

session of the Financial Clerk of the Senate; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the records called for in the subpoena duces tecum to the proceeding before the court, the said court, through any of its officers or agents, shall have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding at a place under the orders and control of the Senate, to take at such place copies of such records in possession or control of said Financial Clerk as the court has found to be material and relevant, and to take at such place such evidence of witnesses in respect to such records as the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, except that (1) the possession of such records by the said Financial Clerk shall not be disturbed and such records shall not be removed from their file or custody under said Financial Clerk, and (2) no minutes or transcripts of any executive session or any evidence of witnesses with respect thereto may be disclosed or copied; be it further

Resolved, That subject to the limitations hereinbefore stated, said Financial Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such records as the court has found to be material and relevant to the proceeding before the court; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena aforementioned.

QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GRAVEL ON TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, immediately following the re-

marks of the two assistant leaders under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTIONS OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1972

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, following the recognition of Senator GRAVEL, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no calendar business ready for floor action tomorrow. Consequently, there will only be a pro forma session at 10 a.m. tomorrow, with no speeches.

Moreover, the state of cleared bills on the calendar is such that nothing can be ready for floor action until Tuesday of next week. Consequently, the Senate will go over from the pro forma meeting on tomorrow until 10 a.m. Tuesday, April 25.

On Tuesday the Senate will convene at 10 a.m. Following the recognition of the two assistant leaders under the standing order, the able Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 30 minutes with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, S. 3507, a bill to establish a national policy and develop a national program for the management, beneficial use, protection, and development of the land and water resources of the Nation's coastal and estuarine zones and for other purposes.

At least one rolloall vote will occur on

that bill. Following action on the coastal zone bill, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Amtrak bill and/or—and not necessarily in that order—the veterans health bill. Other measures may also be cleared for action by Tuesday.

The leadership on both sides of the aisle urges committees to take advantage of the opportunity to meet during Friday and Monday in the hope that most of the Senate's major business can be reported to the floor and, disposed of prior to the conventions.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. Friday.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4:18 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 21, 1972, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 20, 1972:

UPPER MISSOURI RIVER REGIONAL COMMISSION

Robert L. McCaughey, of South Dakota, to be Federal Cochairman of the Upper Missouri River Regional Commission.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

John A. Nevius, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman of the District of Columbia for the term expiring February 1, 1975.

Sterling Tucker, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1975.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Willie L. Leftwich, Esq., for appointment as a member of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the unexpired portion of the 5-year term ending March 3, 1976, effective upon the date of his appointment, pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONSTITUENTS HONOR LES ARENDS

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 15, several hundred of LES AREND's friends gathered in Danville, Ill., to honor him for the great service that he has rendered to the 17th Congressional District of Illinois.

LES has been representing Vermilion County, of which Danville is the county seat, for the past 20 years.

It is indeed unfortunate that LES will not be representing Vermilion County under the new reapportionment of Illinois congressional districts. The redistricting plan worked out by a panel of three Federal judges put Vermilion County in the 22d District.

LES made an outstanding speech on this occasion. He has never hesitated to speak his mind in the service of his country. We are fortunate that he has been a member of the Armed Services Committee for more than 30 years. During that time he has stood for a strong America and a bipartisan foreign policy to be sure that the intentions of this country are not misunderstood by our enemies. I know that all of my colleagues are delighted that LES AREND's constituents have honored him for his long outstanding service in the Congress of the United States.

The following is a report on this great tribute to LES by Randy Kirk in the April 16, 1972, issue of the Danville Commercial-News:

ARENDS SHOWS AUDIENCE SPARK THAT KEPT HIM IN U.S. HOUSE

(By Randy Kirk)

Rep. Leslie C. Arends thanked his hosts for an appreciation dinner Saturday night and then gave off some of the sparks that have kept him in the U.S. House of Representatives for 38 years as he attacked enemy actions in Vietnam.

More than 325 persons, including Secretary of State John W. Lewis, State Sen. Tom Merritt and State Reps. Bill Cox and Charles "Chuck" Campbell, attended the dinner.

THE 17TH DISTRICT

Last year's reapportionment of legislative districts takes Vermilion County out of the 17th District, which Arends, a Melvin Republican, has represented for the past 22 years, effective the end of this year.

The appreciation dinner, sponsored by a group of interested citizens, was to honor Arends for his work in representing the county.

"What is happening in Vietnam?" Arends,

who is ranking minority member of the House Armed Services Committee, asked the question, then answered:

"It is a Communist invasion."

"Why don't the American people know it is an invasion? Because they have not been told by the 'so-called experts' in the news media," he answered.

REPUBLICAN WHIP

Arends, who has been Republican whip in the House since 1943—longer than anyone in history—added, "We fail to do what we have to do and we fail to see what the consequences might be."

It would be awful if the United States became number two, but "I have faith that America will reach the right conclusion," the representative said.

"I am an eternal optimist and can see the light at the end of the tunnel. I look forward to getting back on the steady road," he added.

Arends said this will be an interesting political year. For those who have been living in the "fools paradise" it is time to pay up, he added.

Government has over extended itself trying to do too much which has caused our economic difficulties, he said. People are starting to realize now that the government cannot do all things, he added.

NEW DISTRICT

Arends will serve a new district on the outskirts of Chicago after the first of the year. He won the Republican primary for the 15th District and is considered a favorite in the general election.

He said he has no plans to leave government. "It's a challenge and you like to see it through," the representative said.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN AS A REPRESENTATIVE IN THE ILLINOIS GENERAL ASSEMBLY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, recently I attended a meeting of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia. Always we have interesting speakers to give us some new insight, evaluations, and conclusions of Abraham Lincoln. At the last meeting on Friday, April 14, this was no exception.

Our very able colleague, Congressman ROBERT McCLODY spoke to the group on Abraham Lincoln and his experience and contribution in the Illinois General Assembly. He could and did speak with knowledge because he is an avid Lincoln student and comes from Illinois.

There is so much of value and food for thought that I commend these remarks to all my colleagues for reading and I hope also that students everywhere who may be reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and who may have interest will find this of great value to them as they pursue their studies of this most American of all Americans:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT McCLODY

Commander Dalton, Congressman Schwengel, and distinguished members of the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia: It is a distinct privilege to appear before this prestigious group to discuss an aspect and a brief but highly significant period in the life of Abraham Lincoln—to whose memory this organization is principally devoted. My sub-

ject—dealing with Abraham Lincoln as a member of the house of representatives of the Illinois General Assembly is a subject very dear and very close to me.

I suppose that in the lives of all of us we have memories that stand out more prominently than others in the course of our human experiences—what Lincoln termed the "mystic chords of memory."

In my own career the thrill of approaching the broad steps of the State Capitol in Springfield, Illinois, more than 20 years ago stands out indelibly in my mind and memory. Indeed, as I assumed my seat in the house of representatives and later in the Illinois State senate, I always seemed to sense the presence of Abraham Lincoln with whom Springfield and Sangamon County are the places—outside of this place—with which Lincoln was principally identified.

This identity is most eloquently set forth in his brief remarks when following his election he left Springfield for Washington in 1861. Included in those remarks are these touching and prophetic words:

"My friends—No one, not in my situation, can appreciate my feeling of sadness at this parting. To this place, and the kindness of these people, I owe every thing. Here I have lived a quarter of a century, and have passed from a young to an old man. Here my children have been born, and one is buried. I now leave, not knowing when, or whether ever, I may return with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington. Without the assistance of that Divine Being, who ever attended him, I cannot succeed. With that assistance I cannot fail. Trusting in Him, who can go with me, and remain with you and be every where for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well. To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you in affectionate farewell."

I would like also to point with pride to the slogan of the State of Illinois which is emblazoned on our Illinois license plates—"Land of Lincoln."

I recall in 1955 when the legislation officially establishing this slogan was pending in the Illinois House of Representatives. The Republicans had a bare majority at that time. When the measure was called for a second reading in the House of Representatives one of the Democratic leaders—recalling appropriately that Stephen Douglas was also a son of Illinois, proposed an amendment that the slogan should read "Land of Lincoln—and Douglas." The small Republican majority stood fast and the amendment was defeated. But then another threat occurred when a resourceful Member of the House, who also had an automobile dealership, proposed that we should be designating "Land of Lincoln, Mercury, and Ford."

But loyal supporters of General Motors, American Motors and Chrysler defeated that proposal—and we in Illinois became proudly citizens of the "Land of Lincoln."

Another significant event occurred during my experience in the Illinois General Assembly when we voted funds to restore the Capitol at Springfield to the general condition and appearance which it had in Lincoln's day. Although Lincoln's experiences as an Illinois lawmaker preceded the establishment of the Capitol at Springfield, it was in that Capitol Building where one of the historic Lincoln-Douglas debates took place.

Just a few months ago the President visited the Old Capitol Building—now restored—in official ceremonies which established the Lincoln home a few blocks away—as a national historic site under the jurisdiction of the national park service. Our Lincoln and United States Capitol authority, Fred Schwengel was also present on that occasion.

Lincoln is customarily regarded as a late starter. The view is generally held that most of his education did not occur until he was

an adult. Certainly his formal education prior to his 21st birthday was extremely limited. But there is no indication in any sense that he was uneducated, inarticulate or unskilled in letters when he first arrived in New Salem, Illinois on a flatboat in 1831. He saw New Salem before he journeyed on the flatboat to New Orleans along the Sangamon River—which was then more navigable than it is today. He returned to New Salem and established residence there in 1831. The very next year he was a candidate for the Illinois General Assembly. Having been born in 1809, he was only 22-23 years old as he waged his campaign. Indeed, from April until June 1832 he was away from New Salem and his district entirely—as a volunteer in the Black Hawk War. First, as a captain of the Illinois Militia. Later, as a private in the Federal forces. This limited his campaign activities—but I should add that he never saw Chief Black Hawk or any other Indians except one elderly squaw—and is reported to have fired only one shot—but not at an Indian.

In the early weeks of the campaign, Lincoln set forth his stand on most of the current issues which were of local importance, including his support for (1) internal improvements, (2) public education and his (3) opposition to loaning money at high interest rates. As his principal qualification, Lincoln cited his experience as a Sangamon River boatman. He published this platform and his qualifications in some detail in a piece which appeared in the Sangamon Journal of March 15, 1832.

Running as a Whig in a county where that was the minority party, Lincoln very wisely included the following plea: "My case is thrown exclusively upon the independent voters of this county."

Lincoln made a few speeches after returning to his home a short time before election day, August 6, 1832. Four members of the Illinois House of Representatives were elected from a field of 13 candidates—in Sangamon County, Lincoln ran 8th—and lost. However, his personal popularity in New Salem was established where in his home precinct he garnered 277 of the 300 votes cast.

Obviously he had to make himself better known. This, he did through appointment as postmaster of New Salem and as a surveyor of lands throughout Sangamon County. Meeting the citizens as he journeyed about the countryside with chain and compass, he made friends and won political support. He again announced his candidacy in the 1834 campaign. It is reported that he was approached by the Democrats to team up with them to assure his election with the idea of beating John T. Stuart, the leader of the Whigs. When Lincoln took the proposition to Stuart he was advised by Stuart to accept the offer. Then the Stuart voters concentrated on beating the strongest Democratic candidate, Richard Quinton. It seems like an odd political deal. But Lincoln ran second only 14 votes behind the winner and Stuart came in fourth with the result that Lincoln and Stuart, the two Whigs, were elected along with two Democrats in the 1834 election. Quinton was nosed out by a narrow margin.

I am sure that many have visited the log cabin community of New Salem and can appreciate the primitive conditions which existed there in Lincoln's day. Following his election—and in order to make his initial period in public life more impressive, he borrowed \$200 from a New Salem friend, paid \$60.00 for a new suit which was tailor-made in Springfield and used the rest of the money for other needs until he boarded the regular weekly stage to report to his official duties in the State capital at Vandalia, Illinois—where he could collect his legislative salary of \$3.00 per day. I should point out that while Lincoln gave an extensive description of his qualifications in his first campaign, he did quite the contrary in the election of 1834. He simply recalled the strong bipartisan

support he had received in the 1832 campaign, and appealed as he had before to the independent voter.

Lincoln rode with Stuart from Springfield to Vandalia by stage coach and arrived at the State Capitol in Vandalia at the end of November. Thus began his service in the Illinois General Assembly which continued from 1834 to 1841 (the 9th through the 12th General Assemblies).

Frequent references are made to Lincoln the President, Lincoln the lawyer, and even Lincoln the soldier, but few seem to recall Abraham Lincoln's first important political office as a member of the Illinois General Assembly. Lincoln's political talents and his capacity for leadership were displayed almost from the first day he arrived in Vandalia. He was then just 25 years of age when he took his seat with 53 other House members on December 1, 1834. Lincoln was not then a lawyer and most of his colleagues in the House of Representatives were farmers. Of the total of 54 House members, 35—including Lincoln—were first termers. He showed real wisdom in his immediate association with John T. Stuart with whom he roomed in Vandalia and who was at that time the leader of the Whig minority. Through Stuart he made many important and influential contacts which benefitted him greatly, then and later. However, it is interesting to note that Lincoln, himself, was so little known that the first record of him in Vandalia omits his first name and lists him simply as—Lincoln. However, Stuart knew virtually everyone. He introduced Lincoln and soon Lincoln became well known too.

Some have asked how Lincoln happened to identify with the Whigs (the party of Henry Clay) which was regarded in that day as the party of the Aristocrats, instead of the party of Andrew Jackson—the people's hero.

Indeed, many of the Whigs in advancing their aristocratic identity were trapped by what became known as the "Little Bull Bill." This measure which was passed in the 1836 session of the Illinois House of Representatives, made it unlawful for small bulls to run at large. This law favored by owners of well-bred livestock was intended to prevent breeding with small bull sires. The Democrats accused the Whigs of carrying their aristocratic tendencies even into the animal kingdom and many who voted for the "Little Bull Bill" were defeated when they ran for reelection.

However, Lincoln was one of those who voted against the bill and thus was able to continue his public career until he voluntarily retired from the House of Representatives in 1841. Only five days after he was sworn in as a State representative, Lincoln introduced his first bill entitled "An Act to limit the jurisdiction of the justices of the peace." This may sound somewhat like the present bill to limit the jurisdiction of Federal courts in school busing cases. Other measures which he introduced provided funds for a toll bridge across Salt Creek in Sangamon County for his friend Samuel Musick which later was passed and a bill to add five new circuit judges, which also became law. When the first session ended on February 13, 1835, Lincoln had performed virtually every function of a House member except (because of his minority party position) he could not serve as chairman of a standing committee or chairman of a committee of the Whole House or as a conference committee chairman.

John T. Stuart, who was looking toward the U.S. Congress, appeared deliberately to be grooming Lincoln to take over his role as leader of the Whigs. In this respect, Stuart had done an excellent job. Stuart was a good mentor and Lincoln was an apt and ready pupil. When he left Vandalia at the end of the first term, he returned of course to New Salem as he resumed his duties as postmaster, as well as his surveying activities—but with this difference. Lincoln had determined upon

a profession, namely, the law. While he had done some reading of the law prior to this time, he continued in his reading of the law and was admitted to practice law before his reelection to the Illinois General Assembly in 1836. Indeed, in the 1836 election he led the ticket as he did also in 1838 and I believe in 1840. Lincoln was candidate for Speaker of the Illinois House of Representatives in both the 1838 and 1840 session but lost on both occasions to the Democratic candidate, William Lee Davidson Ewing, who later became Governor of Illinois.

As we know, Lincoln was one of the members of the so-called long nine from Sangamon County who served in the Illinois House of Representatives and State Senate in the session of the Illinois general assembly which began in 1836 and ended in 1837.

As leader of the long nine, Lincoln's principal legislative activity in the 1836-1837 session was the bill to remove the State capital from Vandalia to Springfield.

The measure had been on the ballot in 1834 at which time the proposition was approved to relocate the State capital. Thereafter, Springfield and Peoria and Alton were set forth as possible locations with one proposal that the capital should be located in the "geographical" center of the State.

In the 1836 session, the long nine devoted their principal attention to public improvement legislation. This involved appropriation of State funds for roads, railroads, bridges and other public projects, in which a total of \$10 million was appropriated—a staggering figure for that day.

Secretly, the long nine, representing primarily Sangamon County, had in mind a measure to remove the State capital from Vandalia to Springfield. While the capital at Vandalia had been destroyed—burned for the second time prior to the 1836 session it had been replaced by a new structure. However, when the legislature convened in 1836 the building was found to be too small. The efforts of Vandalia to retain the seat of government in their city seemed doomed.

A bill to remove the State capital from Vandalia without designating a new site reached 3rd reading in February 1838. An amendment was adopted which would require the new State capital, wherever named, to donate \$50,000 . . . to the State, matching a similar sum authorized in the bill. A motion to table was carried by a majority of one vote—39-38.

Lincoln was disheartened but not defeated and he spent the weekend reminding numerous members of the appropriations which had been made for public works in their districts and several days later on a Saturday morning, February 18, a motion was made to take the bill from the table which passed by a margin of 42-40.

Still, several more days elapsed while Lincoln garnered further support for the measure. Finally with every Sangamon Representative in his place, the bill was called on third reading and passed on February 24, 1838 by a vote of 48-34. However, up to this time Springfield had not been officially chosen as the new capital. But this also was accomplished before too long as the other cities which were contending for the State Capital were eliminated: Peoria, Alton, Jacksonville, Decatur. There were four ballots which were cast on this issue with Springfield being selected on the 4th ballot.

Springfield's victory was a great personal triumph for Lincoln, and gave proof of his capacity for leadership and for his political skill.

The victorious long nine were reported to have staged a wild celebration at Ebenezer Capp's Tavern near Vandalia's State House with free champagne, cigars, oysters, almonds and raisins. A full 81 bottles of champagne were consumed and the bill paid by Ninian Edwards totalled \$223.50.

When the session adjourned on Monday,

March 6, almost 400 bills had been enacted and the Sangamon delegation boarded the first stage North. They entered Springfield in Triumph. Of course, Lincoln returned to New Salem but only to prepare for his move to Springfield, the State Capital, where he was at that time the outstanding political hero. In turn, he became a law partner of John T. Stuart. The announcement appearing in the Sangamon Journal of April 15, 1838 that "J. T. Stuart and A. Lincoln, attorneys and counsellors at law, will practice, conjointly, in the courts of this judicial circuit." Springfield made good on its \$50,000 pledge—and after one more session of the legislature in Vandalia, the new State Capitol was established permanently in Springfield. Lincoln was the top vote getter on August 6, 1838 when he was elected to the 11th Illinois General Assembly. He led the ticket again when he was reelected in 1840 for his last term.

What else may be said about Lincoln, it cannot be denied that the political skill which he developed and displayed as a member of the Illinois House of Representatives gave clear evidence of the leadership and greatness which characterized him in later years as one of the most prominent figures in the history of the world.

ABANDONMENT OF NONCOMMUNIST ALLIES UNDER THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the international image of the United States has truly undergone change. Following our President's visit to Red China and the Nationalist China sellout at the United Nations there have occurred repeated instances of non-Communist countries, formerly our friends and allies loosening their ties to our country and becoming truly nonaligned as independent self-sustaining representative governments.

Classic, in the falling away of smaller nations, is the Republic of the Philippines. For example, President Ferdinand E. Marcos of the Philippines, in an April 9 speech at Mount Samat ceremonies commemorating the fall of Bataan, said the tragedy was the result of too much dependence on American military might.

Never again should our country depend on others for its security. We have faith and trust in our allies.

He pointed out that as a sovereign country the Philippines finds herself no longer under the exclusive, all powerful protection umbrella of the United States.

We must not depend entirely on our allies for our security. Bataan was the object lesson.

Subsequently, the five Southeast Asian nations of ASEAN, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia, and Singapore, meeting in Singapore released a so-called Malik statement interpreted as a hard-line regional policy laid down by Indonesia following China's admission to the U.N. and President Nixon's visit to China.

While our present international accommodation of communism is driving free nations from us, Moscow and the

United States announce the extension and expansion of an agreement for cultural, scientific, and educational exchanges. And at Santiago, Chile, a U.S. Under Secretary of State defended the U.S. role in the development of the third world—supposedly unaligned Communist controlled nations.

This was followed by World Bank President Robert S. McNamara's speech at the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development that the Communist nations of the world were not on schedule with their programed progress and that the larger and more wealthy countries should retard their economic well-being and production to benefit the so-called developing countries. Since the World Bank is funded principally by U.S. tax dollars under guidance of the one-world international bankers' umbrella it should be obvious to concerned Americans that not only have we alienated many of our deserving free world allies but on our present course we can be expected to continue to subsidize Communist dictatorships.

I include related news clippings as follows:

[From the Manila Chronicle, Apr. 9, 1972]

MARCOS POINTS TO LESSON OF BATAAN

MOUNT SAMAT.—President Marcos today put heavy emphasis on the responsibility of sovereign nations like the Philippines to look after their own security.

Speaking at ceremonies commemorating the Fall of Bataan, the President said the tragedy in Bataan was the result of too much dependence on American military might.

"Never again should our country depend on others for its security. We have faith and trust in our allies. We can depend on them, but we can best trust ourselves and depend on our own capabilities." Mr. Marcos said.

High government officials and Filipino and American veterans accompanied the President and the First Lady in the trek to this mountain, where the Philippine-American forces surrendered to numerically superior Japanese troops 30 years ago.

American Ambassador Henry Byroade reassured US allies that his country is "slowly getting back to a readiness footing. We are ready and willing to use force, reluctantly but effectively, if we have to deter future aggression." Byroade said.

The US envoy who was among the members of the diplomatic corps who attended impressive ceremonies here, pointed out that the United States had learned from Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Corregidor, Iwo Jima, Leyte and Saipan that "we must remain a part of the Pacific. And being in the Pacific, the US is ready to defend her allies."

"The trend among Asian countries to adopt a policy of self-reliance in their defense is not incompatible with the US policy of helping states needing assistance," Byroade said.

After the last war, President Marcos said, there had always been the constant threat to the country's security posed by internal subversion or external aggression.

He pointed out that as a sovereign country, the Philippines finds herself no longer under the exclusive, all-powerful protective umbrella of the United States. The defense of the Philippines has become the sole responsibility of her people, Mr. Marcos said. He reiterated: "We must not depend entirely on our allies for our security. Bataan was the object lesson."

The President also noted that despite the massive efforts of his Administration there still is an active insurgency in the country fomented by misguided elements. These elements

are just waiting for the right moment to try to seize power from the constituted authorities, he said.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 14, 1972]

FIVE SOUTHEAST ASIAN NATIONS ADOPT INDONESIA'S HARD LINE

(By David Van Praagh)

SINGAPORE.—After thoroughly discussing the Vietnam situation behind closed doors, the leaders of five Southeast Asian countries adopted today the Indonesian concept of "national resilience" that appears the basis for prospective informal backup military alliance in the region.

"It is necessary for member countries to develop national resilience to enable them to face present charges and challenges of the future with greater confidence," the foreign minister said in a joint communique. It was issued on the occasion of foreign ministers meeting of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

The ASEAN members are Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia and Singapore.

Commenting on the two-day meeting, Indonesian foreign Minister Adam Malik said "We may be satisfied with the introduction and eventual adoption of an ASEAN strategy to give up clear direction of how to proceed."

The vague communique and the Malik statement appeared to diplomatic observers to signal acceptance of a hardline regional policy laid down by Indonesia's ruling generals following China's admission to the United Nations and President Nixon's visit to China.

President Suharto's recent visits to the Philippines and Australia and those of his defense deputy, Gen. Maraden Panggabean, to Malaysia and Singapore laid the groundwork for the new emphasis on national resilience.

This was explained by Malik as national and regional economic development without outside interference.

While Indonesia stopped short here of proposing joint ASEAN military measures, it recently reached limited defense agreements with Malaysia the Philippines and Australia and is building up with U.S. military aid a strategic mobile infantry force that could be used within the region.

Reliable sources in Asian countries say that by national resilience the Indonesian generals mean keeping China, Russia and Japan out of Southeast Asia as much as possible, playing down U.S. aid and support and minimizing the proposed neutralization of Southeast Asia.

Indonesia succeeded at a meeting of ASEAN foreign ministers in Kuala Lumpur last November in deleting big power guarantees from the adopted Malaysian ideas of a neutralized Southeast Asia.

This formal Singapore meeting appears to have pushed the five-nation group, primarily concerned with economic matters, further into political and possibly military spheres.

But there is no thought of a formal pact.

At Singapore's suggestion it was agreed the foreign ministers would meet at least once a year to discuss "international developments."

At the suggestion of the Philippines, the working of ASEAN will be reassessed with a view to setting up a regional secretariat.

Thailand and the Philippines are the only two ASEAN members allied with the U.S. Making his first appearance outside Thailand since undergoing a period as a Buddhist monk, former Thai Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman, showed he had lost none of his anti-Communist fervor by blaming North Vietnam and an unnamed major power providing "massive support" for upsetting peaceful coexistence which he said resulted from

Nixon's Peking venture. Thant is expected to be renamed foreign minister.

The proposal of Philippine President Ferdinand Marcos for a summit meeting of Asian leaders—also believed opposed by Indonesia—was again stalled here.

The five ASEAN members have tacitly agreed not to establish diplomatic relations with China for the indefinite future.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate, Apr. 10, 1972]

DEATH MARCH OBSERVED BY PHILIPPINE SOLDIERS

MOUNT SAMAT, PHILIPPINES.—President Ferdinand E. Marcos led thousands of Filipinos and Americans up this historic mountain Sunday in remembrance of the fall of Bataan to the Japanese army 30 years ago.

About 100 Filipino soldiers, bandaged and barefoot struggled along 9 miles of road up the mountain in reenactment of the 65-mile death march of prisoners that followed the battle.

Marcos, a survivor of the Battle for Bataan and the most decorated Filipino soldier in World War II, called on his countrymen not to forget the sacrifices of the thousands of brave men who fell during the four-month long battle and the ensuing battle march.

AMBASSADOR PRESENT

Joined by American Ambassador Henry Byroade, Marcos laid a floral wreath at the foot of the large marble shrine of honor, a memorial dedicated to the Filipino and American soldiers who died.

"We believe in self reliance and mutual respect and accept American friendship the way we did in the years before," Marcos said, "but we must look forward and try to learn on our own."

A squadron of Philippine air force trainer planes circled overhead, dropping confetti on the thousands who braved the hot tropical sun to make the sentimental journey up this 1,700-foot peak.

Japanese forces were represented by Ryochi Sasakawa, who was a member of the Japanese Diet during World War II and who now has become a philanthropist and a strong promoter of Japanese Filipino friendship.

ENDED RESISTANCE

The fall of Bataan and the neighboring fortress island of Corregidor in Manila Bay 27 days later marked the end of organized allied resistance in the Philippines until 1944. But the long battle considerably delayed occupation plans of the Japanese, who had counted on a much quicker victory.

The death march which followed the 120-day battle proved to be one of the grisly episodes of the war and did nearly as much to inflame world opinion against the Japanese as did the attack on Pearl Harbor.

About 12,000 American officers and men and 66,000 Filipino soldiers plus 6,000 Filipino civilian employees surrendered to the Japanese on Bataan.

Exact figures of the number that died during the march are not known, but estimates range from 17,000 to well over 20,000. An official U.S. Government estimate said another 5,200 Americans died after the march in Japanese prisons camps.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1972]

UNITED STATES, SOVIETS SIGN ACCORD EXPANDING CULTURAL EXCHANGE

(By Murray Seeger)

Moscow.—The United States and the Soviet Union agreed today to extend and expand their 14-year-old agreement for cultural, scientific and educational exchanges.

The new accord provides for an increased number of scholars, technical experts and performing artists to be exchanged between the two nations during the 1972-73 period. The greatest expansion will be in scientific

and technical areas, reflecting the current high interest here in improving the efficiency of the nation's economy.

U.S. Ambassador Jacob Beam and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Alexei Smirnov signed the new accord, which has been the subject of negotiations here since March 17.

[U.S. Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, who is in Moscow to discuss grain sales to the Soviet Union, was received by Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev today, Tass news agency reported. The two men conferred in "an informal and businesslike atmosphere," Tass added.]

The new agreement also stipulates that each government can send one official traveling exhibit abroad similar to the Soviet arts show now appearing in Los Angeles and the American technology exhibit, which is currently in Moscow.

American negotiators said the cultural talks have been "businesslike" and not marked by the kind of political wrangling that has interrupted previous negotiations. They attributed part of the positive negotiation atmosphere to a Soviet concern not to mar the approaching summit talks between Soviet leaders and President Nixon next month.

After the signing ceremony, Smirnov, said the cultural agreements had "invariably proved to be beneficial for both sides" and have "a positive influence on the general status of relations between the states."

[In Washington, Secretary of State William P. Rogers said the accord would make "a useful contribution" toward increasing "contact and cooperation between our two peoples."]

U.S. officials noted the agreement is voluntary and simply sets out a plan for exchanges. Frequently, one side or the other has failed to deliver on half of an exchange automatically cancelling the other half.

In the scientific and technical areas, the agreement calls for 21 exchanges including five which were not carried out in the 1970-71 agreement. But the program also proposes for the first time an unlimited number of additional exchanges in 18 specific fields that could be negotiated individually in the next two years.

U.S. officials said they were unable to get written assurances from Soviet officials to reduce imbalances that have marred the cultural agreements. American artists in Russia often find they have been booked into small auditoriums and in remote cities while Russian artists are booked by commercial agents in the U.S. into the best and biggest halls for longer tours.

The biggest imbalance is in the tourist traffic which is also covered by the agreement. In 1971, an estimated 58,000 American tourists visited the Soviet Union while only 200 Russian tourists visited the United States.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 15, 1972]

U.S. ROLE IN THIRD WORLD DEFENDED

(By Lewis H. Diuguid)

SANTIAGO.—Under Secretary of State John N. Irwin II defended the U.S. role in the development of the Third World today.

Irwin's speech seemed in response to yesterday's opening address to the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) by its host, Chilean President Salvador Allende, who severely criticized American performance.

However, a member of the 20-man U.S. delegation headed by Irwin said that his remarks had not been altered as a result of Allende's speech.

"The United States has supported and contributed substantially to the process of development," Irwin said. It has joined with others in establishing the concept that the wealthier countries have a responsibility to help the poorer nations accelerate their economic and social progress."

Allende had said that the industrial coun-

tries, and implicitly the United States in particular, dominated the world economic order and manipulated it to improve their own well-being at the expense of the less-developed nations, which make up 96 of UNCTAD's 141 member nations.

McNAMARA'S STATISTICS

World Bank president Robert S. McNamara also addressed the plenary session today, amply sustaining with statistics Allende's contention that the gap between rich nations and poor—and between rich and poor within many nations—is widening.

McNamara stressed that while developed countries had agreed at previous international meetings that their official development assistance should reach 0.7 percent of their gross national products by 1975, the figure for the United States actually has fallen from 0.5 percent in the early 1960s to 0.3 percent this year. It is expected to drop to 0.24 percent by 1975.

So large a role does the United States play in aid that the overall figure for the 16 industrial nations is expected to be half of the target in 1975—even though several European nations are increasing their aid substantially.

While McNamara noted that the gross national products of developing nations had increased in recent years, he rattled off figures to show that this means no progress for the majority poor in many countries.

INCOME DISTRIBUTION

Citing Brazil McNamara said its GNP had grown 2.5 per cent per capita annually over the last decade, while the share of the poorest 40 per cent of the people had declined from 10 to 8 per cent in the same period. The richest 5 per cent of the people increased their share of the wealth from 29 to 38 per cent.

Mexico, India and other countries show similar patterns, he said. Among measures he advocated to reverse the trend were fast, vigorous tax and land reforms.

"If developing countries themselves do not adopt the policies to deal with this problem, there is little that, international institutions and other external sources of aid can do to help the poorest 40 per cent of their peoples," he said.

Irwin, like McNamara and Allende, stressed that "Increased attention must be given to particular human needs and social goals" at this third UNCTAD. He said U.S. bilateral aid will be focused on "education, nutrition, increased agricultural production and, for countries who wish it, help in family planning."

President Nixon has promised that the United States will provide preferential tariff treatment for goods of the Third World, a step already taken by Japan and European countries.

"As all of you know only too well, the United States has not yet been able to put its own plan into effect. We very much regret our inability to do so," he said. Internal economic problems persist, creating an inauspicious atmosphere, he added. "We will recommend action by Congress as soon as the chances for success improve."

Other speakers today included former Japanese Foreign Minister Kiichi Aichi, French Finance Minister Valéry Giscard d'Estaing and West German Finance Minister Karl Schiller.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, April 15, 1972]

McNAMARA URGES HELP FOR POOR NATIONS

(By David R. Francis)

WASHINGTON.—World Bank president Robert S. McNamara gave the industrialized nations of the world an earful in Santiago, Chile, on Friday. Current and projected flows of official development assistance—at less than half the established targets—"are wholly inadequate," he said.

This situation, Mr. McNamara told the third United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, contributed to a state of development in most of the developing world that is "unacceptable—and growing more so."

The text of Mr. McNamara's speech was made available here.

Unless the industrialized nations expand their aid, the former U.S. secretary of defense said, the poorest countries of the world will be unable to reach their objectives for the Second Development Decade of a 6-percent annual growth rate.

Many other nations, without increased aid, will face mounting external debt problems.

Since the mid-1950's, Mr. McNamara continued, publicly guaranteed debt of the poor countries has been growing at about 14 percent a year. At the end of 1971 it stood at over \$60 billion, and annual debt service exceeded \$5 billion.

Servicing of debt since the mid-1950's has been growing at the same average annual rate of about 14 percent. This is about twice the rate at which the developing countries' export earnings, from which the debt must be serviced, have been growing.

"Such a relationship cannot continue indefinitely," Mr. McNamara noted.

Thus he saw it as a "most imperative need" for the developing countries to expand their export earnings.

This can be done, Mr. McNamara argued, "but only by difficult economic adjustments, broad policy changes, and astute political leadership in the rich and poor countries alike."

Mr. McNamara noted that fuel exports by developing countries, accounting for a third of their export earnings, are growing at an average rate of 10 percent a year. But three-quarters of these substantial earnings go to only 6 nations containing less than 3 percent of the world's population.

By contrast, those poor countries highly dependent on exports of agricultural products find their growth of exports of these primary commodities not likely to exceed 3 or 4 percent a year.

Mr. McNamara suggested these nations might negotiate stabilization agreements—on the international coffee-agreement model for cocoa and other commodities. These might provide for multilateral financial assistance.

Further, he said, "the wealthier nations could well afford to leave more of their markets open to agricultural imports from developing countries."

Agricultural protectionism by the temperate countries for such products as beet sugar "makes neither domestic nor international sense," he charged.

Other developing countries, whose populations total over 1 billion, have greater capabilities for the export of manufactures. To obtain the 6-percent growth target, these nations will need an increase in total export earnings, in current prices, of nearly 10 percent a year, Mr. McNamara stated. This, in turn, necessitates an annual increase of their manufactured exports of 15 percent.

In fact, the manufactured exports of these developing countries did grow at that 15 percent rate in the 1960's.

Mr. McNamara held that the momentum of these exports must be maintained. The developing countries must use their abundant, cheap labor to make textiles, garments, footwear, vegetable oil, processed foodstuffs, plywood, furniture, glassware, plastic and wooden products, and electronic and engineering subassemblies.

"IT IS . . . WHOLLY ILLOGICAL"

He criticized the developing nations for clinging too long to inward-looking, import-substitution policies—that is, high tariffs or other trade barriers designed to encourage local production of imported goods. Rather

they should encourage labor-intensive, export-oriented enterprises.

The World Bank president similarly blasted the developed nations for restricting imports from the poor countries.

"It is . . . wholly illogical," he stated, "after 20 years of development assistance to poorer countries, for the wealthy nations to negate that effort by maintaining higher tariffs on the manufactured goods these poorer countries export than on manufactures from their affluent counterparts."

The level of tariffs on imports of manufactured goods in the United States is 7 percent from rich trading partners and 12 percent from the poor countries. The same figures for the United Kingdom are 9 and 14 percent and for the European community, 7 and 9 percent.

Further, Mr. McNamara added, the discrimination is enlarged by the structure of the tariffs. They rise with the degree of fabrication. For instance, the European community puts a 3 percent duty on cocoa beans from nonassociated countries. Processed cocoa products must face an 18 percent tariff.

"This manifestly means that processing—even simple processing—can by such tariffs be priced out of the developing country's most appropriate markets."

Even more repressive of the developing countries' export opportunities, Mr. McNamara said, is the whole series of restrictive nontariff barriers that rich countries have erected over the years. These include quotas, subsidies, and preferential-purchasing arrangements.

Mr. McNamara held that it was "essential" that the wealthier countries grant preferential treatment to the manufactured exports of developing countries. Japan, the Nordic countries, and the European community have done so. The U.S. and Canada have not.

NEW POLICY URGED

These preference agreements would increase the developing countries' exports of manufactures by only about \$1 billion a year, Mr. McNamara said.

To maintain the 15 percent growth rate for manufactured exports, these nations must increase these exports from \$7 billion in 1970 to \$28 billion by 1980.

The bank president admitted this would be "an enormous task." But he said it would certainly not impose an intolerable import burden on the wealthy countries. The \$28 billion in exports would amount to only about 7 percent of the expected manufactured imports of the affluent countries. It would represent less than 1 percent of their gross national product.

By accepting these more labor-intensive manufactured items, he argued, the rich countries could turn their attention to the production of more sophisticated items and those employing capital-intensive technology.

To prevent the short-term problems of adjustment in the well-to-do countries, Mr. McNamara advocated adoption of policies "to cushion the impact to import competition by retraining, relocation, and refinancing." Until the industrialized countries do this, "labor and management opposition to trade liberalization will be great—and justly so."

KEEP HIM HONEST

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that one reads a newspaper editorial, not an advertisement, that urges

the citizens of a community to attend a fundraising dinner for their Congressman. It is not often that an editorial specifies the amount of money for a plate and emphasizes that it is the duty of people to finance the candidate and cites the reasons.

When it is a newspaper like the esteemed Emporia Gazette that the late William Allen White made famous and when the editorial writer is Mr. Allen's distinguished son, William L. White, I think my colleagues will appreciate this unique situation.

The Congressman who is so knighted is my colleague, JOE SKUBITZ. I include the brief editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The editorial follows:

KEEP HIM HONEST

In the 10 years that Joseph Skubitz has represented the Fifth District, he has become a parental figure, and on this basis its people bring him their troubles. These can be Social Security foul-ups, government checks which have been stolen and must be replaced, citizenship for a relative, or it can be what to do about the price of beef. In 20 years, beef on the butcher's block has gone up from 40 percent to 70 percent, while beef on the hoof is what it was back in 1950. All this they bring to Joe to straighten out, in the belief that he will kiss it and make it well. More often than not he does. He protested this price spread before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee in Washington.

There was also the famous case when the Atomic Energy Commission threatened to use, as a dumping ground for atomic waste, some abandoned salt mines under Lyons. This could have given every man, woman and child in Rice County the hot foot. It could have boiled the catfish in the streams. In their hour of peril, naturally the voters of Rice County turned to Joe, as of course we would in Lyon County were we threatened by such a peril. Small wonder that Joe Skubitz, in the 1970 election, carried every precinct in Lyon County.

And this week we have our chance to support Joe. For Lyon County Republicans are giving him a \$10.00-a-plate dinner this coming Saturday night beginning at 6:30 o'clock in the Student Union Ballroom of the Kansas State Teacher's College. Tickets are now on sale, and there is a student's rate of \$5.00.

So come one, come all! Let us common run of folks finance Joe—to keep him honest so that he will not be beholden to the wicked corporations, and can thumb his nose at IT&T.

Here is our chance to help him who has so greatly and so often helped us.

THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ON STRIKERS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, a serious problem facing our country and its long-established system of collective bargaining is that, in recent days, we have witnessed a situation in which workers on strike have become the recipients of Federal and State financial assistance.

In West Virginia, for example, a coal strike caused 15,000 new families to be added to the food stamp program, a fact

which swelled the State's total food stamp role by 20 percent. In one week, the West Virginia State Welfare Department distributed \$1.7 million in food stamps to the miners' families and declared that the Federal Government had paid for the program.

In a recent address, Dr. Herbert Northrup, Chairman of the Labor Relations Council and Director of the Industrial Research Unit of the Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania, pointed out during the General Motors strike:

We figured that almost 30 percent of the General Motors employees in Michigan were on food stamps and 20 percent on welfare. . . . We've made studies of local situations such as the long Westinghouse strike at the Lester plant outside of Philadelphia. We found out the Welfare Department took on 10 people to take care of this situation.

In cases such as these, the agencies of Government have provided workers with their sole "strike benefits." The labor unions themselves, in such situations, paid no strike benefits at all.

