogance on the part of a few high network executives that has brought public scorn down on the networks. The media are not in any public difficulty because they have dared treat controversial subjects—far from it—but only because they have given the impression that they alone know what the truth is, that they have no need to admit mistakes, no need to correct the record, no responsibility to anyone save themselves, and possibly the Neilson ratings.

Mr. Speaker, Barrons magazine recently published an article on where this kind of attitude can lead; and I include that article in the RECORD at this point:

BROADCAST LICENSE—CBS HAS FORFEITED ACCESS TO THE NATION'S AIRWAVES

We cannot help but admire a man who defends his principles and sticks to his guns. Last Tuesday evening Richard S. Salant, president of the News Division of the Columbia Broadcasting System, gave a nationwide television audience a demonstration of doggedness which in other circumstances, might well have commanded our respect. Under fierce attack from Congress and the White House for airing the controversial documentary, "The Selling of the Pentagon," Mr. Salant refused to give an inch. Perhaps with an eye on the clock—the 11-12 p.m. slot, while not exactly prime time, is still too valuable to waste—the CBS executive took no more than a moment or so to rebut "only a few" of the critics' charges; however, he assured his viewers, "We have an answer for every one..." Then, boldly switching to the offensive, the head of CBS News asserted: "We are proud of 'The Selling of the Pentagon'..." We are confident that when passions die down, it will be recognized as a vital contribution to the people's right to know. Lesser media of communications may occasionally run a correction or retraction; The Washington Post, not long ago, printed an extraordinary confession of error. CBS News, which is made of sterner stuff, stands defiantly on the record.

Quite a record it is, too. As to "The Selling of the Pentagon," Mr. Salant addressed himself to merely two of the many points of criticism raised. Regarding the rest, the chief critics—including the Vice President of the United States, senior editor of Air Force magazine and a non-partisan citizens' organization known as Accuracy in Media (AIM), which plans to lodge a complaint with the National Association of Broadcasters—make a compelling, and thus far uncontested, case. In particular, CBS stands accused of various misstatements, including the amount spent by the Pentagon on public affairs, and the true identity of those responsible for a certain military briefing (not, as alleged, Peoria's Caterpillar Tractor Co., "which did \$39 million of business with

the Defense Department last year," but the local Association of Commerce).

Far worse were the omissions and distortions, including two episodes in which tapes were clipped and reassembled to convey false impressions of what the speakers said. Specific lapses aside, even the untutored eye could scarcely fail to detect, in a so-called documentary, pervasive malice and editorial bias.

On the CBS television network—which includes five wholly owned stations and 198 affiliates—slanted (or, in view of his authority and tenure, perhaps the word should be Salanted) journalism has long been the name of the game. As in "The Selling of the Pentagon," moreover, the thrust has tended to be violently against what most of the country would regard as its basic interests, institutions and values. In a prize-winning "documentary," key sequences of which subsequently proved false, CBS News professed to uncover "Hunger in America"; contrariwise, in an equally distorted report from Cuba, the television camera found, in effect, that Cubans under Castro never had it so good. Not content merely to cover (albeit in its own fashion) the news, CBS time and again has sought to make news. Shortly after NBC scooped the competition by airing an LSD-stimulated interview with Dr. Timothy Leary, WBBM-TV, CBS outlet in Chicago, participated in a headline-making, and illegal, pot party, which became the object of an investigation by the Federal Communications Commission. In a similar, if far more brazen, exploit—on which both Vice President Agnew and Mr. Salant touched last week—CBS sought to stage, and to film, an invasion of Haiti. One picture supposedly is worth a thousand words. High time the U.S. got the picture.

As last Tuesday's performance suggests, it isn't pretty. Among other sins of omission and commission, CBS News failed to mention that it was paid to produce one of the films at which it scoffed. In depicting a press conference, during which the briefing officer, replying to 34 questions, gave three no-comment answers, the camera focused on the latter. Statements made on tape by two Pentagon spokesmen, a Marine colonel and the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, were cut up, transposed and pieced together again in a way that made both of them seem unresponsive and foolish. Rep. Edward Hébert (not Herbert, as the caption later had it), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, turned up on the screen with this gracious—and, despite Mr. Salant's subsequent remarks, wholly misleading—introduction: "Using sympathetic Congressmen, the Pentagon tries to counter what it regards as the antimilitary tilt of network reporting (Ed. note: where would it ever get such an idea?). War heroes are made available for taped home district TV reports from pro-Pentagon politicians."

All this is reprehensible enough. Far worse—in a format presumably dedicated to fact—are the extremist opinions which it was used to convey. Here is a disillusioned and slightly incoherent ex-Air Force officer: "I feel that the military information arm is so vast, has been able to become so pervasive by the variety and the amounts and the way and the sheer numbers it's able to present its viewpoint to the American people, I think this attitude it was able to develop allowed Vietnam to happen..." Here is CBS-News' own dispassionate Roger Mudd: "On this broadcast we have seen violence made glamorous, expensive weapons advertised as if they were automobiles, biased opinions presented as straight facts. Defending the country not just with arms but also with ideology, Pentagon propaganda insists on America's role as the cop on every beat in the world."

Anyone—even CBS, though it won't concede as much—can make mistakes. What the

record shows, however, is a pattern of distortion and slanted reporting stretching back over the years. In 1963, so a revealing article and exchange of letters in The New York Times Magazine has disclosed, President Kennedy gave an exclusive interview to Walter Cronkite of CBS News on such literally inflammatory issues as the Buddhists in South Vietnam and the allegedly repressive government of Ngo Dinh Diem. In the editing process, the footage shrank from 30 minutes to 12, and, according to Pierre Salinger, then White House press secretary, "the result was a partial distortion of JFK's opinion of President Diem. In the actual interview... President Kennedy spoke of his respect and sympathy for the problems of President Diem. When the film was shown to the public, only the unfavorable Presidential remarks remained, and JFK's praise of Diem had been deleted. The impression was left that JFK had no confidence at all in Diem, and when he and his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, were later shot to death in a military coup, there were persistent charges from Madame Nhu and others that the President's statements had given aid and comfort to Diem's enemies. JFK was deeply hurt by the accusations."

Prior to the Republican convention the following year, CBS News struck again. According to Senator Barry Goldwater (R., Ariz.), Daniel Schorr, then serving as correspondent abroad, "took it upon himself to put out a news report to portray the idea that I was trying to forge links with far-rightist, neo-fascist groups in Germany... Schorr dealt heavily in false facts which neither he nor CBS newsmen in this country made any attempt to check with my office." So it has gone year by year. In 1968, after a storm of protest, a Special Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce investigated television coverage of the Democratic national convention in Chicago. In viewing the video tape of the CBS coverage, the Congressional probers noted a passage in which Walter Cronkite cried that the police "were severely manhandling a minister." According to the Committee Report: "The accompanying action shows police merely attempting to get a man dressed in clerical garb into a patrol wagon, using what the investigators felt was reasonable force to overcome the man's resistance." The Report concluded, in part: "In an attempt to give an overall impression, it might be said that the coverage presented over the air does, in retrospect, seem to present a one-sided picture which in large measure exonerates the demonstrators and protestors and indicts the city government of Chicago and, to a lesser degree, the Democratic Party."

The long reel of distortion continues to unwind. In her nationally syndicated column, Alice Widener, frequent contributor to Barron's, has chronicled some of the gamier episodes. In the fall of 1969, Frank Kearns, CBS correspondent in Rome, broadcast a report on alleged Italian opinion in the criminal case against the man who hijacked a commercial airliner from San Francisco. Mr. Kearns chose to quote the views of a single editor, that of the Communist newspaper "Unita," who described the hijacker a "Robin Hood... who made a fool of the repressive and hated FBI." Again, on "Face the Nation," CBS devoted a half-hour of Sunday time to Tom Hayden, revolutionist of the so-called New Left. Mrs. Widener wrote: "He was permitted by reporter Martin Agronsky of CBS, and two other reporters, to get away with intellectual murder... Thus it came about that at the end of the program, the arrogant co-founder of the anarchic Students for a Democratic Society made an unchallenged statement about 'the poverty around the world that the United States is responsible for.'" Abbie Hoffman, convicted of inciting to riot in Chicago, ap-

peared on the Merv Griffin show wearing a shirt made from the American flag (on the air, CBS thoughtfully blipped it out.) Small wonder that Desmond Smith of CBS once told TV Guide: "There's been a great deal of manipulation from the left. The left and SDS have been getting a great deal of play. Americans are starting to feel they're not getting the whole story."

Since then the credibility gap, notably with respect to so-called documentaries, has widened beyond belief. Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary defines documentary as follows:—"adj. (1) contained or certified in writing; (2) relating to, or employing, documentation in literature or art; broadly, factual, objective." The noun, of course, possesses the same qualities. Neither word belongs in the CBS lexicon. In the famous charade on "Hunger in America," the narrator's off-screen voice said: "Hunger is easy to recognize when it looks like this. This baby is dying of starvation. He was an American. Now he is dead." Heart-rending, but untrue. The baby was born prematurely, and, according to an FCC report, died of "septicemia due to meningitis and peritonitis . . . There was no evidence to show that either the mother or father was suffering from malnutrition. . . ." Far less attention than it warrants has been paid the outrageous report on Cuba last September, which, by actual count of Accuracy in Media, contained 10 major doubtful statements, including: "For Cuba's poor, things are a good deal better than they used to be . . . the Cuban poor man doesn't want to leave . . . Schools are free, everyone must go. There is a quiet equality of the races now in Cuba. . . ."

