

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A REMARKABLE LADY SPEAKS
ABOUT A NOT TOO REMARKABLE
FACT OF LIFE

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, recently the Intermountain Observer of Boise, Idaho, reprinted a remarkable essay by a remarkable 90-year-old woman from Boise, Idaho. That wonderful lady, Nell Tregaskis prepared her essay for delivery as a speech to the Boise Unitarian-Universalist Fellowship. In her remarks she discusses with frankness and clarity the rewards and the problems of growing old in America.

In one phrase of her essay Mrs. Tregaskis sums up a simple fact that is all too often forgotten by the young:

The young person who rejects age rejects his future self.

I highly commend the essay and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SOME DAY YOU, TOO, WILL GROW OLD—HE WHO REJECTS AGE REJECTS HIS FUTURE SELF
(By Nell Tregaskis)

(NOTE.—The problems of old age may seem remote to those in the spring of life. But eventually the autumn years arrive for most of us. They will be the golden years only for those who prepare for them. The following essay on what it's like to be old is excerpted from a speech given recently by the writer, at the age of 90, to the Boise Unitarian-Universalist Fellowship.)

Except for the fact that I have lived a few more years than most of you, I have no authority to speak to you. Most of you have had as much or more experience as I have had in caring for aging relatives. I have read a few books on aging and death. I have watched many of my friends grow old and die. I have indeed had the personal experience of growing old but I have made no scientific study of these two related subjects. We are all in this together.

With health sustaining and life prolonging methods of today, each one of you (barring accidents) will, in all probability, live to be old. This is a personal problem for each of us. I am going to talk about it from a personal standpoint.

You, as a group, I as a speaker, should be highly commended for being here this morning prepared to take an honest look at a condition that is usually ignored, denied, covered up, fought against by all possible means. The whole world celebrates life, life personified by youth; we are thrilled and rejuvenated etc., etc. While to contemplate old age and death makes us to "shudder and grow sick at heart."

It is the accepted custom of our culture to deny, hide, reject everything associated with old age. As to death—immediately the life is gone and the body is dead, it must be quickly covered, almost as if we felt that it was wrong to look at the face of death until the morticians' not inconsiderable art had restored to it the semblance of resting life.

There is a wide-spread and popular prejudice toward the old. The aged are exposed to an environmental atmosphere that is

hostile to advanced maturity and relatively unkindful of its needs. Amongst such attitudes are to be found the following examples. Old people are fussy, they are cranky and irritable. Old people are cantankerous, they don't understand or approve of anything the kids do. They resist change, live in the past. All this is of course, true. The care-taking, efficient mother becomes the fussy grandmother, the father who worked hard and saved money to get things the way they are becomes the conservative, stingy gramp.

Even those just over 30 are unwelcome in groups of these "kids" who look at older people (no matter how understanding and sympathetic they may be) as potential critics, symbols of conscience.

In the rapid pace of modern living, the slower elderly are treated impatiently by these arrogant, assured youngsters whose insistence on creating a revolution now is more confusing than effective.

The young person who rejects age rejects his future self. As old age approaches, he who has all through younger life clung to this image horror finds it impossible to grow into the truly mature person who has the time and the will to enjoy the so-called "golden years."

Most of us, when we are planning a trip to a strange country, try to find out what to expect. The best way to do this is to talk with someone who has been there. I have!! and I am going to talk to you about my observations and experiences. I hope I may be able to help those who are coming after me to have a happier, healthier, more economically secure old age.

Realization that I was aging came to me as a stupefying surprise. I am going to read you a haiku that expresses exactly how I felt—

"I have always known that at last I would take this road but yesterday—I did not know that it would be today!"

To a man, this surprising realization may come shortly before he reaches that momentous age of 65. If he has been reasonably successful and well-liked, upon retirement, he will be given a dinner, perhaps even a token, such as a watch or plaque. His co-workers will say the most insulting things they can think of while they pound him affectionately upon the back. If it is a woman who has been active in business, professional or civic work, the leader of her thing, whatever it is, will ask her to stand up in meeting while she says some very nice things and pins an orchid on her breast. The retiring lady will get all choked up trying to tell her co-workers, no matter what bitter battles they have had in the past, what their friendship and cooperation has meant to her.

Now you enter the so-called golden years. I believe that (given the very necessary blessing of good health) the years between 65 and 85 can in deed and truth, be golden; but only if you have made preparation for them. First in importance is health. I will forego any temptation to give you herewith a lecture on this subject. Second, economic security. This is a personal problem each of you must answer to your own satisfaction and ability. My personal advice is to decide during the working years what you feel to be the minimum security you will need to make you feel independent when you no longer are earning. As for the rest of your income (if any) after meeting current obligations), live it up, while you can enjoy it most—and while husband and wife can enjoy together.

Part of preparation for old age is to acquire memories of interesting, exciting and thrilling experiences. Store in your memory times of high adventure, triumphant struggles, and

happy experiences. Some old people tell over and over stories of bitter hate, resentment, old injustices, defeats and wrongs. "If you can remember the beauty of the flame, it will be as a glowing ember to give you warmth."

This retirement business must be hard for men. There is a stoppage of that good old paycheck and all it stands for as head of the family. You are at a loss for routine employment. You realize you are a disturbing nuisance around the house.

You are free now to work at something you truly enjoy doing. If you have been doing that all your life, what a wonderful life! True happiness is doing something you love to do and getting paid for it. However, no job is easy or always pleasant. Now you can take it or leave it, but plan during your working years to have a vocation and an avocation after retirement. Prepare for pleasure. Unless you take time out during your busy, active years to listen to beautiful music, to lose yourself in the grandeur of the great literature of the ages, to go into the solitude of nature's holy places, you may not be able to enjoy these things when you have the leisure to do so.

THE GIFT

If you have the fleeting glimmer
Of a talent, guard it well,
When the sunset hours grow dimmer—
It will light you with its spell.
You can warm your old hands by it
In the evening of your days;
But if meanwhile you deny it
You cannot renew its blaze.
Just a fleeting talent, maybe,
Stringing words on threads of song,
Fashioning little things for baby
Making music phrases run;
This will be your joy enduring,
When you are alone and old,
Dearer and more reassuring
Than the riches you may hold.

This leisurely stage of aging presents fewer problems to the average woman because she never really retires from her job of being a wife and homemaker. However she may have more free time. She should have prepared for it by cultivating, during the busy years, interest and involvement in things outside of home, and routine employment. The world is so full of a number of things that need to be done, and of pleasures to enjoy, no one with fair health should be idle or too unhappy. State, church and social organizations are proliferating places and plans for the comfort and entertainment of this time of life. Private business has built luxurious condominiums for the well-to-do. The whole world is yours to visit at cheap or sky high price. You can go to college, take what interests you and to heck with grades.

I hope this look we have taken at this stage of aging will help us to revise our image of age and to make our revised image a reality for each of us. Now we come to the leaden years. Must we also look at this dark side of the picture? Can any good come from considering it? Yes, I think we should look and yes, I think we may see things that will give us insight and understanding. Dylan Thomas says, "Do not go gentle into that good night. Rage! Rage against the dying of the light."

The great tragedy of real old age is that the power of rage departs with the years that steal life forces from the physical organs. Very few of us (if we live to the leaden years) will depart this life without suffering and final helplessness.