Such a state of affairs tends to encourage and prolong strikes. Dr. Northrup notes that:

It enables the union to hold out without pressure from the rank and file. If there is one thing that was clear in both the General Electric and General Motors strike, it is that there was no pressure on the rank and file to settle the strike.

When no pressure exists to settle a strike, the strike tends to continue, costing all concerned, workers, management, and the tax-payers, huge amounts of money. In addition, states Dr. Northrup:

It makes a big difference in the character of the result. It makes a big difference in the inflationary impact.

Collective bargaining is based, at least in part, upon the assumption of governmental neutrality. Dr. Northrup declared that:

The collective bargaining system in the United States cannot work satisfactorily if the public purse becomes an extension of the union treasury for paying strike benefits.

This, however, is clearly what is happening. Government is becoming a silent partner in labor-management disputes, assisting labor unions to prolong strikes and eliminating pressure upon the union leadership from the rank and file to accept settlements.

Those who are truly concerned with stemming the tide of inflation should consider the inflationary force of such one-sided governmental interference in collective bargaining. I wish to share with my colleagues the address given by Dr. Northrup before a combined meeting of the NAM Committees on Employee Benefits, Employee Health/Safety and Industrial Relations, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

THE IMPACT OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ON STRIKERS

(By Dr. Herbert Northrup)

I am delighted to share with you some of our preliminary findings about a jungle that none of us know very much about—including me, actually.

A couple of years ago I picked up the newspapers during the General Electric strike and saw a picture of a well-dressed gentle-

man carrying a bunch of groceries out of some establishment in Schenectady. Having been involved in getting Schenectady wages in line some years earlier, and knowing that the Schenectady workers were not among our poverty-stricken types, I was fascinated about why I, as a taxpayer, should be paying for his groceries. I have five children of my own and that's really enough to support.

A further investigation revealed that although I was supposed to know what was going on in industrial relations, I had missed something . . . namely, that when you go on strike you become in need and when you are in need there are several things to which you are entitled. This was really the beginning of our study of the impact of welfare on strikes.

Now we are all familiar with the fact that in the undeveloped civilizations of New York and Rhode Island—and on the railroads—you can get unemployment compensation after a period when you go on strike. And we are all familiar with the fact that in New York, if a strike lasts six weeks it is jolly well going to last seven, because after seven the State provides the mechanism whereby the employer pays you strike benefits.

There are a great many other states where you can get unemployment compensation by one wrinkle or another. For example, in Pennsylvania if you are locked-out (instead of striking) you are entitled to unemployment compensation. The definition of a lock-out versus a strike is a fascinating one that the Supreme Court has been debating for about 35 years and still doesn't know the difference, so there is great opportunity for unemployment compensation administrators to decide whether it is a lockout or strike . . . and then there are all sorts of other rules. So my only comment on the whole unemployment compensation front is that, if you are not from New York or Rhode Island and don't work on the railroad, you better look at your state laws in any labor disputes you are involved in before you take any action (or before any action is taken against you) because the unemployment compensation regulations of that state may be a significant factor in the outcome of a strike.

But let's turn our attention to the welfare situation because this is not only new, it is something we don't know anything about and yet it seems to be generally accepted. Now, in every state in the country, welfare seems to be in a mess. Served with my breakfast was the *Washington Post* (which is not a piece of writing that generally goes well with breakfast but that's what they serve in Washington) and it says the Governor of Maryland is going to purge the welfare rolls. Well it so happens that at the present time there is a litigation in Maryland (brought, you will be interested to know, by a community service lawyer whom you and I are paying for) and the purpose of this law case before a three-judge federal tribunal is to see that strikers are not excluded from welfare. I thought you would be delighted to know how your tax money is being used in that way.

Since I am in the company of outstanding legal talents, I hesitate to make a pronouncement about what the courts might do, but I am not optimistic. For the most part these laws were enacted in the 1930's, and all they say, in effect, is that if you are in need you get welfare. And of course they are administered by social workers who don't know the difference between a Schenectady striker and a broken-down fellow who can't work. And the more business they hand out, the more jobs they have.

Recently, the *Wall Street Journal* reported that West Virginia was hard-hit by the long coal strike—and the article said that over 15,000 West Virginia families were added to the food stamp program this month. This swelled the state's total food stamp role by 20%. Last week the State Welfare

Department distributed \$1.7 million in food stamps to the miners' families and then informed us that the federal government paid for the program. But it doesn't say it's bad, it just says that this is happening.

The *Philadelphia Bulletin*—which doesn't go much better with supper than the *Post* does with dinner—has begun a series of articles on welfare and a few days ago reported that welfare is the top industry in Fayette County (a coal mining area in southwest Pennsylvania). It said that 13.5% of the total population in this county is on welfare and this dependency is worsening because of a strike that has closed the mine. But it never gets around to questioning whether strikers should get welfare and that is my point: the concept is now widely accepted.

Furthermore—the second happy thought I give you—is that it is growing fast. Since the General Electric strike, it is the way of life in a strike. It is an accomplished fact and a sophisticated part of union strike strategy. And it does not make any difference where the plant is.

Now how did it get that way? Well, first, while the rest of us were fast asleep, the unions were working very hard. They began to cultivate the welfare area way back in World War II. They set up a Community Service Department and worked to get a union man on every community service board throughout the country. That's the man who does it. He's liaison between the welfare people and the local unions. The union contacts him before the strike starts . . . he sets the thing in motion and the welfare people are most cooperative. They set up special offices in the union hall, provide the union with the forms to fill out so that all the union member has to do is write in his name. They set up special staffs to take care of the situation and they are getting more and more experienced and it begins to work like well-oiled machinery. Consequently, today when a strike occurs they are ready with food stamps, aid to dependent children, public welfare and some other fringe benefits I'll mention.

Now the second thing that makes this a phenomenally successful program which has gradually converted the thinking of Americans to the belief that welfare is a right and that there is an obligation to pay welfare to anyone who is in need, with the word "need" defined as broadly as possible. Thus in the papers I read to you, whether it be the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Washington Post* or a more conservative publication, it doesn't seem to be challenged. The welfare recipient is a "client," you see. Even our language has been used to help lull people into a sleep, and to accept the idea that the client needs to be taken care of. A client, of course, is a person that demands special attention, and the welfare person has become the "client" of the professional social worker.

So, in the greatest prosperity of all time in this country or in the world, welfare rolls have tripled. This is what happened in the 1960's. The whole theory of welfare, particularly old age assistance and aid to dependent children is that it would go down as social security and such other benefits took over. But it just hasn't happened that way.

Now, the third thing is the food stamp program. This is sort of the marijuana of the whole business that leads to the hard drugs later on. Nearly everybody seems to be eligible for food stamps, regardless of what the regulations say. It is very amazing. And there are a lot of people with a vested interest in food stamps. The Agriculture Department sees this as a way to get rid of surplus foods; the supermarkets like it—it is pretty simple and they make for more business; college students like it; the hippies like it; and strikers love it. The minute you go on strike you can become eligible for food

stamps. It varies from area to area, depending on the number of children and a number of other factors, but you can get \$120 or \$150 worth of food stamps for anywhere from \$10 to \$35. You can eat pretty well on food stamps.

Congress has made strikers eligible for food stamps. There is no legal question about this. The issue has been debated several times and provisions which would make strikers ineligible were defeated either on the floor or in conference committees. The matter has been considered; Congress did not make strikers ineligible and it is pretty much accepted that they are legally eligible.

Now the fourth thing which brought this program to a head was a modification of the old age and dependent children's program in the 1960's. This program was something the social workers sold on the basis that it would keep children with their mothers. It is kind of a heart-string approach—it doesn't go into the fitness of the mothers or the legitimacy of the children, but rather into the horrors of the orphan asylum and so forth. This program was designed to enable mothers to take care of children and it seemed like a good idea at the time.

But then there came the question of whether it was contributing to illegitimacy and in order to avoid that, Congress did what it often does, that is to pass another law, and so it compounded the problem. It provided that under certain circumstances the unemployed father would not render a household ineligible to receive aid to dependent children. In other words, the father did not have to be dead, absent or not around for some reason or another. He could be there and unemployed. This opened the flood gates again for the use of aid to dependent children during a strike, because the term "unemployment" to a social worker doesn't mean the same thing as it does to labor relations people or to the Bureau of Labor Statistics who understand that if a person is on strike he is not considered unemployed. He certainly has rights to his job when the strike is over (and if you don't think so there is an agency on Pennsylvania Avenue that will enlighten you on that question). But to the social worker he's unemployed.

Now there are all types of general assistance available. You see the social workers are in the business of selling welfare . . . and they have a supermarket. You come in to get your food stamps and they put their arm around you and they say, "Buddy, we have all sorts of interesting programs that we want you to see." (Just like when somebody comes in to buy something from your outfit. He buys a small nut and you try to sell him a turbine, you know.) Well that's what they do.

Before I go into it, a word about the legal situation. There have been a number of cases about whether they can pay welfare to strikers, that is, aid to dependent children or public assistance, whether it may be paid or not, whether it is compelled to be paid, whether the payment of welfare interferes with the national labor policy pursuant to the Taft-Hartley Act. For the most part, these cases have gone against management and I'm not too hopeful about a change. The laws are vague and quite frankly, in my judgment, the remedy will have to come from legislation. But it is not likely to come from legislation without a tremendous campaign being mounted.

Now what does it involve? Generally, when employees go on strike there is a thirty-day waiting period, during which general assistance is often available. In case of great need, food stamps are available, but generally aid to dependent children isn't available until after a waiting period. This is an extremely difficult job of statistical analysis and the welfare people allow these statisticians to do their best to hide the statistics or to deny they exist.

But we have been able to run enough of a

sophisticated statistical analysis on the computer to come up with a model, which will give us some facts, and in addition, we have a number of case studies—all of which will be published by the Industrial Research Unit early in 1972.

But when people are on general assistance and they go on strike, the state is anxious to get them on aid to dependent children because the Federal government pays a big part of that. So they shift them from general assistance to that, and then there are all sorts of fringe benefits: they can get Medicaid, have their teeth fixed, and their tonsils taken out. You can get eyeglasses while you're on strike; you can get your rent paid or your mortgage payments paid while you're on strike. In addition to substantial amounts of funds, you can come very close in numerous instances, to getting your take-home pay.

The cost goes up, it's into the millions and on its way to the billions. Of course, it depends on the number of strikes. But it has a profound effect on a state economy for example. Take a situation like the General Motors strike, where the state on the one hand is deprived of tax revenues, and on the other hand pays out enormous amounts of money. We figured that almost 30% of the General Motors employees in Michigan were on food stamps and 20% on welfare. And every Local we talked into said "We could have done a much better job if we had more experience in this." We've made studies of local situations such as the long Westinghouse strike at the Lester plant outside of Philadelphia. We found out the Welfare Department took on 10 people to take care of this situation. The welfare was the sole strike benefit; the union paid no strike benefits at all.

We believe that in the future there will not be a major strike which lasts over 30 days in which welfare will not be a significant factor. It enables the union to hold out without pressure from the rank and file. If there is one thing that was clear in both the General Electric and General Motors strike, it is that there was no pressure on the rank and file to settle the strike. This is the unanimous opinion of the union people and the management people. And this makes a big difference in how long the strike lasts. It makes a big difference in the character of the result. It makes a big difference in the inflationary impact. The unions will tell you that it really isn't important in these cases but if it's not important, why do they push so hard to get it? I regard union officials as very rational beings. And I've never seen them work awfully hard if it wasn't important.

The only thing that settled the General Motors strike when it did, was the fact that the company stopped paying for the insurance and welfare pursuant to the contract, that is the health benefits. The union had to pay for them and in two months it broke the union. And incidentally, that is why the unions want additional health insurance so badly because if the Federal government pays for health insurance, on a national basis, then obviously it can't be a factor during a strike, which is something you might ponder. And it's no accident that Ted Kennedy's health insurance bill is the Reuther Bill . . . there is absolutely no difference . . . this is the bill that was conceived by Walter Reuther and his group.

Looking ahead I would have to say that the collective bargaining system in the United States (which fundamentally depends for its working on the ability of strikes to hurt both parties, and therefore to induce us either not to have strikes or to compromise through a settlement once a strike is under way) cannot work satisfactorily if the public purse becomes an extension of the union treasury for paying strike benefits. Yet this is what is happening—and it is happening to such a degree that strikes in many cases

no longer hurt. Now as the unions become more and more experienced and sophisticated in the business field, obviously this is going to have a larger and larger impact.

Unfortunately the Administration does not seem to get the message, particularly where health and welfare are concerned. I understand the Secretary of HEW spoke to you about the new program to reorganize welfare but I would wager that this subject was not mentioned or considered. But somehow, somewhere the message has to get through that this is a fundamental abuse of welfare which, if it continues, will not only drain the Treasury, but in my judgment will destroy what is left of the collective bargaining system.

COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL FACULTY MEMBERS OPPOSE NIXON BUSING POSITION

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, 28 faculty members of Columbia Law School, my alma mater, have issued a thoughtful and erudite statement on the President's proposals regarding busing and so-called "equal educational opportunity." The statement discusses both the constitutional and the educational aspects of the Nixon proposals, and concludes that:

The two bills, if enacted, would sacrifice the enforcement of constitutional rights, impair the functions of the judiciary under a rule of law, and jeopardize improved schooling for many, many children.

I am in full agreement with that conclusion, and am shocked and ashamed—though not surprised—that the President of the United States is trying to return us to the discredited doctrine of *Plessy v. Ferguson*.

For the information of my colleagues, I am including the full statement in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT ON BUSING

The undersigned members of the Faculty of Law of Columbia University are strongly opposed to the two bills proposed by President Nixon for passage by Congress on the subject of busing of school children. We believe that the two bills, if enacted, would sacrifice the enforcement of constitutional rights, impair the functions of the judiciary under a rule of law, and jeopardize improved schooling for many, many children. More specifically, our reasons for opposition are as follows:

(1) The Supreme Court declared the segregated dual school system unconstitutional in the *Brown* case 18 years ago. For much of that period, opponents of the *Brown* decision have successfully avoided and delayed its enforcement. Only recently has the enforcement process achieved any momentum. Enactment of the two bills at this time will certainly be seen—by blacks and whites alike—as a major break in the Nation's resolve to realize the constitutional rights of black children under the *Brown* decision. Moreover, the very proposal of these bills—especially given the psychological impact of the President's speech—will seriously hamper and may well cripple efforts to achieve compliance with *Brown* now under way.

(2) The two bills call for a very substantial change in the standards and modes of enforcement of *Brown* by the courts. Their

enactment by Congress under Section 5 of the Fourteenth Amendment invokes a rarely exercised power whose limits are not at all clear. Strong doubts of constitutionality exist, with constitutional lawyers differing as to the outcome if the bills become law and their legality were tested in the courts.

Whatever may be the scope of the Congressional power, the proposed bills clearly would misdirect it. The President is encouraging Congress to react in a panic to busing, as though that were the key issue, when he should be exercising his leadership to calm the public and to call on Congress to deal with busing as one aspect of a comprehensive program for ending dual systems of segregated schools. This failure of leadership is highlighted by two key facts. According to Administration sources, while about 40% of the Nation's school children are bused to school, at most 1% or 2% of this total are bused for reasons of desegregation. Secondly, in calling for an expenditure of 2.5 billion dollars on "inner-city schools," the Administration has not added one dollar to existing programs or proposals it has previously made. The net effect of the present proposals is to cut back sharply on existing remedies for segregation while offering little or nothing in their place.

(3) The two bills involve a needless and dangerous disruption of the power relationships between the President and the Congress on the one side and the Supreme Court and other federal courts on the other. As recently as one year ago in the *Swann* case, in light of almost 20 years of experience with enforcing *Brown*, the Supreme Court approved of court-ordered busing as one means of disestablishing dual school systems—a means which in particular cases might be necessary to bring about a unitary, desegregated school system. The Court did not insist that busing was required in any mechanical way or that its disadvantages should be ignored by federal judges.

The President has suggested that lower federal courts have gone beyond the Supreme Court—and in his view, improperly so. One would then expect the Administration to press appeals of these decisions to the Supreme Court, and perhaps to ask that Congress mandate stays of execution pending the appeals. Instead, the Administration presents proposals which amount to a declaration of no confidence in the courts and a repudiation of what they have done under the Constitution and laws of the United States. If we take the President at his word, this is premature and unnecessary. It risks the very undermining of the Supreme Court's standing that the President has on other occasions said should be avoided.

(4) One need not be an advocate of large-scale busing to see the harms and dangers in the proposed scheme. Serious questions about various aspects of busing have been raised by both blacks and whites. But the Administration has not asked Congress to regulate alleged excesses of busing in a selective, sensitive way. Rather, the Administration seeks to eliminate all busing as a remedy for desegregation by placing rigid, mechanical limitations on it. The practical effect is that busing could no longer be used even as a minor but necessary part of a desegregation plan that emphasized, for example, new geographic districts, or school pairings. It is in cases of this kind that the threats to the enforcement of *Brown* and to the proper role of the courts are clearest.

We call on Congress to reject the two proposed bills on busing.

Curtis J. Berger, Harlan M. Blake, George Cooper, Harold S. Edgar, E. Allan Farnsworth, Wolfgang G. Friedmann, William R. Fry, Nina M. Galston, Richard N. Gardner, Harvey J. Goldschmid, Frank P. Grad, Louis Henkin, Harold L. Korn, Louis Lusky, Michael C. Meltsner, Arthur W. Murphy, Harriet Rabb, Albert J. Rosenthal, Leonard M. Ross, Benno

C. Schmidt, Abraham D. Sofaer, Philip G. Schrag, Michael I. Sovern, Peter L. Strauss, H. Richard Uviller, Walter Werner, William F. Young, John M. Kernochan.

RESULTS OF THE HONORABLE ALBERT W. JOHNSON'S LATEST QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members and other interested persons, I am presenting today the completed tabulation of the results of my recent questionnaire. As has been my custom in the past, the results of the questionnaire are set out in the form of a newsletter containing the following caption: "Newsletter from Your Open Door in Washington—Congressman ALBERT W. JOHNSON, 23d District of Pennsylvania—Newsletter 22, April 1972."

The newsletter also contains a picture of myself in front of the door of my office, in which picture I am holding a publication of the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce entitled, "Discover the New Pennsylvania." The newsletter then continues as follows:

DEAR FOLKS IN THE 23RD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: The returns from this questionnaire have been tremendous. I have received the greatest volume of returns from this than from any other I have sent out. This is due to the extreme interest in these questions.

Question No. 1—Would you favor an agreement with North Vietnam to settle the Vietnam war which would provide for the return of U.S. prisoners of war and our withdrawal of all financial, economic and military support of South Vietnam?

The Answer: Yes: 66.4%; No: 27%; N.A. 6.6%.

When President Nixon took office there was an authorized troop level of 549,500 Americans in Vietnam; casualty rates were averaging around 300 Americans killed per week; and there was no comprehensive plan to end U.S. involvement. The President has completed withdrawals of troops as follows: August 1969—25,000; December 15, 1969—40,000; April 15, 1970—50,000; April 1971—150,000. On December 1, 1971, the American troops ceiling was 184,000; on February 1, 1972, it was 139,000. By May 1, 1972 remaining troops are promised to be 69,000. President Nixon has effectively reversed the escalation policies he inherited and has dramatically reduced the level of U.S. forces in S.E. Asia. This poll result indicates a majority of people in the district favor withdrawal from Vietnam.

Question No. 2—Do you feel our national defenses are being adequately maintained?

The Answer: Yes: 44.8%; No: 47%; N.A. 8.2%.

Vice President Agnew, speaking before the annual convention of the Society of Former FBI Agents said, "This is the worst possible time for the United States to relax its efforts to stay strong." Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt, Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, testifying before the House Armed Services Committee stated, "The single overriding point I wish to leave with you is that the military and maritime situation of the United States is changing and that it is essential that we understand the implication of the change."

He cited the expanding Soviet Seapower as representing a new dimension in world affairs.

The United States has frozen the size of its nuclear arsenal since the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) were announced in 1968. Russia began heavy expenditures on research and during this time, they have increased their missile force by nearly 300%. Fresh worry over the Soviet arms build-up exists. Not only have they gained nuclear parity, but with this momentum they are on the verge of gaining clear superiority.

President Nixon's proposed Defense Budget for Fiscal Year 1973 is \$83.4 billion, 65% of which represents military, civilian and retired pay cost increases. This represents only 19.8% of the total Federal budget, a 23 year low. The percentage of Gross National Product devoted to Defense continues to decline, and for FY 1972, it is 6.4%, a 22 year low. Significant increases are programmed for the strengthening of U.S. strategic nuclear deterrent including a major step to enhance the sea-based deterrent, Research and Development, shipbuilding, Guard and Reserve forces. Also emphasized are personnel-oriented programs aimed at achieving zero-draft and an all-volunteer force. Total Defense military and civilian strength at the end of FY 1973 is planned to be 3.394 million—38,000 below FY 1972, 1.440 million below wartime peak of FY 1968, and the lowest since 1950.

President Nixon's proposed Defense Budget for FY 1973 represents the minimum request to provide essential force capability and readiness to support the National Security Strategy of Realistic Deterrence. At the same time it is in keeping with President Nixon's determination to provide as much resources as possible for pressing domestic needs.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, we are spending too much on defense;" "No, I believe our national defense is very poor;" "No, I feel what we need is more sea power."

Question No. 3—Do you believe that a volunteer army can be raised to ensure an adequate national defense?

The Answer: Yes: 42%; No: 51.4%; N.A. 6.6%.

There is a tremendous problem of including high quality people to remain in the service. The Nixon Administration has taken a position to move toward an all-volunteer force. Pay will have to be increased in order to make the military competitive with pay scales for similar skills on the outside. Recruitment efforts also face the problem of the current public assaults against the tradition of professional military service.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, but it will take many changes; the greatest one will have to be in the general attitude of the people;" "Yes, in time of peace, but not in times when the U.S. would be in danger of invasion;" "No, I believe it can be used by power-hungry persons to take over our government by force. Keep the draft."

Question No. 4—Do you favor establishing diplomatic relations with Mainland China?

The answer: Yes: 79.2%; No: 16.4%; N.A. 4.4%.

The primary goal of President Nixon's trip was to establish communication with the People's Republic of China. One contact point has been set in Paris involving the U.S. Ambassador to France and the Chinese Ambassador to France from the People's Republic. Journalistic exchanges are also occurring.

Mainland China and the United States share many parallel interests in the areas of trade, culture and education. Major differences between our two governments do exist, and as President Nixon has said, "Peace in Asia requires that we exchange views not so much despite our differences as because of them." Reality will shape the future of our relations and an initial dialogue has begun.

Some comments from 23rd District resi-

dents: "Yes, to offset Russian influence;" "No, treaty commitment;" "No, not if it harms Taiwan."

Question No. 5—Do you favor the gradual withdrawal of all U.S. Armed Forces from Taiwan (Nationalist China)?

The Answer: Yes: 57.6%; No: 37.2%; N.A. 5.2%.

Upon his return from Mainland China, President Nixon stated our established policy that our forces overseas will be reduced gradually as tensions ease and that our ultimate objective is to withdraw our forces as a peaceful settlement is achieved. The United States is sticking to its treaty commitments. Our present policy will probably remain unchanged until the retirement or death of Chiang Kai-shek. Military authorities say Taiwan's principal value to the United States is as an intelligence-gathering base for keeping tabs on Mainland China.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, at once;" "Yes, if they asked us to leave;" "No, Executive Department needs flexibility in this decision;" "No, we must be faithful to our treaty commitments."

Question No. 6—Do you favor a nationwide system of federally financed child care centers?

The Answer: Yes: 31.4%; No: 65.2%; N.A. 3.4%.

Congress considered legislation which would establish a nationwide system of federally financed and operated child care centers. President Nixon vetoed the bill calling the child care provision "the most deeply flawed" part of the bill. I did not vote for this particular provision. There were serious questions as to effectiveness, staff qualifications, management problems, and possible creation of a new bureaucracy. The program would have a weakening effect on family relationships and would not bring the family unit together.

I do not approve of the Federal Government stepping in and practically taking over the rearing of our children. I would favor a system of locally operated and controlled day care centers. H.R. 1 which passed the House June 22, 1971, contains a provision for day care centers to provide for the children of the poor so that their parents can leave the welfare rolls and go on the Nation's payrolls. I supported this measure.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, only if properly run so as to let the ones who really need it to benefit and not have it run like our welfare system;" "Yes, this is very badly needed;" "No, too many overlapping agencies in the field already;" "No, I am against more federal intervention into our lives;" "No, child care is the responsibility of the mother, not the government;" "No, this should be on the state level;" "No, children should be cared for by mothers. If mothers are too busy, then they should not have children at all."

Question No. 7—Do you favor a Federal amnesty law allowing draft evaders to return without prosecution?

The Answer: Yes: 13.4%; No: 84.2%; N.A.: 2.4%.

Tens of thousands of young men (the exact number is not known) evaded the Vietnam War illegally and are now on the run or living in Canada, Sweden or elsewhere abroad. Several bills have been introduced in Congress which would grant amnesty. Questions have arisen as to whom amnesty should apply: draft-resisters, deserters, with or without conditions of atonement, or should prosecution continue. Personally, I do not favor amnesty.

The last time the question of amnesty took on major proportions was following World War II when President Truman established a three-man Amnesty Board to determine whether those convicted of refusing to fight should continue to be punished. Over 15,000 cases were considered and only 1,500 men

were pardoned, most of these on religious grounds.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, if individual cases are tried." "No, absolutely not. You are letting down all those who served and died for our country." "No, four sons and my husband fought for our country. Why should yellow draft dodgers be patted on the back?" "No, let these draft evaders take the penalty for their acts." "No, let them fight for the countries they live in now."

Question No. 8—Do you favor a Federal subsidy for U.S. Olympic teams?

The Answer: Yes: 56.8%; No: 40.2%; N.A.: 3%.

This question raises two issues, the first being the purpose of the Olympics which is primarily to promote friendship, good will and international understanding with secondary emphasis on the athletic contests. Indeed, not all Olympic records are also world records.

One argument for changes cites the practice of Russia and some other Communist bloc countries who totally subsidize their athletes. The adoption of such a practice could result in loss of the Olympic spirit and original meaning of the games. Some feel the games should be for all athletes and not just for amateurs. The problem if opened to professionals is that the games would become a festival of commercialism. Dedicated, hard-working, young athletes who now spend many years of their lives preparing for the Olympics would soon give up as they would have no chance against the seasonal highly-paid professionals who once winning a championship would retain it until retirement.

The second issue raised would be the type of subsidy; should it be directed to an individual, or to the U.S. Olympic Committee. If to the Committee, then what criteria should be used in determining the recipients of these funds. Should such subsidies be directed to training or limited to traveling to the games and living expenses during the games.

There is no legislation pending in Congress for a general subsidization of American participation in the Olympic Games. The only legislation enacted deals with the statute incorporating the U.S. Olympic Committee. This committee functions as a selection committee, but does not receive public funds. In the past 20 years several bills have been introduced to subsidize American participation in the Olympics; however, none has received action.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, to be competitive in Olympics we must do as Russia." "Yes, for team, but not individuals." "No, USA should drop out of the Olympics as other countries don't honor the amateur status." "No, scrap the Olympics or allow professionals to play."

Question No. 9—Do you favor a National Health Insurance program to be financed by increased social security taxes and other Federal taxes?

The answer: Yes: 38.4%; No: 56.4%; N.A. 5.2%.

National Health Insurance has been an issue before the public eye for the past two years. Last year the House Ways and Means Committee held hearings on various plans submitted by the Nixon Administration, the American Medical Society and several Congressmen and Senators. No one is sure of the final form this bill will take; however, this legislation will certainly be a top priority issue for consideration by the next Congress.

It is interesting to review the results of my February 1971 questionnaire: 37.6% favored no new Federal Health Insurance program at all, 28.7% favored a Federal Health Insurance program for everybody which would be financed from Federal revenues and by increased Social Security taxes, and 23.5% favored a new program extending medical care to indigents only regardless of age coupled with insurance to everybody against catastrophic illness. 10.2% had no opinion.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, safeguards against skyrocketing medical and hospital costs." "No, Medicare is enough." "I feel we need federal help in a national health program, but I don't see how we can bear much more Social Security tax."

Question No. 10—Do you favor a procedure for automatic Federal intervention in prolonged strikes that endanger the public's interest?

The Answer: Yes: 87%; No: 12.2%; N.A. .8%.

In the past decade, Congress has acted to curb strikes only in times of crisis. Recently, the West Coast Dock Strike and two rail crises have increased public demands for some positive solutions. Strikes are lasting too long, workers in many industries have been thrown out of work, and the over-all economic impact on the American people has been devastating.

Two years ago, President Nixon submitted to Congress the "Emergency Public Interest Protection Act." This legislation is designed to mitigate work stoppages which imperil the national interest and would cover all transportation industries, airlines, trucking, offshore maritime, longshore and railroads. It provides a formula for compulsory arbitration with an impartial panel ordering the settlement terms. No final action has yet occurred and the bill is still bogged down in Democrat-controlled committees.

Union leaders are showing increased interest in ways to avert strikes. Alternatives such as arbitration are being sought.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, our unions have gone too far." "I favor outlawing strikes of any kind." "All strikes endanger the public interest."

Question No. 11—Do you favor the legalization of abortion by Federal law (now a State matter)?

The Answer: Yes, 44%; No, 50.6%; N.A. 5.4%.

Abortion has become a subject of controversy with many religious and moral arguments against it. Some states have passed liberal abortion laws and a presidential study commission has formally recommended that all states greatly liberalize their abortion laws to permit a doctor to perform abortion at a patient's request. A report from the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future called for the government to fund abortion services and urged abortion costs be covered by health insurance. These recommendations and others have certainly triggered a widely heated public debate. President Nixon has called abortion an unacceptable method of population control. I do not favor any abortion legislation, and I believe this should remain a state matter.

Currently in over 3/5's of the states, abortion is a crime except to preserve the life of the mother. Twelve states prohibit abortion except in cases where the mother's life or her mental or physical health is in danger, or to prevent birth of defective offspring, or in cases of rape or incest.

The Pennsylvania State Legislature will be considering abortion legislation as judges in Allegheny and Centre Counties have ruled the present law as being unconstitutional.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "No, abortion is murder." "No, should continue to be a state matter." "No, Federal government has no business in this." "No, except in cases of health or rape." "I think it should be left to the discretion of the woman and her physician." "Abortion is personal; no laws should govern what to do with your body."

Question No. 12—Do you favor the legalization of the possession and use of marijuana by persons over 18 years of age?

The Answer: Yes: 10.6%; No: 86.6%; N.A. 2.8%.

Since young, white, middle-class groups began smoking "pot" in the mid-1960's, and especially since this use spread to high school and college populations, state arrests for possession have risen about 1000%. Under pres-

ent federal statutes, possession of marijuana or distribution even in small amounts is subject to a \$1000 fine and up to one year in jail for the first offense.

The National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse on March 22, 1972, recommended that marijuana be legalized for private, personal use. However, at the same time, the Commission stated that it strongly favors a policy of discouraging any use of marijuana. This Commission also concluded that marijuana does not lead to "hard" drug use, cause crime or create addiction, and recommended that criminal penalties be ended.

Opinions from medical experts are far from unanimous and this appears to be a dilemma resolved only partially by scientific evidence. It continues to remain an emotion-charged issue. I will not vote for the legalization of marijuana.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes why make criminals out of people for such a trivial thing?" "Yes, I think marijuana should be controlled." "No, we haven't solved problems of alcohol under same rules, why add marijuana until we do?" "No, this is dangerous." "No, marijuana use leads to use of hard drugs and more crime on streets." "No, not unless there is a legal way to obtain the product."

Question No. 13—Should the U.S. continue its generous financial support of the United Nations?

The Answer: Yes: 28%; No: 64.8%; N.A. 7.2%.

Several legislative measures have been introduced in the Congress regarding the U.S. financial contribution to the United Nations and related agencies which is presently 36%. Other bills have been aimed at a review of the United Nations Charter relative to the role the United States should play in the United Nations and possible revisions in the areas of voting procedures, financial support, and membership responsibilities.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, I think we should support the UN as it is our best hope for world peace." "No, other nations should pay their share." "No, it is time for other nations to assume more of the financial burden." "No, I feel that our support to the UN should be reduced but not withdrawn." "No, get out of the UN altogether and get headquarters out of U.S."

Question No. 14—Should general education be financed by a national sales tax rather than through present real estate taxes?

The Answer: Yes: 53.6%; No: 38.8%; N.A. 7.6%.

The affirmative answer to this question indicates the concern over the rising costs of public education. A majority feel that the burden should be shifted to all of the people instead of just to real estate owners. Taxpayers have registered objections to the high cost of new ornate school buildings. They want the teachers to receive fair compensation but deplore recent teacher strikes.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, why should the property owners have to pay for the education of the non-property owners. It would be a more fair system, I think." "Yes, why should property owners share all of the burden." "No, a national sales tax would hurt the poor and pensioners." "No, no national sales tax of any kind for any reason."

Question No. 15—Should the minimum hourly wage of \$1.60 be raised to \$2.00?

The Answer: Yes: 65.2%; No: 29.8% N.A. 5%.

Minimum wage legislation has been reported from the House Education and Labor Committee and is expected to come before the House during this session.

Under the reported bill, persons previously covered would immediately receive an increase to \$2.00. Those persons beginning coverage with the enactment of this bill would receive an immediate increase to \$1.80. This would be raised to \$2.00 in January

1973. This particular bill also has a student provision which permits hiring at 85% of the minimum.

If the Rules Committee grants an open rule on this bill, amendments could be offered from the House Floor. One possible amendment would provide for an immediate increase to \$2.00 for everyone.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, the minimum hourly wage should be raised to \$3.00 per hour so that every American could have a decent living;" "Yes, minimum wage is far too low according to high prices for food and other prices;" "No, inflationary;" "No, wages are too high now. We are working ourselves out of the world market."

Question No. 16—Do you favor a Federal system of "no-fault" automobile insurance?

The answer: Yes: 66%; No: 25.2%; N.A. 8.8%.

Not many motorists are happy with the present automobile insurance system, and the public outcry has risen over spiraling automobile insurance rates. Complaints center on climbing premiums, allegedly arbitrary cancellations of policies, fear of cancellation if claims are filed, and asserted underpayment of claims. Also, there are long waits for trial in court cases—16 months for the average case.

Congress will probably act next year to establish a new system. This new system is called no-fault insurance because fault no longer would be a factor in determining whether an accident victim would be compensated for his injury. Instead, the victim or his family would receive compensation for his life, injuries or lost wages from the insurance company which covered the vehicle he was driving or riding in or which struck him. The system covering property damage resulting when two or more vehicles collide would be left just about untouched by the no-fault system.

At the state level, several states have enacted studies for a possible no-fault system. Only Massachusetts has enacted such a system. Proponents say when no-fault is adopted auto insurance rates are bound to decline or at least halt their steady climb, and Massachusetts drivers have realized substantial savings in the one year their state has had the new system. One argument by those who oppose no-fault is that the system would lead to more accidents, more injuries, and more deaths. Relieved of the fear that he will be punished by the cancellation of his policy for negligence, the argument goes, the driver will drive less safely.

Some comments from 23rd District residents: "Yes, something should be done about auto insurance; it is getting out of hand;" "Yes, if the government underwrites part of the premiums;" "No, not a federal system;" "No, I favor no-fault provided by private companies;" "No, a state matter entirely;" "No, no-fault has not been proven good to my mind yet."

And now, in closing, I want to thank those who took the time to complete and return the questionnaire and I trust you have found this Newsletter both interesting and informative.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT W. JOHNSON.

HON. BRADFORD MORSE

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of my friend and colleague, F. BRADFORD MORSE, to the position of

United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs is welcome news for those of us who believe in the U.N. and its role in world affairs.

We in the House of Representatives will lose a devoted and intelligent mind. BRAD MORSE is renowned in this body for the substantial time and effort he has given to international affairs and for the very high level to which he has raised our consideration of such matters.

BRAD MORSE's involvement and interest in international relations, however, has extended far beyond the Congress. He has served as congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation to the Geneva Disarmament Conference, U.S. delegate to both the Mexico-United States and Canada-United States Interparliamentary meetings, and U.S. observer at the Council of Europe. Even these impressive credentials, however, fail to convey the total on going contribution which BRAD MORSE has and will continue to make to this Nation and the world community.

BRAD has the strength of idealism tempered with vast experience. It is a combination that will serve him well as he steps into the shoes of the late Ralph Bunche.

I wish BRAD the very best of luck in his endeavor. I know that his service will be a credit to the Nation and I am sure that he will find in the undersecretaryship a role which he can expand, grow into, and truly make his own.

"OEDIPUS THE KING": ASSURED

HON. EARLE CABELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, in Dallas in my district, is an outstanding institution of higher education, Southern Methodist University. Students from SMU were selected as one of 10 college groups from more than 300 colleges and universities to participate in the American College Theatre Festival at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

Those of us present at the performance were delighted and I am pleased to insert in the RECORD the following review from the Washington Post by Richard Coe:

"OEDIPUS THE KING": ASSURED

(By Richard L. Coe)

Man's search for himself and the tragedy of his discovery—what could be a more relevant theme for our introspective age?

It was accented more than intelligently in a handsome production of "Oedipus the King" for two performances yesterday in the Kennedy Center's College Theater Festival.

Under the direction of Burnet M. Hobgood, who prepared the adaptation with Anthony Graham-White, the production was from Southern Methodist University of Dallas, where the theater benefits from two theaters, one given by Bob Hope, the other named for Margo Jones. With 9,000 students, SMU enrolls 150 students in a pre-professional training plan. Uncredited on the program, the "Oedipus" set was multilevel with three sails of dark brown textures suggesting the seas of Greece.

The choice for the production probably rests on the Oedipus of Powers Boothe, a 23-year-old post-graduate student with fine presence and voice, the latter especially good. Indeed, the principal voices had an uncommon sense of orchestration, different tones and levels. The diction was mid-Atlantic English. Less effective was the chorus work, where solo speech generally lacked timbre. Resting as it did on Boothe's abilities, the performance boasted handsome assurance.

Already one must question the demands the new booking policy makes. Previous festivals allowed a day of preparation followed by three performances.

At the Eisenhower Theater the production is moved in, set and lighted in the morning, followed by matinee and evening performances. Only professionals tramping one-night stands endure this and with diminishing effectiveness.

Rehearsal limitations in an entirely unfamiliar theater and so full an 18-hour schedule are hardly fair to the students who competed for the Washington honors. As it was yesterday, the Texans explored Sophocles with an assured artistry that does them honor.

ON SECOND THOUGHT: COUNT OF BALDHEADED AMERICAN MEN URGED

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, reading the Washington papers as many Congressmen do, we have come to appreciate the light touch and humor of columnists such as Art Buchwald and Paul Horpe. I consider it a privilege to have as a working editor and columnist in a number of publications circulating throughout my district an outstanding journalist in Mr. Glen Logan whose column of April 12 in the Lemont Herald is typical of his effective and entertaining journalistic style.

The article follows:

ON SECOND THOUGHT: COUNT OF BALDHEADED AMERICAN MEN URGED

(By Glen Logan)

In this day and age of the statistically inclined it is almost certain that some agency must have a record of the number of baldheaded persons there are but just where such figures are to be found is beyond us.

The conservationists seem to have a pretty fair idea as to the bald eagle population which is said to be dwindling because of several different reasons but as far as this department has been able to learn no one has made any check on the supply of bald men.

I say bald men because I have never seen a baldheaded woman. There are some who have thinning hair. I have never seen one with a bare scalp, although I have heard of such. But then one hears so many things—some true, some false. It really behooves one to check on what one hears but one hears so much that there just isn't enough time to verify everything. And with a constitutional amendment making women equal with men, and needing only two more states for adoption, if there aren't baldheaded women now there soon will be.

The U.S. Department of Commerce, which among its other duties runs the census bureau and also keeps tab on a lot of things, like how many people have two automobiles, how many have radios, television sets, bathtubs or more than one job. It is possible the

USDC has made a count of baldheads but where it is I don't know.

The World Almanac, which is chock full of facts and figures, has nothing to say on the subject. We looked for bald in the index but found nothing listed between Balboa and Balearic Islands. Hair was bare too—nothing between Human Island and Haiti, and thinking there might be something under "wigs," we turned to the W's, but there wasn't anything listed between Wight, Isle of and Wildlife.

Yet there must be a count someplace because there are a number of business firms hawkling remedies for baldness, including wigs, who advertise in the newspapers, the magazines, radio and TV and no business is spending money like that unless they have expectations of getting a good return. And today in addition to various organs of the human body there are people in the business of transplanting hair.