So ran the script. However as AIM pointed out in a letter to CBS News, real life refuses to follow it. On the contrary, the organization cited specific examples of working-class Cubans who risked their lives to flee the Castro regime. One, a Negro bricklayer, was quoted in *The New York Times* as saying: "Not only is there not enough to eat, but they make you spend extra hours in the fields after a 54-hour work week." As to schooling, AIM pointed out that on January 5, 1969, Castro admitted that 400,000 school-age children were not in school. Brotherhood of man? AIM quoted Ernesto Oliva, an Afro-Cuban and one of the first Castro appointees, to the effect that even under Batista, "whom we rejoiced to see go," Negroes were judges, Senators and high officials. Today only one black man holds an important post. An American Negro, who defected to Castro for five years, returned in 1968 saying that he would rather live in an American jail than remain. Citing the list of inaccuracies, AIM solicited comment from Richard S. Salant, head of CBS News, which was duly forthcoming (and, with the rest of the correspondence, put into the Record). Nine times out of 10, the criticism went unanswered.

Last Tuesday Mr. Salant took a stab at answering criticism of CBS' role in "financing a secret and illegal invasion of Haiti." Here, word, for word, is his rebuttal. "We did not finance the planned invasion. We did nothing illegal. No significant amount of money even inadvertently found its way to persons involved in the invasion plan. The Department of Justice found no unlawful activities on the part of CBS News. And John Davitt, Chief of the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, said, quote: 'CBS advised us of the facts, advised the Bureau of Customs that they were filming these episodes.' At one point the Treasury Department asked us not to withdraw from the project. But the short answer to the Vice President is that he is attacking a journalistic investigation that never became a broadcast about an invasion that never took place."

For a short answer, not bad. But let's take a longer look at "Project Nassau," as CBS

called it and it is known in the Report of the Special Subcommittee on Investigations of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Let's note at once that the executive producer, Perry Wolff, served in the same capacity on "The Selling of the Pentagon." Let's also dispose of Mr. Salant. If CBS News did not "finance the proposed invasion," it did, according to the House Report, provide funds for the leasing of a 67-foot schooner which was to be utilized by the invasion force, reimburse expenses for the transportation of weapons to be used by the conspirators, make payments to the leader of the conspiracy "with full knowledge of his identity and his criminal intentions." "Significant," of course, is what lawyers call a word of art; while exact figures were never forthcoming from CBS, the House Report states that "Project Nassau" cost more than \$200,000. CBS cooperation with the government was grudging, and, the Report indicates, evoked at official instance (a CBS cameraman blew the whistle to the authorities).

But let the Subcommittee speak for itself. "The implications of what has been learned are disquieting. To the average viewer, unsophisticated in the intricacies of television production, a network news documentary typically represents a scrupulously objective reporting of actual events shown as they actually transpired. If 'Project Nassau' is any indication, this is not always true."

During the preparation of this news documentary, CBS employees and consultants intermingled and interacted with personages actively engaged in breaking the law. Large sums of money were made available to these individuals with no safeguards as to the manner in which these funds would be put to use. Events were set up and staged solely for the purpose of being filmed by the CBS camera. An individual who was retained as a consultant, and later an employee, of CBS, was allowed to or instructed to appear in the actual filming and to provide narration for it. . . .

"The CBS News organization, or at least the individuals charged with the immediate supervision of the project, displayed a shocking indifference to the real possibility that their organization and funds were being made use of to further illegal activities. The control exercised by CBS Management in New York over the activities of the producer in the field seems to have been practically nonexistent. . . . Had the decision . . . not proceeded with the documentary been founded on a recognition of any of the deficiencies indicated above, the only remaining question would be why the decision was so long in coming. But under the circumstances, the rationale for the decision is itself far from reassuring. Rather than responding to any taint of artificiality or fraud in the considerable volume of film which had been prepared, the decision was apparently made on the basis that the project was journalistically unsatisfactory in view of the unfinished nature of the enterprise."

The law requires television quiz shows and commercials to be honest. Unfortunately, however, the public enjoys no similar protection against "documentaries," a credibility gap which the Subcommittee hopes to bridge. We would like to offer a proposal or two of our own. Believe it or not, Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System Inc., serves as Chairman of U.S. Advisory Commission on Information. Unlike Vice President Agnew, who backed away from the idea, we suggest that he be asked to resign. Moreover, to judge by the record cited above (which has exhausted our space, but barely scratched the surface), CBS television stations stand wide open to challenge on their license renewals, and we urge concerned, public-spirited citizens—as well as the FCC—to respond. CBS, in our view, has forfeited its access to the nation's airways. The time has come to turn it off.

CRIME STILL RUNNING RAMPANT

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there are some in our country who would like us to believe that law and order is a dead issue. Fortunately, the majority of Americans disagree and from North to South, East to West, people are united in the fight against the continued rise in our crime rate, including crime in our streets. More importantly, they are united against the lords of crime, for far too long now, law abiding citizens have been the victims of thugs, both professional and amateur.

The crime is that these hoodlums make a mockery of our law officials, prosecutors, judges and the courts themselves. They know that with the kid glove treatment that our officials have been forced to take, they can get away with almost any crime without paying a stiff penalty.

In recent years, the bleeding heart rulings by the courts have helped tie the hands of our police and law enforcement officers across the land. Yet, it is heartening to know that there are some court officials such as Judge Robert D. Simms of Tulsa, Oklahoma, who are still staunch believers in an individual's right to protect his home and his family. A very capable and outstanding newspaper editor, Mr. William Mullen recently wrote on the subject in an editorial which appeared in the *Sun Sentinel* newspaper located in Broward County, Florida. His editorial calls attention to many of the shortcomings existing in our present court system. I wish to share Mr. Mullen's editorial with you. It reads as follows:

[From the *Sun-Sentinel*, Mar. 23, 1971]

NEED OF OUR COURTS—TO CATCH UP WITH TIMES

Law and order was a principal issue in the congressional elections last fall, and although it did not trigger a rush to Republican nominees using the theme in their campaigns under the leadership of President Richard M. Nixon, it was a topic that scored with the people.

This subsequently has been proved in public opinion polls that show personal safety and a curb on crime are major concerns of the law abiding.

Such surveys also revealed more than casual disenchantment with the American judicial system, especially in the realms of light sentences for hardened criminals, easy bail and tortured decisions that placed the emphasis on rights of the criminal rather than those of the victims.

Further evidence of this dark public mood toward the underworld and its permissive pronouncers of penance came this weekend with the favorable response accorded what might be a modern version of the Wild West's "hanging judge."

Appropriately, the locale was in Oklahoma where District Court Judge Robert D. Simms in Tulsa received hundreds of letters congratulating him for his support of a housewife who, carrying her nine-month-old baby in her arms, shot and killed an ex-convict who kicked in the door of her home.

The judge returned the woman's pistol to her after ruling the homicide was justifiable and said she did "no less than what I would expect my wife to do under similar circumstances. If more people did this, we

would have less of the problem we have in this country today."

Judge Simms is, of course, correct in his clearing the woman and in his observation that more self-protection under like circumstances is needed, even though this has prompted bleeding heart liberals to protest that no judge should encourage meeting violence with violent reaction.

He also offered wise advice to each of his correspondents, whom he answered personally, that they express their views supporting his law and order emphasis to their local judges.

We are inclined to believe that an ample amount of mail to our area's Circuit Court and Court of Record judges complimenting them for stern justice and denouncing them for any unwonted forbearance with the habitual and/or hard core criminal might have a salutary effect on our courts, spiraling upward from the local level to the highest bench.

In this respect, we would suggest that our county and state judges lend serious thought and courageous effort to establish some new mileposts in law by logical decisions that disregard outmoded precedents set in other times and in a different atmosphere.

Many decisions handed down these days are predicated on previous findings for cases decided in circumstances that do not prevail today.

In the field of civil rights, for example, the wave of sympathy was at the outset for those struggling for equality, and innumerable decisions stretched or bent the law to conform with the then prevailing public mood. What with the abuses of civil rights, the callous use of the issue for selfish political purposes and the disappointments engendered by desegregation, it is possible that some more practical law can be found in new precedents established in the prevailing and different climate of public opinion.

The same might be said for cases of criminal appeal where precedent has been set on the basis of flimsy technicalities. The U.S. Supreme Court under Chief Justice Warren E. Burger already has begun to undo some of the mischief with the law committed by the so-called Warren Supreme Court.

But the job requires more than distilling the mischief with the law committed by the local and state level with new positions of law upon which the appellate and final courts can base decisions. The federal district court system and its eagerness to assume jurisdictions also could stand some remedial findings at law.