Now is the time of great need for love. Just like a baby, the aged need security and tender loving care. Now is the time the younger members of the family need to have sympathetic understanding and great pa-

tience. It is a joy and constant thrill to do the work necessary in caring for a baby or a lovable child developing miraculously before your eyes, but it is a heartbreaking drudgery to care for an aged malfunctioning body, housing a beloved person with nothing to look forward to but deterioration.

Our modern mode of living has made it physically impossible to care for the sick and senile in our homes. We are a kindly civilized people. We provide clean efficient care and what comfort and surcease from pain is possible. If the aged person is gifted or cursed with a strong heart, he may live, helpless and senile, year after long year, an emotional and financial burden to relatives. Relatives who in self defense acquire a callous indifference.

I am sure that there are doctors who will not use all possible artificial means to keep such patients alive. However our universally accepted social standards are such that if a doctor or nurse gave the least possible positive effort to end this life—just a puff to blow out the flickering candle—that doctor or nurse would be judged a murderer. I am not posing an answer to this problem. I am asking each one of you to look at this situation and decide whether or not you personally should do all you can to change the judgment of society as to the guilt of euthanasia. So much for murder.

Now let us take a look at something most people consider worse. Suicide. This act, when consciously committed, is considered by public opinion as a terrible sin. The aged person (sane and reasonable) may feel that logic and emotion point to termination of life as the best possible thing in every way. He is old, he has had a long, possibly a very good life. Nothing is ahead but pain, expense and sad waiting of relatives. Should this person, I or you, make his last conscious act the act of self destruction? Again, I am not going to answer. But should not each of us do all we can to change the public condemnation of such suicide—remove the feeling of guilt from the actor and from those friends and relatives who will have this burden of guilt added to their natural grief?

I am going to read a few verses of Edgar Allen Poe's poem on—Spirits of the Dead.

Not only because I think it is a good idea to end a sort of preachy talk such as this with a nice poem but because (still speaking from a personal standpoint) it expresses my own feeling for what is beyond death.

SPIRITS OF THE DEAD

(By Edgar Allen Poe)

Thy soul shall find itself alone
Mid dark thoughts of the gray tombstone:
Not one of all the crowd, to pry
Into thine hour of secrecy.
Be silent in that solitude
Which is not loneliness—for then
The spirits of the dead who stood
In life before thee are again
In death around thee—and their will
Shall overshadow thee: be still.
Now are thoughts thou shalt not banish
Now are visions ne'er to vanish
From thy spirit shall they pass
No more—like dewdrops from the grass.
The breeze—the breath of God—is still;
And the mist upon the hill
Shadowy—shadowy—yet unbroken,
Is a symbol and a token—
How it hangs upon the trees
A mystery of mysteries!

NATIONWIDE TOUR

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently a nationwide tour by four farm-

ers to communicate agriculture's true story to the public was conducted by the National Agricultural Institute, a Washington-based organization. One of the tour-team members was a personal friend of mine from Memphis, Mr. John Barringer.

John is an outstanding young Mid-south farmer and an individual who gives me a sense of confidence about the future of agriculture in our country. He is an able spokesman for the cattle producer of the Midsouth and the Nation, and one who understands the relationship between food prices and agricultural production. In addition, he proved on this recent seven-city tour that he has the ability to articulate the farmer's case.

There has been much discussion recently about food prices and I feel that my colleagues will be interested in hearing the facts directly from a farmer. For that reason, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the May 7, 1972, edition of the Memphis Commercial Appeal, which is an interview with John upon the conclusion of his tour. In making this available for Members' study, I wish to commend and congratulate John and the other members of the tour group for the outstanding service they have rendered to American agriculture.

The item follows at this point.

[From the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, May 7, 1972]

FARMERS MISS FOOD COSTS BLAME

Consumers generally do not blame farmers for higher food prices, John W. Barringer, 32-year-old manager of Barringer Farms of Collierville, said yesterday.

Mr. Barringer and three others recently completed a two-week tour sponsored by the National Agricultural Institute of Washington. It was tabbed Operation FACT (food and agriculture communications tour) and carried Mr. Barringer and others into seven leading cities.

"In a number of cities," he said, "the farmer was not even considered a real factor in high costs of food. Many of the housewives to whom we talked said they have family members who are farmers or in farm-related industries, and they realize farmers weren't charging too much at the consumers' expense."

Mr. Barringer and the other tour members spoke to housewives in supermarkets and elsewhere, appeared on national and local television programs and on many radio shows. They started out in Washington with a press conference called by Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz, and also visited Chicago, the Seattle-Tacoma area, Houston, Atlanta, Boston and New York City.

Only in the East did consumers seem to blame farmers for high food costs, he said, and even then they admitted they really didn't understand.

In Washington, Mr. Barringer was asked at the press conference how he would explain to a housewife in the supermarket about beef prices rising considerably since October.

"I have no more control over what I get for my cattle when I sell them than the housewife when she pays for beef," he said. "However, consumers do have some collective control. They bid up the price of beef."

Mr. Barringer said beef prices already are on the way down, and this soon should be felt at the retail level.

The tour team tried to point out positive aspects of the farm story and to seek better understanding of consumers. The housewives were asked how they felt about farmers in general, food prices, and the connection between them. Some homemakers told the

group they felt farmers were making more money—which was admitted to be true.

"Beef prices are up three per cent for the last 20 years at the farm level, but 33 per cent in retail stores," said Mr. Barringer. "On the other hand, for the same period, consumer services have risen 112 per cent, hourly earnings for non-agricultural workers 144 per cent, hourly earnings for manufacturing workers 137 per cent, and retail trade hourly earnings 150 per cent."

And Mr. Barringer noted that per capita income, a key index, gained 145 per cent over the past two decades.

"Meanwhile, farmers' costs have advanced about 125 per cent in the same period."

Mr. Barringer manages a family owned and leased farming operation of 3,000 acres. It has a 500-head cow-calf herd with feedlot facilities for 1,000 head. Also 400 acres are farmed for cotton and feed grains and the farm supports a dairy calf-raising operation.

Also on the tour were J. S. Francis of Peoria, Ariz., cotton and alfalfa producer who is chairman of the National Cotton Council promotion and public relations committee; E. Thurman Gaskill of Corwith, Iowa, operator of a 960-acre corn-hog-soybean farm, and Eugene Moos of Edwall, Wash., operator of a family wheat farm.

THE GOVERNMENT IS THROWING AWAY HUGE SUMS OF TAX DOLLARS

HON. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, in an unusually frank address, George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, made this statement:

The Federal government has been throwing billions of dollars into these problem areas (central cities) without making a dent upon them. It is now foolish to say that if we will only spend a little more money we will resolve these difficult issues . . .

The truth is—none of us are now sure what are the right things to do.

Secretary Romney is a liberal Republican.

Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, of Connecticut, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and a liberal Democrat, has made the statement frequently during public sessions of the Committee on Finance that while the Federal Government is spending \$31 billion annually on 168 antipoverty programs, the desired results are not being obtained.

I think both Secretary Romney and Senator RIBICOFF are right. The Government is throwing away huge sums of tax dollars.

The purposes are good—but the results are nil.

What the country needs most on the domestic front is to have the Government to put its financial house in order, to stop running smashing deficits, and to discard the many Government programs that have been proved wasteful and unproductive.

In his speech, Secretary Romney observed:

The truth is—none of us are now sure what are the right things to do.