We don't know how they go about that. If it is one hair at a time it would seem to be an endless job but perhaps they have something like that species of grass that one plants in clumps quite a few inches apart and it finally grows together? Or perhaps they have something like a creeping bent on golf greens?

Perhaps someday someone will discover what causes baldness and figure out a preventive remedy but until that day arrives there isn't much anyone can do about it but put up with it.

Back in frontier times when scalping was in vogue there were cases of instant baldness, usually fatal. But generally speaking getting bald is a drawn out process.

The hair begins retreating. It is seldom the retreat becomes a rout. Sometimes the process starts at an early age, sometimes it doesn't begin until one is getting long in the tooth. But whenever it starts the erosion process proceeds at a steady pace and contour plowing is out of the question.

It seems that most baldness has a tenuous effect. The top is bare but around the edges, like on the old time surreys, there is a fringe. Some men today take a leaf from the long haired lot and let the fringe grow especially at the back.

There is a risk to letting this back fringe grow so long that it curls up to quite a depth, especially in the spring when birds are in quest of nest sites.

One thing about the fringe type baldness and your correspondent speaks from experience there is no putting off shampoos until the weekend. One gets a shampoo everytime he washes his face because there's no stopping at the forehead.

There are some cases of baldness in which the entire head is devoid of hair and is as slick and shiny as a billiard ball whether the white or the red.

Jefferson P. Throttlebottom was telling me one day that one of the lads that hangs around Kelly's Tap is as bald as a cue ball but it never bothers him, whether the weather is quite cold or extra hot. Sometimes he sits in a chair and takes a little nap. Jeff said, but never near the pool table. He says it makes him nervous to be around a man with pool cue in his hands and him not wearing a hat.

SPACE SHUTTLE INVESTMENT IN THE FUTURE

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the April issue of Aerospace, the publication of the Aerospace Industries Association, carried

an article by Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, my distinguished colleague and chairman of the House Manned Space Flight Subcommittee.

Having served on the Science and Astronautics Committee and this subcommittee since coming to Congress, I know that Congressman TEAGUE has been responsible for much of the success of our space program, and his in-depth knowledge of its implications for the future are unquestioned.

Because of my high regard for his ability, I insert his remarks in the Record at this point:

SPACE SHUTTLE

Ever since the first man-made satellite was thrust into orbit almost 15 years ago, there has been a continuing argument as to whether manned or unmanned systems can most effectively accomplish operations in space.

Advocates of robot spacecraft contend that modern, supersophisticated automated equipment is capable of performing most space tasks at a fraction of the cost of a manned system. The opposing school of thought responds that the admittedly greater costs of protecting humans in space are more than justified by man's ability to judge, observe and forestall failures by corrective action.

I do not propose to rekindle the argument. Rather I suggest that advancing technology has negated it by providing an entirely new approach to space operations which combines the advantages of man in the cycle with a degree of economy hitherto unobtainable. It is the reusable space shuttle, which makes possible manned delivery, repair and retrieval of unmanned satellites and which, alternatively, can serve as a manned laboratory in which investigators may conduct those experiments or operations best managed by manned monitorship.

This system, approved by the Administration and now pending Congressional sanction, offers a number of advantages, among them:

Economy of delivery. Because the shuttle system can be used over and over again, it will replace practically all of the one-shot-only launch vehicles currently in use, offering substantial reduction in the cost of delivering a payload to orbit.

Payload economy. The availability of a large-capacity, reusable "delivery truck" would influence areas other than delivery, such as simplification of payload design, extension of satellite life and reduction in failure frequency, each contributing significantly to overall savings.

Flexibility. The carrier vehicle can accommodate almost any type of payload contemplated—human researchers with their equipment and experiments, scientific satellites or probes, and applications satellites. It can serve the needs of NASA, the Department of Defense, commercial users and foreign governments.

Routine access to space. One constraint on space operations has been the need for elaborate pre-launch preparations, in some cases as much as five months of repetitive systems checks to insure reliability. This is principally due to the fact that the spacecraft's onboard equipment has never before been used. The reusable carrier vehicle will be serviced and maintained more like an airplane, reducing launch complexity and trimming turnaround time to about two weeks.

Stimulus to maximum benefit from space. Routine access to space, lower mission costs and the new latitude the shuttle will provide payload designers, all combine to permit vast improvement in the capabilities of applications satellites, such as weather, communications and survey systems. The shuttle offers added promise to the possibility of

better managing our natural resources by means of space monitoring. Similarly, it may speed the day of the global environment-monitoring system.

Manned space flight continuity. After Apollo and its 1973 follow-on, Skylab, the U.S. will have no manned space program other than the shuttle. The continued presence of American man in space is essential, not only for the broader research capability manned operations permit, but additionally to maintain continuity and keep our options open for the future. With the shuttle, we can keep man in space without reverting to the heavy expenditures of earlier years. NASA has stated positively that the shuttle system can be developed within a budget plan approximating that of the current year, which represents one of the lowest levels of the past decade. Development costs, spread over six fiscal years, amount to about \$5.15 billion for two test spacecraft and their boosters. If Congress approves the plan, flight testing will begin in 1976 and the shuttle can be available for operational use in 1979.

The space shuttle is a two-element system composed of a booster and a spacecraft. The recoverable booster stage, consisting of two large solid-propellant rocket motors mounted in parallel, has a thrust output of more than 5,000,000 pounds. More powerful than any launch vehicle in the U.S. inventory except the mammoth Saturn V moonbooster the twin booster allows the spacecraft to carry as much as 65,000 pounds of payload per flight.

The spacecraft, called the Orbiter, is essentially an "aerospace plane," a hybrid spacecraft/airplane. In appearance it resembles a delta-wing aircraft and dimensionally it corresponds closely to the McDonnell Douglas DC-9 jetliner. Weighing some 70 tons, it is heavier than any spacecraft yet flown, including Apollo.

In operation, the shuttle is launched vertically by the combined energy of the solid booster stage and the Orbiter's three liquid-propellant engines with a total thrust of 1,400,000 pounds. At an altitude of about 25 miles, the booster stage separates to descend by parachute for recovery in the ocean. The Orbiter, manned by two pilots and two flight engineers, flies into space under its own power. The Orbiter's rear-mounted engines draw their propellants from a large external tank which is jettisoned when the craft attains orbit.

In space, the Orbiter maneuvers by means of two smaller engines, also mounted in the rear propulsion cluster, whose aggregate thrust is roughly comparable to that of the main Apollo engine which has performed so impressively on the lunar missions. For minor course corrections and adjustments of attitude, the Orbiter has a series of small thrusters located at the tips of the delta wing and atop the vertical tailplane. Normal mission duration will be seven days or less, but orbital stay-time can be extended for manned operations to 30 days, by the addition of expendables such as water, food and oxygen.

Upon conclusion of its mission, the Orbiter flies back into the atmosphere toward its land base, protected during re-entry by a new form of heat shielding which will last 100 missions, unlike the insulation on earlier recoverable spacecraft, which burned off during re-entry. Once through the re-entry phase, the Orbiter becomes an airplane, gliding as much as 1100 miles to its base, guided by aerodynamic controls. During the final phase of the flight, jet engines permit adjustments to the approach path.

The Orbiters entire center section, corresponding to the passenger cabin of a jetliner, is occupied by a large cargo compartment, or payload bay. For delivery of unmanned satellites, the payload bay is unpressurized; its "roof" consists of a pair of clamshell doors which open outward to permit deployment of the satellites. For manned laboratory-type

missions, a special pressurized "sortie module" can be fitted into the payload bay.

Here are some examples of how the remarkably versatile Orbiter will function:

In injecting satellites into orbit, which is expected to constitute the primary workload of the carrier vehicle, the Orbiter can accommodate a very large satellite or a number of smaller payloads in the cylindrical bay, 15 feet in diameter and 45-60 feet long. Working in the unpressurized bay, space-suited flight engineers will give the payloads a final checkout before deploying them at preselected points in space. The ejected payload, of course, assumes the same velocity as its carrier and it is this velocity which counterbalances the pull of earth's gravity so that the satellite remains in the orbit in which it was injected. The Orbiter's weight-lifting capability, together with the generous dimensions of its bay, permit delivery of any type of civil payload currently contemplated, including general-purpose scientific spacecraft, special-purpose observatories, interplanetary probes, and communications, weather, earth resources, geodetic, navigational and air traffic control satellites. In addition, the shuttle is being designed with careful attention to the special requirements of the military services. We do not hear a great deal about military employment of satellites because of the classified nature of many of the payloads, but the Department of Defense launches space systems with greater frequency than does NASA, a factor which additionally underlines the need for shuttle development.

In another mode, the Orbiter has utility as a repair/retrieval vehicle for satellites already in orbit which have malfunctioned. The crew maneuvers the Orbiter to a close rendezvous with the satellite; the flight engineers, in extravehicular garb, exit through the open clamshell doors, "capture" the satellite by attaching lines, and haul it into the payload bay for examination. If the trouble is minor, it may be possible to repair the satellite on the spot and redeposit it on station. Otherwise, it can be stowed in the bay and returned to earth for rework, then delivered to orbit on a later flight.

Still another area of shuttle utility in handling unmanned spacecraft is the employment of the space tug, essentially a propulsion stage which can be used to jockey a satellite from one orbit to another. An example of the need for this service is the synchronous-orbit satellite, one whose path in space is synchronized with earth's orbit so that the satellite remains in a fixed position relative to earth. Synchronization requires that the satellite operate at an altitude approximately 22,300 miles from earth, a high-altitude orbit that demands additional launch energy. In practice, the satellite is usually injected first into a low altitude orbit still affixed to an upper stage of the launch vehicle. At a given time, the stage's engine is fired to propel the satellite to its synchronous orbit.

The reusable space tug serves as substitute for the "kick" stage. The Orbiter delivers the joined space tug/satellite to a point in low altitude orbit. Operated by command signals from the Orbiter, the tug fires its engine, moves the satellite to its new orbit, disengages itself and returns to the lower altitude for pick-up by the Orbiter. Initially, the tug will probably be an unmanned system, but a manned version compatible with the dimensions of the Orbiter's bay is feasible should expanding space operations dictate its need.

With the addition of the pressurized sortie module, the Orbiter becomes a manned space laboratory where scientists and engineers can work in a shirtsleeve environment for as long as 30 days. The module can accommodate up to 12 persons along with their experiments and other equipment. Since they play no part in the operation of the

Orbiter and since the shuttle is being designed for low acceleration forces during launch and re-entry, the passengers need not be trained astronauts. For the first time, investigators will be able to accompany their experiments into space and contribute to the greater research efficiency that man-monitorship enables.

Here again, there is military potential. For some time the Department of Defense has sought to evaluate, in actual space flight, the role of military man in space. The shuttle can make possible such an evaluation.

Finally, ever since man first ventured into space in 1961, there has been a never-filled need for a space rescue vehicle. A major reason has been the time required to mount and check out a manned spacecraft. With a fleet of five Orbiters, which is what NASA contemplates for the inventory of the 1980's, and the inherent quick reaction of the shuttle, the system can be adapted to fill this long-standing requirement.

The economic advantages of the shuttle system are as broad as the operational gains. Clearly, the employment of a reusable launch vehicle affords savings of substantial order. But although this is the most obvious area of economy, it is not the greatest. NASA estimates that 80 percent of the savings promised in delivery and operation of unmanned spacecraft will stem from the shuttle's influence on satellite design and reuse.

One factor is freedom of design. Today, as in the past, satellite design is pegged to a particular launch vehicle on a cost-effectiveness basis. The launch vehicle's weight-to-orbit capability, therefore, imposes restrictions as to the overall size and weight of the satellite and consequently to the design of each individual component. To meet specifications without sacrificing performance, it is necessary to miniaturize instruments and equipment at considerable developmental cost.

The Orbiter's large bay allows a relaxation of weight and dimensional constraints, permitting designers to use off-the-shelf equipment in some cases or, alternatively, to develop new equipment at substantially lower cost. "We can," says one NASA official, "put the satellite together like an alarm clock rather than a Swiss watch."

Additional savings are possible in the extension of a satellite's operating lifetime by repair in orbit or by retrieval for overhaul at an earth base. There is related economy in the matter of "updating" unmanned spacecraft, improving the capability of a particular type of satellite by incorporating advanced equipment which was not available at the time the basic version was being fabricated. Currently, the only way to update is to build a new satellite which frequently requires six to eight years to develop, test and launch. With the shuttle, a replacement instrument or experiment can be developed within six to eight months, because of the relaxed design specifications; it can be installed in orbit or the satellite can be retrieved for updating at the earth base.

Further payload economies are anticipated in the use of the Orbiter as a test bed for instrument development. For example, consider the development requirements for a major spacecraft such as NASA's Large Space Telescope, to be flown in the 1980s to give the astronomer the capability to analyze the spectrum of stellar objects free of the distorting effect of earth's atmosphere. This system requires a large array of instruments, which must be designed, built and tested. The testing is a lengthy and expensive procedure requiring a variety of special facilities, because the instruments must be examined under conditions approximating as closely as possible those under which they later will operate. The shuttle can be used to fly prototype instrument systems to orbit, reducing ground-test operations and facilities requirements and contributing to greater test effec-

tiveness, because the systems will be checked out in the actual space environment rather than by simulation.

Additionally, there is the important consideration of the costs of failures, which continue to occur despite the most elaborate precautions to prevent them. A prime example of the risk-reduction utility the shuttle offers is the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory program, one of the most costly of all unmanned spacecraft projects and also one of the most important from the scientific standpoint. Three OAO's were launched; one performed perfectly but the other two experienced failures. In one case, a shroud jet-tison problem prevented the valuable OAO from attaining orbit; this would not have happened in the shuttle-delivery mode. In the other instance, the observatory's battery charger failed, rendering the experiments inoperable. Had the shuttle existed at the time, the OAO could have been returned to earth for repair and quickly restationed. Even the successful OAO, which operated as expected for its planned lifetime, could have been provided additional months or years of life by the shuttle; the problems which eventually cropped up were of such a nature that the satellite could have been repaired in orbit.

A NASA study of 131 space failures shows that 78 of them were related to the launch phase and therefore could not have occurred if the shuttle had been operational. In the remaining cases, where the satellites become inoperable or erratic after deployment, the payloads could have been saved by in-orbit repair or retrieval. Thus, the shuttle promises virtual elimination of total failure. Even should the shuttle itself malfunction the Orbiter's crew could abort the mission and return to base with the payload intact.

Collectively, these influences of the shuttle on payload design and operation offer potential savings of a very large order. It is estimated that payload development costs can be reduced about 50 percent and these costs constitute the major portion of space program outlays.

There is one other economy factor connected with the operation of the Orbiter itself, rather than its payloads. Unlike all current and previous U.S. manned spacecraft, the Orbiter descends to a land base instead of splashing down in the sea. This eliminates the need for multi-ship recovery forces, normally on station not only in the primary impact area but also at other locations, against the possibility that an emergency might dictate an alternate descent path.

What order of savings can be expected from employment of the shuttle? That depends to considerable extent on the frequency of shuttle missions, or the number of launches annually. In the first 12 years of space flight (1958-69), the U.S. sent into orbit an average of more than 50 spacecraft a year, including civil and military payloads together with launches for foreign nations and international consortiums. In the past two years, with American space activity at low ebb, the average has declined to 30 a year. The schedule for this year contemplates an increase to about 40 launches.

NASA has conducted a study of anticipated shuttle economies based on a "mission model" that assumes shuttle usage on 580 missions over a 12-year period from 1979, the first operational year according to the development plan, through 1990. That comes to an average of about 48 flights annually. NASA terms the mission model "realistic." It may even be conservative, because of the potentially greater opportunities for deriving concrete benefit from space operations and because of the likelihood of increased foreign use of U.S. launch services with the shuttle's lower costs. At any rate, the study concluded that the combined factors of a reusable delivery system, reusable payloads, design simplification and sharply reduced risk

of failure add up to a saving averaging more than \$1 billion a year.

The economic features of the program are important, particularly to a legislator, but I do not suggest that cost reduction is the sole, or even the primary justification for developing this system. The fundamental reason for carrying out the program is to make available a means for routine access to space, to remove the constraints imposed by an earlier level of technology, to progress from space adolescence to full maturity.

The shuttle can be the instrument for maintaining American pre-eminence in space and for realizing the broad range of benefits that advancing technology promises—those that are already visible and those that we cannot yet envision.

THE SHIFTING SCENE IN EDUCATION

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues some thoughts on "the shifting scene in education" expressed by Dr. Glenn D. Williams, vice president for student affairs at Eastern Illinois University.

Dr. Williams' speech originally was given on February 16, 1972, at the National Convention of Home Economics Administrators of Higher Education in Chicago and later was the subject of an article in the National Home Economics Administrator. Speaking of the need to place more emphasis on those areas of instruction where graduates can make an immediate contribution, Dr. Williams urges universities to embark on "programs for the training of creative craftsmen."

Dr. Williams presents the challenge in these ringing terms:

I can tell you here tonight that in spite of any opposition, there is a change in demand on the education market and there will need to be a change in procedure and emphasis or the market and the producer will soon part company.

Dr. Williams' speech follows.

THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Glenn D. Williams)

There is a story about Khrushchev and John Kennedy that may capture the academic atmosphere in which I present tonight's remarks. It seems that soon after the hot line was put in, Khrushchev decided to test it on a matter of less urgency than that for which it might later be used. He dialed Kennedy and when the President answered, said, "Mr. President, I have it on irrefutable authority that Adam and Eve were Russians. What do you say to that?" Kennedy paused, not knowing quite what to answer, and finally replied, "Well, I can't say much on such short notice, but why don't you call Harold MacMillan in England. He is versed on such things and besides that he is a Protestant and will give you a different view point." Khrushchev took Kennedy's advice and MacMillan, after sputtering a bit, said, "I can't answer for Her Majesty's Government in an off-hand manner. Why don't you call David Ben Gurion in Israel, he's on the scene you know?" Khrushchev immediately placed the third hot line call and when

Ben Gurion answered said, "Mr. Premier, I have it on irrefutable authority that Adam and Eve were Russians." There was a long silence on the other end of the line and finally Ben Gurion's thoughtful voice replied, "Mr. Khrushchev, you may be right. Here were two people, stripped of their clothing, with nothing but an apple to eat, and they thought they were in paradise."

After the stripping of higher education that has gone on in the last two years and with meager financial cuisine which the immediate future seems to hold, there are not many members of the university community who are going to make the same mistake that was portrayed in the anecdote. A fair number of names may apply to the present condition but paradise is not one of them.

But what is the true picture, what are the possibilities and where do we go from here? In pursuit of some thinking about answers to these questions, I would like to outline just briefly, 1. The immediate past and the thrust education has taken. 2. The shifting present and apparent new directions education will take and, 3. The promise of the future and our relationship to it. I give you three little keys or pegs upon which you can hang the clothing of my talk. Needless to say, I relate my observations most heavily to home economics in higher education, rather than higher education in general.

No one can discuss the immediate past in higher education without laying heavy emphasis on a review of our devotion to science and the liberal arts. With the scientific advancements of the Russians and the dramatic display of their pragmatic fruits in the space program, it seemed as though our entire university systems turned its attention to science, mathematics and the supportive scholastics which would produce classic scholars devoted to somewhat abstract technological endeavors. Our effort was directed toward problem solving in the realm of material rearrangement and the procedure for the solving of problems in this area of knowledge is the method of science. It is the only method for solving such problems and it is the sacred duty as well as the privilege of every man to gain such solutions and to know as much about the world, in a scientific sense, as it is possible to know. Indeed, we should not only be eager to gain the great wealth of scientific discovery from the past, but we should all want to contribute to the advancement of man's condition through such discovery in the future.

Unfortunately, this attitude toward discovery and change did not always hold. That is to say, it was not always easy sledding, even for science. There was a period in man's civilized existence when man did not want to know.

I was re-reading the other night, for the ninth time a letter from Galileo to Kepler (both of whom you will remember as being scientists par excellence) Galileo wrote, "Oh, Kepler, would that you could have been here last night. I invited the professor of philosophy (in that period of history the professor of philosophy meant the professor of theology) to look through my newly discovered long glass. He said 'No thank you' he couldn't come. I said, just come down and take a peak, you'll see a star never before beheld by man. He said 'No thank you' he wouldn't come—wouldn't come. He said if he looked he was afraid he'd see it and he had read the Bible backward and forward and knew Aristotle intimately and the star wasn't mentioned in either or them. If he looked and saw it he would know it was a sign set in the sky by the devil to wean him from fealty.

We can laugh at that today, but it is no laughing matter that we still have people who do not want to gather all the information they can, who are not open to change

and who say to us, "It's either science and a classical education or it's nothing." As I say, science itself had a difficult time overcoming the existent atmosphere into which it was born and we may have just as difficult a time emerging from an academic age dominated almost totally by science and the supportive liberal arts.

Let me tell you of a recent incident. It happened when I was speaking to the head of one of our leading eastern girls' finishing schools, right after the first volume of the Kinsey report was issued. I asked her what she thought of the report and what her students had to say about it. She said she didn't care for it. I asked if she disliked it because of the method used in collecting the statistical data. I had heard it criticized on those grounds. She replied that she didn't know anything about that, but she did know something of the contents and she didn't want her girls exposed to such things.

Imagine anyone in this day and age who doesn't want to know all that there is to know through the method of science or through methods designed to bring social change. I say that was the first volume. I don't know what she has done now that the second volume has appeared.

Thus it is the first duty of an educated man or woman to solve every problem that is capable of solution and the method of science is the tool for gaining this end. We have been using this tool in our educational endeavors almost to the exclusion of the practical arts and their supportive curriculum.

Now I want it understood that I come here tonight, not to speak against science and the liberal arts, but rather to point to the need for a balance in our educational program and caution against a kind of pendulum effect which may well be underway at the present time. We seem to have gotten snagged on the scientific aspect of education for the past twenty years and have been fascinated by the semantic rubdown that classical scholarship offers. In the meantime the vast wealth of human endeavor that is not scientific lay fallow and the great arena of human interaction where science comes up dry and classical studies sterile, or nearly so, in their efforts, has been almost totally neglected.

What do you do with human problems that cannot be solved, that haven't been solved and that, in the opinion of many of us, are never going to be completely solved? The great problems of man dealing with man, the problem of leading a rich and rewarding life and the problems that center around the very core of a nation like ours, the interrelations of the family unit. Problem areas where the variables run rampant, and constant adjustability is the key to success. Areas where, if left to science, we could end up as a race of lower primates and higher computers.

These are areas where the practical arts and the high art of human adaptability take over. When we attempt to apply science to the human problems we deal with every day in the areas just cited, and try to get the same kind of precision that scientists get, we not only don't get it, but we make ourselves the laughing stock of people who ought to think well of our efforts. The fact is that we already have the unique tools, particularly in a field such as home economics, to deal with human problems, in a practical way, so that real life satisfactions ensue and an improvement of man's general condition results.

For in fields such as yours, the curricular effort is, or ought to be, tied to the pulse of the times and indeed often acts as a pacemaker to the heart of the evolving human condition.

Our students and many of us who deal with them are coming to the hard questions of life. Questions which deal with man re-

lating successfully to everyday existence, to everyday people and to the everyday running of families and social groups so that satisfaction and happiness result. Somerset Maugham put it well when he said, "There is no more merit in having read a thousand books than in having ploughed a thousand fields. There is no more merit in being able to attach a correct description to a picture than in being able to find out what is wrong with a stalled motorcar. The true, the good and the beautiful are not the prerequisite of those who have been to expensive schools, burrowed in libraries, and frequented museums."

Universities have identified themselves for so long with the imparting of theory and the discussion of aesthetic abstractions that it is now difficult for them to shift gears and cultivate new perspectives. In many ways, they are more resistant to changing academic emphasis than was the case with the general population in its attitude toward science in the mid-centuries. This condition obtains even among people whose disciplines should be in the forefront of change.

I am reminded, in reflecting upon these immovable institutions and their immovable people, of the veteran who came home from the late wars, slightly addled in certain profound ways. He carried on his daily fare in good order, but he took every opportunity to tell people that he was, in truth, dead. Some of his war buddies heard about this and sought to talk him out of this belief.

He saw them coming up the walk and remarked that he was glad to see them. Then he said, "But hold on a minute, I should warn you that I'm dead."

"Well," they said, "That's what we came to see you about, you're not dead."

"I guess I know whether I'm dead or not and I'm dead as a doornail," he replied.

"Well," said one of his war buddies, "what do you mean when you say you're dead?"

"I suppose you want a working definition of a dead man and not some egghead answer," he countered.

"Yes," was the reply.

"Well," he said hesitatingly, "during the war I handled many a corpse and nary a one of them bled."

"You'll put it down then, as fundamental in your thinking that a corpse does not bleed?"

"Yes," he replied.

"May we test it on you?", asked one of his buddies.

He nodded his head in consent. Another whipped out a razor blade, pulled back his sleeve and nicked his wrist a little. He stood there watching the blood trickle down and drip off his fingertips. Finally he looked up sweetly and said, "Well, I'll be damned, a corpse does bleed."

In spite of the stark evidence staring him in the face he stuck to his point of view. And in spite of the stark evidence staring some educators in the face today, they stick to their contention that only a liberal arts education is an education worthy of the name or only a social studies centered curriculum can produce an educated man or, in short, only an education based on theoretical and abstract principles produces a fully schooled graduate. I can tell you here tonight that in spite of any opposition, there is a change in demand on the education market and there will need to be a change in procedure and emphasis or the market and the producer will soon part company.

You can see at a glance that I have already launched into the second of my sub-topics—the shifting scene in education today. This shift was heralded by a fair portion of our youth several years ago in the cry for relevance. They further contended that our current endeavors are antiseptically unhuman and lead to a vocationless future. I submit to you that it is extremely difficult for all disciplines to meet this challenge with equal

expectations of success. Some simply do not lend themselves to day-by-day meaningful implementation; the reduction of life's problem areas into bite-sized chunks.

The forward-looking university today is interested in surveying the tilt of the social landscape and in laying emphasis on those areas of instruction where its graduates can make an immediate contribution. What we need to embark on is a program for the training of *creative craftsmen*. Let me say that again—what universities need are programs for the training of *creative craftsmen*.

Home economics is particularly well suited to play a highly meaningful role in this pursuit. It can best do this through a reordering of current priorities.

Only a few universities have seized upon the notion that man and not knowledge is central in the educational effort. Only a few fields have dedicated themselves to this principle and I trust that home economics is one of them.

During the 1950's and 1960's many disciplines adopted a defensive stance and it appears to me that home economics may have been one of them. In light of the changing scene and the new directions being called for it appears that the time is right for a return to a progressive if not an aggressive stance. I would be remiss here if I did not pause to define the field as I see it. Since I am admittedly no expert and have scant background to attempt such a definition I obviously have considerable latitude for error, so please bear with me. It seems to me that home economics is the study of and involvement in the processes and forces, both cultural and intercultural, material and psychological, as well as social, affecting family life styles—the end result of which involvement is to establish a pragmatic association between theory and practice in family life-support systems. That's a long and stylized statement, but it is necessary as I move toward consideration of the future and your role in preparing creative craftsmen.

As I said earlier, we are in some difficulty in higher education today and home economics may have been in a defensive attitude in the immediate past, but I trust that home economists are like tea—their real strength is unknown until they get into hot water. Let's look at some areas for the possible release of that strength under stress.

I can best launch into this pursuit by relating, briefly, an experience I had just over a year ago. I found myself serving as an educational consultant on the island of Ceylon. The thing that impressed me was their need for the kind of pragmatic home economics that we had at our university. There is at least one person in this room tonight who knows that I sent back a call for help, which was answered and which produced a basic family-involved home economics curriculum that was later cited by the Ceylonese Government as the greatest educational contribution to their schools during that year.

This sets the keynote for what I am about to say concerning the frontiers of the future and an attitude of one-uptime, that is to say, being projective (ahead of the game so to speak) which should be emerging in your field. Our Jewish friends have a word for one-uptime which says it better than we do. The word is *Hutspa*. The only direct meaning of that word I ever got was by way of anecdotal story. One of my Jewish friends said *Hutspa* is when a boy will do away with his parents and then throw himself on the mercy of the court because he is an orphan.

I would suggest to you that the time has come to demonstrate one-uptime by preparing graduates to meet the needs of the families of mankind rather than just the families of Americans. This means adopting a constructive approach to the realities of the human condition in varied cultures, provid-

ing youth and families guidance in developing intellectual and emotional stability to cope with change and the marked diversity in world environment. The need here is to improve the quality of family life through cross-cultural training to help home economists from other countries, as well as our own, to enrich their approach to the peculiar problems of their several lands. In short, we have a challenge to make family planning services more effective for the world family instead of the local family or the American family.

I would propose to you that your field prepare to aid, in a major way, a whole new and malignantly growing segment of American society—the older family. I would attach to the effort, for want of a better title, the name *geriatric home economics*. A shortened employment span and the prolongation of life beyond the age of 70 open an entirely new and demanding vista for servicing the nutritional, economic, recreational and family support needs of what is becoming a major part of the world population.

The demand for proper and continuing interpretation of consumer needs looms as a major concern for those who would look to an ordered and productive general society. The intermediary function of interpreting desires and translating these into meaningful production goals may well fall to the home economist. Thus combined majors, particularly with such areas as business administration, communications and recreation will be in order.

A human services discipline may well emerge as a viable adjunct to the field. Home economists may find themselves on the comprehensive health care team, the mass recreation team or on a social aid team whose duty it is to relate knowledge of interior design to housing problems of tenants in both low and low-middle income housing projects.

It seems to me that home economists could appear on the professional horizon as family ecologists, maintaining a concern for values in the family besides material goods. The stress here would be on family competence rather than adjustment, or an improved family life-style and the maintenance in the family of an environment for educability.

You will note that I have not mentioned the more traditional areas where home economists have always held forth and where they will undoubtedly continue to upgrade and improve without any prodding from anyone. I count on that happening, without stimulation, but doing the things just suggested will require a re-ordering of current priorities and reflective interinstitutional planning will be needed to achieve these new goals.

Now what I have brought to you tonight is just a collection of words. Nothing will happen without action and dedication. I have mentioned before that these are difficult times and I need not convince you of that fact. What may be in need of convincing is that element in your ranks who need to "screw their courage to the sticking place", gather their forces and move forward.

The immediate future will be a time of battle—of battle for improvement of present practices, of battle for progress in new endeavors and possibly of battle for survival itself. This is a moment for those creative souls with dedicated courage to come forward. Let me portray what I mean by way of illustration in citing to you a scene from Shakespeare's *Henry V*.

You will recall that on the night before the Battle of Agincourt Henry looked out on a bleak future. Outnumbered by the enemy, with his past efforts blunted and his forces dampened by the awesome task that lay ahead of them, he called his people together and uttered a speech that I trust will stay in your memory for recall if your professional

armor grows thin. It was the eve of St. Crispin and a bleak one. . . he said:

Let him which hath no stomach to this fight depart

His passport shall be made and crowns for convoy put into his purse

We would not die in that man's company who fears his fellowship to die with us

For tomorrow is called the feast of Crispin He that outlives this day and comes safe home

Will stand atip-toe when this day is named And rouse himself at the name of Crispin

He that lives this day and see old age Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbors

And say, tomorrow is Saint Crispin's Then will he strip his sleeve and show his scars

And say, these wounds I had on Crispin's Day This story shall the good man teach his son

And Crispin, Crispin shall ne'er go by From this day to the ending of the world

But we in it shall be remembered, We few, we happy few, we band of brothers

For he that today sheds his blood with me, shall be my brother

Be he ne'er so vile, but that this day shall gentle his condition

And Gentlemen in England now abed Will think themselves accurs'd that they were not here

And hold their manhoods cheap whilst any speaks Who fought with us upon Saint Crispin's Day.

As we face the eve of our St. Crispin's Day and the possibility of a great victory, armed with the ability to solve our problems and disposed in attitude toward incorporating new ideas and techniques through frontier thinking to advance our profession, the call goes out to stand tall and fight the good fight. Yes, the call goes out, but as I utter these words, I must relate to you a final brief message and leave you, not with answers, but with two questions.

Some of you have seen the play 1776. You will recall that a beleaguered Washington, his army in rags, sent repeated messages to the Continental Congress, asking for guns, blankets and general support. But the Congress was too busy working on its own concerns to answer. And so the messages continued to pour in throughout the play, but the replies never came.

Finally, in the last scene, a chilled commander writing by firelight at Valley Forge sent a last pitiful note. It was short and asked the basic questions which I leave with you tonight:

Is anybody there? . . . Does anybody care?

ATTACKING DRUG ABUSE

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, narcotics addiction has become a national crisis. It affects us all in our daily lives, especially in the large urban centers such as New York City, where heroin addicts are concentrated, and where the crimes they commit to support their daily habits have created a climate of fear that have made many of the city's residents prisoners in their own homes. It is estimated that there are 560,000 heroin addicts in the United States and that more than 125,000 of them live in New York City. In New York City more people between the ages of 15 and 35 years die as

a result of narcotics than from any other single cause—in the year 1970 over 1,000 youngsters died of narcotics overdoses.

The cost to society of these wasted young lives is incalculable, yet it is only part of the terrible cost we pay daily as a result of narcotics addiction. Crime, broken families, fear-ridden communities, and corruption of the law enforcement process are other byproducts of narcotics which are weakening and threatening to destroy the very fabric of our society.

The recognition of narcotics addiction as a national emergency is long overdue. I and other Members of Congress have urged for years that Federal resources be mobilized for an all-out war on narcotics addiction. Realizing the extent of this problem:

In 1966, I introduced the bill which became the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act, an act to provide for the civil commitment and treatment of narcotic addicts charged with Federal crimes.

In 1968, I introduced the bill which became the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, an act which provides States with discretionary funds for law enforcement activities—LEAA grants are now supporting a wide variety of drug abuse treatment and education activities.

In 1970, I introduced a proposal which was cosponsored by 131 Members of the House of Representatives directed at cutting off the supply of hard core narcotic drugs from abroad. Under this bill the President was authorized to suspend economic or military assistance under foreign aid programs to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed in that country from entering the United States unlawfully. The President was authorized to provide financial assistance to any country which undertook a program of attempting to control the narcotics traffic for export and within its borders.

In 1971, I introduced a bill to amend the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 to permit the use of methadone in the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts committed for treatment under the provisions of that act.

In 1971, I chaired the committee which reported out amendments to the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act which provides for the establishment of emergency drug treatment facilities in State correctional institutions.

In 1972, I chaired the committee which reported out amendments to the probation and parole laws significantly expanding the treatment and opportunities available to drug dependent persons convicted of Federal crimes, while institutionalized and upon probation, parole, or mandatory release.

President Nixon's establishment of a Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention in the Executive Office of the President is in response to repeated calls for such action by Democratic Congressmen. Although the Special Action Office has just begun to operate, it appears that its primary role may be merely the coordination of existing Federal narcotics treatment programs rather than the mobilization of additional Federal

resources for a concentrated effort to increase the availability of facilities for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

The Congress has given the Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention the authority to pull together and rationalize the various narcotics treatment programs funded by the Federal Government. We hope that the Director of the Special Action Office will have the support of the administration when it comes time to convince the heads of the various Federal drug treatment programs in the large Federal bureaucracy, who are often in competition with each other, to cooperate and to coordinate their efforts through one central office.

But a reorganization and coordination of existing Federal Government drug abuse treatment programs is not enough, we need to have an expansion of programs to enable us to reach for treatment the thousands of addicts who are not undergoing treatment and, therefore, remain on the street as a hazard to themselves, their families, and to society at large. Only 26,196 of the estimated 560,000 addicts in the Nation are presently enrolled in federally supported treatment programs. We need to establish as a national priority a commitment to provide treatment and rehabilitation services to every narcotics addict.

At the present time throughout the country there are waiting lists of addicts who cannot enter treatment programs because there is no room for them. In New York City, for example, the methadone treatment programs operated by the Health Services Administration have a waiting list of 8,000 addicts. This waiting list is growing at the rate of 400 to 500 addicts per week and is expected to be 12,000 addicts long before June of 1972, even though 8,500 additional maintenance places are being provided under the city's expansion of methadone maintenance facilities. Thus even though New York City is making a major effort to increase the availability of methadone maintenance, the number of addicts coming forth desiring treatment is outpacing the provision of treatment facilities by 50 percent. Information received by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary indicates that growing waiting lists of addicts desiring treatment exist almost everywhere there is a significant addict population. As soon as methadone treatment programs open their doors, addicts are lining up for this form of treatment. Given the oftentimes difficult problem of getting addicts into treatment, there should certainly be an expansion of treatment programs which addicts in great numbers have expressed a voluntary desire to enter. To this end, I recommend Federal funding for a broad expansion of methadone programs.

METHADONE TREATMENT PROGRAMS MUST BE AUGMENTED BY SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

In calling for such an expansion I fully recognize the controversy surrounding methadone as a method of treatment. The Judiciary Committee through one of its Subcommittees has received testimony from witnesses who have charged that the provision of methadone in the treatment of addiction is merely the ex-

changing of one form of addiction for another. We have also become aware that methadone not sufficiently controlled by treatment programs is being sold on the streets and that some people are becoming addicted to methadone as their drug of first addiction. Methadone is a highly addictive drug. Its use must be closely regulated, and it should not be dispensed except by narcotics treatment professionals as a means of detoxification or as a part of a comprehensive treatment program which offers the addict supportive services to prepare him for a new life style. Used in this manner, methadone has proved to be an invaluable tool for the weaning of the addict from heroin addiction and the drug subculture toward attainment of the ability to function in a manner that regains self-esteem. But methadone is not enough. Methadone, taken orally once a day, enables the addict to avoid the hunger for heroin and the fear of painful withdrawal symptoms which formerly dominated his waking hours. He is able, perhaps for the first time in years, to think of something other than his next needle. At this point it is essential that he be given something else to think about—that a purposeful existence be established. Particularly for the addict who is poor and from an environment where the incidence of drug abuse is high, it is important that a methadone treatment program contain the ability to provide him with opportunities for education, training, and employment so that he may build a life different from that from which he has come. If the methadone maintenance program does not contain these elements, then there is a certain validity to the charge that it is merely a substitution of one form of addiction for another.

FEDERAL FUNDING FOR NARCOTICS TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION IS WHOLLY INADEQUATE

The fiscal 1973 budget provides no evidence of the commitment in the President's June 1971 drug abuse message to a substantial new Federal effort toward the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotics addicts. The administration's budget request for drug abuse programs totals \$365.2 million, a purported substantial increase over last year's budget. But when one examines this increase it is apparent that most of the existing funding is scheduled for programs designed to meet the military drug abuse problem. For example, of the \$230.2 million budgeted for the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts, \$84.2 million will be spent by the Department of Defense and the Veterans' Administration, leaving but \$146 million for the treatment and rehabilitation of civilian addicts. This \$146 million represents only \$21 million more than was allocated for nonmilitary treatment programs in the budget for fiscal 1972 and falls far short of the amount allocated by New York State, which has budgeted \$161.5 million for drug abuse treatment programs during its 1971-72 fiscal year. Thus the massive new Federal treatment and rehabilitation effort described by the administration in the summer has, in a little more than 6 months, withered to a program that is not even as large as that

conducted by a single State, the State of New York. We welcome and applaud, as must anyone who is familiar with the national tragedy of the addicted veterans, the additional funding which is being provided for the treatment and rehabilitation of veterans. In fact, this funding is not yet nearly enough, as is proven by the pleas for assistance with the treatment and rehabilitation of returning Vietnam veterans that are increasingly arising from local communities. But we cannot pretend to be waging a war against drug addiction if the Federal Government is limiting its budget increases to treatment of the addicted veteran and providing no significant increases in programs for the treatment and rehabilitation of the large, growing civilian addict population.

EVALUATIVE CRITERIA ARE NEEDED TO JUDGE PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

We on the Judiciary Committee have been concerned about the lack of evaluative criteria to judge the effectiveness of current drug abuse treatment programs funded by the Federal Government. The recent expansion, however, has been until now unaccompanied by any comprehensive evaluation and assessment of the impact of this increased Federal funding. Early last year the Judiciary Committee, through one of its subcommittees, initiated a study of the effectiveness of federally supported drug abuse treatment programs. This study, which has been conducted by the General Accounting Office in five cities, is almost completed. The committee expects that it will provide a fair, objective, meaningful evaluation of the effectiveness of a cross-section of existing federally supported treatment programs. This information will provide the committee with a factual basis for recommendations for the improvement of existing programs and for proposing new legislation to create new treatment alternatives.