Years of deterioration would not be undone overnight, but an approach through establishing new precedents more in keeping with the times would be an effort heading in the direction of restoring confidence in our courts and making law and order an expected commodity and not a biennial election issue.

McCOLLISTER—BOSS OF THE YEAR

HON. CHARLES THONE

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday night a great honor was bestowed on a colleague and a good friend, JOHN Y. McCOLLISTER has been named "Boss of the Year" by the Ak-Sar-Ben chapter of the National Secretaries Association.

Congressman McCOLLISTER was chosen on the basis of his accomplishments in the civic and business world, his enthusiastic nature and his support for the

National Secretaries Association throughout the years.

John's civic activities seem endless, but most important I feel I should point out his interest in young people. While chairman of the board of McCollister & Co., John found time for the Children's Memorial Hospital, the Greater Omaha Association for Retarded Children, and the Boy Scouts of America. He also taught Sunday school for 10 years.

John is well acquainted with the benefits available to members of the National Secretaries. He has sung loud praises about the association to his Washington staff and has urged them to join the Capitol Hill chapter.

His secretary, Mrs. Sandy Sisson, who nominated him for this honor, has been a NSA member since 1966. She is currently a board member and corresponding secretary, and has served as treasurer and recording secretary.

I salute Nebraska's National Secretaries Association for their admirable choice for "Boss of the Year." John has attended every Boss' night since 1966 and I know his "Boscar" was accepted with great honor and will bring him much pleasure.

WHO WRITES THE TAX LAWS?

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, because of the interest and concern of Members of Congress about the proposed asset depreciation range regulations announced by Treasury, I would like to have the following article from the Christian Science Monitor inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The article is from the issue of April 17, 1971, and follows:

WHO WRITES THE TAX LAWS?

The United States Treasury is moving perilously close to violating the spirit and the letter of the tax law, as written by Congress, in a proposed new business depreciation schedule known officially as the Asset Depreciation Range (ADR).

Briefly, the situation is this: the power to tax resides with Congress, which in Section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, provided that business may deduct from the corporate income tax "a reasonable allowance" for wear, tear, and obsolescence of capital assets, such as machinery. Last January President Nixon issued a statement announcing the new ADR system. He described it as "essentially a change in timing" that would allow business "to reduce tax payments now, when additional purchasing power is needed, and to make up these payments in later years."

But Robert J. Domrese, editor of the Harvard Law Review, terms the ADR system "a conceptually distinct system of capital cost recovery" that bears no relation to depreciation accounting as Congress provided for in the tax law. He argues that the ADR is inequitable because it confers a special bonus on business.

Secretary of Treasury Connally acknowledges that the liberalized tax credit will cost the Treasury \$2.7 billion in fiscal year

1972. Mr. Domrese estimates that figure will reach \$5 billion a year by 1976.

Other independent tax experts contend that the Treasury's ostensible reason for the ADR—as a fiscal tool to boost the lagging economy—is a phony argument. Prof. Robert Eisner of Northwestern University doubts the ADR "will have much effect on investment" in the long run, and "certainly almost no effect over the short period."

A public hearing is scheduled for May 3, but a Treasury spokesman is quoted in news reports to the effect that whatever the testimony, the Treasury plans to go ahead with the ADR. The opposition will certainly be represented in force at the hearing. Just as certainly, the Treasury should be on hand, displaying a more sensitive ear than it has to date.

But if the Treasury persists in its over-concern toward business via the tax laws, some public interest law group will have a strong case to carry into the courts for argument on constitutional grounds.

THE TRUTH IN ADVERTISING ACT OF 1971

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill identical to that introduced by Senators McGovern and Moss entitled "The Truth in Advertising Act of 1971." I applaud and endorse the initiative taken by the initial sponsors of this legislation in the Senate and am honored to introduce this proposal in the House. The purpose of this bill is to make available to consumers relevant information used by an advertiser in supporting advertising claims of superiority over competing products.

I have long felt that advertising claims concerning performance, efficacy, and product characteristics which allegedly are based on reliable testing techniques are incorporated in the advertisement itself and consumers should have access to the data upon which the claims are based. This bill would require advertisers to make this type of information available and would act as an incentive to advertisers in developing meaningful data upon which intelligent consumer preferences may be made.

Compliance with this bill by advertisers should not be difficult in that documentation would only be needed to be supplied when requested and that the advertisers would be entitled to charge the consumer for the cost incurred in reproducing the documentation upon which the advertising claims are based.

In John Kenneth Galbraith's book, "The New Industrial State," he defines advertising as "consumer management." Consumers today are demanding that they not be managed but informed and that advertising material contain truly meaningful information as to one product's superiority over another.

This bill should also be welcomed by industry in that competition will be enhanced through actions designed to eliminate deceptive advertising based on

unsubstantiated advertising claims. Deceptive advertising is not only harmful to the consumer but can also result in lost sales to companies who must compete with advertising of competitors based upon false and deceptive claims of product superiority.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of the bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

THE TRUTH IN ADVERTISING ACT OF 1971

A bill to require the furnishing of documentation of claims concerning safety, performance, efficacy, characteristics, and comparative price of advertised products and services

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Truth in Advertising Act of 1971".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that informed consumers are essential to the fair and efficient functioning of the free market economy; that the individual has the right to know and ought to be able to obtain for his personal consideration, the documentation advertisers use in support of claims for the products and services he is asked to purchase; and that this information, which frequently is unavailable through the advertising itself, is needed by the individual to make intelligent and informed choices in today's highly competitive and complex market place.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act (1) to ensure that no advertisement can be disseminated if substantiating documentation is not available to the public and (2) to ensure that individuals will be able to exercise their right to know, to protect themselves from unsubstantiated claims and to act directly to promote fairness in advertising.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "advertisement" means all forms of promotion for products and services conveyed through, but not limited to, radio, television, cable television, cinema, newspapers, magazines, billboards, posters, direct mail material and point of sale display material.

(b) The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(c) The term "commerce" means commerce between any State, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia, and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, possession, or the District of Columbia, but through any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any possession of the United States.

(d) The term "documentation" means—
(1) in the case of any advertisement containing claims concerning the safety, performance, efficacy, or characteristics of a product or service including testimonials thereto—

(A) a full and complete description of all material aspects of any pertinent research or other data, including a detailed summary of all tests, in support of or detracting from any claim in the advertisement, including the name and address of any testing organization or agency and its principal officers, the results of any tests, the brand names of products or services tested, and the technical names of any ingredients tested;

(B) when specifically requested by a person, full disclosure of all material research, tests, and other data contained in the description and summary referred to in clause (A) of this paragraph. Nothing in this subsection shall require disclosure of the exact product formulation when such a disclosure comprises a trade secret;

(2) in the case of an advertisement with respect to comparative price, a substantial representative listing of prices of products or services sold in the marketing area served by the advertisement which form the basis for the comparison.

(e) The term "person" means an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any organized group, including local, State, or Federal Government agencies.

(f) The term "principal office" means the headquarters, corporate or otherwise, of the person disseminating the advertising; however, in the case of regional or local advertising, the principal office shall mean an office located within the regional or local marketing area in which the advertising is disseminated.

UNLAWFUL ADVERTISING WITHOUT FURNISHING DOCUMENTATION

SEC. 4. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to disseminate, or cause to be disseminated, by the United States mails, or in commerce by the use of, but not limited to, radio, television, cable television, cinema, newspapers, magazines, billboards, posters, and point of sale display material, any advertisement concerning the safety, performance, efficacy, characteristics or comparative price of any product or service unless documentation is available at the principal office of such person in the United States for public inspection, including the furnishing of copies of such documentation to any person requesting such documentation by mail, telephone, or otherwise. The cost of duplication may be charged to the person requesting such copies but in no case shall the charge exceed the actual cost of duplication.

(b) The publisher, radio or television broadcast station, or agency or medium for the dissemination of advertising, except the person making the claims subject to this Act in such advertisement, shall be liable under this section by reason of the dissemination of such advertising—

(1) if he refuses, on the verbal or written request of any person, to furnish the name and address of the person who caused him to disseminate such advertisement.

(2) if he fails to inform publicly his readers, listeners or viewers on a regular basis that documentation for advertising claims is available upon request and that the name and address of the person making the advertising claims subject to this Act, and carried by his publication or broadcast station, is available by contacting his publication or station.

(c) The dissemination or the causing to be disseminated of any advertisement in violation of subsections (a) and (b) shall be an unfair or deceptive act or practice in commerce within the meaning of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 5. (a) This Act shall be enforced by the Commission under rules, regulations and procedure provided for in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(b) The Commission is authorized and directed to prevent any person from violating the provisions of this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act. Any such person violating the provisions of this Act shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act, in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers and duties as though the applicable terms and provisions of such Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act: *Provided*, That persons excepted by section 5(a) (6) thereof

shall not thereby be exempted from Federal Trade Commission enforcement of the provisions of this Act.

(c) The Commission is authorized to prescribe such substantive and procedural rules and regulations as may be necessary or proper in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of one hundred and twenty days after the date of its enactment; except that subsection 5(c) shall take effect immediately.