I think this is a correct observation, and that it applies to many kinds of

domestic programs. If we are to have effective programs, ones which really provide meaningful help to those who need it, then we are going to have to re-examine our whole approach—and not just shell out endless billions on programs that have accomplished little or nothing in the past.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from Secretary Romney's address, published in the April 10 issue of U.S. News & World Report, be printed in the RECORD.

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

VAST CITY AREAS "BREAKING DOWN INTO

A JUNGLE"

(By George Romney)

Whole neighborhoods and vast central-city areas are experiencing such serious blight that the whole human social web that makes living possible is breaking down into a veritable jungle. . . .

We are dealing with two classes of poor. Those who attempt to continue to maintain a stable life pattern and who are not a danger to the general community, and, secondly, a much smaller group who have become the victims of social disorder, entering into the heroin subculture, and are participating in crime and vandalism on a large scale. This second population is a threat to the larger group of the poor around them and to the general population.

Unfortunately, society at large is not making the distinction between these two groups but is tending to lump them together and to stereotype the black poor, in particular, with heroin addiction, crime, violence and antisocial behavior.

An additional feature that must be noted is the growing antagonisms . . . between the working poor and the welfare poor. This is an indication that the working poor are attracting the stereotype of crime, violence and antisocial behavior to the entire group of the welfare poor.

Beyond this, we have the growing antagonisms between moderate-income groups that feel trapped within the central city because they cannot sell their home, which is the main investment of their life, in order to move to the suburb, and they feel threatened by the deteriorating social situation around them. . . .

Another very large set of problems that is involved relates to the future of the central city itself. It has been estimated that 50 per cent of the jobs in the metropolitan areas are now outside the central city and the movement of jobs from the central city to the suburb is accelerating very rapidly. The flight of the middle and upper-income groups to the suburbs, the concentration of problem populations in the central city with higher welfare costs, higher crime-control costs, higher educational costs, and a decreasing tax base—both in terms of residential property and in terms of manufacturing and commercial property—results in a growing fiscal crisis for the central city.

At the very same time, municipal workers are becoming more organized and more able to pressure annual wage increases.

The economic resources of the city administrations to meet these increased demands and to maintain services is deteriorating sharply. The more city services decline, and the more general environment appears to be deteriorating, the more is accelerated the flight to the suburbs by both business and the individual. . . .

We would do a disservice to ourselves and to the nation if we continue to approach this problem with any sense of easy optimism. There are those who say that a frank statement of the problem is so demoralizing that it contributes to making the problem worse.

It is my belief that it is essential that we face the problem in all its stark reality and full dimensions, particularly because of its contagious character.

For the problems of the central cities are beginning to penetrate the suburbs. As the Vice President has pointed out—a city is like an apple. If it rots at the core, soon the whole apple will be rotten. . . . We have been throwing billions of dollars into these problem areas without making a dent upon them. It is now foolish to say that if we will only spend a little more money we will resolve these difficult issues. . . .

The truth is—none of us are now sure what are the right things to do.

SPANISH DIPLOMAT SCORES FULBRIGHT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a shocking exhibition of the misuse of authority is being perpetrated by the junior Senator from Arkansas, who is chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as he continues his ill-conceived vendetta against Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Continued news reports and editorial commentaries in the press consistently point out the fallacy of Senator Fulbright's position. Two recent articles that I insert into the RECORD at this point are columns by the esteemed international correspondent of the Copley Press, Dumitru Danielopol, which appeared in the Joliet Herald News of May 22, and by the Asian correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, April Klimley, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of May 24.

The articles follow:

SPANISH DIPLOMAT SCORES FULBRIGHT

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—Sen. J. William Fulbright, D-Ark., is not popular in other countries, either.

Recently Prof. Salvador De Madariaga, Spanish diplomat, writer and teacher, former ambassador to Washington and a fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, deplored Fulbright's bid to silence Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

In an article published in the Argentine "El Globo," Madariaga says that the two stations have earned their right to stay on the air.

"Their main role is to keep alive mentally and morally, like the real human beings that they are, millions of people of Europe and Russia who otherwise would vegetate without hope in that immense prison built by the Soviet Union and its European colonies," Madariaga says.

The two stations give these prisoners a chance to participate daily not only in the life of the West but of the entire world.

To silence these voices, Madariaga says, would be an act of incomparable stupidity.

The Spanish diplomat debunks Fulbright's theories.

It isn't true that the cold war is over, Madariaga says:

When did it stop? What, for instance, was the invasion of Czechoslovakia, the invasion of the Mediterranean by Soviet naval power, what are the 839 hours daily broadcast by the Communists in 100 languages? What is the meaning of the myriad of Soviet spies strewn all over the world?

"Obviously Sen. Fulbright is unaware that

Soviet opposition to the liberal system of the West is absolute," the Spaniard writes. "The cold war will only be over when one or the other is triumphant."

Can one achieve detente?

No! Says Madariaga.

Ever since the war, the West has done everything in its power to have a detente with the Soviet Union, he says, but it was the Kremlin that refused. It was the Russians who refused the generous offer of the Marshall Plan made by the United States, it was they who built the Iron Curtain.

"How is it possible that such an intelligent and honest man as Sen. Fulbright to be so wrong, to be so far from the truth?" asks Madariaga.

"Purely and simply because he is the victim of the persistent propaganda aimed at bringing about confusion which the Soviet Union has deployed year after year. And he is not the only victim of this brain-washing. Another man who is suffering from the same predicament is Chancellor Willy Brandt of West Germany, another honest and intelligent man who has been duped to believe that he is working for peace in his disastrous estpolitik."

In both cases, Madariaga says, "the blindness is not the eyes but in the mind."

FUNDING IN JEOPARDY?—RADIO LIBERTY'S SIBERIAN REACH

(By April Klimley)

TAIPEI, TAIWAN.—Employees at the Taipei branch of Radio Liberty are worried that all U.S. congressional appropriations for their work will end June 20.

The station, which broadcasts in Russian to the U.S.S.R., came under attack this spring when Sen. J. W. Fulbright (D) of Arkansas accused it of being "a relic of the cold war."

Senator Fulbright's remarks and budget cuts demanded by Congress soon forced Radio Liberty's Taipei staff to face a reduction from 15 to 9, not to mention creating the feeling that the entire operation might be in jeopardy.

The Taipei bureau of Radio Liberty serves as a relay station to Siberia. The staff puts together a two-hour program each day based on scripts and tapes sent from Radio Liberty's Munich, Germany, headquarters.

The news is voiced by two Russian-language native speakers in Taipei. Three transmitters send the program simultaneously for eight hours a day with one frequency beamed to the Lake Baikal area and the other two aimed at the maritime provinces. This shotgun effect attempts to elude Soviet jamming.

NEWS EVENTS FOLLOWED

Although the station emphasizes news from Eastern Europe and Russia, there is little blatant propaganda in the daily newscasts. The excerpts from Western newspaper editorials, which follow the news frequently, do not even touch on subjects directly related to the U.S.S.R.

The press review usually concentrates on the big news of the day, such as the invasion of South Vietnam, and newspaper editorials express divergent views. The rest of the show is made up of taped commentaries on cultural, scientific, or political subjects.

Employees of the station deny that their programs are propaganda. One source explained that things have changed since the days when the station called itself "Liberation Radio" and encouraged people to actively oppose their government.

After Western countries failed to respond to the Hungarian revolt of 1956, the station changed its name and began to aim at developing a public opinion within the Soviet Union that could both exert a braking effect on Soviet foreign policy and encourage the government to improve living conditions.