EXPERIENCE WITH THE NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION ACT OF 1966

It is essential that the Congress take steps to develop information for itself. We cannot trust the Federal bureaucracy to monitor and evaluate its own performance in this area. I was made aware of this during hearings held by a Judiciary Subcommittee into the implementation of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966. This act, which I introduced into the 89th Congress, was intended as a breakthrough toward the treatment of narcotic addiction as a medical problem. In its statement of objectives to treat narcotic addiction as a medical rather than a criminal problem and to treat the addict for his addiction rather than to punish him, the act broke significantly with attitudes of the past. The Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act created a system of civil commitment which provides compulsory institutionalized treatment for the addict over an extended period of time.

In creating such a system, the Judiciary Committee, and then the Congress, was responding to the rapid national rise in drug addiction and drug-related crime and to the "revolving door" process which had characterized the treatment

of narcotic addicts at the Federal Public Health Service hospitals at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex. The experience of these hospitals in not being able to hold addicts for sufficient lengths of time to effectuate a treatment program motivated the belief expressed during the debates by several supporters of the bill in both houses that there was need for use of the Government's coercive power to hold the addict in a treatment program long enough to allow him to derive the full benefit of the program.

Under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act civil commitment is initiated either by the court, if the addict has been charged with a crime and it is determined that he will benefit from treatment in lieu of prosecution, or by the addict himself or a member of his family in the absence of a criminal charge if it is determined that the addict is likely to be rehabilitated. There is also provision in the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act for the sentencing of convicted addicts to treatment.

However, despite the epidemic of heroin addiction in the 6 years since the passage of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act, the act has not been used to the extent expected. During our hearings on the act in 1965 and 1966 witnesses from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimated that there would be 900 commitments per year under the commitment in lieu of prosecution provision of NARA alone. Instead, the General Accounting Office reports that in the first 3 years of the program only 207 persons have been examined for admission to treatment in lieu of prosecution and only 179 have been accepted for treatment under this provision of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act.

Likewise under the voluntary civil commitment section of the act there has been a large degree of underutilization, largely because of the overly strict standards used by the administrators of the programs in judging a volunteer "suitable for treatment." The General Accounting Office found that during the first 3 years of the voluntary civil commitment program, 2,801 addicts, or about 57 percent of the total of 4,889 who voluntarily sought commitment for treatment, were rejected by Federal treatment centers during the examination and evaluation phase of the treatment program. Almost all rejections were made on the basis of unsuitability for treatment and rehabilitation.

Although these diagnoses of unsuitability for treatment may have been made on valid medical grounds, the effect of the decisions to reject 57 percent of the addicts who voluntarily applied for treatment under NARA were undoubtedly devastating for the individuals involved and for their communities. For these addicts often had nowhere else to go. The alternative to admission to the Federal treatment program was often no treatment at all and a return to the streets of the home community because State and local communities for the most part have not been able to establish their own drug abuse treatment programs.

To deny an addict treatment is a crime against him and against society. Yet we were not informed that this was a consistent practice until we undertook our own investigation. I am disturbed at the administrative policies which have turned so many addicts away from treatment and sharply limited the scope and effectiveness of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966. The Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention has been specifically charged by the Congress with responsibility for the ongoing evaluation of Federal Government drug abuse treatment programs. The conducting of probing and comprehensive evaluations of existing treatment programs is one of the most important functions the Special Action Office has been asked to perform, and I call for the immediate implementation of a nationwide evaluative study of the treatment results achieved by federally financed drug abuse treatment programs.

I recommend that the kind of ongoing evaluation of drug abuse treatment programs presently being conducted by the Judiciary Committee through the General Accounting Office be built into all new Federal narcotics legislation so that Congress and the public can be informed of whether the treatment programs we establish are meeting their intended objectives.

THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

The Judiciary Committee, which pioneered in comprehensive narcotics treatment legislation with the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, has met successive challenges posed by the continuing heroin epidemic of recent years. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, created by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, now provides \$19.1 million to drug abuse treatment and rehabilitation programs. Through its oversight of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration the Judiciary Committee will continue to encourage the development of effective programs for the treatment of addiction, which remains a major source of criminal activity in the United States.

In the 92d Congress the Judiciary Committee reported out legislation which amends the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for Federal funding of narcotic treatment programs operated by State and local governments in correctional institutions and facilities and in connection with probation and other supervisory release programs. Under the bill, which has been passed by the House of Representatives, but not yet acted upon by the Senate, States which apply for funding for correctional institutions from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act will have to provide for the development and operation of narcotic treatment programs in their correctional systems. This should stimulate the development of narcotic treatment programs in the correctional systems of the States and should assist the development of treatment in States where treatment is presently unavailable to addicts in the criminal justice system.

Because of the often necessary linkage

between narcotics addiction and crime, the criminal justice system acts as a prime, and sometimes the only intake mechanism for the entry of drug addicts into governmental institutions. Drug addicts are often not identified as addicts until they are arrested and charged with a crime.

When an addict is convicted of a crime and sentenced, he enters the correctional system of the State. At this point the State has the responsibility to select the correctional device which is most likely to lead to the rehabilitation of the convicted addict. Good sense as well as good medical practice dictates that a narcotics addict receive treatment for his addiction as a part of his correctional program. However, because of a combination of lack of funds and a lack of experience, exacerbated by the large and increasing number of narcotics addicts entering the correctional system, some States are unable to offer even the most minimal treatment programs for narcotics addiction in their correctional institutions.

It is clear that it does no good to sentence an addict to a prison facility where he cannot receive treatment for his addiction. If the addict cannot be treated during his period of incarceration, it is almost certain that upon release he will resume his addiction and the criminal activity related to it. I thus regard the bill to provide narcotic treatment programs in correctional institutions as one of the most important pieces of legislation passed by the House of Representatives in this Congress.

My committee, in a related piece of legislation, has reported out a bill to provide for narcotics addicts who are placed on probation, released on parole, or mandatorily released. This bill provides the U.S. Bureau of Prisons with authority to enter into contracts with community-based facilities for the continued treatment of addicts who are released on probation, parole, or mandatory release after a period of institutional treatment. Under present law only a small percentage of narcotic addicts qualify for institutional treatment after sentencing under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. Although it has been found that approximately 30 percent of the 11,000 people per year who are committed to serve sentences in Federal prisons have drug-related problems, or have been convicted of drug-related crimes, only 1 or 2 percent of this number are sentenced under the special sentencing provisions of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. The bill recently reported by the Judiciary Committee will provide treatment to addicted offenders who do not qualify for treatment under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. This bill, if passed by the House, should provide a significant increase in treatment opportunities for the addicted population of our Federal prison system.

Another bill reported by the Judiciary Committee during this session was my bill amending the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966 to provide for treatment which controls, as well as treatment which terminates drug addiction. The purpose of this bill, which was passed by the House but still awaits passage by the Senate, is to permit the use

of methadone in detoxification and maintenance as a treatment of narcotics addiction under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. NARA as presently written does not clearly provide for the use of methadone in the treatment of addiction. The treatment programs operated by or funded by the Federal Government should not be denied the use of methadone, whose value in the treatment of narcotics addiction has been proved beyond doubt. The bill makes clear that the treatment professionals in federally operated and federally funded treatment programs will have the full range of treatment modalities available.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF NARCOTICS TRAFFIC

It is heartening that President Nixon has been able to achieve an agreement with the Government of Turkey under which the government will prohibit the further growth of the opium poppy from which morphine and heroin are derived. This action is one I urged as early as the spring of 1970 when I introduced a proposal directed at cutting off the supply of hardcore narcotic drugs from abroad. The bill I introduced at that time authorized the President to suspend economic or military assistance under foreign aid programs to any country which fails to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed in that country from entering the United States unlawfully. Under my bill the President was also authorized to provide assistance in controlling unlawful narcotic production to countries which require such assistance.

I joined with Congressman RODINO, the ranking Democrat on the Judiciary Committee, in sending a letter to all Members of the House of Representatives. It has taken the President 2 years to achieve the goal of our proposed legislation, but we hope now that action has been taken it will be effective in stemming the flow of much of the heroin which enters the United States.

We cannot, however, depend on the agreement with Turkey to be totally effective in stopping the supply of heroin to the United States. Although it is estimated presently that 70 to 75 percent of the heroin which reaches the United States originates in Turkey, current estimates are that the United States consumes only about 1 percent of the total world production of opium. The illicit opium needs of this country could be grown on about 10 square miles of land in provinces in Turkey, Afghanistan, and Pakistan where the governments of those nations do not exercise control over the tribesmen who inhabit those areas.

These areas are wild and hilly—ideal for the growing of the opium poppy, but extremely difficult to patrol. The tribesmen are fiercely independent and will not consider themselves bound by any agreement made by governments to which they owe only the most tenuous allegiance. Far more opium is grown in the Far East than in the areas mentioned above, although at the present time only 15 percent of the heroin which reaches the United States is estimated to have originated in the Far East. The huge profit obtainable from the heroin traffic makes me pessimistic that the Turkish

supply, if stopped, will not be replaced by new sources of supply from the Far East.

We need, therefore, to expand the agreement reached with Turkey to other countries, as suggested in my bill, and at the same time we need to increase the international law enforcement efforts to stop heroin smuggling.

Earlier this year the Committee on the Judiciary reported a bill to increase the U.S. participation in Interpol, the International Police Organization. We hope that Interpol, with the increased financial support of its members, will become more effective in assisting national law enforcement agencies in coordinated efforts to stop the international traffic in illegal narcotics.

At the same time we need to call upon other international organizations, specifically the World Health Organization of the United Nations, for assistance in combating our international heroin epidemic. The World Organization has been working for years on projects to combat addiction and most of the leading treatment authorities in the world have contributed to useful studies on the addiction problems of other countries. Why not use this accumulated expertise on the addiction problem of our own country? I propose that we ask the United Nations, through the World Health Organization, to conduct a comprehensive study of the United States heroin addiction problem and recommend techniques for the treatment and rehabilitation of our addict population.

CONCLUSION

My experience in this area convinces me that there are no simple solutions to the problem of effective treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts. A treatment modality which is successful with one addict can be utterly unsuccessful with another. Motivation plays an extremely important role in determining the likelihood of successful rehabilitation of the addict, and an addict may not be sufficiently motivated towards rehabilitation until he has experienced successive failures to achieve rehabilitation.

What is clear, however, is that there is a need for increased numbers of treatment programs offering increasing varieties of treatment modalities. We must adopt a national goal of providing treatment for every drug addicted person, tailored to his individual need, and we must commit the needed Federal resources to achieve this goal.

AN ASSIGNMENT IN HONDURAS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, year after year Congress has appropriated funds for the Agency for International Development. Some of this money is well spent. Some of it has been spent foolishly. If we fully understood the difference between the two, I am sure Con-

gress could handle AID's annual budget more wisely, both in our authorizations and in our appropriations.

One of my constituents, Armin O. Grossmann, of Cambridge, Ill., stopped in my office recently to describe an assignment he had just completed in Honduras—one funded largely by AID—that is, I believe, somewhat remarkable. Since his experience may help us, as lawmakers, improve our legislative performance, I want to describe it for my colleagues.

Mr. Grossmann retired in December after 30 years as manager of Henry Service Co., a cooperative Henry County farmers own and use to buy \$4 million worth of feed, fertilizer, petroleum products, chemicals, and other farm supplies each year for their own operations. This cooperative—and others like it in Iowa, Illinois, and Wisconsin—in turn own FS Services, a large wholesaling and manufacturing cooperative with headquarters at Bloomington.

Just before Mr. Grossman retired, a federation of farmers' cooperatives in Honduras asked Volunteer Development Corps, headquartered here in Washington, to send someone qualified to advise them on the feasibility of importing commercial fertilizer in bulk. Honduras produces no fertilizer. While a few large banana plantations on the Caribbean coast import bulk fertilizer, the fertilizer Honduras farmers use is imported in bags. The co-op federation felt farmers might reduce the cost of fertilizer if it were imported in bulk.

U.S. cooperatives created Volunteer Development Corps 2 years ago to provide short-term, volunteer, technical help to cooperatives in the developing countries at their request. These cooperatives provide part of VDC's funds. AID provides most of its funds under a grant. VDC asked Mr. Grossman to volunteer for this assignment, and he accepted.

Mr. Grossmann received no salary, fee, or honorarium for his services. With AID funds, VDC paid his travel, lodging, meals, and clothing care, and it also paid his wife's expenses. U.S. cooperatives covered some of VDC's administrative costs. The Honduras co-ops provided Mr. Grossmann's in-country travel, an interpreter, a place to work, and secretarial help. This was a genuine, joint undertaking.

After thorough investigation, Mr. Grossmann advised the Honduras co-ops not to undertake bulk importation of fertilizer at this time. They are not now distributing enough material, he explained, to make this feasible. This advice quite possibly enabled the cooperatives to avoid sinking as much as \$250,000 in an unwise venture.

Mr. Grossmann did not stop there. He gave these Honduras farmers a goal. He told them that when they are handling six times as much fertilizer as they handled last year, they ought to take another look at their proposal. It may then be feasible. He also urged them, meanwhile, to import and distribute bagged fertilizer under their own brand, rent a warehouse and trucks to distribute it, and thus become independent of other importers and distributors so that, when

bulk importation becomes feasible, they will have built a sound operating base.

In several respects, this seems to me remarkable. First, it was Honduras farmers who triggered this undertaking. Not their government. Not the AID mission in Tegucigalpa. No one in the United States. This help, we can be sure, was really wanted.

Second, Mr. Grossmann advised these Honduras farmers not to move ahead now with their proposal. Sometimes, even when we think positively, we come up with a negative answer. Mr. Grossmann did. And "no" may be quite as important as "yes" in helping the people of lesser developed countries avoid mistakes while we help them help themselves.

Third, I am impressed with the variety of organizations that contributed resources to this undertaking. Mr. Grossmann, of course, volunteered his services. AID and U.S. cooperatives jointly finance the work of Volunteer Development Corps, which provided the Grossmann's travel to Honduras and expenses. And the co-op federation there provided various support services. It sounds to me, Mr. Speaker, as if this time U.S. taxpayers got their money's worth.

These three considerations—a genuine desire not for U.S. money but for U.S. assistance, genuine U.S. competence based on years of experience, and a pooling of United States and foreign resources—may help us distinguish between money wisely spent and money foolishly spent as each year we consider AID's budget. I want to commend my constituent, Mr. Grossmann, not only for helping the farmers of Honduras, but also perhaps for helping us here under the Capitol dome.

THE NATION DEEPLY MOURNS THE PASSING OF A GREAT AMERICAN, THE HONORABLE HARRY BURDETTE HAINES, 1882-1972

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, 1972, a respectful silence fell upon the city of Paterson, the Eighth Congressional District, the State of New Jersey, and our United States of America with the shock and sadness of losing our most outstanding citizen, benefactor, news editor, publisher, and friend to all, the Honorable Harry Burdette Haines, who entered into eternal rest after a lifetime of dedicated eminent service to his fellow man. I ask my colleagues here in the Congress to join with me in tribute to all of his good works.

His most prestigious newspaper, the Paterson News, has eloquently provided the historic background of his life which has provided a quality of excellence that bespeaks a great era in our Nation's history in which Harry B. Haines has made a significant contribution that is forever etched in lasting memory in the hearts of all of us who have had the privilege and honor of knowing him. Mr. Speaker,

I respectfully request permission to place his newspaper's statement of Friday, March 31 at this point in the record of Congress as follows:

HARRY B. HAINES DIES AT 89; NEWS PUBLISHER FOR 61 YEARS

Harry B. Haines, editor and publisher of The Paterson News for 61 years, died Thursday at Doctors Hospital, New York, following a brief illness. He was 89 years old.

Born Sept. 18, 1882 in his parents' apartment above the Altoona (Pa.) Morning Call, the newspaper published by his father, the late Edward B. Haines, he was brought at the age of two to Paterson. His father at that time founded The Morning Call which is now combined with The News.

Long known as a "crusading editor," Mr. Haines took over the reins of The News in 1911 following the death of his father. There were then four newspapers in Paterson, The Press and Guardian, which later combined, The Call, which at that time was independent and The News. The sole remaining paper is The News.

As a youth, Mr. Haines was one of the first automobile owners in New Jersey. He, along with the late Henry Ford, founder of the automobile dynasty, the late Guy Vaughan, former president of Curtiss-Wright Corporation, and many other pioneers participated in the "Glidden Tours." Among their achievements were the first trips by automobile from the East to the West Coasts of the United States and a tour through Cuba several years after the Spanish-American War.

An independent in politics, Mr. Haines was a friend of many outstanding public figures. Included among these were the late President Woodrow Wilson when he was governor of New Jersey. The News at that time had a large job plant and was official printer for the state. Also among his close friends was the late U.S. Senator Walter E. Edge, twice governor of New Jersey and ambassador to France, and the late Bernard Baruch, adviser to several presidents.

CHURCHILL TRIBUTE

One of the most singular honors conferred upon Mr. Haines was the recognition given him by Lady Clementine Churchill when she presented him with two copies of the 80th birthday tribute to Sir Winston Churchill a personal friend. Copy No. 11 was presented to the City of Paterson in Lady Churchill's behalf and Copy No. 9 was retained for Mr. Haines' own library. The presentation was made in appreciation of the tribute paid to the late Sir Winston at the time of his death by 16,000 Paterson school children under Mr. Haines' sponsorship. Impressed by the number of spontaneous letters sent to him by Paterson school children, asking whether they might do something to honor the great statesman, Mr. Haines offered to send the condolences of all the city's public, private and parochial school children to Lady Churchill in a bound volume. With the cooperation of the Board of Education and the school faculties, 16,000 letters were received. They were handsomely bound in leather with an introductory illuminated text by the master printers of St. Anthony's Guild.

Mr. Haines at one time was a vice president of the Sperry & Hutchinson Co. and The News in its job plant printed the S. & H. green trading stamps.

During World War I Mr. Haines held a commission as a captain in the U.S. Army. Later he was honored by being appointed an honorary lieutenant colonel by the New Jersey National Guard.

The New Jersey Patrolmen's Benevolent Association for his efforts on behalf of the police presented him with a gold card, one of the few of this type presented by the organization.

When the depression of the '30s struck, Mr.

Haines established The News Save-A-Home Fund which provided food and sustenance for more than 1,000 families until municipal relief was begun. For this effort he was cited in 1930 as outstanding citizen by Paterson's service clubs.

In 1952 he initiated a project to memorialize Christopher Columbus with the result that funds were raised to build the Columbus Memorial in Eastside Park. For this endeavor he was awarded Italy's highest decoration to a non-citizen, the "Star of Solidarity" in 1954.

EDITORIALS WON ACCLAIM

Twice honored by Freedoms Foundation for his editorials awakening a renewed appreciation for the American heritage, he also led a drive in 1957 to display the colors on patriotic holidays. This successful campaign brought him an award from the New Jersey Department, Jewish War Veterans, as New Jersey's outstanding citizen in 1957. The same year he was honored by the Paterson Dux Club as its "Man of the Year."

Numerous organizations conferred honorary membership status upon him including Paterson Rotary and Paterson Kiwanis clubs. He also held an honorary membership in the Knights of Columbus, in appreciation of his leadership in the campaign to erect a statue of Msgr. Anthony Stein in Sandy Hill Park as well as other Catholic causes.

Mr. Haines spearheaded a campaign to raise funds for an addition to Barnert Memorial Hospital and dedicated a special room in honor of his parents in St. Joseph's Hospital.

In the interest of human understanding he caused to be erected at City Hall Plaza statues of Nathan Barnert, Paterson's only Jewish mayor and outstanding philanthropist, and Dr. Andrew F. McBride, three-time mayor of Paterson, a Catholic physician beloved by all the people, to join the statue of Garret A. Hobart, a Protestant and vice president of the United States, thus representing the trinity of the faiths.

In 1958 he led a "Believe in America" campaign that won the support of 28 governors, the White House, three Cabinet members, leading members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, national, state and local Chamber of Commerce heads as well as businessmen, editors, publishers and plain citizens.

In 1959 he was made an honorary member of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union and in 1963 he was honored as the founder of the Paterson Jaycees.

Among his achievements was the establishment of the Plaza of Memories in Eastside Park dedicated to his parents and the parents of all Patersonians. Mother's Day services are held there each year.

FORWARD PATERSON FOUNDER

Mr. Haines was a founder of Forward Paterson and led the fight to have the Great Falls of the Passaic River recognized and restored to its merited position as the birthplace of the city. This culminated in success when the U.S. Department of the Interior designated the Falls and adjacent industrial complex as a National Historic District. The Great Falls Park overlooking the Falls was dedicated last year.

Mr. Haines for a number of years was president of the daily newspaper division of the New Jersey Press Association. He held honorary membership in the New Jersey Patrolmen's Benevolent Association and the Firemen's Benevolent Association, the 29th Blue and Gray Association, Optimists' International, New Jersey Association of State Chiefs of Police and many other service, civic and veterans organizations.

He was a member of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, New Jersey Press Association, Passaic County Historical Society, Passaic County Grand Jurors' Association, the American Academy of Political and So-

cial Sciences, Old Timers' Athletic Association, the Pica Club, Paterson Guam Club, Loyal Order of Moose, New York Athletic Club, the Lotus, Friars and Lambs Clubs of New York, the Columbia Yacht Club, Metropolitan Club, New York Advertising Club, North Jersey Country Club, Grand Street Boys of New York, Paterson Boys Club, the Police Athletic League of New York, the National Premium Advertising Association of which he was a past secretary and United Press International.

Mr. Haines was the son of the late Edward B. and Sarah Haines. He was predeceased by a sister, Esther. He is survived by his wife, the former Helene Brundage; a son, Edward; one grandson, Harry; a granddaughter, Mrs. Frank (Diane) Donato; a nephew and niece, Mr. and Mrs. Edsell Brundage, of Montville.

I am deeply saddened by the loss of a personal friend. Mr. Haines was a long-standing personal friend of the Roe family for generations. His love for the city of Paterson and his unselfish and never-ending labors for his beloved city are without parallel. He was a man of outstanding qualities and his contributions for Passaic County, N.J. and the Nation could fill volumes. His passing leaves a void which can never be filled. Of his life on earth, almost four score and 10 years, it can truly be said:

Well done thou good and faithful servant . . . enter now into thy eternal rest.

The warmth of the friendship of Harry B. Haines to me and all of the members of my family throughout the years is a treasure of life that helps make living worthwhile—and I know that all of those who had the good fortune to be numbered amongst his friends share my high esteem and respect for the quality of the leadership of this outstanding individual of our times.

The richness of his wisdom as editor and publisher of the News and the compassion and benevolence of his helping hand to those in need have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation and will be sorely missed by all of us.

We trust that his family will soon find abiding comfort in the faith that God has given them and in the knowledge that the Honorable Harry Burdette Haines is now under His eternal care. May he rest in peace.

**THE FLIGHT OF VETERANS
IN FLORIDA**

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, veterans who have been disabled as a result of service in the Armed Forces deserve special recognition and gratitude. Although there is no way to fully compensate a man who has suffered irreparable physical or mental injury in his country's service, I feel we must at least provide basic health services and reasonable compensation for expenses incurred as a result of such injuries.

Since my congressional district includes a large number of veterans, I am acutely aware of their problems and

health needs. There are, for instance, over 40,000 veterans in Brevard County alone. Moreover, there is every indication that the veteran population of this area will continue to grow. Patrick Air Force Base located in Brevard has brought many retired veterans from the military to the area. The aerospace industry has brought veterans and retired military personnel to the area because of the nature of their professional requirements. In addition, huge land development projects are attracting veterans to the area. General Development Corp. has about 5,500 people in its Port Malabar and St. John developments. About 70 percent of these families are headed by veterans. This company projects 3,500 homes per year in the next 3 years—and most of them will be occupied by retired military veterans. GAC, another large land development company, has recently started a mobile home community, and is encouraging retirees to settle there. In addition, all interested agencies within Brevard County, including the Brevard Economic Development Council, chambers of commerce, and other groups and financial institutions are advertising to military retirees to make Brevard County their home. The veteran population of the area can do nothing but expand. The same is true in my other three counties of Orange, Osceola, and Indian River.

As a result of this huge and rapid influx of veterans to my district, health care facilities have been unable to keep up with the rising demand for health services. Moreover, reduced compensation payments due to inflation together with gaps in programs compensating disabled veterans are compounding the situation.

Consequently, I am today introducing a package of four bills which, if enacted, would provide needed health services as well as increased compensation to meet more reasonably and adequately the needs of veterans residing in central Florida. And, by providing such, these measures would relieve civilian facilities of a considerable burden. Veterans funds used for military-connected injuries would be injected instead, in one form or another, into the local economy.

The most important of these measures would establish a 500-bed Veterans' Administration hospital in Brevard County.

Mr. Speaker, in the past, decisions to build VA hospitals have been based on such primary factors as veteran population concentration, demand, and the ability to recruit professional staff. Central Florida, and Brevard County in particular, qualify and need a VA hospital. As I mentioned earlier, there are over 40,000 veterans in Brevard alone, and several times that number in the neighboring counties of Seminole, Orange, Indian River, Osceola, St. Lucie, Martin, Okeechobee, most of Volusia, parts of Palm Beach, Highlands, Lake and Glade—the area such a hospital would serve. An estimated 15,000 veterans from Brevard County alone are currently receiving service from VA medical facilities. At present, they must travel a minimum distance of 161 miles to St. Petersburg, which is where the closest of Florida's four VA hospitals is located. If they

choose, the veterans can travel 172 miles to the Miami hospital, 183 miles to the Gainesville hospital, or a comparable distance to a projected hospital in Tampa.

In addition to the large concentration of veterans, and the long distances to the nearest VA facilities, there is the question of treatment availability. Area veterans who need emergency treatment, or who have a service-connected disability are sometimes able to use the 75-bed Patrick Air Force Base Hospital. However, veterans who need nonemergency treatment generally are turned away, and must go to one of the more distant VA hospitals. At present, there is a waiting list of more than 500 for Gainesville's 450-bed VA hospital. There is a waiting list of over 300 for the Bay Pines VA hospital in St. Petersburg.

The Brevard area offers large numbers of qualified medical personnel who would be able to assist veterans in a new VA hospital. Besides Patrick AFB Hospital, there are four existing civilian hospitals and five nursing homes in Brevard itself. A current census of medical doctors in the county totals 166, working in almost all specialties, and also 938 active registered nurses. The county has a mental health clinic recognized as one of the best in the State.

In the past it has been argued that VA hospitals should be located near medical training institutes. There are already 168 VA hospitals in the Nation and only 97 medical training institutes. In view of the qualified area personnel to assist veterans, it is obvious that a medical training institute as a construction requirement is not mandatory here.

Brevard is accessible to the surrounding counties. It is served by an excellent highway network and is in an air center served by excellent interstate and intrastate air transportation facilities.

There are at least five sites in the area which are available for a new VA hospital at no cost to the Government. These offers come from agencies and individuals who feel that there is a distinct need for a VA facility in the Brevard area.

The Veterans' Administration and the Office of Management and Budget in the 91st Congress opposed legislation for this new VA hospital on budgetary grounds. Hopefully, with increased funding for VA facilities, they will reverse themselves. Inflation should not be used as an excuse for denying our veterans the level of service and benefits which they deserve and require.

Two of the three other bills I introduce today would increase the benefits for veterans, which have been reduced because of inflation. Presently, an estimated 123,000 veterans must subsist on an allowance of \$25 per month for a 10 percent disability to \$450 per month for a total disability.

Legislation I introduce today would provide an immediate increase of 10 percent in monthly compensation payments to our disabled veterans. This increase would take into account both the loss in purchasing value since July 1970 and the estimated additional loss which will occur before the next review of the disability compensation program.

There is an especially urgent case for increasing the \$47 monthly award for anatomical loss. This amount was established in 1952, 20 years ago, and numerous attempts to introduce legislation to correct the situation have failed. Meanwhile the severely or totally disabled war veteran suffers a particularly high loss in both economic and noneconomic terms for his service to his country. His present earnings are inadequate. Available statistical data show that the 1971 average earnings for production workers in private manufacturing industries were \$7,809, while the compensation for the severely disabled, unemployed war veteran is \$5,400 per year.

The final bill which I propose today would assist veterans with a permanent and total service-connected disability due to the loss of the use of one upper and one lower extremity, to acquire specially adapted housing. This is an expense which these veterans cannot afford, and it should be borne by those whom they defended.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, if these bills should receive favorable consideration, the many disabled veterans in central Florida would have adequate health facilities available, and benefits to meet their expenses.

INHERITING THE WORLD—A FORUM FOR CHILDREN

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, children's publisher, Russell Dodworth has made a considerable contribution toward bridging the gap between rich and poor, young and old, black and white by creating a forum in which young people—principally between the ages of 9 and 16—can express their views on the significant issues of today through his "Inheriting the World" columns in the New York Voice.

Dodworth's newspaper column invites the young people to write "stories" on drugs, ecology, war, racism, life styles and politics with messages of social reform and community improvement. The articles always close with a new idea or solution.

In the first edition of the "Inheriting the World" column in the New York Voice, a 9-year-old boy, John McCormick, reports on "Child Discrimination" when he and his young friend are not treated democratically and overpassed by adult customers at the pizza parlor; Tom Maxwell, age 12, wishes "peace instead of piece" for the New Year; Robert Whitey, age 10, enjoys his experience in scouting but wants to see more room for black fathers on the executive council of the Boy Scouts so "all can benefit from the practical knowledge and experience of ordinary working people and be useful to his fellow scouts"; Sally Jenkins, age 11, "believes in equal pay and job opportunities for women but stops at 'Dutch

Treat" and says "why go dutch when you do not have to?"; Kim Wha Young, age 16, proposes the idea of a new job on the President's Cabinet, "Secretary of Pensions to protect and prevent foolish and mainly selfish investments by funds of labor unions and insurance companies."

Andrea Wolkenberg, age 14, feels that there should be a new respect and regard for people who work with their hands; and Hunt Richardson, age 13, who is optimistic about world peace with more standardization, that is, system of world currency, weight, and measure.

Russell "Rusty" Dodworth has launched a successor to his continuing concept of having the children write about the world the way they, themselves, see it: the "Overground Press" magazine.

Dodworth and his associates are aware that these young children are the new crop of leadership for the future.

I would like to share now some of the articles that have appeared in Mr. Dodworth's newspaper column since the inception of Inheriting the World in the New York Voice on October 1, 1971. The articles follow:

INHERITING THE WORLD

(By Russell Dodworth)

THE YOUNGER GENERATION SPEAKS ITS MIND

Since we first announced the coming of the "Inheriting the World" column, material has been flowing in and the topics have proved to be most interesting. The New York Voice and I have discovered that there's a segment of the population (the nine to sixteen group), unexplored for their ideas. There's plenty more ore in the mine; the minds of younger people, heretofore voiceless in city newspapers.

Now that the voting age is down to eighteen, younger people will sooner have an important touch of control and more rapidly, qualify for leadership in the world that they know (in youth's less biased conscience) is not entirely right. The best way to alter, or have a course change, in our attitude, is to air our thoughts. Beginning from there, come creative ideas and a few "answers", possibly.

Publishing the thoughts and opinions of "Inheriting the World", in the New York Voice, will also give parents, who may just happen to be glancing, a few ways to relate to their own kids and, as need be, understand "where they're at?"

JOHN M'CORMICK, AGE 9

CHILD DISCRIMINATION

Once, I went to a pizza parlor with my friend, Robert, and we went up and ordered one large pizza. They made one large pizza and cut it up into pieces and they sold it to people who only wanted one slice.

We waited fifteen minutes and they made another pizza and gave it to people who were only buying one slice.

Then, a lady came and she ordered a large pizza and they gave it to her. The pizza parlor started working on another pizza and the lady heard us talking.

Robert and I were talking about the situation. She (the lady) went up to the cook and said, "How come I got my pizza before they did?" The guy mumbled and said, "theirs is cooking".

Then, the pizza was done and he gave it to us and we walked home with it.

What I Think About What Happened: I thought the cook was not paying attention to us because we were children. I also think that, if the lady did not say anything, we would not have gotten it!

ANDREA WOLKENBERG, 14, ON SKILLED WORKERS

Skilled workers, such as watchmakers, shoemakers, metal workers and piano tuners, etc., are becoming more and more difficult to find. This is due, mainly, to social prejudice because parents want their children to become doctors, lawyers, and businessmen, plus go into fields associated with brains and money.

For instance, the Sanitary Engineer (garbage collector) is discriminated against because his job involves handling garbage, which the people, themselves, make. He also makes good money and just imagine where we would be without him. The streets would be covered with garbage, smelling like hell, as was proved when the sanitation department went on strike.

Skilled workers are being killed off by technology. Machines are replacing them and usually don't do as good a job. I believe, if we make more of a demand for handmade goods, which are, indeed, finer, more skilled workers will appear.

MS. SALLY JENKINS, AGE 11

"WOMAN'S RIGHTS"

My opinion of woman's rights is that woman should have equal pay, equal job opportunities and be able to do anything they want. My main opinion is that the "liberation movement" is going too far. Some women (ladies) won't let a man open a door for them and they even let the man step out of the elevator first. That, I think, is ridiculous. Women are given all the advantages but some of them don't realize it! A group of my fellow females think that if a man pays for her dinner, he is discriminating against her; some ladies insist on going "Dutch Treat." That doesn't really matter to me but why go Dutch Treat when you don't have to?

TOM MAXWELL, AGE 12

On peace, I like to say: "let us have it!" For the New Year coming up, I sincerely want to have "peace" and not "piece".

This country has been undergoing a lot of change and I'm hopeful that she will not crack at her seams.

In the true revolutionary spirit that we once had almost 200 years ago, I depend on seeing New Sincerity for the rights of other individuals.

Let every adult or boy and girl see "where it's at" because we all have to live together.

HUNT RICHARDSON, AGE 13

WORLD COOPERATION

Nixon's trip to China has benefited the U.S. and China in many ways. There is one obvious way it has benefited the two countries which is an improved diplomatic relation. There are many other benefits but my main point is, could this lead to total and united cooperation with the Chinese if trips like this one were to be continued? Also, could it be a factor for world cooperation? I believe so. Perhaps in a couple of decades, we might all have only one system of currency, weight and measure. Using the metric system, for instance.

Who knows?, maybe this wonderful world cooperation thing could happen in five years.

I am for peace in this world just as much as anyone. Probably the best way to have peace, world peace, that is, is to have total world cooperation. So let's have more of these diplomatic trips.

ROBERT WHITEY, AGE 10

SCOUT POUT

It takes a certain amount of courage to wear a scout uniform these days. Other kids, who usually have nothing else to do, tease and make fun of our traditional "good guy" uniform. This is what I want and enjoy doing and the others wouldn't be on the outside long, if they knew the kind of fun I have.

Perhaps half the trouble is that there isn't enough future for a black father in Scouting.

The Boy Scout Council, on the level important enough to take a full-time salary paid job is full of rich men who enjoy getting together. They have a real good time talking about brotherhood and these folks ask each other for donations. The important thing is that these men do not benefit from knowing other men with less education and lower income simply because they discriminate by making their requirements so high. I think the practical knowledge and experience that ordinary working people have can be useful to my fellow scouts. I guess it's hard to fight an exclusive club and then Rockefeller probably wouldn't leave a big tip at lunch.

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW FAVORED BY WIDE MARGIN

HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a column by Ray McHugh, Washington Bureau Chief, Copley News Service, that appeared in the San Diego Union on March 30, 1972.

In his column, Mr. McHugh notes that a poll conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business shows 93 percent of the organization's 295,000 members favor enactment of H.R. 11827, a bill introduced by Congressman SAM STEIGER, myself, and 17 other cosponsors that would ban compulsory unionism.

According to McHugh, the federation reports that:

This is the largest majority recorded on any question in recent years. . . . No state registers less than 91 per cent support.

The complete text of the column follows:

RIGHT TO WORK PLAN SUPPORTED

(By Ray McHugh)

WASHINGTON.—A nationwide small business organization numbering almost 300,000 members is supporting proposed right to work legislation.

A bill by Rep. Sam Steiger, R-Ariz., would repeal clauses in the Nation Labor Relations Act and the Railway Act that give federal approval to compulsory union membership.

The National Right to Work Committee has urged President Nixon to throw the full weight of the administration behind efforts to hold hearings on Steiger's bill. The committee cited the AFL-CIO walkout from the President's wage control board as an example of "excessive union monopoly." It also is fighting Democrat-sponsored legislation that would establish collective bargaining procedures and authorize compulsory unionism for state and municipal employees.

The committee has won support from the National Federation of Independent Business. A poll of the federation's 295,000 members shows 93 per cent in favor of the Steiger bill, only 5 per cent opposed.

"This is the largest majority recorded on any question in recent years," reports the federation which regularly polls its membership on national policy issues. ". . . No state registers less than 91 per cent support."

BUSINESS VIEW

Many businessmen see compulsory unionism as the basis of union power which they feel has grown out of proportion and contributed to the "dictatorial" position of some union leaders, the federation says.

"Let the unions make their membership desired by workers," comments an Arkansas funeral director.

"Compulsory unionism is clearly not working for the benefit of members or the economic benefit of our country," wrote the owner of a Dallas manufacturing firm.

DENIES HARM

An Iowa business owner observes: "Iowa is a right-to-work state and this has not hurt the workers in any way. The good unions who are truly serving their members still get very high percentages of workers to join . . . but if the union fails in its purpose, the members get a chance to withdraw their support."

While outlawing the closed shop which enforced a "hire union members only" policy, the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 left the question of union shops (requiring union membership soon after hiring) to the states. Nineteen state legislatures have banned the union shop with right-to-work laws.

The 19 states have reported greater industrial growth in recent years than the other 31 states combined.

To men close to the labor and right-to-work movements only the overwhelming margin of the federation's poll is surprising. Surveys have demonstrated consistently public opposition to compulsory unionism.

A poll taken for the National Right to Work Committee by the Opinion Research Corp., Princeton, N.J., last year showed a national right-to-work law was favored by a 2-1 margin.

SURVEY RESULT

One of the earliest polls on the subject was taken by the American Institute of Public Opinion in 1957. It asked respondents if they would vote for a law stipulating that each worker had a right to hold his job, whether or not he joined a union. Sixty-three per cent said "Yes," including 33 percent of the union members polled.

A 1966 nationwide survey indicated a 63-25 margin in favor of a federal law making all union membership voluntary rather than compulsory.

AFL-CIO President George Meany allegedly has suppressed a John E. Kraft poll of union members that the AFL-CIO paid for. The Right to Work committee claims that poll shows union members disagree with Meany's wage-price stand and reflects deep misgivings about the AFL-CIO positions on political, social and economic matters.

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleagues in extending best wishes to the Honorable F. BRADFORD MORSE upon his appointment as Deputy Secretary General of the United Nations.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on which he also serves, I have had the opportunity to work with BRAD for many years. He has made a very important contribution to the shaping of our foreign policy undertakings. He has been imaginative and openminded in his approach to the problems which have confronted our committee, the Congress, and our Nation over the years. And he has persevered in working for the principles which he has considered important to the development of a more

stable, more peaceful, and more just world community.

We have not, of course, agreed on all of the issues which have been considered by our committee. This is only natural. I must say, however, that at all times I have found BRAD sincere, thoughtful, and very articulate in presenting his position and diligent in the discharge of his responsibilities.

I know that the cause of peace and international understanding is very close to BRAD's heart and I am confident that his new assignment will afford him ample opportunity to employ his considerable talents in supporting that cause.

We will miss BRAD MORSE in these halls. He has been a good friend and a valuable Member of the Congress. Our loss, however, will be the United Nation's gain.

My sincere congratulations, BRAD, and very best wishes for satisfaction and success in your new assignment. I hope that our paths will continue to cross for many years to come.

THIRTEENTH NATIONAL POLICY CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, today, hundreds of my colleagues in the House and Senate joined hundreds of delegates at a luncheon in the Rayburn Building sponsored by the American Israel Public Affairs Committee currently conducting their 13th National Policy Conference to celebrate the 24th anniversary of the State of Israel and to honor the distinguished Israeli Ambassador to the United States, Lt. Gen. Yitzhak Rabin.

A series of speeches were delivered from a distinguished list of leaders of the House and the Senate, including the Speaker, Mr. ALBERT, the minority leader, Mr. FORD, the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. MORGAN and Senators JAVITS and GRIFFIN.

Special tribute was paid to the group and its work by the dean of the House of Representatives Mr. CELLER.

Two speeches were of particular importance. The first was by Irving Kane who is the president of AIPAC and is a resident of my congressional district. The second statement was delivered by the Ambassador Rabin. The Ambassador enumerated the difficulties faced during the past year by Israel and recounted for the delegates the great assistance voted by the Congress to provide solutions to Israel's problems. General Rabin clearly noted the great help provided by the President as well.