FORMATION OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ASSOCIATION

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I received information concerning the formation of the Selective Service Association of the United States. During the month of April, I received a newsletter from the founder and national president of this organization, Brig. Gen. Bernard T. Franck III, retired. I was very much impressed with the high quality of the newsletter and the thoughtfulness of its content, and I believe it would be of interest to my colleagues in the House of Representatives:

SELECTIVE SERVICE ASSOCIATION,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., Apr. 9, 1971.

GREETINGS: The enthusiastic response to my letter announcing formation of the Selective Service Association of the United States was most gratifying. Rather than attempt to answer your letters individually, I am using this means to thank each of you and respond to your requests for further information on the Association; its purposes, structure and eligibility for membership.

The purpose as set out in Article II of the Constitution is to foster an adequate and effective national defense posture by: a) supporting a realistic national military manpower procurement policy; and b) promoting and improving development and execution of such policy.

The Association structure is highly decentralized with a chapter in each state. Each chapter has a president, vice-president, secretary and treasurer. The chapter president is a member of the National Executive Committee, the governing body of the National Association. Hereafter membership in a state chapter will be a prerequisite to hold national office.

Membership is open to all persons now heretofore or hereafter connected with the Selective Service System in any capacity, active or inactive, at any level, including local and appeal board members, clerical assistants of boards, and advisors to boards and other elements of the system.

In order to promote frequent and effective two-way communications, membership dues will be divided evenly between state chapters and the national office and each member will hold a national membership and membership in his state chapter. The types of membership are: Annual—\$10; Life—\$50; Charter—\$100 (limited to 500 memberships); Benefactor and Honorary—Selected by the Executive Committee.

State chapters are developing. As soon as you can, please write or phone us so that we can know what part you wish to take in the formation of your state chapter. The nation-

all office will give all necessary help and assistance in the formation of the state chapters.

The Association will actively participate in anything that is likely to affect the system administratively or legislatively and will keep each member currently informed. A complimentary copy of the Association's most recent communication to members is enclosed.

Sincerely,

BERNARD T. FRANCK III,
Brigadier General (ret.) VANG.,
President.

REPORT TO THE ASSOCIATION

An emphatic step in Congressional repudiation of the recent trend toward centralization and federalization of the Selective Service System was taken when the House of Representatives voted to prohibit "colocation" of Local Boards of which over 600 were in progress.

Present authority in the law to create intercounty Local Boards was at the same time taken away from the President, removing the only remaining basis that conceivably could be used to consolidate or colocate Local Boards.

Responsible for these were the "Brinkley Amendments" that could well be ranked historically with the nationally famous "Tydings Amendment" to the 1940 Selective Service Act.

Authored and ably presented by Representative Jack Brinkley of Georgia, the amendments to insure the continued integrity of the Local Board System received almost unanimous endorsement of the House membership, which almost certainly insures their survival through the Senate, where many members already have been made aware by you of what has been occurring in their states.

State Headquarters and Local Boards have every reason to expect action soon to halt all local board centralization in process and to create new local boards with functioning offices in every county which may not now be serviced with a board.

The Selective Service System is still living, however, in the shadow of an effort to abolish states and localities in its operation, under frequently asserted, but never demonstrated, claim that in centralization lies all the virtues of fairness, uniformity and freedom. Evidence of this is contained in claims of monetary savings by closing local boards occupying free quarters, by professing that service to registrants whose boards are open only a few days a week is improved by closing the boards completely and by the proposed dismissal of the more than 600 local board personnel while at the same time substantially increasing and upgrading the National Headquarters staff.

One of the most telling arguments on the House floor was that consolidation of Local Board facilities, regardless of how it is done, in addition to destroying local board integrity, merely transfers the cost of operation from the Government to the registrants, their dependents and board members who must bear this additional burden of time and travel.

The House also rejected the Selective Service proposals to eliminate exemptions for divinity students, to authorize and pay Advisors to the Director \$150 per day and to soften the alien provisions. It disregarded their advice to leave the existing conscientious objector provisions stand and toughened it up to require 3 years of work and provided induction into the armed forces as another penalty for failure or refusal to work. All of these actions are in line with the information and indication given you in the previous Association Report.

As was predicted, the House returned to the President authority for undergraduate student deferment. Authority for a national call in conjunction with the lottery was also given but legislative history makes it clear that the functions of selecting and ordering for induction must remain with the Local Boards.

An important point to bear in mind:—even with the full time we are spending at the Capitol on this legislation, the Association will succeed in its endeavors only to the extent that we have your support and the back-up you and the many members of the System have been furnishing in keeping the Members of Congress informed on how things are going back home.

ALASKA RESOLUTION

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary functions any government can guarantee its citizens is that it enable each and every individual access to adequate health care.

One area in which adequate health care, especially proper dental care is lacking, is for many citizens of Alaska. Though the Public Health Service makes a genuine attempt to provide this service because of the shortage of trained personnel and lack of financial backing, it is unable to bring proper dental care to the people of the bush.

In too many instances, dentists visit the village on a once-a-year basis and then they treat only the emergency cases. Clearly the public service needs more dentists to fill this important void. The State legislature of Alaska has observed this problem and has passed the following resolution:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 65—RELATING TO DENTAL CARE IN THE RURAL AREAS OF ALASKA

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas one of the greatest needs of the citizens of rural Alaska is adequate dental care; and

Whereas, in order to encourage the practice of dentistry in rural areas, the state permits dentists to practice in areas that are 100 miles or more from a resident licensed dentist; and

Whereas in the rural areas of Alaska there is not a large enough population to support a private practitioner; and

Whereas both the residents of any given community and the dentist involved would greatly benefit if the United States Public Health Service would contract with those dentists living in rural areas to service those United States beneficiaries who reside in the area of the dentist's practice; and

Whereas, if this were done, it would free Public Health Service personnel to concentrate their efforts in the rural areas that currently receive no dental aid in any way; and

Whereas in certain areas the United States Public Health Service is now planning to send their personnel into areas where practicing dentists are already in residence and this is due to a lack of funds in the Public

Health Service budget for contractual services;

Be it resolved by the Alaska Legislature that the United States Public Health Service is urgently requested to immediately seek adequate funding for contractual services so that it may contract with private persons to service United States beneficiaries in the area of a private practitioner's residence, and to redirect their dental care services to those areas of the state that are totally lacking in dental services at this time; and be it

Further resolved that the United States Congress is urgently requested to provide increased and adequate funding for all areas of concern to the United States Public Health Service, and especially the allotment of increased contractual funds for dental services.

Copies of this Resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable Elliott Richardson, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Mike Gravel, U. S. Senators, and the Honorable Nick Begich, U. S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

CONSERVATION IS A BASIS FOR NEGOTIATIONS WITH ECUADOR, PERU, AND CHILE

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Associated Press reported out of Cincinnati this week on a speech by Ecuadorian Ambassador Carlos Mantilla-Ortega. The Ambassador was quoted as saying his country has been seizing U.S. fishing vessels in an effort to control the ecological balance of fish in the Pacific Ocean.

This was a welcome admission for it might be a basis for negotiations over our dispute and their seizures of our tuna fishing vessels as well as their claim of 200-miles jurisdiction off their coast. Peru and Chile share this claim of sovereignty offshore.

It was the first time I had heard that ecology was the reason for the jurisdictional claim, and I welcome the news. And, by the way, the Ecuadorian Ambassador is a man highly respected by our Government.

American fishermen are second to none in their desire to conserve fishery resources, and if conservation is the basis for the Latin Americans' concern, then we certainly have a basis for settlement of our differences.

I am urging our State Department to make the overtures necessary for talks on the conservation of fish in these waters, and I am hopeful agreement can be reached in the matter for I commend the Ambassador's statement when he said:

Our position toward tuna fishing off our coast rises mainly from our interest in ecology.

U.S. tuna fishermen, I am sure, will be glad to cooperate to protect and conserve the ecology.

THE ANTIENVIRONMENTALISTS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the sorry state of the national economy since the Nixon administration came into office has led me to have grave doubts as to the competency of President Nixon's economic advisers. Despite the rhetoric of the President and his advisers, the economy remains in very bad shape indeed. Unemployment is up, employment is down. Prices keep rising, corporate profits keep falling.

In view of these facts, one would think that the President would insist that his economic advisers stick to their own knitting and try to make whole the fabric of our economic system. However, the President's economic advisers apparently are not satisfied with the havoc which has been done to the economy; they now appear to be out to wreck the environment as well.

Specifically, I am referring to Hendrik S. Houthakker, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers who switched from economics to ecology in a speech to the Cleveland Business Economists Club on April 19, 1971. As an economist, the record shows Mr. Houthakker to be a "C" student at best. As an ecologist, I am afraid that he would rank as a clear-cut failure.