BOOKS BROADCAST

One way the station tries to do this is by broadcasting "samizdats," or self-publica-

tions, which are unauthorized writing smuggled out of the U.S.S.R. They are read at dictation speed, chapter by chapter, so that listeners can make copies if they like.

The station broadcast all of Alexander T. Solzhenitsyn's books this way, with the exception of his latest, which is yet to come.

Mr. Solzhenitsyn himself has come to the defense of Radio Liberty. In early April he told a New York Times reporter that "if we hear anything about events in this country, it's through them."

The station transmitted Eugene Ginsberg's book "Noontime" and the court transcripts of the trial of the young poet Vladimir Bukovsky.

Recently the bureau has been broadcasting something on Mr. Solzhenitsyn almost every day. On April 26 it read his New York Times-interview defense against an attack made on the funeral lament he had given for an editor-friend.

He told the Times that it was while listening to Radio Liberty that he first heard of the attack.

FEEDBACK LACKING

Despite its important target area in the far eastern Soviet Union, the Taipei branch of Radio Liberty is considered a country cousin of the metropolitan headquarters in Munich. European relay centers beam programs to the Soviet Union's more populated western cities, and fan letters usually come from these areas.

"They frequently think of closing us down because of this," complained one man close to the Taipei station. He went on to explain that this lack of feedback is probably the result of the fact that mail from Siberia, unlike mail from western Russia, must first go through Moscow before leaving the country.

In the early 1950's Radio Liberty had private income sources. But these have gradually dried up.

ACHIEVEMENTS CITED

The people in the Taipei bureau feel they have played a vital part in creating the new intellectual climate visible in the Soviet Union today—so different from that under Stalin. "We're needed now more than ever," one employee insisted.

"Without our broadcasting, things would be even more tragic for people like Solzhenitsyn. For instance, without us very few would have heard his works. They wouldn't know whether the charges against him are true or not. Now he's so well known even inside the country that the government can't afford to make him disappear all at once."

In his Times interview Solzhenitsyn readily admitted the Radio Liberty broadcasts help protect him. But solitary achievements like this may not be enough to keep Radio Liberty alive.

BRAND NAMES RETAILER-OF-THE-YEAR

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Ace Hardware, of Springfield and Jacksonville, has been named 1971 "Brand Names Retailer-of-the-Year," in the hardware category, by the National Brand Names Foundation of New York. The award was presented to George T. Preckwinkle, president of the firm, in ceremonies held in New York in April 1972.

In recognition of this honor, Gov. Richard Ogilvie has proclaimed the month of June as Brand Names Month in Illinois. The coveted award is bestowed for good retail citizenship, consumer protection, and outstanding name brand merchandising.

Twice a certificate of distinction winner in previous competition, the 17-year-old hardware company received this top award under a basic brand policy of "offering only the best—of merchandise—of service—and of ourselves." The firm is now eligible to compete for the "Merchandiser-of-the-Year" award in 1972—the symbol of brand names merchandising excellence in all categories.

Ace Hardware has grown from a modest three-man operation in Springfield in 1955, when it had a combined sales, service, and warehouse space of 1,500 feet, to one of the largest and most modern hardware facilities in Illinois, employing approximately 100 persons in Springfield and Jacksonville today. Immediate plans call for construction of a second, larger store in Springfield and a store in Taylorville late in 1972 or early in 1973.

This is a fine example of how our Nation's policy of free enterprise encourages its citizens to succeed.

Mr. Preckwinkle's own philosophy of "offering the best—of ourselves" is exemplified in his personal life by expenditures of vast amounts of time and resources to activities such as serving as trustee of his church; as vice president of the Scout Council in his area; as board member and membership chairman of the YMCA; as secretary of the Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce; and as a board member of the Kiwanis Club.

In addition, his personal example and encouragement have resulted in active participation by his employees in other worthwhile activities.

Ace Hardware, of Springfield and Jacksonville, Brand Names Retailer-of-the-Year, is working toward the future and investing in the growth of America.

CONGRESSMEN CONOVER, DENT, GAYDOS, HEINZ, AND MOORHEAD ATTEND LUNCH HONORING WINNING AND RUNNER-UP TEAMS OF WTAE-TV JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL QUIZ PROGRAM

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, Thursday, May 18, Congressmen MOORHEAD, HEINZ, GAYDOS, CONOVER, and myself had the pleasure of having lunch with the winning and runner-up teams of the WTAE-TV, Pittsburgh, Pa., junior high quiz. This is a most interesting and constructive public service program. WTAE-TV of Pittsburgh and western Pennsylvania deserves the gratitude of citizens, parents, and educators for their untiring efforts in this phase of education and public service.

The winning school was Penn Joint High School, Claridge, Pa., which is in my district. The runner-up, Cornell High School, is from Allegheny County. I assure you that it was a proud moment for me to congratulate the winning team, Penn Joint High School, for its success of the season in the contest. These youngsters show an exceptionally high I.Q. and a fine, clean, competitive attitude.

A special congratulation and commendation must go to the moderator, Ricki Wertz. She is an accomplished, capable, and experienced moderator. The rest of the tour members were: Tom Borden, Preston Stover, Bob Taylor, Charles McGrath, Bill Verno, Wally Abel, and Tom Phipps.

In behalf of the Members of Congress, I wish to thank all of those who participated in the program.

THE SHAME OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues an article from the Decalogue Journal by Bernard Epton, an eminent Chicago lawyer, who presently serves as a member of the Illinois General Assembly.

Senator Epton's article entitled "The Shame of the Legal Profession," was written in response to an earlier article in the same publication which projected the future structure of the legal profession and observed that the practice of law will be increasingly concentrated in large firms modeled on business corporations, and that the practice of law will increasingly resemble a business rather than a service profession.

Senator Epton agreed that this is the current trend, but properly questions whether the trend is inevitable. He suggests that the profession has a strong responsibility to resist further concentration of power in large, elitist firms. Entry to the profession should be broadened, not restricted, if the law is to be an impartial tool available to all who need its protection, rather than a weapon available only to those who can afford it.

The text of the article follows:

THE SHAME OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION

(By Bernard E. Epton)

It was with a sinking heart that I read William J. Fuchs well written article "Lawyers and Law Firms Look Ahead—1971 to 2000," in the October 1971 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. Mr. Fuchs is a much better prophet than he suspects. I, for one, agree with many of his conclusions. The shame of it, however, is the fact that many of the inevitable conclusions he predicts are ones which the legal profession itself has given birth to.

It is sad indeed to consider that lawyers will still flourish even though the practice of the law will change when we realize the destiny that we have ordained for ourselves. To suggest that "for better or worse, the law firm of the future will become more and more like a business corporation. The law

will become more a business and less a profession than it has been . . ." and supinely accept this as the future, is not worthy of a man of Mr. Fuchs caliber.

I cannot help but reflect upon the outcries by the great bar associations, including the American Bar Association, upon the necessity of disciplining the legal profession. I am enraptured at the thought that the Chief Justice has indicated that the bar need cleanse itself. Where, oh where, was the Chief Justice and the noble bar associations when the problems of the legal fraternity were festering in every urban community throughout the land? Where, oh where, was the Chief Justice as well as the large law firms and the bar associations when the illiterate and the impoverished were being preyed upon? Where, oh where, were our leading jurists and our large law firms and our legal associations when corrupt and incompetent lawyers were sowing the seeds of despair and cynicism throughout 50 states. To be sure, seminars undoubtedly were being held in London or in San Francisco or in Miami Beach or in Hawaii dealing with the problems of corporate law and probate practice and tort law. The cry for disciplining the legal profession and its errant practitioners may not have been entirely absent, but it most assuredly was rather muted.