At this point I would like to insert a copy of Mr. Kane's remarks followed by a copy of the complete schedule for this important AIPAC conference in Washington. This important statement clearly outlines the challenges of the past year

for Israel and those which lie ahead. The work of AIPAC in its earnest quest for an enduring and lasting peace for Israel and her neighbors is a great tribute to Mr. Kane and to I. L. Kenen, the executive vice president of AIPAC. Mr. Kane's statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY IRVING KANE

This function is a major part of the Annual Conference of AIPAC. We meet each year in Washington to consider how we can best serve the cause of American-Israel friendship—how we can deepen their mutual commitment—how we can help to achieve an Arab-Israel peace.

And so it is appropriate that we take counsel with our Congressmen—today, as we shall tomorrow with the Department of State.

As you know, AIPAC is a non-partisan organization. We have always appealed to and won support from both sides of the aisle.

We and our predecessors have brought our story to the national political conventions since 1944, when both parties came out for restoration of the Jewish Commonwealth.

This year we shall again present our views to the Platform Committee of both conventions in the hope that we may again win bipartisan reaffirmation of American interest and support for Israel. We urge you who will be participating in these conventions, to help us achieve this objective.

Much has happened in the 12 months since we last met. Much of it has happened as a result of the initiative of the Congress, and we who are concerned about the survival and peace of Israel, offer you our thanks.

At this luncheon last year our Committee appealed to our Government to take measures to strengthen Israel's economy and defenses. Since then the Congress has taken the initiative and included a supporting assistance grant in the Foreign Aid bill, the first such grant to Israel since 1959. In addition, Congress approved military credits, to enable Israel to acquire the weapons she must have, to deter further aggression against her.

Late last year, there was a renewed demonstration of support by the Congress, when 78 members of the Senate and 257 members of the House sponsored resolutions urging the United States, "without further delay," to take affirmative action on Israel's request for Phantom planes, and to provide such supporting equipment and assistance as are essential to maintain Israel's deterrent capability. That resolution also reaffirmed "the importance of secure and defensible borders as a vital element in a peace settlement to be negotiated by the parties themselves."

By this action, the Congress was informing the Administration that the people of our country are committed to Israel's survival. And equally important, the message was being conveyed to the Arab states and to the Soviet Union.

We have seen a convergence of American and Israeli interests in the Near East. United States recognition of Israel's economic and military needs is a manifestation of the closer relations that have developed since we last met. The Administration has responded vigorously in support of Israel.

There is now a far better understanding of America's interests and responsibilities in the Near East and we warmly commend the Administration for its much firmer commitment.

This year, we again urge you to give sympathetic consideration to Israel's needs for military credits and a supporting assistance grant. The Soviets, who have already provided Egypt and other Arab states with military equipment to the tune of many billions of dollars (some say over five billion), continue to provide them with sophisticated

weapons, and at the rate, according to one estimate, of \$5 million per day.

Some 20,000 Russian personnel are now stationed in Egypt—a sinister threat to Israel. There should be no diminution or relaxation in our support or in our vigilance.

For their part, the Israelis themselves have shouldered the major burdens of defense. They do not ask for our soldiers. They are prepared to defend themselves and are paying a huge price. They have gone deeply into debt.

And now there is a new and moving chapter in Israel's history. Since she was established, Israel has opened her doors and given sanctuary to every Jew in search of home and freedom. Now suddenly, for whatever reasons, Russian Jews are allowed to make their way to Israel. But their absorption constitutes a new challenge to the Israelis. Many of you in the Senate and House have sponsored the pending legislation to assist Israel to discharge this enormous responsibility.

We are pleased to note that recently the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted to include in the authorization for the Department of State the sum of \$85 million for this purpose. We are hopeful that this legislation will win final approval.

We appeal to you for your support of this humanitarian undertaking. You have—so many times in the past—reaffirmed the close ties of friendship between the U.S. and Israel. We trust that you will continue to do so, in the still perilous times ahead.

PROGRAM: AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, 13TH NATIONAL POLICY CONFERENCE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19

8:30 A.M., registration, Lobby, Shoreham Hotel.

10:00 A.M., opening of conference, Palladian Room, Shoreham Hotel.

Rabbi Eugene Lipman, Co-Chairman, Washington Committee, AIPAC.

Briefing, Isaiah L. Kenen.

Submission of Policy Statement.

Discussion.

(Buses will leave Shoreham Hotel at 11:30 A.M.)

12:15 P.M., luncheon, Room B-339, Rayburn Building, Capitol Hill.

Presiding, Irving Kane, Chairman, AIPAC. Ambassador of Israel, Lt. General Yitzhak Rabin.

Rep. Carl Albert, Speaker of the House.

Rep. Hale Boggs, Majority Floor Leader of the House.

Rep. Gerald Ford, Minority Floor Leader of the House.

Sen. Robert P. Griffin, Assistant Minority Floor Leader of the Senate.

Rep. Thomas E. Morgan, Chairman, House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

(Buses will leave Rayburn Building at South Capitol Street entrance at 2:00 P.M.)

2:15 P.M., symposium, Palladian Room, Shoreham Hotel.

Presiding, Albert E. Arent, President National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council.

"The Image of Israel," Zvi Brosh, Israel's Minister of Information.

Discussants:

Dr. Isaac Franck, Executive Vice President, Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington.

Milton Viorst, columnist.

Discussion from the floor.

(Buses will leave Shoreham Hotel for Kennedy Center at 4:30 P.M. & 5:30 P.M.)

Please see your invitation for time.

5:00-8:00 P.M. and 6:00-7:00 P.M., reception, The John F. Kennedy Center Concert Lounge (adjoining Concert Hall).

Tendered by the Ambassador of Israel and Mrs. Rabin.

(Because space is limited, this event must be held in two sessions. Please see your invitation for time.)

8:30 P.M., public meeting, Palladian Room, Shoreham Hotel.

"Israel on the World Scene."

Presiding, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, Honorary Chairman, AIPAC.

Dr. Hans J. Morgenthau, Professor Emeritus, University of Chicago.

Mrs. Rita Hauser, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Human Rights Commission.

Ambassador of Israel, Lt. General Yitzhak Rabin.

THURSDAY, APRIL 20

8:00 A.M., buffet breakfast, Forum Room, Shoreham Hotel.

9:00 A.M., executive session, Forum Room, Shoreham Hotel.

Presiding, Mrs. Max Schenk, President, Hadassah.

Briefing, "Background from Cairo".

Donald Bergus, United States Principal Officer, United States Interests Section, Cairo, 1967-1972.

Questions from the floor.

(Buses will leave from Shoreham Hotel for Capitol Hill at 10:30 A.M.)

11:00 A.M., appointment on Capitol Hill. Delegates may have lunch in cafeterias in Senate and House Office Building.

(Buses will leave Capitol Hill for the Department of State at 1:30 P.M.; from the Rayburn Building on South Capitol Street; from the Senate Office Building at First and Constitution Avenue; and from the Shoreham.)

2:00 P.M., briefing, International Conference Room, Department of State.

Assistant Secretary of State Joseph J. Sisco.

Questions from the floor.

(Buses will leave from the State Department to the Shoreham and Sheraton Park Hotels.)

(Buses will leave from the Sheraton Park and Shoreham Hotels for the Statler Hilton Hotel at 5:45 P.M.)

6:00 P.M., reception, Federal and South American Rooms, Statler Hilton Hotel.

7:00 P.M., dinner, Presidential Ballroom—Statler Hilton Hotel.

Presiding, Irving Kane.

The Foreign Minister of Israel Abba Eban. Isaiah L. Kenen.

AMERICAN ISRAEL PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Patrons: The Thirteenth National Policy Conference.

Albert E. Arent, Max Barash, Paul S. Berger, Jules Bernfeld, Hyman S. Bernstein, Norman Bernstein, Rabbi Isadore Breslau, Joel Breslau, Leon Cherner, N. M. Cohen.

Wallace Cohen, Mr. & Mrs. Jess Fisher, Joseph L. Fradkin, Leopold V. Freudberg, Henry Gertler, Aaron Goldman, Hymen Goldman, Milton M. Gottesman, Louis C. Grossberg, Mr. & Mrs. Alexander Hassan.

Jerold C. Hoffberger, Joel S. Kaufmann, Mrs. Isaiah L. Kenen, Paul D. Kerman, David Lloyd Kreger, Mr. & Mrs. Herman Lewis, Mrs. Harold Linder, Louis Marcus, Harvey M. Meyerhoff, Joseph Meyerhoff.

Joseph Ottenstein, J. H. Pearlstone, Jr., Nat Popick, Morris Rodman, Dr. Morris Rosenberg, Mrs. John Safer, Charles E. Smith, Mr. & Mrs. Marcus S. Smith, Donald E. Wolpe, Herman Wouk, Hanina Zinder.

Officers:

Chairman, Irving Kane.

Honorary Chairman, Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein.

Executive Vice Chairman, Isaiah L. Kenen.

Treasurer, Louis C. Grossberg.

Co-Chairman—Washington Committee: Mrs. Alexander Hassan, Rabbi Eugene Lipman. Suite 720—1341 G St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005—638-2256.

STRUGGLE FOR SUPREMACY IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, too often, in our review of international developments, we have been so long concerned with complications in the Mediterranean that the overall significance of that area is not quite appreciated. I felt, therefore, that the article by Harry Homewood in the *Suburbanite Economist* of April 12, was a very profound commentary with timely historic references and that it was a true public-service article reminding his readers of the strategic significance of the Mediterranean Sea.

The article follows:

HARRY HOMEWOOD COMMENTS

The Mediterranean has been a focal point of power down through history. Control over that body of water meant dominance over much of the land against which its seas washed. The picture is not so very different today. The sea where the galleys of the Barbary pirate Barbarossa ranged and fought bitterly with Admiral Andrea Doria is still an area of contention. But where once the struggle was resolved by the boarding pike now politics and economics are the weapons.

The recent crisis of Malta is an example of the continuing struggle for supremacy of the Mediterranean. Malta, an island, sits in the channel that connects the east and west basins of the Mediterranean. Britain has been paying the government of Malta \$10,000,000 a year to use its harbors for British naval vessels and to maintain military and air bases on the island.

Dom Mintoff, the premier of Malta, demanded an annual rental fee of \$45,000,000—or he said he would kick the British out and invite the Soviet Union in to use Malta as a Mediterranean base. After much agonizing Britain agreed to pay Malta \$13,000,000 a year and the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization will pay Malta an additional \$22,500,000 a year.

That isn't as much as Premier Dom Mintoff wanted, but the Maltese leader had an ace or two up his sleeve. Prior to the new agreement with Britain, Premier Mintoff had given the Soviet Union the right to use Malta's shipyards and harbors for refueling and repairs. He had, as well, given the Arab nations of the Middle East the right to establish military missions in Malta. And then, just to keep everything in balance, Dom Mintoff flew off to Peking to solicit economic aid from the Chinese, who, in all probability, will demand the right to establish at least a legation in Malta from which they can keep an eye on the Middle East—and the Soviet Union's naval fleet. There is much to look at in that direction; the Soviets have as many warships in the Mediterranean as the United States.

There isn't any doubt that the struggle for supremacy in the Mediterranean will go on for a long time. Premier Dom Mintoff may hold the keys to that struggle. The new agreement that allows Britain and the NATO forces (with the exception of the United States) to use Malta as a military base is only temporary. Premier Mintoff may demand even more money as annual rental next year. And the odds are that he will get it because no major sea power will be the first to give up its hold in the Mediterranean—a sea that has seen its waters incarnadined for centuries past and whose bottom holds the hulks of scores of warships sunk in battle.

EXPLOITING WASHINGTON PUPILS

HON. ROBERT McCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. McCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most objectionable trends which has occurred in recent years is the use of our public schools as testing grounds or stages for exploiting social and political schemes and issues. It is my considered belief that schools should be used essentially for the education of schoolchildren and not as forums for advancing social or political ends, no matter how lofty or idealistic the goals might seem to be to the promoters.

A flagrant abuse of the public schools was evidenced recently in the Nation's Capital, when the partisan promoters of an attack against President Nixon organized and carried out a reprehensible "Children's March for Survival." The schemes and devices which were employed, and the cheap political exploitation of innocent children which was practiced should bring public and official rebuke to those misguided and misinformed individuals and groups who perpetrated this spectacle.

A most perceptive article on this subject appeared in a recent—April 6, 1972—article in the Chicago Tribune by Nick Thimmesch, entitled "Exploiting Washington Pupils."

I am pleased to include this article, which I am attaching to these remarks.

EXPLOITING WASHINGTON PUPILS

(By Nick Thimmesch)

WASHINGTON.—The White House still fumes over last week's "Children's March for Survival," wherein some 10,000 Washington school children were mustered to protest government welfare programs, particularly President Nixon's proposed family assistance plan.

The spectacle of small children, recruited by the District of Columbia School Board, superintendent of schools and teachers, chanting "Nixon doesn't care" and carrying crude anti-Nixon signs, was galling to the President's men, who already take all manner of guff from the Republican right wing over Nixon's welfare reform proposals.

The march drew 20,000 folk, including a dreary array of elitist activists who plain hate Nixon; black "names" like Mrs. Martin Luther King who is trundled out for every last stunt; and Presidential aspirant Eugene McCarthy, now a sad and coldly desperate figure.

AND NO POINTS

The upshot was 1,000 children got lost and were found crying in a mess of chicken bones, garbage, and discarded bagfuls of bread; fierce denunciation in the press and in Congress for exploitation of children; and no apparent points scored at the congressional power center.

The demonstration won its key blessing with an endorsement at a March 1 meeting of the D.C. School Board [interrupted by a bomb threat] which listened to the persuasions of George Wiley, executive director of the National Welfare Rights Organization.

Then Supt. Hugh J. Scott ordered all school principals to distribute literature promoting the march, and also urged them to hold assemblies and focus on the march. One cartooned leaflet distributed in the schools showed Nixon scowling down on two

children and was captioned: "Peace, not war . . . Nixon doesn't care." The children were promised puppets, an art fair, balloons, and other entertainment. Anti-Nixon day would be fun.

Supt. Scott refused to criticize or withdraw the offensive leaflet. People were suddenly outraged.

School board member Bardyl R. Tirana, absent when the resolution passed, criticized the board and Scott's instant blind support, noted the irony of the board and Nixon agreeing on the notion that no welfare mother should be required to register for work and training until after her youngest child reaches the age of 6.

Indeed, Wiley's organization and other critics of the proposed Family Assistance Plan fear government control of children, and also charge that the Nixon program is inadequately funded. But Nixon's statements and veto of the child day-care bill go heavy on the notion of favoring family, rather than government, control of children. Moreover, the administration argues it's better to get some sort of welfare reform passed now, just to get it started, because the nation is fed up with the failure of the welfare system.

Above all, tho, this march, as dissenting board member Albert A. Rosenfield says, "is a sinful use of children for political exploitation." The complexities of welfare reform are too much for most adults and many congressmen to understand, much less school children.

LESSON IN HATE

What the children might have derived from this march was a lesson in hate of their government and their President.

One consequence is that the House subcommittee on District of Columbia appropriations might be of a mind to include an amendment in its upcoming bill which would prohibit the use of federal funds by D.C. school administrators or teachers for any partisan political activities. Another is a reinforcement of the conviction of many congressmen that home rule for the District of Columbia would turn out to be a painful, expensive folly.

INNOCENT BUSINESSES SUFFER
INDICTMENT

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is much political discussion these days about various tax inequities and loopholes which permit the wealthy to escape their proper tax obligations. However, many of us fear that far too wide a brush is being used to paint the picture with the result that the innocent are being indicted along with the few who may be guilty.

The political accusations being tossed around so freely have quite naturally created concern within the business community. This fact is evidenced by a letter I have received from Mr. Harry Heltzer, chairman of the board of the 3M Co. based in St. Paul, Minn.

Mr. Heltzer points out that in the period 1965 through 1971, his company alone has paid over \$1 billion in Federal, State, and local taxes in the United States, an amount representing over 51 percent of the company's U.S. book income. It is, therefore, a much more

sizable proportionate tax contribution than that paid by most individual taxpayers.

We should remind ourselves that business big and small is the mainspring of our private enterprise system. Its contributions through jobs and taxes have given the American people the highest standard of living of any people on earth. We must not let this superlative living standard be jeopardized by the victimization of innocent businesses.

I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete text of Mr. Heltzer's letter at this point in my remarks, and I hope that its contents will help to offset the damage being done by those more interested in their personal political future than in the truth:

3M Co.,

St. Paul, Minn., April 12, 1972.

HON. ANCHER NELSEN,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANCHER: In recent weeks, through a few widely reported news items, U.S. corporations have been cited as allegedly paying zero federal income taxes in 1971. I am not familiar with the circumstances surrounding the cases in question. However, it would be unfortunate if the public is misled by generalizations in the news media suggesting that U.S. corporations are avoiding their tax obligations. I am sure you recognize that the overwhelming majority of corporations, including 3M, have paid substantial taxes over many years.

You may be interested in knowing that in the period 1965 through 1971, the 3M Company has paid over \$1 billion in federal, state and local taxes in the United States. This amount represents over 51 percent of our U.S. book income.

In 1971, 3M's total U.S. tax payments exceeded \$151 million and in 1970, \$146.5 million, and continue to represent more than 50 percent of our U.S. income. As noted above, these amounts include federal and state taxes, as well as substantial amounts paid to the many local communities in which our facilities are located.

I hope this information proves useful to you as I'm sure you share my concern that any future tax legislation consider fully the substantial tax burden presently borne by the large majority of corporations, including 3M Company.

Sincerely,

HARRY.

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 18, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to join in the tribute which so many Members of the House have paid to our respected colleague F. BRADFORD MORSE of Massachusetts.

Having served for many years with BRAD on the House Foreign Affairs Committee and on numerous meetings of the Interparliamentary Union, where he served effectively as one of the U.S. delegates, I can attest to his foreign policy expertise. He is eminently well qualified to serve in his new position as United Nations Under Secretary General for Political and General Assembly Affairs.

BRAD is also a great individual. He is sincere, dedicated, and energetic, and, throughout his public career, he has exemplified the type of service which the public and his constituents expect in an elected official. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that, with his energy, talents, and, above all, thorough knowledge of world affairs, BRAD MORSE will be not only a credit to the United States in his new position at the U.N., but will also serve the world organization at a time when a resurgence of effectiveness is necessary in that organization.

I join the Members of the House who wish BRAD well in his assignment, and I am looking forward to continuing our friendship since the support of U.N. programs depends so much on the support of our Government and the Congress.

ISRAEL AT 24

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, how does a nation feel upon reaching the age of 24? In what manner does she view the world and in which position does she best perceive her own place and recognize her responsibility in meeting the challenges and reaching the hopes which lie in so many of our hearts? At 24, a nation has had time to learn, to grow, to develop a foundation of knowledge and insight, to act with sound judgment, and to think and evaluate with the quiet guidance of experience and understanding. These 24 years have brought with them significant pride in past achievements; Israel possesses the ability to stand firmly on her own feet and to perceive clearly what she wants and needs.

In 1948, Israel was established to provide a safe and secure home for the thousands of Jewish immigrants who sought refuge in her land. From its inception, therefore, she has been a nation ready to give strength, pride, employment, education, and an answer to the hopes of all those who sought a homeland and of all those who depended on her for their very survival. As chairman of the House Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality and as chairman, this year, of the annual Intergovernmental Committee on European Migration, I well understand the important place this nation holds in the hearts of those who have been uprooted throughout the world.

Israel has progressed at so rapid and surprising a pace, from constructing highways to Sharamelsheik, to building homes where marshland had formerly flourished, to creating expansive and well-respected universities, to forming cultural centers and a symphony orchestra esteemed and recognized throughout the world. We cannot forget, however, that the country is faced with complexities and difficulties; this would be true of any nation which has taken such giant steps in growth, in the absorption of immigrants, and in development. The problems within are augmented, as we well

know, by threats, fears, hostilities, and continued dangers from without. The country still mourns the death and destruction of its youth, with each son who goes to the Sinai and with each victim of cruel sniper fire.

Combined with an outlook and an approach implanted with realism, pragmatism, and with the continual fight for survival, at 24, Israel is a nation filled with the excitement, the vigor, and the idealism to look forward confidently to building a future of positive goals and of very special dreams.

Israel is 24 years old today. As she continues to move forward, those of us who share her dream for peace and progress reaffirm our belief and trust in the principles for which she stands.

SLAUGHTERHOUSE SIX

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Anthony Lewis, New York Times correspondent in London, has again placed American bombing of North Vietnam in perspective. His commentary will not make any American very comfortable, but this is not a time for complacency. He says:

For the truth is now impossible to escape if we open our eyes: The United States is the most dangerous and destructive power in the world. And its political leadership seems virtually immune to persuasion by reason and experience.

This is strong language but who, having experienced the last 7 years of Vietnam war debate, can deny Mr. Lewis' observations.

And the fear expressed recently in the Financial Times of London by Theo Sommer, deputy editor of Die Zeit, and repeated by Mr. Lewis, I also heard expressed during recent visits to Europe: continuation of the Vietnam war may lead to a revulsion by Americans against all U.S. military commitments. We are already seeing evidence of this. Next to the grave effects the war is having on our society, this is the most serious effect of our nonending war involvement. Our people will no longer distinguish between valid U.S. security interests and spurious ones. We must end our military involvement in Indochina.

Lewis' April 17 column follows:

[From the New York Times, April 17, 1972]

SLAUGHTERHOUSE SIX

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, April 16.—In my generation we grew up believing in America. We knew there was a fundamental decency and humanity in our country, whatever its wrongs, and openness: The wrongs could be changed by reason and persuasion.

The violent anti-American rhetoric of the radicals and the young has therefore repelled us. To call the United States an aggressive country, so tightly controlled that only revolution could change its course, seemed the stuff of fantasy. A general might talk about bombing the Vietnamese back to the Stone Age, but our political system would never allow it.

That faith in America has been sorely tested in these last years, but never more terribly than by Richard Nixon's bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong. For the truth is now impossible to escape if we open our eyes: The United States is the most dangerous and destructive power in the world. And its political leadership seems virtually immune to persuasion by reason and experience.

It is seven years—seven years!—since Lyndon Johnson began bombing North Vietnam. Literally millions of tons of American explosives have been dropped on Indochina since then, but the peninsula is no more "secure"—secure for the American system that we want to impose on it. Only a fool or a madman could believe, now, that more bombing will bring peace to Indochina.

Why are we bombing? To keep Nguyen Van Thieu in office in Saigon. To make sure that Nixon is not the first American President to lose a war. To teach the Russians a lesson about supplying arms to our enemies.

Those are some of the reasons that are advanced. To state them is to laugh, because none of them could remotely justify the disproportionate cost of the bombing in human or political terms.

Proportion: That is the terrible failure of American policy in Vietnam. Of course the Communists are fighting the war too, and attacking in the South, and killing human beings. But they are doing so in what they regard as their own country, for a genuine cause and at immense sacrifice to themselves. The United States is dropping bombs from 50,000 feet above a country thousands of miles from our shores, for no cause that Americans can state. How different the moral equation would be if the officials and the generals who give the bombing orders ever found their own lives at risk.

It is the old question of means and ends. For American leadership in the world there is no more important question. Our allies have accepted our leadership because they believed we would exercise our power with restraint and wisdom.

Englishmen and Frenchmen will not easily lose their affection for America, and certainly not their fear of Communist tyranny, but they can hardly help noticing that it is not the Russians or the Chinese but the Americans who are bombing a distant country for reasons of pride and pique.

Yes, pique. Thinking about it, one realizes that that is the real reason for the escalation: Richard Nixon does not know how else to react to the Communists' advances on the ground, so he has chosen to punish them by slaughter in the mass. That is the ultimate disregard of the relationship between means and ends. It passes mistake and approaches crime.

The effect on Indochina will be to delay still further the adjustment to political reality that must some day take place—reconciliation among the people who inhabit the peninsula. Bombing can only destroy and embitter.

For America's place in the world, too, there must be damage. The reason was expressed the other day—before the expanded bombing—by a German known to American strategists as an outstanding thinker on alliance problems, Theo Sommer, deputy editor of Die Zeit.

Writing in The Financial Times of London, Mr. Sommer said: "It would be sad to see South Vietnam go down, but fatal to see the United States go in again." For "re-escalation" by the America side, he said, would make more likely an eventual American "revulsion" against military commitments elsewhere, notably in Europe.

But the most disastrous effects of the bombing escalation must be inside the United States. For no society can be at peace within when it begins to see itself as a destroyer outside.

What is left to say to these who question the very nature of America? After seven years, it is not possible to go on saying that it will all work out, that peaceful change within the political system will have its effect eventually. I cannot believe myself that violence improves the lot of mankind. The only hope left is that somehow—in some new form of protest—the decent strain in American life will make itself felt. The alternative is black despair.

AMERICAN ASSEMBLY ON THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, during the past weekend I had the privilege of participating in the American Assembly on the United States and the United Nations at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y. For 3 days, approximately 40 persons—including former U.S. Ambassadors to the U.N., distinguished scholars on international organization affairs, Members of Congress, officials of the executive branch, and prominent citizens interested in the United Nations—met to discuss the role of the United States in the United Nations—past, present, and future. At a later date, Columbia University will publish the report of the Assembly.

One of the most significant statements of the 3-day meeting was made by former Supreme Court Justice and Ambassador to the U.N., Arthur J. Goldberg. He cited the need for all member nations to return to the principles of the U.N. Charter and breathe new life into them. The great powers, including the United States, tend to turn to the U.N. only when world political problems have become insoluble, or when they think the U.N. might achieve their national goals for them. Ambassador Goldberg commented on these tendencies:

Our government, for example, should ask itself not how the United Nations can help it do what it wants done in Vietnam, but how it should conform its Vietnam policy to its United Nations commitments.

If the charter system is to work, the members of the United Nations, including the United States, will have to ask themselves not just what the United Nations can do for them, but what they can do to build a regime of law for the resolution of differences.

Implicit in this statement is the requirement that nations must accept the risk of adverse judgment in the United Nations, something we and the other leading members have been unwilling to do. Noting that never in the 27-year history of the United Nations has this country accorded the world organization such a low priority in its foreign policy, Ambassador Goldberg called upon President Nixon to act on his state of the world declaration that "the end of bipolarity requires that the structure [of peace] must be built with the resources and concepts of many nations."

I insert Ambassador Goldberg's com-

plete statement in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS BY ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG

Before addressing myself specifically to the subject of the United States and the United Nations, I should like to say some words about the United Nations in general. In doing so, I want to go beyond the usual, albeit true, generality that the United Nations, with all its faults, is indispensable and our best hope for peace. I want to offer some thoughts on the role of the United Nations in peacemaking and peacekeeping.

In discussing this subject I do not minimize, in the least, the importance of the U.N.'s work in economic and social development, in human rights, in science and technology, and in new areas like the human environment, population control, and the seabed. I want to emphasize, however, that unless the U.N. is made a more effective instrument for peacemaking, its other activities may all evaporate one day in a mushroom cloud.

Nor do I wish to diminish in any way the vital role the United Nations has played in several areas in deploying military forces to contain and control violence. On the contrary, I believe the time has come to strengthen the peace-keeping capacity of the United Nations, and I fully endorse the recommendations made on this subject by the Policy Panel of the United Nations Association headed by President Kingman Brewster of Yale and former Ambassador Cyrus Vance.

Peacekeeping is important, of course. But we cannot keep a peace we haven't got—and we simply do not have peace in the world. Rather, in the recent past, major conflicts have occurred and at least one—Vietnam—is still going on. Therefore, we need greater attention to making the peace. The very first paragraph of the very first article of the United Nations Charter declares that one of the purposes of the organization is "to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace."

We need greater attention to this purpose—and to the solemn treaty commitment that all United Nations members have taken in Article II, Paragraph 3, to "settle their disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered."

And we need to breathe a new life into the provisions of Article 33, which declares that the parties to any dispute, the continuation of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, should "first of all"—I repeat, *first of all*—"seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

I think it is obvious to all that these provisions are not being implemented sufficiently today. Indeed, they are the great underdeveloped areas of the Charter.

The peaceful settlement of disputes is not a Utopian dream. It is a practical necessity for survival in the nuclear age. Nations, like individuals, will resort to self-help and violence unless they have some other means for the satisfaction of their legitimate grievances.

I have no illusions that institutions by themselves can be the chapter. In the international as in the domestic community, institutions are of no avail unless there is the political will to make them work.

It is the absence of this political will that is at the root of the United Nations' difficulties today. Virtually all members pay lip service to the United Nations while at the

same time pursuing their short-term advantage, ignoring them when they do not.

This is true of all countries—large, middle and small. It is true of the United States as well as of the Soviet Union, and I have no doubt that it will be true of the People's Republic of China. Our government, for example, should ask itself not how the United Nations can help it to do what it wants to do in Vietnam, but how it should conform its Vietnam policy to its United Nations commitments.

If the charter system is to work, the members of the United Nations, including the United States, will have to ask themselves not just what the United Nations can do for them, but what they can do to build a regime of law for the resolution of differences. Then and only then can the world organization be what U Thant said it should be—a place for the reconciliation of differences, not just a place where they manifest themselves.

What does this mean in specific terms?

It means that in the interest of saving the community of nations, each nation must recognize that it cannot have its way on every issue. Nations must accept the risks of adverse judgment. And they must also accept the responsibility of making judgments on controversies in which other nations are involved, with greater attention to the merits and less concern with bloc affiliations and the protection of their own interests.

If the members of the United Nations—and particularly the United States—were to take this attitude toward their Charter obligations, I believe we could make real progress toward a more effective peacemaking system.

It is in light of these general observations that I now address myself to the specific subject of this Assembly.

In the "State of the World" Report to Congress on February 9, 1972, President Nixon set forth his philosophy of a "new American foreign policy." In the President's words, the "core principles" of this philosophy embrace these concepts:

"The end of the bipolar postwar opens to this generation a unique opportunity to create a new and lasting structure of peace.

"The end of bipolarity requires that the structure must be built with the resources and concepts of many nations—for only when nations participate in creating an international system do they contribute to its vitality and accept its validity."

If multipolarity involving "the resources and concepts of many nations" is to be the basis of our new foreign policy, rather than bipolarity, embracing essentially those of the two super powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, one would naturally assume that the President's new foreign policy envisions a strengthened and reinvigorated United Nations.

This assumption would be unwarranted. The President's quest for a "new and lasting structure of peace" envisions and institutional approach separate and apart from the United Nations.

Never, since its creation in 1945, has the United Nations been so downgraded as an important component of American foreign policy as it is today under the present Administration.

The Administrations own statements and actions vis-a-vis the United Nations show how little the U.N. now enters into the philosophy and execution of our foreign policy.

In fairness, it needs to be said that a Democratic Congress shares responsibility with the Administration for the present lack or regard by our government for the United Nations. There is, however, an important difference between the present Administration and prior ones—Republican and Democratic—regarding Congressional attitudes towards the United Nations. Prior administrations vigorously resisted Congressional attempts to undercut our participa-

tion in and support of the U.N.; the present Administration at best gives lip service only to opposing such attempts. Notable cases in point are the present Congressional default in appropriating the federal government's share for necessary expansion of U.N. headquarters in New York and, more important, the Congressional sabotage of our continued participation in the International Labor Organization (ILO). The Administration's efforts to overcome such ill-conceived Congressional action have been, to say the least, less than wholehearted.

The United Nations has learned to live through and survive many crises—political and economic. What is new in the present situation is that there is a crisis in the relations of the United States and the United Nations—political and economic. U.S. relations with the U.N. are so strained and attenuated as to threaten the very survival of the United Nations. I do not believe it can be gainsaid that without vigorous support by the United States, the United Nations cannot long endure.

One of the reasons advanced for the Administration's disregard of the United Nations in its new foreign policy is the U.N.'s inability to cope with crises of the present and recent past—Vietnam, Bangladesh, Czechoslovakia and the Middle East—to cite only some examples.

This sense of frustration is shared by all, including the U.N.'s strongest friends and adherents. If frustration was the basic cause of the Administration's attitudes concerning the U.N., it could and probably would be alleviated either by the passage of time, including some future U.N. success in peace-making or peace-keeping, or by such reforms of the U.N. as are suggested in Professor Gardner's excellent and comprehensive background paper.

In my view, however, the Administration, in writing off the United Nations as an instrument for building peace, is acting out of a deep-rooted philosophy rather than responding to frustration. Basically, the President's philosophy is not multipolarism in the sense of the Charter of the United Nations. Rather, it is multipolar in a balance of power sense—scarcely a new concept in foreign policy. The multipolarism of the President seems more accurately described as tripolarism—groupings of nations and alliances around the three great superpowers, the U.S., Soviet Union and China.

Underlying the President's philosophy, I believe, is the conviction that what nations really respect is not "the law of the Charter" but political power. This view was expressly articulated by the late Dean Acheson. Mr. Acheson described our present era as going through "a withdrawal of the legal order" in which sheer power is more decisive in international affairs, and law, especially that of the United Nations, has become little more than a mockery.

It is my belief that we should beware of accepting a philosophy of either national or international affairs in such a way that law and power become antithetical. In real life, law and power operate together. Power not ruled by law is a menace; but law not served by power is a delusion.

The Charter of the United Nations is law, particularly for us, since under the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution a treaty, such as the Charter, is part of the Supreme Law of the land. The Charter is a good law and neither we nor any other nation should withdraw from the legal regime it prescribes. And that we are withdrawing, in considerable measure, is becoming more and more apparent. Again, in fairness, it should be said that past administrations participated in this withdrawal, e.g., our failure to resort to the U.N. before heavy military involvement in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic. But the commitment to withdrawal

is more evident in this Administration than any previous one.

I hope that the deliberations of this Assembly will help in reversing this direction of the President's new American foreign policy.

Instead of abandoning the U.N., the Administration should be addressing itself to the real problem involved; namely, how to put the power of the U.N.'s member nations, and particularly the power of the great nations, to the service of the law of the Charter—to the service of world peace and security. If the law of the Charter is, in many instances, a delusion, as it has been, it is because of the unwillingness of the great powers, including ourselves, to put their power to serve the law which they agreed should govern the international community.

As a nation committed to the rule of law here and abroad, we should take the lead role in advancing and supporting proposals to this end. It is neither seemly nor in our national interest for the United States, a principal architect of the United Nations, to undermine its foundations, and this we are now doing.

I am a realist, and, therefore, ask the Administration what other alternative to the U.N. do we realistically have? The President, in the report from which I have quoted, says "that the end of the bipolar postwar world opens to this generation a unique opportunity to create a new and lasting structure of peace" and "that the structure must be built with the resources and concepts of many nations." The President nowhere defines, except in balance of power terms, the institutional structure he would create. If the search for peace is to be institutionalized, and it surely must, then a structure is required. And if a structure is required, why start from scratch and build a new one when we have on hand the United Nations? It is a weak structure which needs to be buttressed by our support rather than allowed to fall in ruins by our increasing neglect and disregard.

The American people do not want to witness, let alone be responsible for, the decline and fall of the United Nations. Polls show that although a majority of the people now believe the U.N. is not doing an adequate job, an overwhelming majority of the American people would like to see the United Nations become a stronger organization rather than the weak one it now is. In response to the Gallup poll question (October 1970), "Would you like to see the United Nations become a stronger organization?" 84% said yes and only 8% said no. In this overwhelming expression of the American desire to strengthen the U.N., the United States led all other countries in the world.

The Administration would do well to heed the peoples' voice. It reflects a common sense and realistic appreciation that the United Nations, with all its many faults, is indispensable in our Nation's quest for peace.

The "real politick" of the Administration seems to me to reflect a dream of an international Utopia in which a few great states would use their power to settle the affairs of the world, much as the major powers of Europe did in the century after the Congress of Vienna. But we should remember that when the rule of the concert of Europe finally fell apart, world war ensued. This happened in great part because, in large areas of the world, the international order of the nineteenth century did not redress grievances but merely submerged them—until in our own century they erupted in revolution and world war.

The world law we should seek would be different. It would extend impartially to white and black, north and south, old and new. This law, in other words, is the unrealized law of the Charter. It would still be imperfect, as the U.N. is now imperfect; it would still depend for its effectiveness, as the

U.N. does, on the willingness of the stronger nations to put their power at its service. But it will embrace in a spirit of equality all the races and cultures of the world—and it will address itself to the real troubles of mankind: poverty, inequality, and the deprivation of rights. In that respect, it will surpass even the hundred years' peace of the Congress of Vienna, which was based on the subjection or impotence of half the world's people's.

Our nation derives its great influence in the world not only from great physical power but also from the fact that our basic law and our national outlook are premised on the equality and dignity of all men. The way to peace in this turbulent age is to keep to that national vision and to extend it to the international sphere; to work with all our might for the strengthening of the U.N. as the structure of law and enduring peace. For though the United Nations alone cannot assure world peace, there can be no peace without it. Our national power and all our energies should operate in the light of that truth.

FROM GATHERING OF WATERS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to learn recently that a constituent of mine, Miss Suzanne Hoogesteger of Rudolph, Wis., has been chosen essay winner of the sixth grade history competition sponsored by the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Miss Hoogesteger has compiled as her entry a most interesting history of the State of Wisconsin and am pleased to commend her on her essay, the text of which follows:

FROM GATHERING OF WATERS . . .

(By Suzanne Hoogesteger)

In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth, and He created me, Wisconsin, the 30th state of the United States of America.

Over a billion years ago, parts of me were covered by shallow, silent oceans. I was one of the first portions of the present surface of the earth to rise out of the original ancient sea. Some geologists believe I was the very first land created. Red Rocks found through the central northern part of me are called the most ancient rocks in the world. They are estimated to be about 1,600 million years old! At least a dozen times I was subjected to cycles of sea, emergence of dry land, and development of streams that carried new valleys, hills, & plains.

The last of my great geological periods was the Ice Age which ended 25,000 to 50,000 years ago. Huge massive glaciers from Canada covered my rough surface. It broke down mountains into hills and hills into little mounds. The glaciers carried away much of my soil. About a quarter of my land in the southwest corner escaped the glaciers. After many hundreds of years, the glaciers finally melted. They left many lakes and ponds in my valleys and low spots.

Many different kinds of people have inhabited my lands. As long as 8,000 years ago, what we now know as the Copper Culture Indians lived here. They pounded copper out of rocks and made useful items and jewelry.

Less than 100 years before white men came to Wisconsin, a cannibalistic people roamed my lands. They have been given the name of Aztalans because of the resemblance in their

way of living to the Aztecs of Mexico. They ate other people because they believed they would inherit the strength of those eaten!

When the first white explorers came to visit me in the early 1600's, they found many different tribes of Indians. In what is now Door County lived the Potowotomi. My oldest resident Indians, the Menominee, or "rice eaters" lived on the north shore of the Green Bay. The Winnebago or "men of the sea" made their home at the mouth of the Fox River. Other Indian tribes were the Mascouten, Sauk, Fox, Ojibwa or Chippewa, Sioux and Kickapoo. These Indians lived in little huts and tents made of bark and rushes. They hunted, trapped, and fished for their food.

Through my long and exciting history, I have been called by many names. The Chippewas called me Wees-kon-San, which meant "gathering of water." When Father Marquette traveled my mighty river in 1673, I was given the name Meskousing, meaning "red stone" which they found alot of along the banks of my largest river. Father Hennepin in 1683 chose to call me Misconsin or Miskonsing because of the strong current and wild rushing channel of my river. The oldest French documents spell my name, oh- so many ways: Misconsin, Ouisconsin, Ouisconsin and later Ouisconsin. Historians can't agree just what this Algonquin word meant. Suggested meanings are: "hole of the muskrat" "holes in the bank of a stream in which birds nest"

"muskrat lodge"

"good place to live"

"gathering or meeting of waters"

In the early 1800's, I appeared on maps as Wisconsin and, as you know me today, Wisconsin. In 1836, I became a territory and my name became officially Wisconsin.

Eons of time have passed. Feet have trudged . . . men have toiled . . . today, I stand, Wisconsin.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Wisconsin: Bernadine Bailey, Albert Whitman & Company, Chicago, Ill.

Wisconsin: Allen Carpenter, Childrens Press, Chicago, Ill.

Badger Tales: Clara L. Tutt, Lyons & Carnahan.

Wisconsin Magazine of History: State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Sept. 1942, Sept. 1946.

Wisconsin: R. G. Thwaites, Houghton Mifflin Company.

Wisconsin, Its History & People, Vol I: Milo Qualfe, S. J. Clarke Publishing Company.

Wisconsin . Story: Austin, Milwaukee Journal.

Wisconsin Blue Book 1925—article: W. O. Hotchkiss State geologist of Wisconsin.

History of Wisconsin Territory: Moses Strong, Democrat Printing.

The Romance of Wisconsin Place Names: Robert E. Gard & L. G. Sorden, October House Inc.

Forty-Seven Wisconsin Stories: Mary G. Muggah & Paul H. Rathle, Chippewa Falls Book Agency.