The New York Times of April 20, 1971, carried a news report on Mr. Houthakker's Cleveland speech and on April 22, 1971, the Times commented editorially on Mr. Houthakker's views under the heading "The Anti-Environmentalists." I would like to share both the news report and the editorial with my colleagues and, therefore, I insert the texts of these two items at this point in the RECORD:

NIXON AIDE CONTENDS ENVIRONMENTALISTS UNDERESTIMATE SOCIAL COST OF GOALS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON.—One of the Government's top economists criticized and even ridiculed some environmentalists today, saying they would impose too heavy a "social cost" in trying to achieve their goals.

Discussing current issues such as the proposed Alaskan oil pipeline and cutting timber from the national forests, Hendrik S. Houthakker, a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, concluded:

"We have to be sure that no single interest group, no matter how highly motivated, be allowed to dictate an extreme solution that is not in the general interest."

Mr. Houthakker gave his views in a speech to the Cleveland Business Economists Club, the text of which was made available here.

Contending that the nation had "an urgent need" for the oil from Alaska and that there was "no satisfactory alternative" to a pipeline, he maintained that it was "clearly extreme to suggest that we cannot take any chances at all with the permafrost" in Alaska. Permafrost is a permanently frozen layer of soil or subsoil in an arctic region.

"Even in the highly unlikely event that some of the permafrost would be melted," he said, "the area involved could hardly be more than a fraction of 1 per cent of the total permafrost in Alaska."

As for the national forests, Mr. Houthakker emphasized the need for more lumber to meet the universally desired increase in housing construction, noting that lumber prices had recently begun rising again. He continued:

"The search for less damaging ways of cutting timber should be actively pursued, but at the same time we should be careful not to impair our ability to supply the nation with the housing it needs while at the same time satisfying the legitimate demands for a better physical environment. Some of the more extreme conservationists come close to arguing that there should be no cutting on the national forests at all."

He said the nation might need "a more clear-cut division of the national forests into recreational and other uses." The present method of multiple use "worked well until recently," he said, "but apparently no longer satisfies present conservationists demands."

In discussing the air pollution problem, Mr. Houthakker said there should be some degree of local choice on how stringent standards should be.

Any air standard, he said, "implies a value judgment on the social importance of clean air relative to the social cost of achieving it." He continued:

"There is no obvious reason why this value judgment should lead to the same conclusion everywhere. It is conceivable that a depressed area may want to attract industry at the expense of a less stringent air standard; the citizens of that area should be able to have some influence on the choice involved, even though it is also appropriate for the Federal Government to set minimum standards for the entire country, as the Clean Air Act provides."

He denied that this viewpoint amounted to a "Magna Carta for polluters," as has been charged by Representative Henry S. Reuss, Democrat of Wisconsin.

Mr. Houthakker began his speech with a sarcastic description of the gloomier forecasts of man's future by some environmentalists.

"While human ecology does not seem to have developed either the conceptual framework or the empirical evidence that would make it into a science," he said, "the literature makes up for this by a liberal supply of horror stories that make the description of economics as 'the dismal science' obsolete."

He said that "while prophets of doom do not always agree whether the human race will starve to death, boil to death, freeze to death or merely blow itself up, they do seem to agree that things cannot go on much longer."

THE ANTIENVIRONMENTALISTS

Besides the expected and appropriate speeches on protecting the environment, Earth Week has produced a number of pronouncements urging limits to such protection. Conservation is all very well, their authors suggest, but other matters should have priority—such as poverty, crime and even the need to attract industry to depressed areas—and, anyway, the threat of pollution is overdone. Such arguments seem to us painfully illogical when they are not downright disingenuous.

If these critics merely deplored the doom-crying which a few environmentalists indulge in, there would be little room for disagreement. Extravagant scare-tactics in this area are like defeatism in war—they either paralyze the troops or discredit the source. But some of these opponents of environmental reform go a great deal further.

It is especially hard to take at face value the protestations that concern for the underprivileged should have precedence over concern for the environment. Why does it have

to be the either-or? Aren't the lungs of the poor as badly affected as those of the rich by the polluted air they breathe? More so, one would think, since more of them are concentrated for more of the time in the industrialized central cities.

Are the children of the poor not entitled to relax at clean public beaches and to bathe in unpolluted water, especially since, unlike those of the rich, they are not likely either to have their own pools or be sent away for the summer? Do the poor have some immunity to fish contaminated by pesticides, or to other chemically poisoned food, which their affluent brothers do not enjoy?

The argument is foolish, but it is innocence itself compared with the shabby statement put out a few days ago by Hendrik S. Houthakker, a member of President Nixon's Council of Economic Advisers. Going down a list of environmental causes, Mr. Houthakker found reasons to minimize them all: since there is "no satisfactory alternative" to the Alaskan oil pipeline, why worry about "a fraction of 1 per cent of the total permafrost" in the state? "extreme" conservationists are "close to arguing that there should be no cutting on the national forests at all"; any air standard is only a "value judgment" which should be left to local option, etc., etc.

On every one of these points the distinguished Presidential adviser is guilty of more blatant oversimplification, more extremism, than the most one-sided of propagandists for the environment. There is no reason whatever to assert that no satisfactory alternative exists to the Alaskan pipeline when a probably safer Canadian route is right now being considered. The danger of a disruption in the hot oil line is not to the "permafrost" as such, but to miles of ground and riverbed, not to mention wildlife, and perhaps above all, to the teeming waters of King William Sound, where the oil would be transferred to tankers.

Similarly, no conservationists we are aware of want to prohibit all cutting in the national forests; many want, rather, to curb the kind of cutting that is death to a forest and a violent jolt to the ecology of an entire area. As for local preferences on air quality, Mr. Houthakker must know which segment of the population would have the last word and which would suffer the consequences.

Reasonable men will differ on this or that attack on an environmental evil as well as on priorities. But to denigrate the whole current effort to undo man's long abuse of nature is to assume a responsibility as senseless as it is gratuitous.

INCOME TAX CREDIT TO RETIRED CITIZENS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the practice of providing an income tax credit to retired citizens is a commendable feature of present tax laws. Retired Americans, often living on fixed incomes and having low earning potentials, are plagued by inflation and rising medical needs, and they deserve special and generous considerations to tax time.

The present schedule R of Form 1040 for retirement income credit computation can often have the result of providing maximum credits for those retired citizens needing them far less than

others who derive little or no benefit from this method of computation.

I have just introduced legislation aimed to simplify and universalize tax credits for the retired. It would provide a flat \$400 credit to filers 62 years of age and older. It is my feeling that this credit will more fairly serve to relieve tax pressures on those retired citizens who need such benefits. This straightforward approach would provide retired Americans with an uncomplicated and uniform assurance of tax relief.

Surely those who have contributed to the wealth of this Nation should be given such tax considerations in their later years.

FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, almost since the initial enactment of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act the need for yet stricter antipollution enforcement measures has been clear.

Several days ago I attended the Long Island Sound Enforcement Conference in New Haven, which was called because it is demonstrably evident that the sound continues to be polluted at an alarming rate in spite of Federal and State antipollution laws which have been on the books for some time. I am sure that this is true not only of Long Island Sound but of every major body of water in our country. The present law was a significant step when it was enacted, but regrettably it seems not to have enough teeth to insure that the battle against water pollution will be won.

The principal deficiencies in the current law are:

That it applies only to water pollution of an interstate character;

That it provides no subpoena power to compel attendance of polluters at enforcement conferences and hearings;

That it gives the polluter far too great a period of time—at least 12 months and as a practical matter closer to 2 years—for voluntary compliance with abatement schedules; and

That it does not authorize or mandate any financial penalties for a polluter's failure to comply with an abatement schedule.

I am introducing today a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act so as to remedy these deficiencies. Essentially it parallels the administration bill recently introduced, but with two important differences: it provides a shorter period for compliance with abatement schedules, and it doubles the potential amount of financial penalties prescribed in the administration bill. In its principal features, my bill would:

First. Broaden coverage of water quality standards and enforcement provisions to intrastate, as well as interstate

waters, including all navigable waters, ground waters, and tributaries of any such waters;

Second. Empower the Environmental Protection Administrator to issue an order for prompt remedial action to a polluter; the order may be based on any information, however obtained, that the polluter was violating water quality standards;

Third. Allow 15 days for a polluter to request a hearing on such an order, after which time the order shall become final if no hearing is requested;

Fourth. Authorize the Administrator to modify and finalize his order at the completion of hearings if hearings are requested; and

Fifth. Provide civil penalties up to \$50,000 a day for violations of final enforcement orders.

The last provision would mean, for example, that a municipality which permitted effluents of unacceptable quality to be discharged in its sewage for a month would be subject to a fine of \$1.5 million.

The time has come to crack down hard on industrial and municipal polluters that have flouted the public interest for several years. The principal answers, in my judgment, are prompt compliance with abatement schedules and, in the absence of compliance, major fines. My bill would accomplish these objectives, and I urge this House to expedite its enactment.

PUBLIC HOUSING PLIGHT

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the plight of public housing throughout the Nation is acute. Local public housing agencies are in dire need of funds; the supply of public housing units is totally inadequate. In New York City, for example, there are currently more than 130,000 families on the waiting list for public housing.