I have no quarrel with Mr. Fuchs or the Chief Justice. Although I have never met either gentleman, undoubtedly they are well intentioned individuals with impeccable credentials. I do, however, have a quarrel with the large law firms whose contribution to society will, more than any other single entity, bring forth the very future that Mr. Fuchs predicts. These are the large law firms which so thoroughly dominate the leading bar associations. To suggest otherwise is to simply deny the existence of the sun. In Mr. Fuchs fine article, he indicates that the sole practitioner may well be the "vanishing American." He very gently suggests that all is not lost, however. The sole practitioner or the small law firm can always find a pleasant existence in rural areas and I do not believe that he is too far short of the mark. The large firms today dominate such a great segment of our nation that practice in the urban communities is not too far removed from a monopoly.

Although I do not have any studies to scientifically substantiate the charge, unlike Mr. Fuchs, it is more than an article of faith. I am satisfied that the "Court can take judicial notice." Large law firms tend to monopolize the available good legal business and the only way this tendency could be counteracted would perhaps be through legislation limiting the number of lawyers who might associate in a firm or a professional service corporation for the practice of law. It is certainly true that no one has as yet produced a comprehensive study along scientific lines relative to the economics of the legal profession, but the investigations that have been forthcoming have assembled enough information to warrant the conclusions that the bar in metropolitan areas is definitely stratified in terms of income and influence.

In New York City and Chicago and other very large cities, the "best" law business is in command of a relatively few large law firms, who represent the banks, insurance companies, public utilities, manufacturing concerns, large retail merchants, etc. These "aristocrats" of the metropolitan legal world come from the prestigious law schools and congregate in the largest law firms, those with staffs of 50 to 300 lawyers. Their connections in the business, financial and social worlds practically guarantees a lucrative flow of legal business to these men and their firms. Is it difficult to believe that in many of the large law firms, you have what appears to be a law mill or a law factory? In many cases, situations exist where the individual lawyer handling a particular matter may not even

know the client he represents and certainly any personal relationship is non-existent. Can any lawyer worthy of his license simply allow this situation to exist without making an effort to reverse the trend? The very basis of the legal profession was and is a client-lawyer relationship and how or why that can continue to exist in the face of these large and expanding law firms is difficult to perceive.

We will not dwell upon the obvious possibility of conflicts of interest which may occur with great frequency in factories of this size. Time and again, one law firm may handle a particular matter only to find that the party on the other side is a client of their firm as well. More important than this potential conflict of interest, however, is the fact that this bigness, this machine efficiency which is threatening to engulf our nation and our way of life is something which should be stopped. Not only the legal profession, but our medical brethren as well, should be foremost in their determination to retain the personal relationship so essential to our sanity.

There are many who might disagree with some or all of my previous comments, but can anyone question the tremendous power which is contained in any large firm? Some of the leading large law firms steadfastly insist that their power is utilized for good, that they are in the forefront of civic endeavor, charitable drives and social welfare. The fact remains that much of their power is often used in an opposite direction and even were that not the case, the fact that potentially it could be so utilized is something to be feared. Why even have situations where large law firms have not only dominated the news media or a particular interest, but at least one large law firm in Washington has successfully swayed foreign governments and initiated national treaties.

Are there any amongst you who would question the charge that large law firms effectively dominate the various bar associations? Because of their activities in that area, time and again, lawyers from leading law firms are found in high appointive government offices or in the judiciary, almost always by appointment, rather than election. The power emanating from a large law firm is a power to destroy and if the bar associations were truly honest and objective they would be in the forefront of this fight to effectively restore the legal profession to the individual lawyer rather than the law factory.

And speaking of bar associations, as a member of the pillar of the legal profession, the American Bar Association, I question its arrogance in taking unto itself a determination of what individual is or is not fit for a Federal judicial post. It is bad enough when a local bar association takes a popularity poll to determine whether or not particular candidates are qualified for the Municipal or the Circuit bench, but who has given the right to the American Bar Association to determine who will sit on the Supreme Court or the Federal bench, Attorney General Mitchell notwithstanding.

The Constitution of the United States clearly states that the President of the United States will have the power of appointment, subject to approval by the Senate and if the President is foolish enough to frustrate the intent of the law, certainly no bar association should lend itself to such a deception. Of course, the President has every right and perhaps a duty to consult with individuals and associations before making any appointment. The present method of character assassination and veto power exercised by a handful of lawyers, however, is unfair to the entire profession as well as the nation.

Imagine the arrogance of a bar association which is dedicated to the concept of ethics and the dignity of the law which allows itself to be used as an instrument to gauge

public opinion. If the Constitution wanted the legal profession to select our jurists, undoubtedly it would have so stated.

Let us for a moment, dwell upon the composition of the members of the august body who sits in judgment of our candidates for the judiciary. Of the 12 members presently serving on the Association Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary, a check of their firms would indicate that they have respectively 52 attorneys, 45 attorneys, 33 attorneys, 10 attorneys, 101 attorneys, 31 attorneys, 142 attorneys, 35 attorneys, 120 attorneys, 50 attorneys, 6 attorneys and 51 attorneys.

Although all of the firms do not list their respective clients, it would appear that such clients as Standard Oil, DuPont, Mobile Oil Company, Bethlehem Steel Company, General Electric, Metropolitan Life, Delta Air Lines, IBM, etc., are the most frequently named.

These 12 distinguished gentlemen are the individuals who approved Messrs. Haynsworth and Carswell, etc., and yet disapproved some of the most qualified jurists and lawyers in the country.

It is truly remarkable that with 200,000 practitioners in the United States, so few individual practitioners or lawyers in small law firms can be found with impeccable civic as well as legal credentials.

The American Bar Association is not unique in its indifference to the average lawyer. The same practice, the same hierarchy and the same scale of values is repeated time and again in the state bar associations as well as the local bar associations. All of them have much in common. Almost without exception, they have all failed to meet the problems of disciplining the errant lawyer or removing any cloud from the wrongfully accused attorney.

I would not have you think that all of their activities are without merit. Oh no. There are occasions when the bar associations will present their request for funds, naturally government funds, to provide legal services for the indigent or the oppressed. This once great proud and self-reliant profession but rarely voluntarily provides the money or the time to aid the less fortunate. It might be treason to suggest that an individual could not join a bar association unless he agreed to donate one day a year to aid those who could not afford legal counsel. It might be treason to suggest a compulsory fund to reimburse the client or the litigant who was defrauded by a practitioner or left without redress by virtue of sheer incompetence or malfeasance. It might really be unfair to request additional voluntary time or effort since so much time must be expended in insuring that the Internal Revenue Service allows deductions for trips to London or testimony before committees to obtain certain additional privileges.

Mr. Fuchs has said it well. Large law firms will continue to dominate the present and the future even more. Our disagreement, however, lies only in his belief that it is inevitable. The law can still be a profession. It can still be a relationship between an individual and his client. It can be all of these things without in any way sacrificing the excellence of the practice, or without in any way succumbing to the alleged omnipotence of the large law firm.