JOHNNY UNITAS HONORED

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to a person whose name is familiar to nearly every American and especially to those living in the Baltimore-Washington area. He is

Johnny Unitas, the great quarterback of the Baltimore Colts, whose brilliant career is truly a guiding light for all aspiring young football players.

Johnny Unitas was recently honored by the Maryland House of Delegates, and his many achievements are detailed in the house resolution which was drawn up in his honor. Mr. Speaker, I insert the resolution into the Record at this point:

MARYLAND HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 79

House Resolution honoring John Unitas on his brilliant career with the Baltimore Colts and, in particular, for his display of physical and mental courage and total commitment demonstrated by his recovery from an Achilles tendon injury in 1971

John Unitas has become a legend in his own time in the annals of professional football. He undoubtedly holds more individual records for quarterbacks than anyone else in the history of the game.

As an example, Johnny has completed more passes for more yardage, more touchdowns and more mileage than any player in National Football League history. As of the completion of the 1970 season, his credentials would show that he had 2,616 completions in 4,777 attempts (54.8%) for 37,715 yards, 280 touchdowns and over 21 miles. He holds the incredible record of having thrown a touchdown pass in 47 straight games during the period 1956 to 1960. Among other records that he holds are most passes attempted in a career, most games passed for 300 yards or more (25), most touchdown passes in a career, the league record for passing yardage in a Championship Game (349) against the New York Giants in 1958, a game known as "The Greatest Game Ever Played." He naturally holds every Baltimore Colt club passing mark.

Mr. Football has had many injuries throughout his brilliant career, the last big one being in 1968 which caused him to miss most of the season prior to 1971. At the age of 38, in April of 1971, he ruptured his right Achilles tendon, an injury which has terminated the careers of many athletes in sports less strenuous than football. At that age, and with his many injuries sustained in the past, Johnny Unitas could easily have "called it a day" and gracefully retired from football. However, this would not have been a reflection of his indomitable spirit. His dedication, his mental courage, and his physical commitment led him to a recovery which, from the standpoint of time, made it close to a physical miracle, and he was able to see his first action in the opening League game of the 1971 season.

Johnny U was all pro six times, selected to the Pro Bowl 10 times, and is a three-time NFL Most Valuable Player. He was, also, selected by the Nation's fans as NFL Man of the Year in 1971, an award which resulted in five Baltimore area youths sharing \$25,000 in scholarship money. In Maryland, they speak of Johnny U and "Fly the Friendly Skies of Unitas," and all who hear know the man these saying represent; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That John Unitas is hereby honored on his brilliant career with the Baltimore Colts and, in particular, for his display of physical and mental courage and total commitment demonstrated by his recovery from an Achilles tendon injury in 1971; and, be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to John Unitas, Carroll Rosenbloom, Steve Rosenbloom, Alvin "Pete" Rozelle (Commissioner of the NFL), and the National Football Hall of Fame in Canton, Ohio.

SCANDANAVIANS BACK OSTPOLITIK

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor, in a report in today's editions from Oslo, outlines the attitudes of the Scandinavian countries toward West German Chancellor Brandt's Ostpolitik. In particular, Scandinavian views toward the coming vote in the West German Bundestag on approval of the German-Soviet and German-Polish treaties are described by correspondent Harry B. Ellis.

His conclusion is that a defeat of the Eastern treaties, and therefore, of Brandt's Ostpolitik, would gravely affect the confidence of the northern European countries in the Common Market and in the whole role of Germany in Western Europe.

Mr. Ellis' article, which follows, is an interesting account of the crucial role of the coming Bundestag vote:

SCANDINAVIANS BACK OSTPOLITIK

(By Harry B. Ellis)

OSLO.—"Just below the surface," said the tall, gray-haired man quietly, "there is always the question: Are the Germans reliable?"

Speaking was Trygve Bratteli, Prime Minister of Norway, who spent the wartime years in a Nazi concentration camp while his country was occupied by the German Army.

"I think all of Norwegian opinion," he continued, "not only the Labor Party, would regret it very much if Brandt's Eastern treaties were to be defeated."

I had asked Mr. Bratteli how Norwegians would react, if the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) opposition in Bonn succeeded in blocking ratification of Chancellor Willy Brandt's treaties on normalization with the Soviet Union and Poland.

"If Brandt's Ostpolitik is defeated, it will be a great setback for peace in Europe." This was Olof Palme, Sweden's young Social Democratic Prime Minister, answering the same question in Stockholm.

"Brandt," declared Mr. Palme, "is a symbol of a new Germany. He persuades even the Danes and the Norwegians that the Germans can be trusted."

Danish Prime Minister Jens Otto Krag spoke of specific consequences for Denmark, if Mr. Brandt's policy should be overturned.

"Defeat of Brandt's Eastern treaties," said the husky Danish leader, "would be a heavy burden on our struggle to join the Common Market."

"I prefer to put it another way," replied Mr. Bratteli. "Success of Brandt's Ostpolitik would make it much easier for Norwegians to accept going into the Market."

Both Denmark and Norway face critical parliamentary tests and national referendums on whether or not to join the European Economic Community (EEC).

Mr. Palme was blunt. "They [the Danes and Norwegians] will lose their referendums, if Brandt is defeated. That is simply a fact."

Mr. Palme's government is negotiating only a limited form of association with the EEC. So the Common Market question is less acute for him than for the Danish and Norwegian leaders. Experts say that the Danish and Norwegian standards of living will drop by 5 to 10 percent, if the two nations stay outside an enlarged EEC.

All three Scandinavian leaders, interviewed by this reporter in their respective capitals, stressed that trust of Mr. Brandt among their peoples extends far beyond the ranks of their own Social Democratic Parties.

"There is a feeling among Danes," remarked Mr. Krag, "that much of the economic co-operation developed by the Common Market has resulted partly from its political and foreign-policy outlook."

"There would be a psychological change in Denmark," he said, "if a German Government came in, which had rejected a key part of this foreign-policy outlook."

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS REHABILITATION-EDUCATION CENTER

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I know we have all observed at one time or another a physically handicapped person using either crutches or a wheelchair or other artificial means of transporting himself. Recently, a reporter on the Champaign-Urbana News Gazette did a series of articles on the Rehabilitation-Education Center at the University of Illinois. Carol Mathers' first article relates to her own personal experience in using a wheelchair and meeting all circumstances as any other handicapped person. It follows and I am sure my colleagues will find this one and the subsequent ones of great interest:

AN OVERWHELMING FEELING OF HELPLESSNESS:
A DAY IN A WHEELCHAIR—MORE PUSHING—
MORE RAMPS—MORE COLD

(By Carol Mathers)

The overwhelming feeling was one of helplessness.

Having enjoyed excellent health for twenty-plus years, I take it for granted. Being able-bodied is my right. Right?

Wrong.

Because every year more than 200,000 people suffer spinal injuries which permanently paralyze them and put them in wheelchairs for the rest of their lives.

I had talked to several such people, all of them UI students enrolled through the Rehabilitation-Education Center at the university. They had tried to prepare me for the experience. But talking about it and doing it are two different things.

One does not, I discovered, simply sit down in a wheelchair and push off. Like driving or flying, wheelchair operating requires special instruction.

I had to be "fitted" for a chair—one that was not too heavy, not too wide, not too cantankerous. Next I had to learn how to use it.

In one cram course I learned the fundamentals of wheeling (wrist action is all-important), turning (it is not considered cheating to use the nearest wall to help you round a corner), stopping (not as difficult as I had anticipated) and curb hopping (this one's tricky).

I also learned that decent clothes, long fingernails, rings and watches are all taboo. There is no "clean" way to push a wheelchair even in dry weather—the insides of your arms get filthy from rubbing against the wheel. Fingernails catch and break in the wheel spokes, rings and watches cause blistering.

Thus forewarned, I arrived at the Center the following morning in jeans and grubby

sweater, completely devoid of jewelry. Also completely devoid of confidence.

Fortunately I was not going to have to solo my first time out. I had been assigned a "wheelchair buddy," sophomore Ed Scherer whose diving accident two years ago left him a quadriplegic (paralysis in all four extremities).

With flaming red hair and beard, Ed was the picture of enthusiasm. Throughout the day this enthusiasm never flagged, and he showed superhuman amounts of patience, kindness, and encouragement. He immediately made me feel like one of the gang and when a staff member of the Center jokingly asked Ed, "Who's your gimpy friend?" I was actually proud to belong to the club.

Of course, they could have made it easy for me—but they didn't. Tim Nugent, director of the Center briefed us before we set out and directed Ed to take me to "every difficult place" he could think of. The campus itself, thanks largely to Nugent's efforts, is completely accessible to people in wheelchairs. But the outside community certainly is not.

We were assigned our own private bus—one of the five operated by the Center and specially equipped with hydraulic lifts for wheelchairs. The bus driver's name was Martin. In the course of the day it became apparent that Martin knew as much about campus accessibility as the kids themselves.

Our first stop was the supermarket, one of the "everyday living experiences" Nugent thought I should encounter. Marketing in a wheelchair is no small job. What would ordinarily have taken me five minutes to accomplish took almost half an hour.

In the first place, the way merchandise is stacked in supermarkets makes it impossible for a wheelchair shopper to reach the top-most item. And no matter how gingerly I tried to extract one of the boxes stacked near the bottom, I was in constant danger of being buried alive.

Then there's the problem of produce. By wheeling up alongside the refrigerated counter, I could just manage to reach the lettuce lined up near the front. If that particular head didn't suit me, there was no way for me to examine and choose from among the others—they were out of reach.

Meat selection presented a similar problem—fortunately all the chicken looked pretty good that day.

Pushing a grocery cart is an impossibility, so I stacked my purchases in my lap and wheeled to the checkout counter. Another obstacle—the check-out lanes are much too narrow for wheelchairs. So I waited until the girl had bagged my groceries, then holding the bag in my lap I wheeled for the door.

One more impediment—the only door I could get to in a wheelchair was the "In" door. Electronically operated, the "In" door opens, naturally enough, in—but not out. So a clerk had to be summoned to go out and step on the mat to open the door for me.

Back on the bus again our next stop was the UI Assembly Hall. From the ridiculous to the sublime—the Assembly Hall is a model of accessibility, built with wheelchair patrons in mind. The ramps, though somewhat steep, lead everywhere, and there is even a special place reserved for wheelchairs around the top of the first section. We were in and out in five minutes.

Next Ed asked Martin to drive us over to campus so I could tackle the job that every wheelchair student faces every day—getting to class.

The UI campus is no place for the faint-hearted. It was a Herculean struggle for me just to keep my wheelchair moving in a straight line. (The sidewalks tend to slope in one direction and I was constantly drifting that way.)

Getting up some of the ramps was an almost insurmountable challenge. When I finally got up the ramp at Mumford Hall which requires going halfway up the ramp,

stopping, pulling open a door, pushing through it and then on up to the top of the ramp) I was as proud as if I'd conquered Mt. Everest.

The Math and English buildings and Lincoln Hall were almost as difficult, but by that time I was feeling like an old pro. The problem was all the pushing we had to do between buildings—by the time we actually arrived, I was too exhausted to try to get in.

As we went from bus stop to bus stop Martin kept up a running commentary on the accessibility of various buildings. He and Ed, who is chairman of a committee on campus accessibility, agreed that while a wheelchair student can get into any building on campus, it isn't always as easy as it might be.

"We generally refer to this as the maintenance man's tour," Ed told me as we progressed from building to building. "Often you'll find, that the only door you can get through and enter by is in the basement."

Still, the basements were warm—which is more than we could say for the weather outside. It rained, of course. A fine, freezing mist that penetrated through any number of sweaters and a parka. The rehab kids hate winter and I was beginning to—it isn't easy in any weather—but when there's snow and slush on the ground, it's twice as hard.

As soon as my wheels got wet they threw the slush up the sides of my chair and it wasn't long before my sleeves were soaked and I was frozen through. Ed wasn't faring much better, so we were glad when we could use lunch as an excuse to take a break.

Martin drove us back to the Center and we got permission to use the driver education car which is specially equipped with hand controls. Ed—who drives his own similarly equipped car all the way home to Long Island for vacations—showed me how to stow a wheelchair in the back seat in less than five minutes. He said it used to take him more than an hour, but he's improved with practice. I was beginning to see that people confined to wheelchairs don't go anywhere in a hurry.

We drove to a steak place near campus and parked the car—being careful to choose a place where we couldn't be parked in too close to load and unload our chairs.

It was at lunch that I got my first real feeling of what it's like to be the object of to understand why. Wheeling unveiled curiosity. Ed said the wheelchair kids live with it all the time—he even thinks it's kind of fun because it gives him a "chance to show AB's (able-bodied people) that handicapped people are not necessarily disabled."

People everywhere were very helpful—but they couldn't stop staring. They stared through the windows of the restaurant as Ed and I got out of the car and unloaded our chairs—a process which took a full five minutes.

They stared as Ed showed me how to get up the shallow curb of the restaurant sidewalk (place your front castors against the curb then push your chair forward while leaning backward to tip it up) and that took another five minutes.

They stared when we entered and took our place in the cafeteria line, trays on laps, reaching up to the counter for silverware and napkins. The waitresses were very helpful, moving benches for us so we could wheel our chairs right up to the table. But the eyes of the entire restaurant were riveted to us. I was somewhat unnerved, but it didn't bother Ed.

It was during lunch that Ed explained his philosophy to me. We talked about the deep depressions which grip many people who have accidents which leave them paralyzed. Ed said he never went through a period like that.

"For one thing, I had really great care. Everyone at the hospital where I was was fantastic. The other thing is that from the very beginning I was fascinated by the whole thing—I wanted to know everything the doctors were doing and why," Ed said.

That same determined attitude took Ed a long way once he got out of the hospital. From the very beginning he insisted upon doing everything for himself—no matter how difficult. Today he has almost full use of his hands, though they still are weak, and unless you watch him carefully as he pushes his wheelchair, you might think he was paralyzed only from the waist down.

After lunch we took the car back to the Center and caught the next regularly scheduled bus back to campus.

More pushing. More ramps. More Cold. The later it got, the more discouraged I became. Each door I had to get through seemed heavier than the one before, every ramp steeper. Even Ed was beginning to tire. "I haven't pushed around this much in months!" he confessed.

The kids on campus, accustomed to seeing wheelchair students everyday, gave us no more than a passing glance. At times here I felt free from stares.

I was relieved to see the day end. And yet I hadn't had it as rough as a real paraplegic. I had dressed before getting into the chair. I hadn't had to do any housework, I didn't have to care for our little boy.

I didn't have to go to the dentist or fight traffic downtown or try to get into a department store dressing room or a public restroom.

But most of all, I had full use of all my muscles. There is no way to simulate the paralyzed condition—even though I wasn't actively using certain parts of my body, the muscles nevertheless were in good condition and they helped to support me all day long. The difference that makes is hard to measure—but its considerable.

I was exhausted when Ed and I got off the bus at the Center for the last time. I was ready to call it quits and turn in my chair. It had been a rough day. At least I had the comfort of knowing that it was over.

But for my friend Ed and others like him there would be tomorrow—a whole lifetime of tomorrows.

REDUCTION OF FLIGHT SERVICES AT ILLIAMNA AIRPORT

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, the Iliamna area in Alaska not only is renowned for its recreational potentials but as well is the transportation hub for several area villages and the portal through which a great many light aircraft en route to the Bristol Bay area must pass.

I am inserting into the RECORD for my colleagues' interest a copy of a resolution adopted by the Alaska State Legislature opposing the reduction of flight services at Iliamna airports as proposed by Airspace Proposal No. 72-AL-10NR:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 58—OPPOSING THE REDUCTION OF FLIGHT SERVICES AT ILLIAMNA

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the Iliamna area has experienced a remarkable increase in light aircraft operations during recent years; and

Whereas the navigational aids and weather reporting services at the Iliamna Federal Aviation Administration Station have become increasingly important due to such expanded activity; and

Whereas Iliamna is an area which experi-

ences some of the most dangerously capricious weather conditions in Alaska; and

Whereas the Iliamna area not only is renowned for its recreational potentials but as well is the transportation hub for several area villages and the portal through which virtually all light aircraft en route to the Bristol Bay area must pass; and

Whereas the safety and convenience of such increased aircraft operations indicate an expansion rather than a reduction of minimal flight services now rendered:

Be it resolved by the Alaska Legislature that it urgently opposes any reduction of flight services at the Iliamna airport as proposed by Airspace Proposal No. 72-AL-10NR.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable John A. Volpe, Secretary, Department of Transportation; the Honorable Peter G. Peterson, Secretary Designate, Department of Commerce; the Honorable John H. Shaffer, Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration; 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.

PUBLIC OPINION POLL

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, recently, Local 5051 of the Communications Workers of America of the AFL-CIO conducted a public opinion poll in Cook County, Ill. Approximately 400 individuals received the questions, and an 87 percent response followed. I commend Local 5051 for their efforts in determining the thinking of the American public on such important issues as U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia, busing, wage and price controls, environmental protection, and taxes. I am certain the results of the poll will be most interesting to my colleagues and request that the public opinion poll follow my remarks.

The public opinion poll follows:

PUBLIC OPINION POLL

1. Do you support present efforts being made to end U.S. involvement in Vietnam? Yes 65%; No 32%; Undecided 3%.

2. If your answer to question No. 1 was No, then what steps do you favor?

(A) Immediate pullout: 44%.

(B) Major concessions at the Paris Peace Talks: 10%.

(C) All out military victory effort: 44%.

(D) Other: 13%.

3. Do you feel that any Vietnam settlement should include immediate release of all American P.O.W.'s?

Yes 98%; No 2%.

4. Do you believe amnesty should be granted to those who fled the U.S. to avoid being drafted?

Yes (Amnesty should be unconditional)

7%.

Yes (Amnesty should be Granted Provided Equivalent Time is served in a Non-Combat Roll.) 27%.

No (No Amnesty) 65%.

(Undecided) 1%.

5. Do you believe amnesty should be granted to military deserters?

Yes (Amnesty should be unconditional)

4%.

Yes (Amnesty should be Granted Provided Equivalent Time is served in a Non-Combat Roll.) 17%.

No (No Amnesty) 76%

(Undecided) 3%.

6. Whom do you favor in the coming election for President?

Nixon 45%; Wallace 15%; Muskie 10%; Humphrey 9%; McGovern 4%; Jackson 2%; McCarthy 2%; Lindsay 0%.

7. Do you approve of busing to achieve school integration? Yes 7%; No 88%; Undecided 5%.

8. Welfare—Which of the following do you favor:

(A) Stop all welfare: 3%.

(B) All able-bodied welfare recipients should be made to work in order to earn their payment: 90%.

(C) No change in welfare: 2%.

(D) Other: 5%.

9. In your opinion are the existing wage price controls effective? Yes 20%; No 78%; Undecided 2%.

10. Would you favor additional controls on any of the following: (Check if Yes.)

Wages 30%; Prices 59%; Profits 46%; Rent 33%; Interest Rates 54%; No Controls 7%.

11. Do you favor Full disclosure of All Income and its source by public servants? Yes 89%; No 10%; Undecided 1%.

12. Do you believe the United Nations serves a useful purpose? Yes 66%; No 32%; Undecided 2%.

13. In your opinion is it necessary to maintain military supremacy regardless of cost? Yes 64%; No 32%; Undecided 4%.

14. Environment (Choose one or more):

(A) Both Federal and State government should have stricter enforcement of violations: 86%.

(B) Present standards are adequate: 2%.

(C) Present standards are inadequate: 46%.

(D) Heavier penalties should be levied: 62%.

(E) Other: 9%.

15. Would you favor, in principle, abolishing All State and Local Taxes as they now are, replacing them with a single flat rate income tax. A tax to be applied equally to individuals and to corporations, and not allowing for Any deductions, exemptions, or other loop holes for either individual or corporation? Yes 61%; No 18%; Undecided 21%.

16. Would you favor a tax plan similar to question number 15 for Federal Tax Reform? Yes 54%; No 21%; Undecided 25%.

A SALUTE TO THE HONORABLE GORDON CANFIELD, 1972 RECIPIENT OF THE COVETED U.S. COAST GUARD DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE AWARD

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a great privilege and honor to participate in the recent U.S. Coast Guard testimonial to our most distinguished senior statesman, former Congressman, and my good personal friend, the Honorable Gordon Canfield of our Eighth Congressional District of New Jersey. Through this historic journal of Congress I respectfully request you to join with me in national recognition of the standards of excellence he has imparted to our community, State and Nation in a lifetime of dedicated service to his fellow man.

In further tribute to all of his good works, having tallied up an enviable record of achievements during two

decades in service to our State and Nation as a Member of Congress, Mr. Canfield has now received still another citation from the U.S. Coast Guard—the Distinguished Public Service Award—which indeed connotes the great pride and respect that all of us in New Jersey share in the wisdom and quality of his leadership during his tenure as our Representative in the Congress.

Mr. Canfield first came to our Nation's Capital in 1923 as secretary to the late Congressman Seger of Passaic, N.J., and was elected to succeed him in Congress in 1941. Prior to coming to Washington, he was a distinguished newspaper correspondent in Passaic, N.J., and received his exemplary knowledge of the law at the New Jersey Law School in Newark and George Washington University Law School, Washington, D.C., LL.B. 1926. He served during the First World War in the Signal Corps, U.S. Army, and during World War II served during the congressional recess in 1944 as a seaman on North Atlantic tanker duty, U.S. Merchant Marine.

As a guardian of our Nation's Constitution and our people in the Congress, it is indeed a fitting tribute to now receive this most coveted award from the U.S. Coast Guard whose major phases of operations range from support of naval activities in the conflict in Southeast Asia to its many and varied peacetime activities including oceanic research, exploring ways to combat and control oil pollution, the regulation of dangerous bulk cargo transportation, and all other phases of marine safety.

This Distinguished Public Service Award is symbolic of the deeply profound manifestation we all feel and applaud in grateful acknowledgement of the warmth of his friendship, his impeccable ethics, the richness of his compassion for others, and the integrity of his sincerity of purpose.

As history is recorded, we are most fortunate to have been the beneficiary of this distinguished public service of a great American. Many, many thanks, Gordon Canfield—We do indeed salute you.

HELP VLADIMIR MACHLIS

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, today I was visited by Leonid Machlis, a 27-year-old Russian Jewish activist just released from the U.S.S.R. He is here in the United States to plead for assistance in obtaining permission for his twin brother, Vladimir, a leading figure in the Moscow Jewish resistance, to leave the U.S.S.R. Leonid, his sister Ella, and their mother were permitted to leave for Israel after much harassment and frustration. He told me of one incident where a neighbor of the Machlis family was incited to throw a pot of boiling milk in Ella's face after they applied to leave for the Jewish State. Reaching their goal almost penni-

less, Leonid borrowed money to travel to America.

Leonid further told me that his brother is now subject to prison, having been discharged from his job and accused by the Soviet Government as a result of his not being employed as a "parasite." Only in the U.S.S.R. could such an impossible situation exist.

It is very important that President Nixon, when he travels to Moscow in May, take up the plight of Vladimir Machlis and seek exit permission for him so that he might join his family. Yesterday the Congress passed a resolution urging the President to take up the plight of the Soviet Jews and intercede with Soviet authorities on the behalf of that persecuted minority. Surely, the President will exercise his great powers in such a humane endeavor.

FOREST INDUSTRY VITAL TO AMERICA

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, one of the most articulate and knowledgeable voices raised in Congress with regard to the great and essential forestry industry in the United States has long been my friend and able colleague from Florida, Representative BOB SIKES.

When it comes to forestry legislation, Members of the House of Representatives listen to Congressman SIKES because they know that he knows what he is talking about.

On March 27, 1972, he made an outstanding speech to the American Pulpwood Association at their annual meeting in Atlanta, Ga.

His statements are revealing and valuable for all Americans because forestry and its attendant industries are vital to the economy and the future of this great land.

For that reason I would like to have his remarks reprinted so that others might have a chance to read them.

The speech follows:

SPEECH BY ROBERT L. F. SIKES, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TO ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN PULPWOOD ASSOCIATION, ATLANTA, GA., MARCH 27, 1972

I congratulate this notable group upon your objectives and your achievements. Collectively you have planted more trees and put out more fires than any other group in the world. I am very glad to meet with you.

We meet in a time of change, a time of great significance as well as great concern to those interested in forestry. This includes a great many people and their interests are far from uniform. For instance, House action is expected this week on the Water Pollution Bill. This very probably is the most important environmental issue of the year. The Senate passed by unanimous vote the most restrictive anti-pollution bill in history and I doubt that many of them knew what it is in the bill. Most people other than the environmentalists feel it is a bill the nation simply can't live with. The House Public Works Committee has amended the bill very sig-

nificantly and even this version is going to require strong efforts by industry and the public if its stipulations are met. There are those who will seek to restore the tighter Senate language and they have strong support from a number of responsible recreational and environmental organizations that should know better.

Both the House and Senate bills declare their objective is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation's waters. The Senate bill declares this to be national policy which means it is enforceable by law. The House bill declares this to be a national goal.

Both bills change from the present policy of water quality control to a "point source discharge" program. This means eventual elimination of any effluent discharge into the streams, rivers and public waters.

The Senate bill has a "zero discharge" effective not later than 1981. The House position is that technology is not available to enforce "zero discharge" without serious disruption of industry. Certain industries, such as the pulp industry, the steel industry, and the chemical industries, produce pollutants for which we have no satisfactory method of disposal. So the House bill moves the effective date to 1985 and further provides that the National Science Foundation shall undertake a national study to determine feasibility, desirability, and the best available technology for achieving "zero discharge."

The Senate bill would require all industry and designated plants to secure permits indicating the volume of discharge and type of pollution being discharged. The Senate version leaves all permit and enforcement policies with the Federal Environmental Protection Agency.

The House version would require EPA to provide guidelines and leave enforcement to the States so long as they maintain Federal standards. This is one of the major objections of the environmentalists.

They are attacking the House bill as a weak bill, yet my personal opinion is that the House version itself would result in the closing of some 4% to 5% of our industrial capacity. But the Senate version could close as much as 20%. It is obvious that we are going to have either the Senate bill or the House bill, and the Senate bill could close most of the nation's pulpwood plants.

Consideration for the ecology, which was a virtually unknown thing just a few years ago, has in many areas become a major item. In particular, it has affected proposals for waterway improvements. It also affects forest use considerations. It very definitely slows approval of developmental projects and in some instances blocks them completely.

Ecology is a new and exciting "catch" phrase. It is something very important; also it can be overdone. Admittedly it is serving to force attention on the need for correction of abuses, particularly abuses which are associated with pollution. What has been done generally has been needed. There are exceptions, such as the Cross-Florida Barge Canal, where work was stopped after consideration only for the viewpoint of the ecologists. In fact, it was the only viewpoint heard by the Administration.

This is an illustration that there must be a balance between what people want and what is practical. We cannot close down this country's business and industry just for the sake of the ecology. But it is very certain that we cannot allow the growing and steadily worsening pollution of our earth to continue.

Pollution can take many forms. It can mean clear-cutting timber with no effort to plant new trees or re-seed damaged earth. It can mean indiscriminate strip mining. It can mean pollution of air from the smog in many American cities which even for a non-smoker is equivalent to smoking three packs of cigarettes a day, to sulphuric fumes which

hang over other cities. It can mean pollution of water, from Lake Erie which is dead, and in once beautiful estuaries around too many American cities which are now stinking and poisonous from disease-producing and crippling organisms.

Present conditions did not develop overnight. They got their start long ago, but in recent years they have worsened rapidly as industrial development has accentuated and city slums have mushroomed. Now we understand the problem and we are embarked on a program of corrections. It will need revision and strengthening, but we are on the way. We must accomplish the things that are needed in a sensible and orderly way. We can't burn down the barn to get rid of the rats.

Let's talk about forestry legislation. A forestry legislative package which I was privileged to introduce contains some very important provisions. There are approximately 100 Congressmen who are cosponsors and who are scattered the length and breadth of the land, and it is hard to find 100 Congressmen nowadays who have an understanding of forestry. H.R. 8817 is a multi-purpose bill which is designed to update the Nation's forestry programs to meet present day needs. The bill was drafted with the help of Federal and State forestry agencies and industry representatives.

As you well know, most of today's forest legislation was placed on the statute books in the late 1940's and early 1950's, and some of this carries my name. The measure which is now before Congress updates the Clarke-McNary Act for fire protection, provides increased authorization for cooperative forest management, and a new program for urban and environmental forestry management. Let me briefly discuss what it does in each instance.

Under the Clarke-McNary Act, although designed for 50-50 sharing, Federal contributions for forest fire protection have never reached that level. The States are carrying about 85% of the load. In order to permit more equitable sharing of responsibilities, the present Federal authorization of \$20 million annually should be raised to \$40 million, and that is what we propose to do. Fire prevention, detection and control require activities far beyond the capabilities of individual forest owners. Yet on 200 million acres, protection forces are spread too thin for effective control, and 31 million acres are not protected at all. In 1969, more than 103,000 fires started on State and private lands, nearly all of which were preventable. They destroyed forest resources on more than 2½ million acres. A greater Federal effort to support the work of the States is required.

The Cooperative Forest Management Program which was authorized in 1950 has provided a primary vehicle for making technical forest management assistance available through State forestry organizations to hundreds of thousands of non-industry private owners. Although the benefits of the program are substantial, they fall short of national needs if the 300 million acres of non-industrial private forests owned by some 4 million people are to furnish their share of products in the future. Currently, only about 115,000 owners annually receive assistance. Greater use must be made of America's forests and much depends upon Federal-State cooperation in providing technical assistance to landowners who lack forest management expertise. The present authorized limit of appropriations is only \$5 million. This amount is to be increased to \$15 million annually.

We also seek to authorize a new program for urban and environmental forestry. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's Forest Research Advisory Committee recommended a new forestry program to meet a need which only recently has been recognized. It is a

program to provide technical assistance for protection, improvement, or establishment of native trees and shrubs on private lands and particularly in public areas in urban and suburban areas. Administration would be by the States through cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Agriculture and a State agency designated by the Governor, usually the State forest service. The services of landscape architects, foresters, horticulturists, nurserymen, and other qualified experts could be used as needed. It is estimated that by the year 2000 about 85% of the people of the United States will be living in metropolitan areas. This will create severe environmental problems in maintaining open spaces, greenbelts, and natural woodlands in and near heavily populated areas, for which there is now no overall program. For this we propose an annual authorization of \$5 million.

I am happy to report to you H.R. 8817 passed the House of Representatives unanimously, and this is an almost unheard of thing for major legislation. We had support from all segments of the forestry industry and many organizations, including yours, gave strong endorsement. The bill has not fared as well in the Senate. It was reported unanimously by Senator Herman Talmadge's Committee on Agriculture, but it has remained inactive on the Senate calendar for nearly three months. I am told by Senator Mansfield it is on his list of bills to pass. I am confident he means to call the bill up but I confess to concern about the delays which we have experienced in the Senate.

I have also introduced a forestry incentives bill which is awaiting action in the House Committee on Agriculture. It proposes that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to develop a program to encourage sound forestation and reforestation practices, multiple-purpose management, protection of forest resources, and the enhancement of recreational opportunities. It will include cost-sharing with the landowner to support practices which carry out the purpose of the forestry incentives program. It is directed principally to the small non-industrial private forest landowner. It is intended to serve the forest landowner by encouraging sound forestry practices as agricultural programs have served the farmer by helping him to take advantage of better farming practices. It is obvious that this type of program would require strict management but I feel that it has a definite potential for good. The number of the bill is H.R. 12873. We have asked for a \$25 million authorization to be expended as the program develops.

There is one very important side effect for all of these bills. They will help to improve standards of rural community living. One of the urgent needs in our nation today is to reverse the trend of population which is flowing from rural areas to city slums. People are leaving the farms and small towns because they simply can't make a living. But the conditions they find in the cities often are worse. If we can help people to find a good life and an adequate livelihood in the rural areas instead of sending them to the welfare rolls in the slums, we will have benefited America greatly.

Legislation is, of course, important. So are many other things which directly affect forestry and your industry. Land taxes are increasing at an astronomical rate. Land is continually removed from the timberland base for agriculture, suburban sites, industrial development, and many other special uses. The cost of clearing, cutting, and hauling is going right through the ceiling. Pulp and paper mills are under heavy pressure to meet air and water pollution control regulations. Some mills and even some companies can't survive.

I'm not at all certain that there are enough

people in the land who understand the significance of forestry and its economic importance to the nation. There is a requirement to intensify efforts to educate the public so they may better understand the blessings which come to us simply because one-third of the nation's area is forest land. That forest land provides a continuous flow of renewable wood fiber for housing construction, packaging and paper, in addition to scenic, wildlife habitat, watershed, and recreational values. We must insure that more people recognize the fact that productivity of the forest is essential to the economy in employment and community development. The public needs to better understand the nation's wood needs, the ABC's of renewable resource management on forest lands. There are so many who have little or no contact with or knowledge of forest problems who could be easy game for special interest groups, including ecologists, who want to place their stamp on all programs, forestry and otherwise, even to the point of stopping sound utilization of forests.

There is also a requirement for intensive research. It is time for particular stress on insect and disease control and on genetic studies toward stronger and more productive strains in trees. New harvesting practices and improved marketing methods obviously are due more consideration. Research can well be directed toward solution of environmental problems. These can be as important in our time as tree planting activities have been in earlier days. We also need to be aware of the problems of visual impact on forest visitors, of wildlife habitat and of other management considerations. There will be more and more sensitivity of the public on the way we manage forests. It's better to do our research and come up with the right answers than have it done for us and to have the wrong answers inflicted upon us.

I emphasize quality and environmental management because they make sense, but also because of increased public awareness of environmental issues and the influence it is bound to have on legislators, both State and national. I do not want to see forest practices regulated by law, yet that is just what some people are threatening or crying for.

It is important that industry and the administrators of public lands maintain a harmonious working relationship with conservation groups and remain flexible in seeking common ground for management and resource objectives.

What seems clear to me is that the momentum toward a more expansive forestry program nationwide, some kind of accommodation with a more environmentally conscious public, and a more balanced use and development of natural resources on public and private forest lands are realities that will loom larger as time goes on. The way we meet these challenges will determine, to a great extent, not only the state of our future timber supply, but the whole vast environmental picture in which each one of us—timber producer, forest user, manufacturer, public forest administrator, general consumer, and the man in the street—has a place.

A long time ago one of America's greatest conservationists, Gifford Pinchot, said, "Conservation means wise use of the earth and its resources." That's still the name of the game for those who believe in strong forestry practices. But we have a selling job to do.

Now, at the risk of talking too long, I feel I must discuss with you some other considerations.

America is moving and moving fast. I am not sure we know just where we are going. There is great new moral concern for the people, for the environment, for minority interests and this is good. We should work toward a better life for everyone. But as a

part of this changing public attitude, there has been a loss of a sense of responsibility on the part of too many Americans who now believe that society owes them something, too many who expect more from our Nation than they are willing to give in return. Their demands are transmitted to Washington and Washington is listening.

There is dissatisfaction, uneasiness, on the part of the public. It was vividly expressed just two weeks ago at the polls in Florida. There we saw a man receive more than forty percent of the votes because he was able to express in plain and simple terms the feelings of a disturbed America. He did not propose panaceas or pie-in-the-sky. He simply phrased the doubts which have been building up in America. Americans sometimes vote from prejudice—they vote against the establishment rather than vote for logic or even for constructive programs. But the voters also were saying America needs leadership, needs it badly; needs leadership which can point the way safely through the maze of difficulties which confront us.

American leadership during much of our history has been an exciting, dynamic thing. Perhaps that leadership has now been weakened by slackening of the national will. The United States needs purpose, coherence and integrity among its leaders. The American people need to know where we are going. They need to be told again and again that citizenship involves responsibilities and burdens, belief in our country, and patriotism. This is part of the story of America. We are not sick—we just need purpose and confidence.

There has never been a time when we didn't have problems. A hundred years ago this country was torn apart by war between the States, but we endured. Forty years ago a great depression shattered the security of most of our people, but we endured. Today's problems are serious. They may be as serious as any in our history. But the most serious problem would be a loss of faith in our ability to endure.

It is time for new stress on Americanism. This means involvement with America. It means an interest in what is happening to America. It means an effort to make our America a better and a safer and a happier country. It means interest in the methods by which government operates. There is great need for that kind of interest. The government directly affects the livelihood, health, happiness and pocketbook of every person. But Americanism is not effective until it is translated into programs—programs to stimulate patriotism, programs for a stronger America.

Yes, it is time for more active participation in government. Historically, too many of you have been reluctant to get involved. The time for involvement is now.

That brings me to this final word. America has demonstrated time and again that it can do whatever it sets its mind to accomplish. We have explored the moon in a most dramatic way. But there are too many problems at home which haven't been solved. Herein lies a warning. We like to do the spectacular, but the problems confronting us can't be dealt within this fashion. They require constant effort, tireless endeavor, and full dedication. We cannot afford a continuation of the indifference which has produced destructive pollution, intolerable crime rates, Black Panthers, ugly slums, unsolved disease, drug problems, and hospital costs that are out of reach. The country which gave opportunity to nearly all who sought it and produced a standard of living unheard of elsewhere in the world can cope with its problems, but it is time to be about it. This nation must realize and use its own strength.

I believe in America. I am sure you do. But all of us need to be reminded time and again of the importance of believing in America. It is easy to take the United States for granted.

Its great power and prestige make us feel that it will go on and on just as we have known it. But that isn't necessarily true. Time for our country may be running out.

America must have the confidence and support of its own citizens to carry on its mission. Let's tell the world and each other that we have not lost our sense of mission, that we still have confidence and pride in this great adventure which produced the world's ideal of freedom and democracy. Let's be about America's business. Let's not classify and hold secret the fact we believe in America.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS REHABILITATION-EDUCATION CENTER

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in writing her series of articles on the physically handicapped and earning their degrees at the University of Illinois, Carol Mathers tells about the Rehabilitation Education Center at the university which is the only one of its kind in the world. The second article gives the personal experiences of four individuals. The third article concentrates on Timothy J. Nugent who started the program in 1949 with one wheelchair student. These two articles follow:

DISABLED?—NOT THESE REHABILITATION CENTER ALUMS

(By Carol Mathers)

After my own disastrous experience in a wheelchair, I would not have thought it possible that anyone so confined could manage to take care of himself—much less lead an active, productive life.

But hundreds of UI graduates who have spent four years at the Rehabilitation-Education Center daily explode the myth that handicapped people are "disabled."

On the contrary, the Center boasts some locally well-known and highly accomplished alums.

Tom Jones, for instance, Jones is sports director for WCIA, Channel 3, in Champaign. A native of Carbondale, he graduated from the university in 1959 and last year received his master's degree in TV journalism from the UI College of Communications.

Jones has been a paraplegic since age five when he was shot off his tricycle by kids playing with an "unloaded" hunting rifle.

"At the time of my injury, a paraplegic was not expected to live long," Jones said. "But my mother, who was a registered nurse, was determined to rehabilitate me early—and she did."

He attended public school in Carbondale and played sports with the neighborhood kids. "I could hit the ball, but I had to have a runner run for me," Jones explained. "And I played first base—but the second baseman played pretty close to first."

While in high school, Jones got a part time job with a radio station in southern Illinois. When it came time to go to college, Jones said, "the university was the only place where I could go when I was looking for a good, well-balanced education."

He pursued his interest in electronic media and landed a part time job with WCIA while a sophomore in college—and went to work there full time after graduation.

"I'm not the least bit bitter," Jones reflected. "I would not have been able to do all I've done if it hadn't been for that accident.

My whole life style was changed. If it hadn't been for my accident, I probably would have been content to get a high school diploma and go to work for the railroad like my dad."

Jones attributes a large measure of his success to the Center, and to its director Tim Nugent. "Nobody else would have sacrificed as Tim did to get this done—a lot of us have him to thank."

Evelyn Moore is in complete agreement. "I wouldn't be doing anything I'm doing now without the Rehab Center," she said.

"I was totally unfunctional when I arrived at the Center," Mrs. Moore went on. An automobile accident left her a quadriplegic at age 18. "That first semester I had to get up at 4 a.m. to be ready to go to class at 8:30. It took me two hours to get ready for bed. But by the end of the semester it took me only 45 minutes to dress, and ten minutes to undress! There was almost nothing I couldn't do."

Mrs. Moore said she "did it because I had to if I wanted to stay at the university—and I really wanted to stay because I was having a ball!"

She graduated in 1969 with a degree in sociology and went to work for the state Department of Public Aid as a case worker. She maintains a caseload of some 300 families whom she counsels on financial problems.

Married six years, the Moores have a 2-year-old son Justin. "I worked up until two weeks before Justin was born," Mrs. Moore said. She was also the first quadriplegic to give birth to a baby.