Congress has not been unaware of these problems. In the 1970 Housing and Urban Development Act, an additional \$75 million was authorized for fiscal year 1971 for the production of public housing. Both in the 1969 and 1970 Housing Acts, Congress provided for the provision of operating subsidies to enable local public housing authorities to maintain existing developments while keeping rentals at levels which low-income families can afford to pay. A total of \$150 million annually was authorized by these two acts. In addition, \$225 million is authorized for fiscal year 1972 for annual contributions for public housing.

Unfortunately, Congress, cognizance of the problems, and its actions to ameliorate them, have not met with affirmative action by the administration. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has chosen not to use the \$75 million authorized for fiscal year 1971. It has also determined that pro-

duction in fiscal year 1972 will be limited to 100,000 units, thereby using about \$150 million of the total \$225 million authorized. And as to the \$150 million for operating subsidies, the Department has released only a small amount of such funds to date. Furthermore, the Department is eliminating special subsidies hitherto available, looking to the \$150 million authorized by operating subsidies as the replacement for them.

Thirteen of my colleagues have joined me in writing to Secretary George Romney, of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, urging reversal of this decision. I am at this point including a copy of that letter to Secretary Romney, dated April 21, 1971:

APRIL 21, 1971.

HON. GEORGE ROMNEY,
Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

DEAR SECRETARY ROMNEY: The plight of public housing programs across the nation is severe, as we are sure you know. In New York City, the situation is dire. Currently, more than 130,000 families are on the public housing waiting list, and this staggering figure exists even after the deactivation of applications which are more than two years old. In light of this state of affairs, there are several matters concerning your department's operation of the public housing program which are of particular concern to us, as they very seriously affect the public housing situation in New York City.

In the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970, the Congress authorized \$75 million to support contracts for additional housing to be undertaken in fiscal year 1971. It voted this additional authorization because it was clear that available funds were substantially exhausted. It is our understanding that despite this, your department does not intend to use any of these additional funds.

In addition, the 1970 Act authorized \$225 million to be contracted in fiscal year 1972 for the initiation of additional public housing units. It is our understanding that your department intends to limit its approvals during fiscal year 1972 to a maximum of 100,000 units, thereby using only about \$150 million of its available contract authority.

We feel that both of these actions are in contravention of the intent of Congress, and we specifically request that your department use both the \$75 million authorized for this year, and the full \$225 million authorized for the next fiscal year, with New York City of course being allocated appropriate sums from these totals.

Both in the 1969 and 1970 Housing Acts, Congress provided for the provision of operating subsidies to enable local public housing authorities to maintain existing developments in good condition while keeping rentals at levels which low-income families can afford to pay. A total of \$150 million annually was authorized by these two Acts. However, your department has released only a small amount of such funds to date.

Again, we request that your department implement Congressional intent by using these authorizations to their full extent.

We are also concerned regarding the apparent decision to terminate special subsidies hitherto available. These include the special subsidy for elderly, disabled, handicapped, displaced, unusually large, and unusually low-income families residing in public housing; and the special subsidy provided under the Housing Act of 1969 by the Brooke Amendment to make up the difference between the reduced rent of tenants and the total operating costs of the units occupied by the tenants.

Each of these special subsidies amounted to more than \$50 million annually nationwide. HUD's apparent decision is that the funds available for operating subsidies are limited to a maximum of \$150 million on the basis of amendments enacted in 1969 and 1970. The consequence is that the \$150 million authorized for operating deficits will be eaten up by being applied to these former special subsidies, and the remainder will be inadequate to cover the operating deficits of local public housing authorities. We strongly urge your reconsideration of this decision, and would appreciate your apprising us of the basis for that decision, should it not be changed.

Finally, we are concerned regarding that provision of the 1970 Housing Act authorizing your department to promulgate cost limitations suitable for localities on the basis of prototypes for various types of construction. These are to be issued by the end of April. We are very much concerned that the new prototype cost limits which will be established will be sufficient to allow construction in New York City, where costs are particularly high. We are also concerned that allowance be made for subsequent upward revisions to reflect increased costs.

With best regards,

WILLIAM F. RYAN, BELLA S. ABZUG, HERMAN BADILLO, JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, HUGH L. CAREY, EMANUEL CELLER, SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, SEYMOUR HALPERN, EDWARD I. KOCH, BERTRAM PODELL, CHARLES B. RANGEL, BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, JAMES H. SCHEUER,
Members of Congress.

THE REAL GREENING OF AMERICA— SPEECH BY HON. WENDELL WYATT

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, WENDELL WYATT, from Oregon's First Congressional District, addressed the annual meeting of the Western Wood Products Association in San Francisco on March 11 of this year. His remarks are so pertinent and far reaching and present such an exciting challenge to this country that I am sure they will be of interest to other Members of Congress and I offer them herewith:

THE REAL GREENING OF AMERICA

A timely title for my remarks might be "The Real Greening of America." I think this topic is timely because I believe that we are now entering an era when understanding and cooperation between conservationists and wood fiber producers is absolutely essential. I think the time is long past when a wood fiber merchant and conservationist have been sworn enemies. Some of the very best conservation practices in this world are today a part and parcel of sound tree farm and sustained yield goals of timber producers.

First, let's define conservation. To me, it means the development and use of our natural resources on a continuing basis so as to yield the maximum benefits, short term and long term, for all of our citizens. These people-owned resources, which nature has made available to us, do not belong to any one person, to any one group of persons, or to any single interest group. They belong to all of our people. The most disadvantaged

child in the ghetto has an equal stake, an equal ownership of these public natural resources, equal to that of each and every other person in the United States.

Wilderness, recreation, watershed management, wild life habitat protection, timber production and the other purposes for which we manage the forests of the United States do not have to be either/or propositions. With effort and with good common sense we can accommodate all of these public values. I suppose our differences, as usual, center around the application of a definition or a goal, to a specific circumstance, or problem. Perhaps an example of the very broadest conflict, would come between the right of the ghetto child to a decent home, inevitably containing some wood products, and the maintenance of hundreds of thousands of acres of pristine wilderness, sometimes accessible only to a handful of people.

I would ask you here, "What about the interest of the avid conservationist in meeting the housing goals of our country and conversely, what about the right of the ghetto dweller to the ultimate enjoyment for himself and for his children in our great wilderness areas? These and other instances can be resolved and largely protected and the other purposes for which our timberlands are held can be achieved only if we join together as persons of good will in this country, determined that a massive effort will be undertaken to preserve, to manage and to multiply these resources.

It was just two years ago that the timber industry faced a real crisis. There was the perennial boxcar shortage, bad logging weather the previous winter and labor strikes that combined with a very inelastic timber source to throw supply and demand for timber completely out of harmony. This resulted in prices that rose to very high levels. You all remember well the screams at that time that came from all sides, the resulting congressional committee investigations (I think there were as many as four at one time), and the Presidential Task Force formed to examine this problem. Unfortunately, the economic situation deteriorated so quickly that prices went the other way, where they have stagnated until just recently.

During this two-year period, I have been predicting that the squeeze would come again. That housing demands, long pent up, would again result in a repetition of the 1969 problem which no one wanted at that time and I am certain that no one wants again in the future in the same magnitude.

What have we done to prepare for this problem? The answer is, essentially—nothing. Just last week the House Interior Appropriations Committee (on which I serve) heard testimony from both the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management on their budget for fiscal 1972. They, of course, are not free agents and are very much subject to the whims and domination of the Office of Management and Budget of the federal government.

I was shocked to see that this expansionary budget (which is being adopted) did not contain one nickel for research construction, that forest research itself was slightly cut over the current fiscal year, that such important areas as watershed management research, forest recreation research, range management research, wildlife habitat research, fire research and forest surveys, were either cut slightly or continued at the current year's level. With the inflation that is going on every day this means a cut in services in every one of these areas in real terms. I say to you that this "budgeteering" has prevailed in spite of the very high return from modest investments in good forestry, which includes reforestation. The Forest Service has testified that its experience is that there is a return of \$5.75 to the government for every dollar

invested in intensive management. It is therefore clear that it is, in fact, in the public interest that these investments be made.

Forestry is a science that is relatively young. We imported our original technology from Europe at the turn of the century but greater advancements in this science have been made in the last 10 years than in the preceding 60 years. The bulk of this advancement and knowledge has been developed on intensively managed private lands where the dollars spent must bring a return. This budgetary shortsightedness is in the face of the testimony of the Forest Service that we are losing over five billion board feet annually in our national forests to insects and diseases.

It is very clear that we face a real crisis in what I believe will be an unprecedented and a continuing demand for wood and for wood fiber products. When the day comes, and I don't think it is far away, that black men in the big cities find they can't have a house because wood products are not available at any price or without prolonged delays, they and those who are representing them in Congress, will be knocking very loudly at our door demanding their share of the national timber resource. I hope we don't have to wait until that moment before the conservationists and you in the industry join together seeking solutions to our mutual problems. I would hope that you can decide that logic, that reason and fairness will guide you in your decisions—not plain, blind emotions and "sloganeering" of the type that has become all too prevalent in the last few years.