YOUTH COALITION 1972

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Youth Coalition 1972 representing various youth

groups around the country, met in Washington, D.C., for 2 days in May to coordinate their efforts behind a unified approach to Democratic victory in November. Youth Coalition 1972 is involving young working people including veterans, labor, and minority groups as well as unemployed youth in their program. Following is a summary of their purposes and goals:

YOUTH COALITION MEETS TO MAP STRATEGY FOR MIAMI DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION—DOMESTIC ISSUES TO BEAT NIXON

Fifty youth leaders from labor, minority, and student life met Friday, May 19th, to plan a program for mobilizing non-college youth in a campaign to defeat Richard Nixon and to avoid conflict at the Democratic National Convention like that which took place in Chicago in 1968.

A statement issued by the group, which met at the Philip Murray Building, a union headquarters in Washington, urged young people to join in Miami behind the following points:

A Democratic platform which speaks to those issues which vitally concern young people from all walks of life, particularly issues such as employment and child care which affect non-college youth.

Strong criticism of those in either the right or left wing of the party who are attempting to blackmail the convention by threatening to sit out the election or to form a third party if their favorite candidate is not nominated.

The conferees mapped plans for the presentation of platform proposals in areas of concern to young people. They decided to seek time at upcoming regional hearings of the Democratic Platform Committee for presentation of platform planks on aid to education, employment, drug addiction, housing, voting rights, veterans' benefits and child care.

Youth Coalition organizers plan to work during the months before the convention and at the convention to contact youth delegates to build support for this strategy.

GOALS AND PERSPECTIVES

Twenty-five million new voters will be eligible to go to the polls this November. Some five or six hundred young activists will go to Miami Beach this July as delegates to the Democratic National Convention. Young people will wield an unprecedented, and perhaps decisive, amount of power in the decision-making processes of 1972.

We hope that that power will contribute to electing a new President. We believe that it will, because the policies of the current administration have harmed so many young people. This administration has consistently championed the special interests of the rich and powerful at the expenses of the vast majority of Americans. Youth, like other marginal groups—the elderly, the racial and ethnic minorities—are the special victims of its callous policies.

When this administration decided as part of its economic game plan, to increase unemployment levels, the unemployment of 20 to 24 year-olds was driven to 11%, the rate among teenagers to 18%, among Negro teenagers to over 40%. When this administration decided to cut the federal budget by vetoing increased aid to education, it denied educational opportunities to thousands of young Americans and impaired the quality of education available to countless others.

While this administration has lavished billions of dollars on big corporations in tax give-aways, it has, in the name of economy, denied funds to programs vitally affecting the nation's youth.

The president vetoed the child development act while millions of pre-school children of working mothers are left without licensed day-care, and millions of other young

mothers are denied the opportunity to seek work.

It has refused to seek increases in G.I. benefits adequate to even the most minimal needs of young veterans.

It has offered only idle rhetoric, but not desperately needed funds for research and rehabilitation—in answer to the steadily mounting epidemic of drug addiction.

Despite the promises of his 1968 campaign, the president has failed to bring about an end to the war in Indo China. For these reasons, and more, the vast majority of young people—workers and students, soldiers & housewives, whites, blacks & browns—have a deep stake in the election of a new President.

But despite the harm which Nixon's policies have done to so many, defeating him in this year's elections will be an up-hill struggle. He has at the service of his reelection effort the vast powers of the presidency. He will have an enormous financial advantage.

But his greatest asset lies in the fragmentation of the Democratic Party. It was just such fragmentation which enabled Nixon to get elected in 1968 when, after a raucous convention, elements from both the left and right wings of the Democratic party deserted the candidacy of Hubert Humphrey.

In 1972, the Democrats face the prospect of another chaotic convention, with no likely first-ballot nominee and a potential for myriad credential challenges. There will be several hundred delegates pledged to George Wallace, who has threatened to oppose the Democratic nominee if he does not get what he wants. On the other side there are some youth activists—including some of the leaders of the National Youth Caucus—who have branded various nominees "unacceptable", threatening to withhold support or to form a fourth party if someone not to their liking gets nominated.

The vast majority of young people have a great stake in opposing any such rule-or-ruin tactics. Any delegates who engage in such tactics will be responsible for enhancing Nixon's reelection chances.

Only through energetic and well-planned efforts can these advantages of Nixon's be overcome and the perils which lie ahead for the Democrats be avoided. Toward this end Youth Coalition 72 will work:

To maximize participation of young people in the 1972 elections. In 1968 only 51% of the eligible 21 to 24 year olds voted while 70% of those 25 and over voted. We will encourage voter registration and get-out-the-vote drives among young voters with the goal of bringing their voting levels at least up to those of other age groups. We will also seek to maximize youth participation in the hard day-to-day campaign work which alone can offset Nixon's enormous financial advantage.

To build an atmosphere of unity at the Democratic convention and after, despite the obvious differences on issues and candidate preferences that are manifest within the Democratic Party. Either Humphrey or McGovern or any of the perspective "dark-horse" nominees will offer an immeasurably positive alternative to the current administration. When the Democratic Convention settles on a candidate, there inevitably will be many delegates who will be disappointed. But the urgent needs of young people make it imperative that such disappointment not lead to opting out of the election campaign by those whose favored candidate fails to win the nomination. Similarly, we will work to see that the hot contest for victory at the Convention does not devolve into the kind of bitterness which in 1968, left the Democrats paralyzed. We will oppose any attempts to use blackmail—in the form of threats of deserting the party—to affect the Convention's decisions.

To build cooperation among youth and

other major Democratic constituencies such as labor and minority groups. While we firmly assert the right of young people to a meaningful role within the decision-making processes, we are also sensitive to the necessity of compromise in forging the kind of coalition which will be vital to a successful presidential campaign.

To dramatize the ways in which Nixon's policies have done harm to young people. While great public attention has been given to the opposition among young people to the war in Viet Nam, other vital youth issues have been ignored. These include unemployment, aid to education, child care, G.I. benefits, drug abuse and tax inequities, to name but a few. By focusing on such issues we hope to help mobilize the millions of non-student youth who have all too often been ignored in political appeals aimed at young people. We are painfully aware that young voters account for a good part of the support which Governor Wallace has won in the primaries—more than 50% in Michigan. We believe that this in part reflects the neglect of working youth by our political leaders. We plan to work to reverse this pattern by bringing into sharp focus the issues which most centrally concern non-student youth.

We will bring these issues before the Democratic Platform Committee, and work in concert with other groups to dramatize their urgency.

PLATFORM PROPOSAL

Among the reforms it has adopted this year the Democratic Party has decided to treat with unprecedented attention and seriousness the construction of its election year platform. It has expressed the desire to include in the platform a section which addresses the concerns of youth.

There are of course no issues which concern young people exclusively, nor are there issues which fall to affect the lives of young people, and certainly none about which politically aware young people do not have profoundly held convictions. However, there are a number of vital areas of national policy which affect young people particularly sharply or in disproportionately larger numbers. Following are proposals on some of the most urgent ones.

Employment

Young people have been the special victims of the Nixon administration's engineered rise in unemployment. Among teenagers the unemployment rate for 1971 was 16.9% and for 20-24 year olds it was 9.9%. These figures do not reflect the large number of part-time employees who have accepted such employment only because they were unable to secure full-time work. Nor do they reflect the number of "discouraged workers", those unemployed who have abandoned the active search for work. According to the 1971 Manpower Report of the President: "most discouraged workers are either teenagers or adult women..."