So now besides working full-time, Mrs. Moore takes care of her son, does her own housework, and still finds time to swim, bowl, and play table tennis.

Another quadriplegic with a busy schedule is Jack Whitman, a sales representative for radio station WDWS. Whitman injured his neck in a trampoline accident as a college sophomore and has been confined to a wheelchair since then.

Totally paralyzed at first, Whitman slowly regained the use of his hands. After being out of school for more than two years, Whitman returned to the University of Illinois and enrolled at the Center in 1952.

Whitman was the first Center student to graduate with a degree in journalism—but his real fame lies in his archery records, many of which will never be broken.

"In 1962 I missed the record in the British Open by only four points," Whitman said with justifiable pride. He competed in the Paralympics in Rome in 1960 and in the International Wheelchair Games held every year in England.

"The nicest thing that ever happened to me was being named to the National Wheelchair Sports Hall of Fame last spring," Whitman said. "That was a real thrill."

Though he himself no longer shoots, Whitman is still active in archery. He spends some time every afternoon at the Center working with wheelchair archers, and he holds Wednesday night classes at the Osage Archery Range for kids 7-18 years old.

"I've coached more than 80 kids," Whitman said, "and eight of them have gone to international championships and about two dozen to national championships."

Whitman said that the hardest thing he had to learn was "how to handle the tension of being a champion."

"You're under pressure to get better at the time—and when I first started shooting in tournaments, I was a real rarity," he said. "I shot in two wheelchair tournaments a year plus the regular national and international tournaments. It really got to be an awful lot of work."

Whitman said he owes a lot to the Center. "The program was new and not much accepted when I was there," he explained. "So the students had to help Nugent make the program work—to prove that it had value."

About Nugent himself Whitman said, "I was awestruck when I first met Tim 20 years ago and I'm still a little awestruck—I still can't quite believe him, he's such a dynamic individual."

"Of course, he made a big impression on all of us," Whitman continued. "At that time, Tim was the Center—he handled all the administration and the therapy."

"We all had to work hard to make that program a reality," Whitman said. "The kids today don't realize how much they have in that Center."

Another graduate who has watched the Center grow from nothing but an abstract theory is Don Swift, supervisor of placement services for all nonacademic UI personnel.

A World War II veteran Swift was the first paraplegic ever to graduate from college. He majored in accounting because "it was one of the few areas wheelchair people could get into."

"Once I graduated I had job offers from all over the world," Swift recalled. "Being the first paraplegic to get a college degree, I received all sorts of publicity—really it was played all out of proportion."

He decided to take a job with the university and has been there since 1952. "When we graduated we had to be a success," Swift pointed out. "You had to give a good impression both on and off the job because everything you did was a reflection on the Center."

The Center had barely begun when Swift arrived on the Galesburg campus in 1948. "Even after being injured in the war, I never gave up the hope of going back to school," he said. "I spent some time in the veterans' hospital in Chicago and there I met Harold Scharper, Nugent's first student. Scharper told me about the program starting in Galesburg and I was immediately interested."

Swift was part of the program when the Galesburg campus closed in 1949 and the wheelchair vets had to find another place to go to school.

"We surveyed hundreds of campuses all over the country, but nobody seemed interested in having us," Swift said. "So in desperation we held what proved to be the forerunner of the sit-in—we went to Springfield and convinced the Legislature that it should allow our program to come to the Champaign-Urbana campus."

The Legislature agreed—grudgingly. They allotted the program two tarpaper shacks left over from World War II surplus housing. "The whole program—everything—was housed in those two shacks at first," Swift recalled.

Swift was also a part of the first wheelchair sports team and participated in the first national basketball tournament in 1949 in which six teams competed.

"We've come a long way since then," Swift said, "not just in athletics—the whole program has grown."

And what Swift experienced was only the beginning.

UI REHAB PROGRAM HAD "TEMPORARY" START:
NUGENT JUST KEPT ACCEPTING STUDENTS . . .
DESPITE UNIVERSITY WISHES

(By Carol Mathers)

Actually, it wasn't supposed to be anything more than a temporary assignment.

When Timothy J. Nugent, graduate student at the University of Wisconsin, arrived on the University of Illinois campus in Galesburg, he was working on his doctoral dissertation in educational psychology and administration.

The subject of his dissertation was to be the development of an educational program for the severely, permanently handicapped. After a couple of years, when his research was completed, Nugent planned to go back

to Wisconsin to write his dissertation. The program would be completed.

That was 25 years ago.

Today Nugent is the director of the nation's most comprehensive university rehabilitation and education program: the Rehabilitation Education Center at the University of Illinois.

He never did go back to Wisconsin. Said Nugent, "There was so much to be done. Nobody had ever worked with paraplegics and quadriplegics before—because nobody expected them to live more than three or six months."

According to Nugent, it was not until after World War II that paraplegics became the subject of any intensive medical research. So little was known about the paralyzed patient—certainly a college education was never considered.

"But from the very beginning I was convinced that paros and quads could do more than they were being given a chance to do," Nugent emphasized. "It was my aim to afford people with severe, permanent disabilities the opportunity for a normal education like other people have—including extracurricular participation and all the things which are part of a college education."

The obstacles were formidable, but in September, 1949, Nugent began his program at what is now the State Research Hospital in Galesburg. He had one wheelchair student.

"By the next fall we had 13 students on campus—and 22 students before that year was out," Nugent recalled.

The program ran on a shoestring. With no firm commitment from UI to develop a full-time program, Nugent had to raise the necessary funds by himself.

According to Nugent, he raised money "from gifts and grants" and from contracts which he had with the Veterans' Administration and the state Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DBR).

"Because my students were entitled to certain benefits, due to the nature of their disability, the VA and DVR were required to help pay for their education," Nugent explained. "For every student, I had an individual contract with a public agency to pay for our services—and that's how we financed the program initially."

About the time the program was off to a promising start the state legislature decided to close the Galesburg campus. Nugent and his students wrote "hundreds of letters to colleges all over the country"—but got little response. "Nobody was interested in taking over the program," Nugent said.

Not to be dismissed lightly, Nugent and his two dozen students decided to take their case to Springfield. Their demonstration—probably the nation's first "sit-in"—illustrated the need for and interest in the program.

"Our primary objective in that demonstration in the spring of 1949 was to keep the governor from signing a bill to close the Galesburg campus," Nugent said. "Our second objective was to get a guarantee that our kids could continue their education even if the Galesburg campus was closed."

Their first objective failed—but their second was victorious after Nugent brought a group of his students to the Champaign-Urbana campus to demonstrate that wheelchair students could, indeed, get around.

Nugent and his group of 28 handicapped students arrived at their new headquarters in the fall of 1949. UI administrative support was half-hearted at best.

"They gave us two Army surplus barracks in which to house the students and the program," Nugent reminisced. "In half of one tarpaper shack we put our therapy, work room, treatment room and office. The rest of the space was used for student housing."

The whole program was still "temporary," according to UI officials. Nugent was told that

he could fulfill his commitment to the students he had brought from Galesburg—but that was as far as the university intended the program to go.

"The university didn't appropriate any funds for the program that first year," Nugent said. "In fact, it didn't appropriate any money at all for the first nine years."

The program lived a hand-to-mouth existence but continued to thrive. Bypassing university administration wishes to phase out the program, Nugent accepted new students every year.

"We just kept taking over more tarpaper shacks for student housing," Nugent shrugged. By 1955 the complex included about eight such shacks.

And by 1965 the university was beginning to take notice. For the first time that year the program for handicapped students was granted a budget appropriation by the university and Nugent was able to hire one full-time staff member—the only other one besides Nugent himself.

"Of course we hadn't been sitting still all those years," Nugent pointed out. "Ever since coming here in '49 we had been building ramps and cutting curbs to make the campus accessible for our kids."

Having worked its way into the university family—if only as a step-child—the program continued to expand. So did its needs.

In 1958 Nugent, striving to make a dream come true, submitted a development proposal for a new rehabilitation-education complex which would be without rival on any campus anywhere in the world.

The original proposal called for \$1.2 million, one-third of which would come from federal funds under the U.S. Public Health Service, one-third from state funds and one-third from private resources.

"The way things turned out, I had to raise a good deal more than that one-third from private resources," Nugent said. "Our original estimate was low and as additional funds were needed, the only place to go was to our friends."

In the summer of 1965—almost 18 years after it was begun—the program moved into its new headquarters on Oak Street. Almost simultaneously the bulldozers plowed down the old tarpaper shacks.

Sitting now in his modern office, Nugent learned back in his executive-size chair behind his executive-size desk and lit a cigar.

"We've come a long way in 25 years—but there's still a lot to be done," he said. "Financially we're still hunched over and can't stand up straight—but at least we're not on our knees any more."

The director has pushed—hard—to make it all happen. And he doesn't see an end to his task just because things look a little better.

He drives himself and his staff to their absolute limits—and then some. His violent red hair is fading—but his temper is not and he demands excellence at all times. If an award exists, he's won it—from presidential citations to Chamber of Commerce plaques.

In one half hour he handled a request from the Easter Seal Society for 20,000 copies of a paper he'd written and a plea for help from an ex-student who is sitting in a Chicago jail. The Center, he says, gets some 200 special requests a week concerning facilities, treatment, transportation, and therapy.

He takes a personal interest in each and every one of "his" students and is affectionately known around the center as Tim.

According to Nugent, much remains to be done. "Public education about the handicapped, accessibility of buildings and transportation, elimination of employer prejudice—these things may never be fully accomplished," he says.

But Nugent, and the members of his staff, go on trying.

BECKMAN HONORED BY ALMA MATER

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, April 18, 1972, Chicago Tribune White House Correspondent Aldo Beckman returned to his alma mater, Western Illinois University, where he was honored by both students and faculty alike. Aldo has been a most capable Washington correspondent for the Tribune for several years, covering the complete spectrum of significant events emanating from our Nation's Capital.

He has just recently come back from the Republic of China where he covered the President's precedent-setting trip. His return to Western Illinois gave him the opportunity to share with the students there the insights and experiences he has obtained from his years of traveling with the President.

I would like to insert the Chicago Tribune article concerned with Western Illinois' tribute to Aldo Beckman for my colleagues attention. I believe that it was a well-deserved honor for a very capable man.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 19, 1972]

BECKMAN HONORED BY ALMA MATER

(By David Gilbert)

MACOMB, ILL., April 18.—Tribune White House Correspondent Aldo Beckman was honored today by students and faculty at his alma mater, Western Illinois University.

For the students and faculty, Beckman's homecoming gave them a chance to hear an eye witness report on the activities of President Nixon, whom Beckman has covered for the last two years.

For Beckman, the day of activities gave him a chance to renew old acquaintances and to speak in his traditional Illinois twang without sounding out of place.

WAS GRADUATED IN 1956

Beckman was graduated from Western in 1956. Nixon was Vice President then, seeking reelection, and one of the big campus events was a concert by Fred Waring and his Pennsylvanians.

"Things have really changed," Beckman said as he was greeted by John T. Bernhard, university president.

"Driving thru the campus I noticed a coed wearing hot pants," Beckman said. "We sure didn't have anything like that when I was at school."

Instead of Fred Waring, students will hear a concert Saturday by Isaac Hayes and the Hot Butter and Soul group.

Beckman recalled that only 1,400 students were enrolled when he attended Western. The sprawling university campus now houses more than 14,000 students.

DISCUSSES NIXON'S TRIPS

Beckman discussed Nixon's recent trips to China and Canada with political science students.

He also was interviewed by journalism students.

One person who remembered Beckman when he was a student, was Reef Waldrep, professor of journalism.

"It is nice that a member of the class of 1956 is coming home by way of the People's Republic of China and Canada," he said.

"It is also nice to know that THE TRIBUNE

man who covers the President once sat in classes here."

This school has developed nicely" Beckman said. "I'd probably would flunk out now as a freshman."

A BILL FOR AMNESTY

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, while our President soothes us with regular reports of his troop withdrawals and claims of success in his Vietnamization program, our forces increasingly devastate the land and people of Southeast Asia and Asians continue to kill Asians with American weapons. A vast and cynical effort is underway to transform the American people's bitterness against the war into a pacified, postwar mentality, even while the computerized destruction in Southeast Asia continues peace.

Perhaps one indication that this new deception is enjoying some success is the recent upsurge in public discussion of the question of amnesty. In one sense the popularity of the subject is a good sign. It is evidence of the widespread judgment that the war is immoral and that steps should be taken to vindicate those who reached this judgment long ago. But at the same time talk of amnesty may show a willingness to close the book on the war, to resolve the war issue prematurely. Amnesty is regarded by some as part of a postwar program of reconciliation—one of those issues we deal with now that peace is restored, now that the fighting is over.

Well some of us are not reconciled yet. Some of us are not fooled. We know that without sending troops into the field we still kill hundreds of Asian soldiers and civilians every week, victims of our new electronic monsters, of our remote control warfare. Our Government is still eagerly perpetuating an immoral war, and talk of postwar programs is not going to pacify us.

Still, most of us are deeply sensitive to the issue of amnesty. We are aware of the needs of those other victims of the war—those conscientious Americans whose moral commitment to peace subjected them to prison sentences or exile. We feel a strong sympathy for those war resisters because we know that the war is and has been morally wrong.

Thus the dilemma: how to talk about amnesty, while not compromising our fierce opposition to the continuing war? I, for one, feel that we can and we must discuss amnesty as long as we deal with the war as a first priority, and as long as we support the kind of amnesty measure which recognizes our constituents' assessment of the whole war policy. In other words, we need amnesty legislation which responds to the war resisters by confronting the war issue straight on—an amnesty measure which focuses, rather than dilutes our bitterness against the war.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose

just such a measure. I am submitting today legislation which I regard as the first honest, consistent, comprehensive response to the problem of amnesty. My bill is not simply a means to grant relief to certain persons. It is first and foremost a demand for peace and a demand for a new direction in our national goals. My bill would grant relief to war-resisters of course, and it would acknowledge their hardships and their courage. But first it would echo their conscientious opposition to the continuing war.

CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES

My bill embodies six major features. First, of course, it demands a speedy and total cessation of U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia. It does this not only by implication—through vindication of war-resisters—but also by specific language.

Consistent with this first goal, the amnesty I propose would not become effective until the war is really ended. This is necessary if we are to validate the stand taken by war-resisters, and the fact is that the resisters themselves would have it no other way. They have taken their stand on principle and they will not be reconciled except on principle. They would be degraded and their acts of resistance rendered meaningless if they were to accept reinstatement while the war which prompted their acts continues.

UNCONDITIONAL AMNESTY

Second, my bill would grant, after the cessation of hostilities, unconditional restoration of rights to war-resisters, without imposing requirements of alternative service or a showing of "repentance." Imposition of such conditions would imply two fallacious assumptions: first, that recipients of amnesty shirked some legitimate duty to contribute to the war effort, and second, that by avoiding this duty they enjoyed some unfair personal advantage. The answer to the first of these points should be obvious to anyone who has judged the war immoral. How can a citizen have a legitimate duty to support an immoral war? And on the second point, how can it be said that one who has had the courage to face imprisonment or exile has enjoyed an unfair personal advantage? One cannot fail to recognize the bitter hardship that a young man suffers when he must abandon family, friends, job, and home for an uncertain life in a strange country, or worse a life of degradation in prison, with the permanent stigma which that attaches. For the Government to impose these hardships for the sake of a corrupt war policy is equally as unjust as conscripting men and sending them to risk their lives to defend such a policy. A proper amnesty measure must mitigate these hardships while an alternative service requirement would only supplement them.

UNIVERSAL AMNESTY

Not only is the amnesty I propose thus unconditional, but it is broad enough to cover all classes of essentially nonviolent war resisters. I feel that amnesty should extend not just to draft evaders but to deserters and antiwar demonstrators as well. Under my bill amnesty would be

granted automatically to anyone who refused or evaded induction under the draft laws, to anyone who absented himself from the Armed Forces, and to violators of associated statutes when such violations occurred or will occur during the war years. In addition, my bill proposes the establishment of an Amnesty Commission appointed by the Congress and the President to grant amnesty to violators of any other Federal, State, or local laws when the Commission finds that the violation was motivated substantially by opposition to the war and that it did not result in significant property damage or personal injury. The bill gives the Commission leeway to grant amnesty further when it finds in rare instances that although the violation did result in damage it was nevertheless justifiable on the basis of a deeply held ethical or moral belief.

FULL RESTORATION OF RIGHTS

The amnesty I propose is thorough enough to negate every legal consequence suffered as a result of war resistance. With respect to the violations I have mentioned, a grant of amnesty under my bill would restore all civil, political, citizenship, and property rights. It would release those imprisoned. It would immunize from criminal prosecution. It would expunge all criminal records. And it would require the Armed Forces to grant an honorable discharge to anyone who received other than an honorable discharge because of the violations I have mentioned. A further provision would require restoration of citizenship upon simple request, to anyone who renounced his citizenship because of his opposition to the war.

AVOIDING UNFAIR DISCRIMINATION

In developing amnesty legislation it is essential to insure that a grant of amnesty will not discriminate unfairly between resisters in different formal legal classifications, or from different socioeconomic backgrounds. It would be hypocritical in the extreme to restore the rights of draft evaders while denying reinstatement to deserters, who simply came to their moral awareness after entry into the service rather than before. The legal distinction between draft evaders on the one hand, and deserters on the other is not relevant to the question of amnesty. The question is a moral one, and no moral distinction can be made between these two groups.

Other amnesty proposals have suggested automatic amnesty for draft violators but more careful consideration or no consideration at all for deserters. The theory, supposedly, is that the motives of draft evaders are more easily identifiable as conscientious, while the motives of deserters are more diverse or tend to be selfish. While this theory is not supported by the facts, I question its relevance, since it is impossible to devise a fair administrative mechanism to identify motives. The records of draft boards and military boards who have ruled on the sincerity of conscientious objectors show that such proceedings are by nature arbitrary and capricious, discriminating flagrantly against those who are less well educated and less articulate in

stating their beliefs. In fact, many war resisters, both convicts and fugitives, are themselves conscientious objectors who were unable to convince their draft boards but unwilling to compromise their beliefs. It would be absurd to require such men to submit their consciences to further governmental scrutiny. What recourse would they have if they failed a second time to establish their sincerity in an arbitrary administrative proceeding?

At the same time there are a great many other convicts or exiles who have never applied for CO status or perhaps would not consider themselves CO's under the law, who might be unable to articulate their beliefs but who, nevertheless acted upon a deeply felt opposition to the war. The only way to restore justice for those individuals is to grant a blanket amnesty, for certain acts, which undeniably would apply to all regardless of motive.

But is this a real problem? Must we really be concerned as to the motives of those who refused to fight? In the final analysis, if we affirm and stand by the judgment voiced by the majority of the people that the war is immoral, then it follows that no one could rightly be compelled to participate in it. If the duty to fight was not legitimate then we cannot punish anyone who failed to fight, regardless of the motives for his failure. Under our birthright as Americans none of us can be deprived of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness without just cause. I submit that our war policy in Southeast Asia has never constituted such a just cause.

BRINGING HOME THE WAR-RESISTERS

The final unique feature of my legislation is its effectiveness in responding to the just demands of war-resisters themselves. It is an unprecedented and tragic fact that this country has lost to self-imposed exile, an enormous number of its finest, most conscientious, most creative young people. One of the most important purposes of any amnesty measure must be to bring these exiles home, so they can lend their energies to rebuilding the Nation, to effecting the changes we need, and to working with the political structure to insure that we have no more Vietnams. No measure short of the one I propose can succeed in accomplishing this purpose.

Every communication from war exiles abroad which I have seen in the press, in my own mail, and at recent congressional hearings, makes it clear that virtually none of the war exiles would return home under the half-way amnesty proposals which we have seen in Congress up to the present.

War-resisters to whom amnesty would apply have rejected previous amnesty legislation for a number of sound reasons. First, they must, on principle, oppose any attempt to reconcile them or the American people to a war policy which they have found unconscionable, and which our Government continues to espouse. Second, they reject discriminatory amnesty measures which grant relief to some members of their group while ignoring others, especially deserters.

Third, they reject amnesty measures which impose essentially punitive conditions such as alternative service. They regard the war as criminal, and they ask, "Since we refused to commit the crime, why should we be punished?"

I join with war-resisters in rejecting the tokenism inherent in previous amnesty legislation.

To summarize, my bill would grant unconditional amnesty upon a stipulated end of the war. It would grant amnesty to all classes of essentially non-violent war-resisters who have violated Federal, State, and local laws in the course of their protest. It will restore to the recipient every right of citizenship and negate every legal disadvantage suffered as a consequence of war protest. My bill will avoid discrimination against those who are less well educated, by not requiring a sophisticated explication of the philosophical motives behind the acts subject to amnesty. Finally my bill will effectively reconcile and repatriate war-resisters, as soon as that is made possible by an end to the war.

This bill embodies honesty and consistency, while not compromising an unalterable opposition to the war. I feel that only by adopting such a measure can we hope to end the war decisively, restore justice to the war's victims and begin to renew our country morally.

Critics of amnesty are numerous, vocal, and, in the main, sincere. Two arguments are most frequently advanced by them to counter the idea of amnesty. First, while few critics attempt to justify the war policy itself, they argue that amnesty for war-resisters would dishonor or disown the sacrifices made by those Americans who fought in Southeast Asia. I do not belittle these sacrifices. On the contrary I mourn them bitterly and deeply because I deem them to have been purposeless, squandered by the Government for wrongful ends or no ends at all. I am angered and I am sickened when I consider all of the tragedies of the war, but I do not direct my anger at those who refused to fight, who were themselves victimized. I direct my anger at the responsible parties—the warmakers in our Government. They are the ones who dishonored our soldiers, by using them and wasting them in a corrupt enterprise. If the Government had listened to the draft refusers, the demonstrators, and the deserters long ago many lives could have been saved and much suffering averted.

To make an analogy, when a court system sentences a man to death and later strikes down the law under which he was sentenced, reversal is ordered. The courts do not insist upon the sentence for the sake of consistency or to honor others who were wrongfully executed. In the carrying out of this war, it is the Government which, as it were, pronounced sentence erroneously against 55,000 young soldiers. It is time for the Government to reverse itself now, and not blindly perpetuate the wrong by punishing those who refused to fight.

Furthermore, how can we be so concerned that amnesty would dishonor the veterans and casualties of Vietnam, when many of the veterans themselves are the most active, dedicated opponents

of the war, and the most vocal proponents of amnesty. Many veterans, having experienced the war firsthand, having witnessed its consequences, and having examined the war's deceptive rationale, have concluded that they should not have fought and would themselves have refused to fight had they been aware at the appropriate time.

A second argument commonly advanced to oppose amnesty is that amnesty now would lead young men of the future to believe that they could shirk their military duties with impunity. Thus, the argument goes, in some future national emergency we would be unable to raise armies. But I would point out that amnesty measures have followed nearly every major war this country has fought. Historically, amnesty is an American tradition. And yet history also shows that whenever the country has been in danger, young citizens have responded and sacrificed willingly in combat. In fact, this country never has experienced significant difficulty in raising armies for its military endeavors. I have faith in the patriotism of young Americans. I have faith that they would rise to defend this country if a national emergency really required it. But I also have faith in their ability to think for themselves, to distinguish right from wrong where their Government's policies are concerned, and to have the courage to resist official policies where they are manifestly immoral.

For these reasons I reject the contentions of those who would deny amnesty. I submit, to the contrary, that a broad amnesty measure would honor us as a nation and serve our most vital national interests.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider carefully this legislation, the text of which I am including in the RECORD. I invite your attention to a brief compilation of statements which support unconditional amnesty eloquently and from various points of view.

I include the text of the bill introduced by myself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 14175

A bill to exonerate and to provide for a general and unconditional amnesty for certain persons who have violated or are alleged to have violated laws in the course of protest against the involvement of the United States in Indochina, and for other purposes
Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "War Resisters Exoneration Act of 1972".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress finds and declares that a general and unconditional amnesty with full restoration of all civil, political, property, and other rights is a necessary measure, after the cessation of United States military operations in Indochina, for the reconciliation and reinstatement of persons who have been prosecuted, or who may be subject to prosecution, for failing to comply with any requirement of, or relating to, service in the Armed Forces during the involvement of the United States in Indochina, or for engaging in any nonviolent activity or activity justified by deeply held moral or ethical belief in protest of, or opposition to, the involvement of the United States in Indochina.

(b) The Congress further finds and declares that it is an immunity of citizens of the United States (within the meaning of section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States) to enjoy the annulment of all legal disadvantages that have been incurred or suffered by reason of opposition to the involvement of the United States in Indochina, to the greatest extent consistent with the preservation of life and property.

EFFECT OF GENERAL AMNESTY

SEC. 3. The general amnesty granted by or under this Act shall, with respect to any violation of law enumerated in section 4 or covered under section 6—

- (1) restore to the grantee all civil, political, citizenship and property rights which have been or might be lost, suspended, or otherwise limited as a consequence of such violation;
- (2) immunize the grantee from criminal prosecution for such violation;
- (3) expunge all notation relating to such violation from the records of courts and law enforcement agencies;
- (4) require the granting of an honorable discharge to any person who received a discharge other than an honorable discharge from the Armed Forces if such violation was solely the cause, or a substantial cause, of the granting of such other than honorable discharge; and
- (5) nullify all other legal consequences of such violation.

AUTOMATIC GENERAL AMNESTY

SEC. 4. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, general amnesty is hereby granted to any person for violation of one or more of the laws enumerated in this section, or regulations and policies promulgated pursuant thereto, if such violation was committed between August 4, 1964, and the effective date of this section. Such amnesty is automatic, and no application to the Amnesty Commission or any other agency is necessary to effectuate it.

(b) General amnesty is granted for violations of any of the following laws:

(1) Section 12 of the Military Selective Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 462) with respect to the following prohibited acts—

(A) evading or refusing registration, evading or refusing induction into the Armed Forces, or willfully failing to perform any other duty under such Act, or conspiring to do so;

(B) knowingly counseling, aiding, or abetting others to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or conspiring to do so; or

(C) publicly and knowingly destroying or mutilating any registration or classification card issued or prescribed pursuant to such Act and knowingly violating or evading any of the provisions of such Act, or rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto relating to the issuance, transfer or possession of any registration or classification card.

(2) Section 882 of title 10 United States Code, which prohibits the soliciting or advising another, or attempting to solicit or advise others, to desert the Armed Forces of the United States.

(3) Sections 885 and 886 of title 10 United States Code, which prohibit deserting or going absent without leave from the Armed Forces of the United States.

(4) Section 887 of title 10 United States Code, which prohibits missing the movement of a ship, aircraft, or unit with which it is required in the course of duty to move.

(5) Section 888 of title 10 United States Code, which prohibits using contemptuous words against the President, the Vice President, Congress, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of a military department, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Governor or legislature of any State, territory, Commonwealth, or possession on which he is on duty

or present while a commissioned officer in the United States Armed Forces.

(6) Section 1381 of title 18 United States Code, which prohibits the enticing or procuring, or conspiring or attempting to entice or procure any person in the Armed Forces of the United States, or who has been recruited for service therein, to desert therefrom, or aiding any such person in deserting, or in attempting to desert from such service; or harboring, concealing, protecting, or assisting any such person who may have deserted from such service, knowing him to have deserted therefrom, or refusing to give up and deliver such person on the demand of any officer authorized to receive him.

(7) Section 2387 of title 18 United States Code, which prohibits the advising, counseling, urging or in any manner causing or attempting to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty by any member of the military or naval forces of the United States, with the intent to interfere with, impair, or influence the loyalty, morale, or discipline of the military or naval forces of the United States.

AMNESTY COMMISSION

SEC. 5. (a) There is established a commission to be known as the Amnesty Commission (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Commission");

(b) The Commission shall be composed of five members, qualified to serve on the Commission by virtue of their education, training, or experience, as follows:

- (1) One appointed by the President.
- (2) One appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate.
- (3) One appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.
- (4) One appointed by the minority leader of the Senate.
- (5) One appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

Individuals who are officers or employees of any government are not eligible for appointment to the Commission. A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) Members shall be appointed for the life of the Commission.

(d) (1) Members of the Commission shall each be entitled to receive an annual salary equal to the annual salary payable to a judge of a United States district court.

(2) While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703(b) of title 5 of the United States Code.

(e) Three members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum. The Chairman of the Commission shall be elected by the members of the Commission.

(f) The Commission may appoint and fix the pay of such personnel as it deems desirable, including such hearing examiners as are necessary for proceedings under this section. The provisions applicable to hearing examiners appointed under section 3105 of title 5 are applicable to hearing examiners appointed pursuant to this subsection.

(g) (1) The Commission may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable it to carry out this section. Upon request of the Chairman of the Commission, the head of such department or agency shall furnish such information to the Commission.

(2) The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(3) The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a

reimbursable basis such administrative support services as the Commission may request.

GRANT OF GENERAL AMNESTY BY THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commission shall grant general amnesty as provided for in section 3 of this Act to any individual who, during the period beginning August 5, 1964, and ending on the effective date of this Act, violated any Federal law (other than one enumerated in section 4 of this Act) or State or local law if the Commission finds that—

(1) such violation was in substantial part motivated by the individual's opposition to, or protest against, the involvement of the United States in Indochina; and

(2) the individual was not personally responsible for any significant property damage or substantial personal injury to others in the course of his violation of any such law;

except that, in any case in which the Commission finds that an individual was personally responsible for significant property damage or substantial personal injury to others in the course of his violation of any such law, the Commission shall grant amnesty if it finds that such conduct was justifiable on the basis of a moral or ethical belief deeply held by the individual.

(b) (1) Whenever the Commission grants general amnesty under this section to an applicant who received a discharge other than an honorable discharge from the Armed Forces, it shall make a finding as to whether any violation of law or which general amnesty is granted was solely the cause, or a substantial cause, of the granting of such discharge.

(2) The Commission shall also have jurisdiction to hear and determine applications from individuals entitled to automatic amnesty under section 4 of this Act and aggrieved by the refusal of the military board concerned to grant an honorable discharge to him under section 3(4) of this Act.

(3) Any finding or determination made by the Commission pursuant to this subsection shall be conclusive upon the military board concerned and is not reviewable by any agency or member of the Armed Forces or any civilian officer of the military establishment.

(c) Any individual desiring amnesty under this section, or review of the decision by a military board to deny him an honorable discharge, shall make application therefor to the Commission in such form as it shall prescribe. The Commission shall not receive any application for amnesty or discharge review under this Act after the close of the 48th month after the month in which this section takes effect.

(d) Any application for amnesty or discharge review which is timely filed shall be determined on the record after opportunity for hearing in accordance with sections 554, 556, and 557 of title 5, United States Code. The entire record developed at the hearing on any application shall be certified to the Commission for decision. All decisions of the Commission shall be by majority vote.

(e) Any applicant may obtain judicial review of a decision by the Commission which is adverse to him by filing a petition for review in the United States court of appeals for the circuit wherein he resides within 60 days after the date on which the decision is made. The Commission shall thereupon file in the court the record of the proceedings on which the Commission based its decision, as provided in section 2112 of title 28. The court shall have jurisdiction to review the decision in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5 and to grant appropriate relief as provided for in such chapter.

(f) Any individual not able to apply to the Commission for a determination under

subsection (b) (2) of this subsection because the decision of the military board concerned to deny him an honorable discharge was made after a date sixty days prior to the closing date specified in subsection (c) of this section may obtain judicial review of such decision by filing a petition for review in the United States district court for the district wherein he resides within sixty days after the date of such decision. The military board concerned shall thereupon file in the court the record of the proceedings on which the board based its decision. The court shall have jurisdiction to review the decision of the military board in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, and to grant appropriate relief as provided for in such chapter.

RESTORATION OF CITIZENSHIP

SEC. 7. Upon petition to any district court of the United States, the United States citizenship of any former citizen who states that he renounced such citizenship solely or partly because of disapproval of involvement of the United States in Indochina shall be fully and unconditionally restored.

SUITS IN THE DISTRICT COURTS

SEC. 8. (a) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction without regard to the amount in controversy to hear actions brought to redress the deprivation of rights granted by section 3 of this Act, and to grant such legal and equitable relief as may be appropriate.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2283 of title 28, United States Code, or any successor provision thereto, a district court hearing an action brought pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may grant injunctive relief staying proceedings in a State court.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 9. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 10. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 11. Sections 4, 6, 7 and 8 of this Act shall take effect upon the date of cessation of United States military operations in or over South Vietnam, North Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand which date shall be proclaimed by the President and shall be not later than three months after the date of enactment of this Act.

THE GENTLE GIANT FROM BROOKLYN

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. CAREY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues three articles written by Dick Young which appeared in the New York Daily News on April 4, 5, and 6, 1972.

These articles pay tribute to Gil Hodges, who died suddenly on Easter Sunday, just 2 days before his 48th birthday. Gil Hodges was a great success in baseball, first as a star first baseman with the Brooklyn Dodgers and later as

manager of the New York Mets. His achievements, as well as his sincerity and humility, served as an inspiration for thousands of youngsters in Brooklyn, where he lived for more than two decades.

I had the personal privilege and honor to be in the company of Gil Hodges a number of times. He met my young children who idolized him. We attended many functions for the benefit of young people. He was famous for giving freely of his time and energy to any good cause in his adopted hometown of Brooklyn.

Mr. Speaker, I insert these articles in the RECORD at this point:

BORN IN MIDDLE AMERICA, TESTED ON IWO JIMA

(By Dick Young)

The fireboat, a mayor's plaything, came around the bend, shooting its water-spouts to the evening sky in a fine spray. The people at the cookout, the baseball players and the basketball players, and their ladies and some children, hurried excitedly down to the edge of the lawn that slopes to the East River behind Gracie Mansion. Gil Hodges remained behind long enough to stuff the last large bite of a hotdog into his mouth.

He turned and noticed a man coming toward him, a man taller even than himself, and as broad. The square jaw, the tousled hair, looked strongly familiar. Gil Hodges' mind spun rapidly, trying to put a name to the face.

"Dave DeBusschere," said the man, a step away, extending his hand. "I just want to tell you I like your style."

"Thanks, and congratulations," said the manager of the champion New York Mets to the forward of the newly-crowned New York Knicks, that mild May evening of 1970.

Let me, please, tell you about Gil Hodges' style. It was born in mid-America, tested on Iwo Jima, and nurtured in Brooklyn where it will be buried on Thursday.

No, that's wrong. He will be buried, but his style lives on in all men of high moral value. He loved his family, his home, his God, Jesus Christ, his country, his team, in that order. He made a show of none of them. Whatever he did, he did quietly, in a time when being quiet, when having those values, seemed to have gone out of fashion.

In managing a ballclub, his style was the detached, aloof way. He resented the propaganda that said the kids of today are different; they must be handled differently. He refused to diaper them, to burp them. He treated them like men, realizing that men, too, must live by rules. His cardinal rules were: Be on time, and be ready to give your best. If you weren't there, it was no big deal. Somebody else would take your place. No fuss. The world would go on. You're not that important. It is a philosophy often tested by ball players, even now.

Ron Swoboda was the first to test the new manager in the spring of '68. The Mets were playing the Orioles at Miami. First inning. Ken Boswell up, and Ron Swoboda due next. The on-deck circle was empty. Gil Hodges looked down the bench. "Where's Swoboda?"

"I'll send somebody into the clubhouse for him," said Rube Walker.

"Don't bother," said Hodges. "Cleon, you get up there."

There was another time, earlier, when he managed in Washington. Perhaps the only major league ballplayer he had was the shortstop, Ed Brinkman, whose wife was expecting. Just before the game, the clubhouse man came to the dugout and told Brinkman the hospital was on the phone. Brinkman went in to answer. A few minutes later, Hodges walked back to the clubhouse. There, alone, in front of his locker sat Ed Brinkman.

"What are you doing here?" said Hodges. "Get to the hospital where you belong."

It's a matter of values. His weren't infallible, but they were good, very good. People will be asking who should manage the Mets. If Gil Hodges were to have a say, he would say Rube Walker. On the rare occasions when Gil couldn't be there, he would turn the team over to Walker, his old Brooklyn teammate, and his first mate through nine years of managing.

One day in Washington, the flu bug hit Hodges hard. He went to the park, but couldn't go on. He turned the club over to Walker, went back to the hotel, climbed into bed, and listened to Rube lead the Senators to victory in the doubleheader, an historic feat.

A moment after the second game ended, the phone rang. Hodges picked it up and, without hearing a thing said, "Yes, Rube."

"Any comments?" said Walker, as smugly as only a close friend can be.

"That's the most disloyal thing I've ever seen a man do!" said Hodges.

His humor was the straightfaced needle, and he could laugh as loudly as anyone at a joke, but there were some things Gil Hodges could not joke about. When he came to manage the clowns who kept falling down in Shea Stadium, he announced that there was nothing funny about losing. The entire philosophy of Shea Stadium changed almost overnight.

Two years later, when the Mets had won the World Series, the editor of a new sports magazine, which specialized in an iconoclastic approach, had an idea for a special cover. Several Mets, in uniform, would pose raising their flag, in exact replica of the famed photograph of the Marines planting Old Glory on the crest of Iwo Jima's Mt. Suribachi. Hodges couldn't believe it.

"Nobody," he said to the editor, "is prouder of my players than I am. But they only won a pennant. The boys you are mocking in that picture died for their country." The magazine printed the picture with models posing in Met uniforms, and shortly went out of business.

Most people who met Gil Hodges, and saw him play ball, recognized him as John Wayne in knickers. He was a stoic figure. He had courage and strength, but was born with neither. He made himself do things, forced himself to stand up to the plate, overcame the common tendency to ball out, the ballplayers' expression for striding away from the pitch on a breaking ball. Sometimes his front leg, planted astride the plate, would quiver visibly. "That's my curve ball knee," he would say smiling.

In "The Boys of Summer," writing of that very thing, Roger Kahn says: "It is a measure of courage that Hodges fought his cringe reflex, year after year. To taste fear as he did, and to choke it down and make a fine career is a continuing act of bravery."

As most outsized men of strength, Hodges was the peacemaker rather than the combatant. Early in his career, when a field fight flared between Pee Wee Reese and a Ft. Worth farmhand named Dee Fondy, Hodges wrapped his steel arms around Fondy, a large man, and deposited him yards away. Another time, when the Braves attacked his roomie, Don Drysdale, and bodies were thrashing on the mound, Hodges reached into the pile, grabbed a leg and pulled. I still can see Eddie Mathews emerging from the heap, his nose furrowing the ground.

"It is not natural for a man to suppress his anger the way Gil Hodges does," I have heard people say. They said it when he had his warning heart attack in August of 1968, blaming it on emotional repression. "A man like that would be better off exploding once in a while, letting it all out."

Gil Hodges did have self-control beyond most men. He considered it a badge of civilization, but there was another reason. He loved his fellow-man. When pushed to the wall, Gil was human enough to explode, and

hated himself for it. There was the pitcher who, due to work that day, showed up drunk. Gil threw him bodily out of the Washington clubhouse.

The pressures of winning, and not winning, got to Gil Hodges much as they get to all big league managers. Pressure was a personal thing. He had gone back to smoking cigarettes, against the doctor's warning. At the Tampa airport last Friday, he was putting his wife and two younger daughters on the plane to New York. And their white poodle, Slugger. The dog, in kennel, would require a ticket said the Eastern Airlines agent. That would be \$12.

"Does he get a first class meal?" Hodges said, peeling off the money. He turned, kissed Joan Hodges, and Cindy and Barbara, and headed out of the terminal.

"Watch the cigarettes," Joan Hodges called after him.

YOGI METS' MANAGER . . . IF HE WANTS JOB (By Dick Young)

Bud Harrelson's right eye was bloodshot red from two days of intermittent rubbing. "If they name one of the coaches," he said, "then Gil Hodges will be managing the Mets in 1972. That would be good. I know I don't want an outsider and I don't think the rest of the guys do."

There will be no outsider, says Don Grant. This much, he says, was decided at an emergency meeting of the club directors Monday night. They met at his Florida place on Hobe Sound, some 40 miles north of where Gil Hodges died suddenly on Easter Sunday.

"It will be somebody within our organization," says Don Grant. You do your organization some good when you promote from within.

I do not doubt the directors already have made their decision. They would prefer to delay an announcement until after the funeral, but an abandonment of propriety may be forced upon them. Should the player strike end abruptly, and everyone scramble to make schedule commitments, the Mets would open in Pittsburgh tomorrow, with a field leader. Tomorrow, Gil Hodges is to be buried.

I believe there were seven names under consideration at the Hobe Sound meeting: Yogi Berra, Rube Walker, Eddie Yost, Joe Pignatano, who are the four coaches; Bob Scheffing, the general manager; Hank Bauer, manager of the Mets' highest farmclub; Whitney Herzog often described as the man who knows a ballplayer when he sees one.