Now, what can we do? What can I propose to meet the demand that is coming?

I propose that this country adopt as its national policy the reforestation of America. Perhaps it would be even more proper to call it foresting of America. It is a program that can unite recreationists and industry in a determination to take full advantage of the opportunity given us by nature to solve these problems.

There are in this country literally millions of acres that are really little more than a vast wasteland today. They lay unused, unloved and completely neglected in this great country of ours. They have perhaps been logged over many years in the past. They may be lands overgrown or made useless by rampant brush or weed-tree growth. They may be marginal farm lands removed from farm production for economic reasons.

In one segment of our forest economy alone, I found that it will take nearly 50 years at the present rate to reforest just our national forests under the supervision of the Forest Service.

So here is what I propose: It is the concept of total reforestation and that we adopt a national program with the aim of achieving total reforestation within the next 10 years. This concept requires a fresh and a vigorous new attitude toward our forest lands.

I would suggest that the program be divided into four separate parts. First, that we commit ourselves and the necessary dollars to forest every acre of federally owned land capable of high growth trees. These lands would include our national forests, public domain lands, lands managed by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and all other federal government agencies. This would require the announcement of a policy and a program and then its implementation by the allocation of sufficient dollars to finance it. The federal government would, by way of example, lead the way to this program.

Second, the federal government would intensify its cooperative efforts with state and local governments to see that the same result is accomplished on all non-federal lands. This concept would include furnishing seedlings, education, encouragement, technical assistance and perhaps through direct aid

or through the Youth Conservation Corps, some of the manpower to see that this job is accomplished.

Third is in the area of the third forest where a great total land area of small wood lots and timber-capable lands remain unused. Here the federal government, by use of various incentives, possibly including tax devices, free seedlings and technical assistance could see that a maximum effort would be made to return these lands to productive use for the common good.

This morning I held a brief press conference and I received a number of questions centering on the possibilities that the large timber companies might be the beneficiaries of this federal-private timberland aspect of the program I'm outlining. My response was that virtually all of the large companies are already doing what I am proposing for the public and the small private wood lots. I would just hope that the large private timberland owners won't feel disadvantaged by efforts to grow millions of additional trees on the neglected lands of America.

Besides replanting I would propose that in all three of the areas I have outlined here—the federal area, the state and local area and the private area—that wholesale programs of thinning and salvage be undertaken for the maximum use of these lands and to discourage timber insects and disease.

Finally, the last part of my proposal involves the reforestation of the cities of America. You all know how barren Tokyo and Berlin were left immediately following World War II. Many of you, I am sure, have seen what has been done in these cities in the last 25 years, and in many other war-ravaged areas of the world. You also know what has been done in most of the suburban developments of America. You have seen developers bulldoze areas naked, lay out the streets and sewers and then start construction minus trees. There are a few exceptions to this practice, but they remain the exceptions in the development of the suburbs of this country.

We must make ornamental seedlings available to cities for this use in making parking lots and other center strips decorative for park and private use. We must help the horticultural industry to meet the needs in our cities for varieties of ornamental trees suited to each geographical area. Each tree planted is a small oxygen factory. Each tree planted in America will contribute to the beauty of our environment. Each tree will help absorb the increasing noises of the urban environment.

In my judgment, and based on preliminary estimates, the program I have presented in rough outline would command an investment of an average of 250 million dollars per year for 10 years. It may be grandiose in concept but clearly something like this commitment is required, and immediately, if we are to satisfy the multiple purposes for which we manage our forest lands and if we are to leave our children a United States of America as rich in natural resources and beauty as the great country which we ourselves inherited.

IMPORT COMPETITION AND CONTRACT NEGOTIATIONS IN THE STEEL INDUSTRY

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to support the position of my distinguished colleague, Congressman DENT, chairman of the General Labor Subcom-

mittee, who for many years now has served as one of the country's foremost guardians of the American worker against the flood of imports which threatens ever larger numbers of jobs in our economy and the well-being of many of America's fairest, happiest, and most peaceful communities. Congressman DENT is not, and I certainly am not, opposed to imports in principle. We know that we must import if foreigners are to get the dollars they need to buy our exports. What Congressman DENT and I object to are imports brought in from extremely low-wage areas with indecently substandard working conditions. American labor is not afraid of competition, but only under accepted rules. Baseball has rules, golf has rules, chess too, in fact every aspect of civilized living needs and subscribes to rules. Why should not international trade do the same?

One of the underlying requirements for acceptable international trade competition is worldwide fair labor standards. American management should not be required to observe fair labor standards at home and then be expected to compete with foreign suppliers who produce under subhuman labor standards. This principle is the basic rationale of the much-publicized Davis-Bacon Act, which has been on the legislative books since 1931—to make it unnecessary for construction contractors operating with fair labor standards to compete with contractors who do not. That is also one of the basic purposes of the Federal Wage and Hour Act, which has been law since 1938—to outlaw unfair competition from producers paying excessively low wages. Why should not the same rationale exist, the same requirements apply to foreign trade?

Congressman DENT has included a much needed provision in H.R. 7130, a bill which he introduced on April 1 and for which I am happy and proud to serve as a cosponsor, which would give the President power to take appropriate action to regulate imports which threaten serious impairment to the health, efficiency, and general well-being of any group of American workers and the communities in which they are employed. H.R. 7130 also contains provisions to raise the Federal hourly minimum wage to \$2 and to extend its coverage. Hearings on the bill were begun very recently, on April 20, by the General Labor Subcommittee. The hearings are scheduled to end April 29. It should not be long after that before the bill goes to the full House Labor Committee for its consideration and, I hope, its approval.

We all know that one of the American industries most sorely beset by imports is the steel industry. Steel imports from Japan and European nations at present are regulated by voluntary quotas agreed upon by those countries and the United States. These quota agreements, entered into in 1968, are scheduled to expire at the end of this year. The Nixon administration should be starting negotiations at this time for new steel import quotas beginning in 1972, and should be pressing in such negotiations for the protection of jobs in the American steel industry and

for the maintenance of decent wages and working conditions in U.S. steel production.

The Nixon administration appears to be doing just the opposite. It appears to be holding the threat over the heads of American steel labor that it may not negotiate for the extension of steel import quotas. This threat is intended to force the steel workers to settle for very low wage increases in their forthcoming contract negotiations this summer with the steel companies.

It is plainly unfair for the White House to ask steel labor singlehandedly to try to plug the large and gaping hole in the dike against the floodwaters of inflation. And yet this is what the administration is asking, with an implicit threat behind the request, in numerous statements emanating from the executive office, the latest one being in the third inflation alert.

The price elevator has been zooming rapidly up during 1969 and 1970—years of power for the Nixon administration. The Consumer Price Index rose 5.4 percent in 1969 and 5.9 percent in 1970; these were the largest annual increases in this index since the period of Korean hostilities in 1951. One would have thought that the sensible and reasonable way to curb our inflation was to institute some sort of incomes policy, whether wage and price guidelines, review of wage and price changes, or whatever. Congress gave the President the power to do this through the Economic Stabilization Act, legislation still in effect. But no, the President and some of his grand pooh-bahs appear to entertain an almost theological aversion to any sort of comprehensive, across-the-board incomes policy. Instead, the administration wasted 2 years and gravely disrupted and divided our countrymen by playing around with its so-called "game plan," a course of action which was crude, unjust to many economic interests such as the housing industry, and to cap it all, a failure.

Inflation was caused by massive economic forces unleashed in Washington and must be curbed by massive correctional steps taken in Washington. In effect, the White House has already joined up with the steel companies as a partner at the bargaining table against the steelworkers. I am opposed to this action of the administration, as I think all fair-minded men must be.

I call upon the President not to interfere in the upcoming contract negotiations in steel. I ask him not to bludgeon the steelworkers with the club of low-wage steel imports. I suggest that he not encourage the steel companies to take an uncompromising stance and gird for a strike. Hands off, Mr. President. Give collective bargaining a chance to work freely. You believe in the principles of free markets, free domestic competition, and free men. Why not free collective bargaining in steel?

According to the U.S. News & World Report, the "real" buying power of average steelworker earnings fell 4.4 percent over the past year. Steelworkers want to make up this lost purchasing power.

They want wage increases which also reflect productivity improvements—about 3 percent annually in American industry, according to U.S. Labor Department statistics. Further, they want full and unlimited protection against future cost-of-living increases. These are all legitimate aspirations. They are no more than American workers deserve. They are no more than other workers have been getting. I hope that steel labor will achieve these goals, and in a free bargaining climate I think they will.

DAVENPORT FIRE CHIEF RETIRES

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, Les Schick, the fire chief at Davenport, Iowa, is retiring. He has served his community for 32 years as a member of the Davenport Fire Department. For over 20 years he was the fire chief.

Les Schick's career is marked by his dedication to his profession and the city of Davenport. He has held the highest offices in the organizations of his profession. The many awards and other recognition he has received indicate the high quality of his work.

Upon his retirement, Les Schick will again be accorded well-deserved tributes. None can be higher, however, than the simple thank you of his community for a job well done.