For Negro teenagers the unemployment rate for 1971 was 31.7%. Calculating in the relative high rate of "discouraged workers" which must prevail among ghetto youth and the numbers of those needing full-time work but only able to secure part-time jobs, and the number of those "employed" in the most menial and debasing jobs—errand boys, shoe shine boys, etc.—reveals a pattern of overwhelming unavailability of job opportunity.

It is worth noting, in the light of persistent myths that teenage unemployment result from their own shiftlessness, that in 1971 "quitting" accounted for a smaller percentage of the unemployed among teenagers than among workers 20 and older.

Young people desperately need a full employment economy. Full employment can be achieved and maintained through vast expansion of the public sector to meet urgent social needs. Manpower at all skill levels can be employed in social services e.g. schools, recreational facilities, hospitals, libraries, environment protection. A national commit-

ment to a program of massive building of new housing, schools, hospitals, and transportation systems—all of which is desperately needed if our cities are to survive—would make possible the employment and training of tens of thousands of young people.

Only through a national commitment to full employment will the bitter unemployment problems of young people be solved. The Nixon administration has sought to set a special minimum wage for teenagers 20% below the prevailing minimum. This program will not significantly diminish teenage unemployment, nor will it provide the kind of jobs which offer significant training and advancement. It will throw out of work marginally employed adults. Teenagers too, need a living wage.

Drug abuse

As of the end of 1971 there were 82,000 reported heroin or opiate addicts in the U.S. Two thirds of these were under 31 years old. The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs estimates that there are 560,000 heroin addicts.

Heroin addiction ruins the lives of hundreds of thousands of young people each year. It is the single largest cause of soaring urban crime.

There has been little success in treating heroin addiction. Imprisonment virtually never eliminates addiction nor does hospitalization and drying out. Nor does standard psychoanalysis. In recent years two new kinds of treatment have shown some promising successes—methadone maintenance and therapeutic community as exemplified by Synanon or New York's Phoenix House. But still little is known about addiction rehabilitation. Government funds should be made available for a major research program about drug addiction and for the expansion of those programs which have registered initial success.

One of the few things that is well established about drug addiction is that rehabilitation virtually never succeeds in the absence of meaningful opportunities for the former addict to establish a constructive and respectable life style. Massive youth unemployment, particularly in the nation's ghettos, virtually dooms all attempts to contain the drug epidemic. Here again is an urgent reason why there must be full employment.

One of the most important areas in which rehabilitated addicts can be employed regardless of traditional skill level is in programs to rehabilitate other addicts. Even the fragmentary evidence currently available indicates great potential success in their kind of program.

Veterans

The needs of veterans returning to civil life from an unpopular war are being treated with unprecedented governmental and public indifference. For those seeking to pursue their education, G.I. benefits have not kept pace with costs. Current benefits for a single full-time student are \$175 a month, for a student with one dependent, they are \$205 a month, with two dependents, \$230 a month. These are paid only during the school year, ordinarily nine months. With current average annual cost for tuition, room and board running at \$1,350 in public institutions, \$2,500 in private ones, even a student employed full-time during 3 summer months has little chance of making ends meet without outside assistance.

G.I. benefits must be increased well beyond the meager 8.6% proposed by the administration. Substantial increases, such as are proposed in Senator Hartke's bill S. 2161 are needed to give veterans returning to school adequate assistance.

Among veterans 20-29 years old returning to the labor force 326,000 or 8.8% were unemployed in 1971. Veterans, like teenagers, and all other segments of the American population need a full-employment economy.

Child care

There are some 4 million pre-school age children of working mothers for whom no licensed day-care is today available. There are probably millions of other mothers of young children who would like to work if good child care was available at costs which were reasonable in comparison to the mother's own earning potential.

Young mothers who are thus denied the opportunity to enter the work force until their children reach school age suffer doubly. When they finally are able to seek work they are likely to be severely hindered in their employment and earning prospects by late entry into the work force.

Young children and young families need the kind of comprehensive federal child development program which President Nixon vetoed in 1971.

Housing

Young people have been the special victims of the intensifying shortage and spiraling costs of housing. This crisis has worsened during the Nixon recession. Older families contemplating moving often have some flexibility and can adjust their plans to the vicissitudes of the housing market. But the young person embarking on a new career or the young couple setting up a home have no such flexibility. In the year between March 1970 and March 1971, 44% of all persons between the ages of 22 and 24 changed residence. This does not include college students who moved between their family's residence and their college residence.

Young people, generally without savings, are also the special victims of skyrocketing interest rates.

Young people need energetic government action to end the housing shortage and bring down costs of purchase and rental. Youth have a big stake in increased construction of public housing and more federally subsidized housing, as well as in government credit and loan institutions that will enable people to borrow at rates which they can afford.

Higher education

The cost of higher education has been spiraling steadily in the last few years. The burden of the increasing costs falls most heavily on these students who can least afford it. Today, most college students come from families whose annual income is below that established by the Department of Labor as modest but adequate. With the average cost (tuition, room and board) of public education being \$1,350 per year and that of private education being \$2,500 per year, moderate and low income families can barely sustain one child in school, much less several children, without help. There is need for increased aid to educational institutions and a program of direct government aid to students based on financial need.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM H. "BILL" FLANAGAN

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened by the passing of my dear friend, William H. "Bill" Flanagan who died on May 22, 1972.

"Bill" was a loyal son of South Boston and earned the respect and admiration of all with whom he came in contact. He

was cited, in 1958, by the South Boston Citizens Association as "the private citizen who has done the most for South Boston in the past 25 years." The award was presented by Speaker John W. McCormack.

Among the many services rendered by "Bill" to the people of South Boston was his founding of the "Hall of Fame" blood bank for all hospitalized South Boston residents. He also sponsored the youth band of its Jay-Jays which was most successful in competition. He also founded the South Boston Checker Club, another community youth organization and it was through his efforts a solarium for women, the Boys Club, and gymnasium to serve the needs of the district became realities.

"Bill" Flanagan received a citation from President Truman for his services during World War II on the draft board. It was through his weekly GI Newsletter that the South Boston young men serving during World War II and the Korean conflict were informed of all community events.

This great humanitarian will be sadly mourned by the youth and senior citizens whose problems were his concerns.

We, in the Ninth Congressional District, have lost a good friend. "Bill" Flanagan will be long remembered and deeply mourned.

MOVING AHEAD PARENTS CONFERENCE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to participate in the program at a banquet of the Parents Conference of "Operation: Moving Ahead" which was held at the University of Maryland.

The enthusiasm and commitment of the parents present were an inspiration to me as I am sure they have been to their children.

If their children do not now recognize the full value of what their parents are doing for them, it is only because they are still children. Tomorrow, they will know the depth of their parents' love.

The principal speaker at the banquet was Francis W. Gates, a specialist from the Maryland State Department of Education, who concentrated on the role of the parent in the total education of his child. Mr. Gates emphasized the importance of the parents knowing what "Operation: Moving Ahead" is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Gates' address into the Record:

PARENTS NEED TO KNOW

(Remarks by Francis W. Gates)

It is always a happy privilege to visit Prince George's County and I am especially pleased to have been involved in the activities of the past three days. This conference for Title I parents is not only evidence of an earnest and continuous search for new and different ways to reach the minds and

spirits of children, but also, of our having finally come to grips with the fact that the task of broadening and strengthening educational opportunities for the children in our schools is too complex for us, as educators, to attempt alone. The problems are great and multiple. We need the help of others to share the load. Therefore, we must mobilize all of the resources available: financial, physical, human, community plus any other productive resources, and so utilize them that they will make a difference in the lives of children.