Quickly the field was reduced to the three men who have managed in the bigs: Berra, Bauer and Scheffing. Scheffing, as general manager a member of the board, told the others he would rather not return to uniform at age 58. Scheffing managed the Cubs for three years and the Tigers for 2½, and has been away from it since June of 1963.

That left Hank Bauer and Yogi. Oddly, both have managed in the American League only. Bauer ran for 4½ seasons in Baltimore and, in the midst of it, had a spectacular success. He won the pennants in '66, and swept the Dodgers in four straight—the Koufax-Drysdale Dodgers. A year and a half later, he was canned.

The appreciation of Yogi Berra, manager, was even more mystifying. He led the Yankees for one season, won the pennant, lost the World Series to St. Louis in seven games, with Whitey Ford useless to him, and was fired the next day. A month later he signed on as coach of the Mets. The Yankee decline traces to that place in time.

From time to time, Don Grant has said two things pertinent to this case:

"Yogi Berra has the best job in baseball." "I think Yogi is the highest-paid coach in the game, and worth every penny of it."

The average coach in the bigs goes between 20 and 25 thousand. Yogi is an image-coach, and as such is paid \$35,000. He has

no major responsibility, is under no great pressure. He has substantial outside income, broad security, and he is loved. It is, as Grant says, "the best job in baseball." Why would any man give that up for say, another \$30,000 and a million dollars worth of aggravation?

It's an addiction, that's why. You catch it once, just once, and the craving never leaves. I have asked Yogi, at different times, about managing. Invariably, his answer is something like this: "If the right offer came along, I think I'd like to manage again." There is no offer more right than this one.

Carmen Berra believes that Yogi Berra, Met coach, is "the best job in baseball." She likes the serenity, the handsome smile on that unhandsome face when he comes home at night. She remembers the agony, the worry of those managing days, the times he came home and grunted only once instead of his usual twice, and she wants no more of it. Still, Yogi is her man, and she has a wonderful feminine quality. She believes in him.

The job is Yogi's if he says yes. If not, it is Hank Bauer's. I believe that's how the directors left it at Hobe Sound, and I believe Yogi will take it, right after Carmen Berra says, go ahead, you nut!

"I think the guys would accept Yogi, or any of the other coaches," said Bud Harrelson. "They wouldn't try to crap on him like they might do with some outsider. I think if it's Yogi, that the whole four coaches will really be running the club, and that means Number 14 will be the manager, because they would do things as if he was still there."

"Number 14 is still there, that's right," said Tom Seaver. "Number 14 is still there. If we miss curfew, he'll fine us a hundred."

It is a boyish trait of ballplayers that they refer to their manager by uniform number. Leo Durocher is "Number Two," and Walt Alton is "Double Dozen." Gil Hodges was Number 14, and they would say it big, like the man.

Gil Hodges was just getting to know his men, and they him, when they parted. "I think we were closer this spring than ever before. He seemed happier than I'd seen him," said Bud Harrelson, and his eyes were wet above the red.

It wasn't that Gil Hodges had changed. They had changed, and he had grown happy in the realization of it. They had begun to appreciate his values, to realize he was fair. In past years there had been talk of the Hodges Doghouse. Some players were convinced they had suites in it. Ron Swoboda was one. Cleon Jones another.

Gil Hodges was a shy man. It manifested itself in his horror of speaking publicly. "I am not an orator," he said simply.

It was his phobia that led him and others in his Brooklyn playing years, to believe he would not manage. "Pee-Wee and I used to talk about," I remember him saying. "We had similar beliefs. We love the game so much, but not the outside stress of making public appearances . . ."

Then came the hurt knee, the days on the bench, watching another play first. "Sitting on the bench," he once said, "you start analyzing things. You ask yourself, would I do it that way. I watched Alton make moves, and Stengel, and the opposing managers. I think most players think that way around that time."

"And when did you finally decide to manage?" I asked him.

"On May 21, 1963," he said, grinning. "That's the day I was asked."

HODGES' HANDS QUICKER THAN WILLIAMS' EYES

(By Dick Young)

During the 1969 World Series, Ted Williams, one of baseball's more perceptive men, sat in a field box near third base and watched Eddie Yost in the coach's box. He studied Yost's swift hand signs, then glanced into the dugout at Gil Hodges . . . then back at

Yost. By the end of the game, Ted Williams had reached a startling conclusion.

"Gil Hodges doesn't do anything," he announced. "Once the game starts, Yost runs the club. He gives all the signs. Hodges just sits there."

Eddie Yost tells the story with a smile, not to make out Ted Williams as a dumbo, which he hardly is, but to illustrate how sharply advanced was the Hodges mind, the mind that dropped, mournfully premature, on Easter Sunday, two days short of his 48th birthday.

"Gil was so quick," says Yost, "the other team really didn't know where the signs were coming from, or when. He gave them, all right. But he gave them to me far ahead of time."

"Say there's a man on first, and the batter hits one of those first-to-third singles. As the runner is sliding into third, Gil is giving me the squeeze sign. I glance into the dugout and I see it. The other people in the park are watching the play, they don't see it."

DEVICE OF MAGICIANS

It is the device of magicians, the distraction that makes the hand quicker than the eye. At all games involving a ball, 99.9% of the people watch the ball. The delayed steal is baseball's known exploitation of this common trait—the runner who goes while the catcher lobs the ball back to the pitcher; while the shortstop and second-baseman are relaxed, not thinking of covering. Hodges used this to his advantage, making signs pilfer-proof. He readily adopted stratagems from other sports and applied them to baseball.

"Have you ever watched Johnny Unitas after a turnover?" says Rube Walker. "He just might throw that bomb right quick, first down. The other team is dazed over the fumble, so he hits them while they're down. Gilly liked to do that. If the other team made an error, especially one that cost them a run, steal on them right away. Don't let them up."

Rube Walker is the Met pitching coach. He was Gil Hodges' No. 1 aide: "Some people think I decided when a pitcher was coming out. Not so," says Rube. "He had absolute say on everything. He hated to take a guy out of a game. He was very good at detecting when a pitcher was getting tired."

This was part of the Hodges way of doing things: If the pitcher needed to be slowed down, or a bit of advice, Hodges would send Rube Walker to the mound. If the pitcher was done, it was Hodges who undertook the unpleasantness of sticking a fork in him.

"Gil felt he should be the one. The pitcher who didn't want to come out could give a little guff to me a lot quicker than to Gil," says Rube Walker.

WARNING TO KNOWLES

Harold Knowles had a disconcerting habit. Whenever the manager came out to get him, approaching to within a few steps of the mound, Knowles would flip the ball to him, rather than place it respectfully in the palm, as is custom.

"You are lucky I have pretty good hands," Hodges said to Knowles. "I thought I'd let you know that the day you toss me that ball, and I have to pick it up, it will cost you a hundred."

The Hodges hands were legend. Before I heard of Hodges, I heard of his hands. "We have a kid," Branch Rickey, Jr., said one day in Havana, where the Brooklyn Dodgers trained in '47, "who has hands like hammers. I want you to meet him. He's gonna be something."

When the time came I stuck out my hand, flinching inwardly. "Watch this big hick try to show me how strong he is," I thought. It was like sticking my hand into a bin of feathers. The big hands were gentle.

Yet so adroit. They came to be known as

the best hands at first base. "The only reason Hodges wears a glove," Pee Wee Reese used to say, "is because the rules require it."

He was fearless charging a bunt. Left-handers are sought to play first because they can charge a bunt, or field a ground ball, and throw it to second without wasted motion. Hodges, a righty-thrower, could spot them the extra split-second, the turn of the body, and make the play better than most. His audacity at charging the plate in a bunt situation, disdainful of the possibility that the batter might swing away, was matchless. He once caught a foul-popped bunt on the other side of the third base line.

CAME WITH FRANCHISE

He went to the Dodgers to Los Angeles, but when National League baseball returned to New York, Gil Hodges returned with it. I doubt that Mrs. Payson or Don Grant would have accepted the franchise otherwise. Baseball recognized the obvious, and Gil Hodges became a side deal of the expansion move. When it would be time for the Mets and Houston to pick players from the other clubs, Hodges would be protected for New York. The Mets need not expend an early draft for him. He would be there, waiting. The Astros would keep hands off. On the seventh round, Hodges was picked.

He was 38 then, and he brought with him the old Dodger spirit, and a knee that needed surgery. He played in 54 games that first year and, oh, poetic justice, who hit the first home run ever hit by a Met? Gil Hodges, on opening day 1962. By the next year, his mobility gone, he decided the time had come. On May 21, George Selkirk offered him the job of managing the Washington Senators, another expansion ballclub.

Hodges did exceptionally well there, considering the tools, and the Mets brought him back as their manager for the 1968 season for \$100,000 and a young pitcher named Bill Denney.

The first thing Hodges did was order the Mets to take off their greasepaint. They were to be clowns no longer. The Mets were not a joke. Losing was not a joke. They would win, he told them, and they believed him. A year later, far ahead of his fondest expectations, the Mets, genuinely amazin', were champions of the world.

There were better players in baseball than the Mets that year, but no better team. He made them play as a team, not as individuals, and yet he thought of them as individuals.

"Gilly treated everybody alike," says Joe Pignatano, "but handled each man different. He was a master at it." It was Joe Pignatano who, rushing up to his fallen friend on Easter Sunday, pounded on stilled heart, slapped the face, screaming, sobbing, trying frantically to command some sign of life.

Today, they will bury Gil Hodges, and the Mets will be there. The players' strike, the general strife, all seem so far away. Had there been no strike, had the Pittsburgh ballclub gone through with its opening game tomorrow as intended, the Met players would have defaulted the game. That's how most of his players loved him, respected him. They were in open revolt.

On Tuesday night, before Pittsburgh cancelled, Tom Seaver, the opening day pitcher, said, "I don't know how they expect to play. The players will all be here, at the funeral."

"I'm staying back here for the funeral," said Tommie Agee. "I wouldn't think of playing ball on that day. Gil helped me when I needed him. In his first year, and mine, I had a terrible time. I went 35 at-bats without a hit. He stuck with me. He played me. I was 0-for-two-months, and he played me. I should have been in the minors. He had gone through it himself. He knew what I felt. He always said, hang in there . . . how do you feel? . . . how's the family?"

The players came to the bier in the funeral home on Flatbush avenue, and the umpires.

"He never cursed us," said Tom Gorman. "Hell was about the strongest word he'd use. He'd come out and say, well, what's it all about? He'd give you a chance to explain. If he disagreed, he'd have his say. That was it," said Nick Colosi.

Alongside the casket, in the widow's ordeal, sat Joan Lombardi Hodges, the Brooklyn girl who married the strong young man from Indiana. "Only 48 years," she cried out Tuesday night. "Today was his birthday. Would you believe the children and I never had a birthday party with him?"

A baseball man is a travelling man, and on April 4 he is away from his family. The many absences struck home to Joan Hodges. "Oh, my God," she sobbed. "If I could have him back for just one of those road trips . . ."

RESOLVED TO DIE OR TO BE FREE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, 151 years ago the Greeks rose up in arms to begin a war of independence to free themselves from Turkish oppression.

On the anniversary of this important day for all of mankind, I was invited to speak before the Philadelphia Federation of American Hellenic Societies at Independence Hall in Philadelphia.

I believe it was particularly appropriate to celebrate the revolution of the first pure democracy at the site of the birth of American democracy, Independence Hall.

For 300 years, the Greeks had endured Turkey's rule, then on March 25, 1821, the Greek leaders issued a Proclamation of Revolution:

We, the Greek Nation of Christians, knowing that the Ottoman race despise us, and that it intends destruction for us, using one means or another, have decided resolutely, either to die to the last man or to free ourselves, and because of this, we now hold arms in our hands seeking our rights.

This proclamation is an inspiration to all Americans. For it shows that the Greeks, our cultural forefathers, loved freedom more than life; they rejoiced in it and found they did not want to live without it.

In southeast Pennsylvania there are approximately 25,000 families of Greek extraction. The Greeks are one of many ethnic groups that have contributed so much to the enrichment of the cultural and political life of our Nation.

It is with great pride that I enter into the RECORD the agenda and portions of the proceedings of the 151st anniversary of Greek independence at Independence Hall in Philadelphia:

PROGRAM

Master of Ceremonies: The Honorable Thomas N. Shiomos, Judge of Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas.

Presentation of Colors: VFW "Eleftheria" Post No. 6633 Honor Guard.

National Anthems: Mrs. Eugenia Daglos Vozakis.

Invocation: Reverend John A. Limberakis, pastor, Church of the Annunciation, Greek Orthodox Community of Philadelphia, oldest of its denomination in the triState.

Opening remarks: Mr. George P. Pavlos, A.I.A. President, Philadelphia Federation of Hellenic Societies.

Greetings: The Honorable Gregory G. Lagakos, Judge of Philadelphia Court of Common Pleas.

Proclamation: The Honorable Frank L. Rizzo, Mayor, City of Philadelphia, Presented by the Honorable Martin Weinberg, City Solicitor.

Proclamation: The Honorable Milton J. Shapp, Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and Remarks by the Honorable Frank C. Hilton, Secretary of Property and Supplies, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Remarks: The Honorable Joshua Ellberg, U.S. Congressman.

Address: Dr. Achilles N. Sakell, Public Affairs Advisor, A.I.D., United States Department of State.

Address: The Honorable Elias Gounaris, Consul General of Greece in New York City, representing His Excellency Basil Vitsaxis, Ambassador of Greece.

Benediction: Reverend Stamatios Ganiaris, pastor, Greek Orthodox Church of the Holy Trinity, Wilmington, Delaware.

REMARKS FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE PHILADELPHIA FEDERATION OF AMERICAN HELLENIC SOCIETIES—MR. GEORGE P. PAVLOS.

As President of the Philadelphia Federation of American Hellenic Societies I want first to introduce the Co-Chairman of this celebration—My wife Anne and Mr. Frank Mar-marov for the beautiful job they have done, and then on their behalf, and on behalf of the entire American Greek Community, I wish to express our sincere thanks and gratitude to each one of you, for coming to help us celebrate the 151st Anniversary of Greek Independence.

To all those city of Phila. officials who were kind and cooperative in our efforts, to the superintendent of these Historical grounds made available to us, to Police Commissioner Joseph O'Neill, to Captain Joseph Cifelli and his band, to our soloist Mrs. Eugenia Vozakis, to all the police, to VFW, Boy Scout troop, the church communities and organizations who helped to make this affair a success my heartfelt thanks.

I want to take this opportunity to extend belated special thanks and appreciation to my dear wife who not only this year, but every year takes full charge of problems and details necessary for an affair of this type.

It was 151 years ago, on March 25 1821, that bishop Germanos raised the flag and the Cross, and declared that henceforth Greece will be free from the Turkish rule.

Modern man is fortunate to have inherited many examples of Greek Art, Sculpture, Architecture and Literature.

The U.S. and Greece have always enjoyed good relations because of American respect for the Greek devotion to Freedom.

Such eminent Americans as Henry Clay and Daniel Webster voiced their approval of Greek Independence, as did two other Presidents, James Monroe and James Madison.

During the Post-World War II struggle against the communist rebels President Harry S. Truman noted "This valor of Greece . . . convinces me that the Greek people are equal to the task."

President Dwight D. Eisenhower said in 1953, after the Greeks defeated the communists: "Greece asked no favor except the opportunity to stand for those rights for which it believed and gave the world an example of battle . . . a battle that thrilled the hearts of all free men and free women everywhere."

REMARKS OF DR. ACHILLES N. SAKELL, PUBLIC AFFAIRS ADVISOR, AID, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

We are gathered here today to celebrate the 151st anniversary of the beginning of the

Greek War of Independence. In these trying times it is well to pause for a moment in order to pay tribute to one of the finest human values and qualities, the love of freedom. Love of freedom is a preeminently hellenic attribute. According to the national Greek anthem, "Liberty sprang from the very marrow of the bones of the Hellenes."

The role of Greece in ancient times has been not only that of a brilliant beacon of enlightenment and refined civilization, but also that of an unshakeable rock upon which all the thrusts of the invaders were smashed.

Eventually, however, after repeated incursions, the forces of aggressive despotism prevailed. For four hundred years Greece, the glorious land of heroes and philosophers, the cradle and fountain source of our western civilization was under an alien yoke.

Finally the Greeks took up arms against the oppressors. On the 25th day of March, 1821, the Archbishop of Patras officially raised the standard of the Greek War of Independence and blessed the holy struggle.

I should like to leave this final word with you. Some years ago, at Princeton, Dr. Albert Einstein, undoubtedly one of the ten greatest men that ever lived, Dr. Einstein, while toying with the potentialities of nuclear physics, told me that once the atom is split, the salvation of humanity will lie in the fundamental morality which existed from time immemorial. Unless, he said, we apply the transcendental principles and norms of justice to human relations, the human race will perish. Dr. Sakell, he said, you are of Greek descent and you know the meaning of the Greek word *atom*. It means undivided or indivisible. Well, he said, once the atom is split, humanity had better remain united or perish.

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ELIAS GOUNARIS, CONSUL GENERAL OF GREECE IN NEW YORK CITY, REPRESENTING THE HONORABLE VASILIOS VITSAXIS, AMBASSADOR OF GREECE

In the history of Nations, there are certain events which, quite rightly so, are characterized as turning points, because they decisively influence the future progress and evolution of those nations. The Revolution of 1821 was such a turning point for the Greek Nation, which celebrates, with excusable pride, the 151st Anniversary of that Revolution, this year.

The 151st Anniversary of the Revolution of 1821 finds the nation in a period of intense activity and arduous creative effort. The creative task, which began a few years ago, is already bearing fruit. Law, order, good legislation, intensive economic development and the turn towards improvement in all branches of the States' activities, provoke deep satisfaction with the present state of things and provide guaranties of a better future.

The fruit of those efforts are worthwhile achievements in all branches of Greek national existence. It is the duty, then, of the younger generations to continue the work of their ancestors—that course towards creation and prosperity, with the same faith and the same ambition.

DOUBTS ABOUT THE PRESENT WEST GERMAN GOVERNMENT

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 19, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I have doubts about the sincerity and the

good intentions of the present West German Government. My doubt and apprehension with regard to the future are based on the fact that some of the leaders of the Socialists have maintained that West Germany would be isolated within the Western alliance in case the treaties with Moscow and Warsaw are not ratified plus statements that our Government and its Allies have supported the Willy Brandt Ostpolitik, and that President Nixon has welcomed the Moscow and Warsaw treaties.

Many German leaders are saying that the West could and would seek a detente over the heads of the West Germans in case the treaties are not ratified and that only Brandt and Bahr have a "peace" policy or even that, in case that the treaties are not ratified, the entire Western alliance would be "shaken."

Such statements are nothing but free fabrications and propaganda.

The truth is that we see the acute danger of West Germany slipping slowly into the Socialist camp. There is no doubt that the Communists in the Soviet Union, and everywhere else, want to have all Germany in the Socialist camp. This aim could not be achieved under a Christian Democratic Government, as shown by history. The Christian Democrats have fought in the past for Germany's alliance with the West against the opposition of the Socialists. It is obvious that it can be achieved only under a Socialist Government in West Germany.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize these points:

The West German Parliament is free to make its own decisions. The administration has never supported the Brandt type of Ostpolitik and his type of treaties. The present Moscow and Warsaw treaties are not in the interest of the free world.

The Communists and Socialists have used massive means of pressure on the German people in the last days and weeks through Brezhnev, Gromyko, Pravda, and others. If the West Germans ratify the treaties, they will be subject to future Soviet blackmail and will be drawn slowly but surely—first in the economic field, then in the political field—into the Socialist Communist bloc. If they reject the ratification, the treaties will be renegotiated in the interest of the Federal Republic of Germany and her allies.

I think the German people should know:

The United States will never desert West Germany. It will not go over the head of the Federal Republic of Germany to get a detente and a European Security Conference with the Soviet Union without the Federal Republic or even against its interests.

When President Nixon visits Moscow, he will be there in order to negotiate as a free and equal partner with the Soviet leaders, not in order to sell out Europe. Willy Brandt's policies would seem to weaken the position of our President and the position of the entire free world.

PROGRESS REPORT—THE ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, on December 18, 1971, the Alaska Native Land Claims Act became law, and a factor in Alaska history to rival statehood. I credit my colleagues who worked on this legislation with creating a fair and just settlement, with unprecedented reliance on the concept of self-determination for the Alaska Natives who are the subjects of the act.

The new law, as my colleagues well know, is complex and comprehensive, and will demand the best efforts of the Natives, the State of Alaska, the Federal Government, and many others to be successful. Because I believe my colleagues are interested in the results of their work, and because I believe the concept of self-determination is so well served by progress to date, I offer the following brief report.

Though the funds authorized have not yet been appropriated, many of the different groups as well as a large number of individuals in Alaska have already begun the difficult task of preparing for the implementation of the act. The enrollment process is now well underway under the auspices of the Department of the Interior and the leadership of the Alaska Federation of Natives. Some of the regions have also begun the process of incorporating under the terms of the Settlement Act. Of most importance, I think this legislation is serving to unify and to provide a meaningful sense of direction to many people who have been living in poverty.

Mr. Speaker, I have today received a copy of a comprehensive economic and social development study, entitled, "Implementing the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act," from the Robert Nathan Associates, Inc., of Washington, D.C. I think this study represents the leadership of Alaska Natives and their desire for well planned and orderly development under the terms of the Settlement Act. I know my colleagues will be interested in this study. I would like to share this report by inserting in the RECORD certain portions, including the preface, background, challenge, and plan of action, which presents a good summary statement of the 220-page report. The summary follows:

IMPLEMENTING THE ALASKA NATIVES CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT

PREFACE

In March 1971 the Alaska Federation of Natives Charitable Trust, supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation, contracted with Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc., to conduct a comprehensive economic and social development study. The purpose of the effort was to assist Alaska Natives to take full advantage of the anticipated resources they would receive for the settlement of their land claims.

As often happens in projects of broad scope, research and analysis is constrained by and

dependent upon the availability of pertinent information. Fortunately two institutions in Alaska, the ex-Federal Field Committee for Development Planning of the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Institute for Social, Economic, and Governmental Research of the University of Alaska, have been actively engaged in studies related to the development of Alaska and its Native people. We drew upon both their experiences and their findings and wish to express our thanks for the willingness with which these were shared. Our thanks are also extended to the many officials of both Federal and State agencies who generously contributed their time and knowledge to our analysts.

Of invaluable assistance throughout the study were the staff members of the Charitable Trust. Their daily participation and general counsel not only contributed to the substance of the report but also served to direct our efforts and kept us from straying from our ultimate purpose. Our special thanks are extended to the Board of Directors of the Charitable Trust and to the Alaska Native leadership, without whose support and guidance our efforts would have been without focus or meaning.

BACKGROUND

Alaska history was made with the passage of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act by the U.S. Congress on December 18, 1971. For the Alaska Natives, the importance of the act is unprecedented, for it resolves their long-disputed land rights. For extinguishing their claims the act compensates them with title to 40 million acres of land and \$962.5 million. But of equal importance, the act endorses the principle of Native self-determination and represents an opportunity for Alaska Natives to become a significant force in controlling their own destiny.

To the State of Alaska the act is probably only second in importance to the Alaska Statehood Act itself. The settlement increases the amount of land controlled by the State or its residents by 40 percent and endows a group of its citizens with \$462.5 million from the U.S. Treasury. Large portions of this amount and of the earnings derived from it will be spent or invested in Alaska, thereby substantially stimulating the local and particularly the rural economy. Of special significance to the State is that the consumption and investments will be directed toward improving the social and economic well-being of the Alaska Native, and thereby contributing to the overall well-being of the State.

The following papers report our research and analysis. We trust they will help the Native associations in the State as they go about implementing the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.

THE CHALLENGE

In absolute terms \$962.5 million is a considerable amount of money, but spread over 20 years and 75,000 people its present value is considerably less. Furthermore, in terms of the magnitude of needs to be met, even the gross amount of the settlement is only a minor part of what is required to improve significantly the conditions under which many Alaska Natives live. Whatever index is used for judging the standard of living, the conditions in villages in Alaska are among the lowest. The majority of villages go without indoor plumbing, water and sewers. Many are still without electricity. A recent study reflected that 80 percent of all housing was substandard and needed to be replaced.

The social needs are as great as the need for physical community improvements. The vast majority of Alaska Natives lives apart and removed from Western society. Health care is half as good and illness is twice as prevalent as it is among the white society.

Educational attainment is about one-third that of the white Alaska population. While most white Alaska children attend neighborhood or community secondary schools, the majority of Native students in secondary education are removed from their home towns and placed in dormitories or boarding homes hundreds of miles from their parents, friends, and communities.

The problems of improving health and education in rural Alaska will not be solved by money alone. The per capita health expenditure for the Alaska Native is almost twice that of the U.S. average, yet the care is half as good. Even in education the per pupil expenditure in rural Alaska is higher than that in the more urbanized centers. Approximately \$50 million a year is spent by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Public Health Service in providing health care and education for the Alaska Natives. If this expenditure were constant over a 20-year period, the total amount spent on health and education would be \$1 billion, \$37.5 million greater than the total cash portion of the claims settlement. What is most wanted is the active Native involvement and control of the planning and operation of programs designed to meet Native needs. This participation is essential to the improvement of the present social conditions.

The vast majority of Natives live in small remote villages in harsh climates and on rugged terrain. Those who migrate to urban areas seldom have the opportunity to employ their skills or to attain required skills. Many who remain in the villages prefer life there despite the absence of economic opportunities. In most villages in Alaska the few jobs available and viable are frequently occupied and controlled by non-Natives. Not only is unemployment extremely high, but employment available to Natives is very seasonal and often requires a very mobile work force.

The claims settlement and the accompanying influx of money will serve to expedite change, both social and economic, in the culture. The challenge to the Native community will be how to capitalize on the change and to minimize the harmful effects. The challenge, in short, is whether or not the Alaska Native community will attain the power and rights of self-government to make decisions regarding its own future.

A note of caution needs to be introduced here because hasty and ill-planned actions would significantly water down the benefits of the Settlement Act. Some of these involve:

1. The danger of using Native funds to supplement or replace public services to which all citizens are entitled.
2. The desire of each village and region to act alone, to compete rather than to cooperate for mutual benefit.
3. The tendency to spend without planning as a response to demands to produce immediate and visible results, a tendency that will cause inflation and allow others to profit unreasonably from the monies derived from the settlement.

PLAN OF ACTION

The sections of the report present the different issues facing the Native community in the months and years ahead.

Section II concerns itself with the enrollment. It outlines a position for the Native community to take before the Secretary of the Interior as he begins to draft the rules and regulations which will govern the enrollment process and influence the plan by which the enrollment will be carried out. The paper briefly reviews the previous enrollments in the Native community and compares the task facing the Alaska enrollment to the taking of a population census. The paper concludes with specific recommendations regarding a plan of action.

Section III pertains to Native land selection

and examines several basic steps in the land selection process and raises several issues which should be kept in mind by villages and regions. The steps are categorized as follows: (1) organization for land selection, (2) identifying land resource needs, (3) gathering information, (4) reporting findings, (5) reporting information to the people, and (6) outlining objectives in making the final selection. The paper was intended to serve as a means of help, particularly to villages, in preparation for land selection.

Section IV pertains to the management of the financial resources to be received under the act. It presents the range of alternatives available to regional and village corporations regarding the use of the funds. It discusses the various considerations in establishing a long-term investment program and discusses the various types of investments available to Native corporations. The paper concludes with a discussion of the various arrangements by which investment decisions could be made and implemented.

Section V is an introduction to the process of planning. It examines the basic question of how Native corporations can go about deciding and planning for the future they desire. It demonstrates how one relates resources to needs and develops a plan for using the resources to meet the needs.

Section VI identifies and assesses the major human and material resources available to Alaska Natives and presents guidelines for using these resources to the best advantage in terms of creating more and better jobs, establishing viable business enterprises and obtaining higher levels and qualities of goods and services. It also deals with public employment as a source of jobs and with methods for capitalizing on opportunities for Natives to participate to a far greater extent in filling government jobs.

Section VII provides information about how villages can go about the task of organizing themselves to obtain the benefits to which they are entitled under the Settlement Act.

Section VIII identifies and explains the vital resources, rights and responsibilities of the regional corporations as set forth in the Settlement Act. It also outlines the steps that must be taken to organize the corporations and get their programs underway in an effective manner.

RICHMOND-HENRICO-CHESTERFIELD SCHOOL CONSOLIDATION

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 13, 1972, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, sitting in Richmond, heard oral arguments in the Richmond-Henrico-Chesterfield merger case.

In view of the widespread interest in this case, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Reason Versus Absurdity," published in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Friday, April 14, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

The editorial page editor is Ed Grimsley.

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

REASON VERSUS ABSURDITY

If the Richmond school consolidation case could be resolved on the basis of reason alone, foes of the proposed merger could claim complete victory now. Yesterday, their lawyers utterly demolished the U.S. District Court's rationale for ordering the school systems of the city, Henrico and Chesterfield counties united to promote racial balance in the public schools. All that remains to support the concept of merger is the perverse desire of social engineers to manipulate the racial attitudes of the community.

In mandating consolidation, U.S. District Judge Robert R. Merhige Jr. accepted the theory that "quality education," whatever that is, is impossible without integration that results in a predominately white school system. Ideally, the social psychologists argued, the typical school's black enrollment should be from 20 to 40 per cent. But because blacks constitute the majority of Richmond's school population, an ideal integration plan for the city alone could not be developed. Thus those experts recommended consolidation, and Judge Merhige obliged, ordering the creation of a metropolitan system of predominately white schools with black enrollments of from 17 to 40 per cent. Such a school system, he decreed, is constitutionally required.

Yesterday, Philip B. Kurland, a University of Chicago law professor retained to represent merger opponents, devastated Judge Merhige's absurd doctrine. If the U.S. Constitution requires each school system to be predominantly white and supports the concept of black quotas ranging from 17 to 40 per cent, Kurland noted, 118 of Virginia's 129 school divisions would have to be considered unconstitutional because they either have too many or too few white pupils. Moreover, it would be impossible for many of them ever to meet Judge Merhige's standards of constitutional acceptability.

Consider some statistics:

Buchanan County's school system is 100 per cent white because the county has virtually no black residents. Under Judge Merhige's doctrine, Buchanan's school system is therefore unconstitutional and should be merged with another to promote the desired racial balance. But merged with which county? Neighboring Dickenson? Its school system is 99.2 per cent white. With neighboring Tazewell? Tazewell's school system is 97.2 per cent white.

At the other extreme, Surry county's school system is 100 per cent black. How could it obtain a white majority and thus attain constitutionality? By merging with neighboring Sussex County? No, for the Sussex system is 82 per cent black. By consolidating with neighboring Isle of Wight County? No, because that county's school system is 65 per cent black.

Of course, if the school systems of Surry, Sussex and Isle of Wight could be consolidated with the school systems of Buchanan, Dickenson and Tazewell, a predominantly white and presumably constitutional system would result. But Surry, Sussex and Isle of Wight are about 300 miles as a jet flies, from Buchanan, Dickenson and Tazewell. It is doubtful that even Judge Merhige would approve busing children that far to promote racial balance. On the other hand, would it be fair to allow geography to interfere with the constitutional rights of any student?

Obviously, if the Merhige doctrine of racial balance is constitutionally and educationally essential for the Richmond area, it should be constitutionally and educationally essential for all areas. But it is equally obvious that it would be ridiculous to attempt to implement such a doctrine throughout Virginia. In other words, the whole theory of racial balance is absurd,

which should be reason enough for the appeals court to overrule Judge Merhige.

SHOWDOWN IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 20, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Hanoi's deliberate invasion of South Vietnam in violation of its bombing halt agreement proves Hanoi is the aggressor in Vietnam, which it has been all along. Its commitment of 13 out of its 14 regular army divisions to offensive attack in invasion of otherwise peaceful neighboring countries that only ask to be left alone, is a go-for-broke phenomenon that requires a meaningful military response.

Should this invasion for the North be defeated the odds favor agreement at long last that the war in Vietnam be ended and our prisoners returned. In fact the probability is that this is the only way such agreement can ever be achieved.

To defeat the aggressor South Vietnam's troops are fighting valiantly aided by U.S. air strikes. The invasion depends in large measure on its mechanized force and these depend on oil. If their oil supplies are cut off those enemy tanks cannot keep on.

The showdown is here and as Smith Hempstone puts it so well in the Washington Star, the world is "Heading Toward a Moment of Truth in Vietnam."

HEADING TOWARD A MOMENT OF TRUTH
IN VIETNAM

(By Smith Hempstone)

In a number of ways, it may be just as well that the North Vietnamese launched their massive, multi-pronged invasion, now about to enter its fourth week, of South Vietnam.

With some 12 of its 13 main-force divisions locked in combat on South Vietnamese soil, it becomes a trifle difficult for Hanoi to cling to the hoary fiction that the conflict is essentially a civil war between freedom-loving, anti-imperialist South Vietnamese and a puppet, neo-fascist regime in Saigon.

The war is revealed finally and conclusively for what it in fact has been since the early 1960s: A war of naked, coldly calculated aggression waged by North Vietnam, with the support of the Soviet Union and Communist China, against South Vietnam, supported by the United States.

Not that this will deter Sen. George McGovern. Nor will it change the attitude of the Dovesday Gang, whose bag is denigration of their country and exaltation of its enemies. They have, after all, demonstrated an infinite capacity to believe whatever they wish against and all evidence to the contrary: To hear them tell it, the murder of thousands of South Vietnamese civilians in Hue during the Tet offensive of 1968 was no more than a true expression of the popular will in which a few (no doubt unpleasant) people happened to lose their lives. Nothing to compare to My Lai; Oh, my no!

In the end, of course, the war will be presidential campaign trail, in Ivy League faculty clubs or in the newspaper columns of the mea culpa pamphleteers. It will be won

or lost in the paddies of the Mekong Delta, in the mist-wreathed mountains of the Central Highlands and in the twisting streets of Hue and Saigon and of a hundred nameless villages. And it will be won or lost by the only people who can win or lose it, the people of South Vietnam. American air power and (where it can be brought into) outcome, but they cannot determine it.

The track record of the ARVN (South Vietnamese) troops admittedly is mixed. They have not done well in Cambodia, and rather less than that in Laos. But on their own soil, in defense of hearth and home and family (as was the case during the 1968 Tet and is so now), they have, when well led, given a good account of themselves.

And so perhaps it is just as well that the decisive campaign of the war—and who can doubt that this is it—should come, not in Cambodia or Laos, but literally in their own backyards. And in this respect it is perhaps worth noting that the pitiful flow of refugees is not toward those areas “liberated” by the North Vietnamese but toward government-controlled sanctuaries—and no Asian peasant lightly abandons his land. That is known as voting with your feet.

Thirdly, the invasion is to be welcomed because it casts the cold light of reality upon the euphoria engendered by President Nixon's visit to Peking and his forthcoming trip to Moscow. The exchange of musk oxen and pandas is well and good but it does not alter the fact that the men in charge in Peking, Moscow, Hanoi and most other Communist capitals are a bloody bunch of cutthroats dedicated to the ultimate destruction of democracy everywhere and of the United States in particular.

And finally, that the North Vietnamese should be willing to sacrifice so much blood and treasure with the obvious intent of resurrecting the war as an issue in American politics and procuring the defeat of Richard Nixon in November can be taken as a measure of the effectiveness of the President's policy. Hanoi apparently is convinced that it has no hope of winning the war if Nixon is re-elected and that, at least to this observer, is a rather good reason why he should be.

Nobody in his right mind wants this (or any other) war to continue. But there are worse things than war, things like enslavement and betrayal and self-deception and cowardice. So the lines are drawn and the battle is joined. The distinction between aggressors and defenders is clear.

Peace is very much to be desired, but not at any price. Not the false peace of the Neville Chamberlains and the George McGoverns which contains within it the seeds of later and greater conflicts. Not the peace which is a euphemism for surrender.

Indeed, one could do worse than to recall the words of Lord John Russell, uttered 119 years ago: “If peace cannot be maintained with honor, it is no longer peace.” That still holds true today. Which is one reason Mr. Nixon launched the B52s against Hanoi and Haiphong.

DELAWARE: THE FIRST STATE IN HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 20, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, Delawareans are very proud of the fact that we are the first State of our Nation. Now we are thankful that we are achieving another distinction: The most progressive State in reducing highway accidents.

Recently, I spoke to the Senate about the commendable traffic safety record that Delaware achieved in 1971. Delaware reduced the number of traffic fatalities last year by approximately a quarter from the 1970 rate. This was a greater percentage reduction than in any other State in the continental United States.

Now, Delaware has achieved the highest ranking of all the States in compliance with the Highway Traffic Safety Standards established by the Department of Transportation. It should be noted that Delaware also achieved the No. 1 ranking the previous year.

Much of the basis for this accomplishment is due to the excellent work of our State police and the Department of Public Safety. I would also like to commend the excellent work of Delaware's Federal-State highway safety coordinator, William Scotten, and his deputy, Capt. Walter Nedwick.

I know that all Delawareans are proud of this accomplishment. But more than proud, we are thankful, as this effort has great meaning to the safety and welfare of the people of our State and those who visit Delaware.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a report on this latest achievement by Gov. Russell W. Peterson be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

REPORT BY THE GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

For the second year in a row Delaware has earned the highest national ranking from federal officials for compliance with 16 Highway Safety Standards—scoring 1,387 points out of a possible 1,600.

Governor Russell W. Peterson recently received from John A. Volpe, Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation, a detailed evaluation of Delaware's 1971 highway safety program as compared to the programs

of the other states in the nation, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

“I was very pleased to learn from Secretary Volpe that Delaware's highway safety efforts during the past year were ranked Above Average—the highest possible ranking—placing us among 12 states and the District of Columbia which scored better than 1,250 points,” Governor Peterson explained. “We received a perfect score of 100 points in five standards, a score of 80 or better in another seven standards, a score of 70 or better in three standards, and our lowest score was 66.”

The 66 points were scored on the standard which pertains to a program of highway design, construction and maintenance to improve highway safety. The Governor noted that while Delaware's score on this single standard was low, it was still above the national average of 59.

The only improvement needed to increase to a perfect score the 75 points received for the Emergency Medical Standard is a state wide comprehensive plan for emergency medical services which is already under preparation.

The other standards and the points earned were: Periodic Motor Vehicle Inspection (88), Motor Vehicle Registration (82), Motorcycle Safety (100), Driver Education (90), Driver Licensing (82), Codes and Laws (100), Traffic Courts (100), Alcohol Safety (100), Identification & Surveillance of Accident Locations (91), Traffic Control Devices (86), Pedestrian Safety (81), and Debris Hazard Control and Cleanup (100).

“The Federal report card on the State's implementation of the 16 High Safety Standards, coupled with the fact that the 117 highway deaths on Delaware's roads last year was 23 percent fewer than the 152 of the year before, points up very clearly that we are definitely working the highway safety problem and achieving significant results,” Governor Peterson said.

“But our past achievements in highway safety should in no way lead to complacency,” he added. “Already this year, 29 persons have died on our highways compared to 14 during the same period last year.”

“While this year's higher death rate is partially attributable to the fact that there already have been four multiple fatality accidents claiming 8 lives including two pedestrians, which is an unusual circumstance in so short a period, our law enforcement and highway safety activity remains at the same high level as last year,” the Governor explained.

“I call for every citizen of Delaware to put forth the extra effort needed to further reduce the needless loss of lives on our highways,” the Governor urged.

The National Highway Safety Act of 1966 authorized the U.S. Secretary of Transportation to develop highway safety standards each state strives to meet in order to continue to receive federal highway funds. The implementation of the standards in Delaware is coordinated by the Federal State Highway Safety Coordinator's Office of the Department of Public Safety.

SENATE—Friday, April 21, 1972

The Senate met at 10 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of yesterday, the Senate will now stand adjourned until Tuesday, April 25, 1972, at 10 a.m.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, APRIL 25, 1972

Thereupon, at 10 o'clock and 10 seconds a.m., the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, April 25, 1972.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON DEEP WATER PORT POLICY ISSUES

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will hold a hearing on April 25, 1972, pursuant to the study of national fuels and energy policy authorized under Senate Resolution 45, to review deep water port policy issues. Testimony will be presented by Government witnesses who include:

Dr. Gordon J. F. MacDonald, member, Council on Environmental Quality;
Mr. Robert J. Blackwell, Deputy As-

sistant Secretary for Maritime Affairs, Department of Commerce; and

Lt. Gen. Frederick J. Clarke, Chief, Army Corps of Engineers.

The hearing will convene at 10 a.m. in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building. Representatives of other Government agencies, coastal States and communities, industry, conservation, labor and consumer groups, and independent experts are being asked to submit written statements for the hearing record.