An article which appeared recently in the Davenport Times-Democrat highlights some of the more important events in Les Schick's career:

WHAT THEY ALWAYS SAY ABOUT OLD FIRE HORSES

(By Jim Arpy)

The ever-present pipe is out, as if after 32 years Lester Schick had had his fill of fire and smoke.

The truth of that was evident recently when the Davenport fire chief surprised everyone by announcing his retirement at the age of 55.

Now he is cleaning out his desk, filling cardboard boxes with the accumulation of more than a century, old scrapbooks, photos, cartons and sacks full of memories.

Memories . . . "I almost had a short-lived career. I'd been on the department less than six months when I helped fight my first big fire, a very serious one at the Holbrook Furniture store in the 100 block of East 2nd street.

"Capt. Herbert Miller, who was then a private, and I had a line out in the alley behind the store, the heat built up in the nearby Murdock Paint Co. store and the concussion blew a large steel safety door clear across the alley. It hit the wall on the other side, just 18 inches from where we were standing, with terrible force. If I'd been in front of that door, my career would have ended right then," Schick says.

The fire caused a \$103,000 loss and several firemen were badly burned. Did young Schick then have any doubts about his new profession?

"No, I guess it was as much a challenge as it has always been. Fighting fires gets into your blood. Just a few weeks later I was at another major fire when the two top floors

burned off the Vale Apartments at E. 4th and Perry Streets."

The retiring chief recalls that the most difficult fire he ever fought was not necessarily a very spectacular one.

"It was in the Chandler Hotel in the 600 block of Harrison Street. There was formerly a stable in back and they had later added two floors there to make it a three story building. This left a 150-foot void between the old roof and the second-story level, but we didn't know this at the time," Schick relates.

"The fire originated in the basement and got into all the walls. Every place we'd put an axe into was burning. We couldn't imagine what made it burn like that. Then one of the firemen noticed that one wall was unusually hot. We opened it and there was that wide open void, feeding the flames like a chimney. We put a line in and were able to knock down the fire. But we fought it for six or eight hours before we got it under control."

Schick's face is pained as he relives the worst fire of his career, the St. Elizabeth's Hospital blaze that snuffed out 41 lives on a cold January day in 1950. It was later determined that a mental patient had set curtains afire with a cigarette lighter. He was chief at the time.

"The alarm came in at 2:08 a.m. I was home in bed. I dressed quickly and drove to the scene. I never hope to see anything like that again. I got out of my car and ran to the chief's car where my gear was. I could see we had a terrible fire under the worst conditions. There were locked bars on the patients' rooms.

"As I turned my back to put my boots on, the roof practically exploded from pent-up heat in the attic area. In a flash, the whole roof was burning all over. We not only had to bring the fire under control, but to try to get the people out.

"I stayed there working until 6:30 the following night. Then I went to clean up and came back and stayed until 11 p.m. I was exhausted by then, as we all were. I went home and was back at the hospital at 6 a.m. It was an experience I never hope to have more than once in a lifetime!" Schick says.

"We had many unaccounted-for bodies. We lost 39 people in the fire, and two died later. It happened so fast. By the time anyone could get there the damage to property and loss of life were pretty well established."

As a young man, Schick never thought of joining the fire service. After graduation from high school, he spent some time in the Civilian Conservation Corps. Returning to Davenport, he bought a house-to-house bakery route.

"One of my customers was a captain on the Fire Department. One afternoon I sat on his front porch complaining about how bad business was, and he asked why I didn't join the Fire Department.

"I said, 'You're crazy. What do I know about fighting fires?' But it gave me an idea. I took the entrance examination, but there weren't any openings then. I had to take it two more times before I was accepted.

"If I had any real ambition as a young man it was to become a professional baseball player. I played in an organized league when I was in high school and later played semi-pro hardball around here. Then I was on the Red Jacket and later The Democrat softball teams, which played some of the best teams in the country. I always played either third base, or in the outfield," Schick recalls.

Once he was on the fire department, Schick set about learning all there was to know about his new profession. Some years later, he jumped from lieutenant to chief, over many older men, by scoring highest in an examination for the post.

"There were a lot of fires in the winter years ago. Furnaces were manually fired, and

houses of frame construction with shingle roofs. People would often overfire their furnaces. Today you never know when a major fire will occur.

"One of the most physically exhausting fires I ever fought occurred during a terribly hot summer day at the old Moss Clothing Co. store in the 400 block of W. 2nd St. The heat was as bad as the cold winter, maybe worse," Schick says.

The Clark Furniture Co. fire of a few years ago was one of the most potentially dangerous blazes he has fought. For a time there was a very good chance it would engulf an entire block.

"During my time as chief we've never had any major extension of a fire beyond the building of origin. We've been quite successful in containing them within one building," Schick says.

Schick's biggest fire, in relation to dollar loss, occurred toward the end of his career as chief, the Davenport Machine and Foundry blaze on Jan. 28, 1970. The total loss to building and contents was \$1,085,833.

"I've never been seriously injured fighting a fire. I've been real lucky in that respect," he says.

Schick plans to rest and travel for a couple of months. After that he hopes to find a position where his knowledge and experience in firefighting techniques and prevention can be utilized.

"I also hope to be available to give any assistance to the man who gets the chief's job, whoever he may be. I've had a fine relationship with all these people on the department for so many years. I want to help them in any way I can," he stresses.

And what if the throaty bullfrog alarm sounds, and the big motors roar to life and he's standing there in his civics listening to the long, mournful wall of sirens?

The eyes in the face familiar to so many Davenporters twinkle. "Well, you know what they always say about old fire horses . . ."

SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS WITHOUT REGARD TO AGE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today in support of a most deserving group of Americans. I am referring to the thousands of people who live quiet, unheralded lives, characterized primarily by years of hard work.

The Social Security Act is intended to insure that no American is forced to work beyond his years, or to live his last years in poverty once he is no longer able to work. At present, social security benefits are keyed to age. The bill I am introducing today would add another criterion of eligibility: number of years worked. If a man has worked and paid social security deductions for 40 years, he should be able to retire if he wishes to and to receive a return on that long investment. There ought to be nothing magical about age 65 or 62. Under the legislation I am introducing, old-age benefits would be available to any worker either upon reaching the minimum age, or upon completion of 160 quarters of coverage. Any man or woman who has worked and contributed to social security for 40 years should be entitled to retire and to receive full old-age insurance benefits, without regard to his or her age.

ASSET DEPRECIATION RANGE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1971

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury recently announced an unprecedented proposed ruling on depreciation called asset depreciation range—ADR. It will cost the public Treasury \$3 to \$5 billion per year and nearly \$40 billion in this decade. The Treasury action is unconstitutional, an illegal usurpation of authority and an inefficient economic tool which wastes the Nation's tax resources.

The Constitution states that—

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes.

And provides that—

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

If the Executive has the authority to "wash-out" or remit \$3 billion annually

from the Public Treasury, what are the outer limits of this power? Can he excuse or give back 40, 80, or 100 percent of annual depreciation?

If the President can legally excuse \$3 billion in corporate taxation by accelerating depreciation by 20 percent this year, he must also have the incredible power to excuse 100 percent depreciation, or \$15 billion in annual taxation. This power, unrestrained, is the power to eliminate corporate taxation—which appears to be the goal of the President. What power remains to Congress?

As part of an effort to oppose this usurpation by the Executive, I am testifying at the hearings at Treasury beginning May 3.

In addition, I have introduced in the House today the following concurrent resolution:

That it is the sense of the Congress:

(1) That the Treasury Department does not have the authority under existing law to grant taxpayers the additional income tax deductions which would be allowed under the proposed asset depreciation range system as set forth in proposed regulations issued on March 12, 1971; and

(2) That the proposed regulations, if adopted by the Treasury Department, would be null and void in the absence of action by Congress in the form of enabling legislation.

This resolution was sponsored by the following Members:

Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mrs. ABZUG, and Mr. ADAMS).

Mr. ADDABBO.

Mr. ASPIN.

Mr. BADILLO.

Mr. BEGICH.

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. CORMAN.

Mr. DRINAN.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. GIBBONS.

Mr. HARRINGTON.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. NIX.

Mr. PODELL.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. SARBANES.

Mr. STOKES.

SENATE—Friday, April 23, 1971

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Right Reverend Monsignor Patrick J. Ryan, major general, U.S. Army, retired, former chief of U.S. Army chaplains, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-loving God, who has been the help of our forefathers from the beginning of our Nation's history, look with favor upon this group of lawmakers. Direct them in their actions, grant them wisdom and strength to perform their important duties for the people of our Nation. Give them vigilant hearts and temper their zeal with prudence. In the long tradition of great lawmakers in our country, may they continue to protect and perpetuate the high principles and lofty ideals upon which our Nation was founded. Guide them in their deliberations, bless them with Your counsel that their endeavors may begin with Thee and through Thee be happily ended. Amen.

JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal and the proceedings of Thursday, April 22, 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the 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. AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—IN THE ARMY AND IN THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army and in the Navy, which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ARTHUR RIKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 65, S. 157, and that the rule of germane-