Parents have assembled, because we need your help, we are asking you to become even more involved than ever before, for parent involvement is a vitally important and necessary component of any educational program for children.

Why?

1. As parents, you are very special people to your children.

2. You and other family members are the most continuous teachers your children have.

3. Parents wield the greatest influence over their lives.

4. You know much more about children than we give you credit for.

5. As parents, you have ideas about the kind of education you want for your children and, as educators, we should listen to your concerns, assist you in developing your personal strengths, and plan with you—not for you—meaningful programs for involvement. This point was demonstrated by your parent conference committee through their insistence on planning this conference themselves. The conference program, this banquet, the securing of facilities, including the university for this meeting, the food services, the baby sitting arrangements for some 80 or 90 parents with small children, invitations to out-of-county guests, over-night accommodations, registrations, transportation to the meetings—every detail was handled by a parent committee with minimum input by the O.M.A. staff. To you, Mrs. Rosetta Chase, for your leadership in accomplishing what some might call the seemingly impossible, I congratulate you for a difficult job marvelously done.

Your selected conference theme suggests that in order to play their powerful role in making Title I work, "Parents Need to Know."

1. They need to know "about Title I"

a. What the legislation is all about—and

b. Why it exists

Title I emanated from a concern for children—

a. Children with special educational needs and whose needs are not being fulfilled by the regular school program;

b. Children for whom we have not been doing the job;

c. Youngsters who need much more than their school system, or any school system, can financially provide. Recognizing that (1) the future of their nation lies in the extent to which all of its people become useful and productive citizens—and (2) that the overwhelming challenge to broaden and strengthen education for the millions of children needing the extra help is a scope of responsibility beyond the capability of most school systems, the government has provided funds for such programs as Operation: Moving Ahead—a new and different approach for giving children the extra help needed to raise their achievement level—so that they can function like other children their ages. Parents Need To Know that this is not an "across the board program." It does not provide extra help for every child in the county or every child in a school... only those children who have been identified as having the greatest need. In 1965-66, Maryland received \$15,512,023.00 under Title I; in 1970-71 the State was allocated \$19,393,356.00. This school year—we received \$19,423,141.00 and from that amount—Prince George's County was allocated \$1,318,250.29.

2. Parents Need to Know—more about Operation: Moving Ahead and What makes this program different.

First of all, the O.M.A. staff is committed to such educational principles as:

1. Accepting each child where he is; taking him where they find him.

2. Working with him at his own level.

3. Planning and providing a program that will help him reach the highest level of which he is capable—educationally, socially, physically.

4. Assisting schools in bringing about necessary changes in attitudes and programs by employing new personnel, new materials, new techniques—in order to achieve:

a. a greater motivation for the child in helping him succeed in something tried.

b. a strengthening of each child's performance by developing in him—a health concept—in other words—that "he is somebody."

c. in realizing that personal dignity and worth are indisputable rights of every child regardless of race, creed, color or condition.

The learning problems of each child are met by a helping teacher and the classroom teacher who plan instructional activities with the aides—who, in turn back up the program by working with each child individually to help fix the needed skills. Should there develop the need for the services of a psychologist or a social worker, they are "on the scene" coming to grips with the problems that adversely affect school adjustment.

I was particularly interested in and impressed with the manner in which parents expressed their concerns in the group sessions on Social Services. Although O.M.A. is an educational program and should focus on meeting the assessed learning needs of children as a "number one priority," basic to its success is a recognition of the need to identify and come to grips with the problems which might well be blocking their opportunity to achieve. We must deal with the problems of hunger, of clothing, of medical needs, of emotional problems and others. Therefore, this component must have comprehensive planning and well coordinated activities so that maximum benefits to its recipients can be ascertained.

3. Parents Need To Know—about the "Guidelines of Title I."

The Federal Government, realizing the importance of parents being a part of the action and having some "say" in the decisions which affect their children's education, has issued recent guidelines requiring the establishment of a County wide Title I Parent Advisory Committee in each school district. It also recommends that each Title I school have an advisory committee on which parents of Title I children are heavily represented. The main functions of these committees are:

1. To analyze the educational problems of the school.

2. To give input to the planning and development of Title I programs for meeting the needs of children.

3. To help determine what the budget of these programs should be, and

4. To continuously evaluate the program in action.

a. Does it meet the needs?

b. Does it involve the children who need the services?

c. How can it reach more eligible children?

At least 50% of the committee's membership must be parents of the children for whom the program is designed.

Parents are to be informed and consulted on services to be provided and on ways in which they can assist their children in realizing the benefits those services are intended to provide.

All parents of the children to be served must have had the opportunity to present their views to the appropriate school per-

sonnel and to the Parent Advisory Committee concerning the project application prior to its submission to the State for approval.

Another regulation of Title I which should be understood by parents has to do with the Comparability Amendment—which goes into effect this July 1st. Essentially, comparability means that Title I schools and non-Title I schools are to be treated equally in all respects. One of the main problems that poor children face in schools is that they do not always get equal treatment in the school system. In order to know if comparability exists between schools in all respects—that is, equal in the amount of state and local money being spent, the services offered, the equipment available, and the kind and number of people employed within each school—(4) Parents Need to Know About the School System.

A good education is one of your greatest hopes for your children, but, if you are locked in a poor rural community, the odds are that your children may get an education that is far less than you want for them unless you intervene and insist on changes that will benefit your children. Continuous sessions devoted to an understanding of your school system in terms of (a) its demonstrated position on Compensatory Education, (b) its level and quality of support to Operation: Moving Ahead, (c) its commitment to programs for providing extra help to disadvantaged children through local initiative, and (d) its willingness to initiate legislation at both state and national levels to secure additional funding for compensatory programs—in addition to the areas covered in your conference programs—would seem appropriate.

That Parents Need to Know about being parents was an area of consideration on which I am not fully agreed. This concept might find support from those who would criticize parents of deprived children and willfully overlook the circumstances.

1. Some of us do look upon the school with suspicion and pessimism—but this attitude is due to our own unpleasant experiences in dealing with the school in educating our children.

2. There may be some who view learning as a magical process that occurs between 9:00 and 3:30 and fail to understand the supporting role they must play twenty-four hours a day to help their children learn. However, these parents are not teacher-trained and should be helped to understand the learning process.

3. A few of us may appear to be unable to make future plans.

It must be remembered, however, that the demands and problems of daily living require the constant meeting of daily necessities and this precludes any planning for future goals. Thus, education is necessarily viewed by them on terms of the present. It is for this reason that we need more school counselors who are sensitive and empathetic to the needs of poor children and who are willing to leave their offices and work with these children and their parents with post high school planning.

I believe that parents do care about their children and are deeply concerned about their programs in school and their general well-being. Because the school is an important factor in the lives of children, I see parents looking upon it as a source of hope. The sessions this week on Parent Involvement will, hopefully, translate our aspirations and hopes for our children into a commitment to action that will help the children fulfill these aspirations and hopes. To do this, we will reach out and widen our horizons through a more significant and effective school involvement. This is my challenge to you as we ask the question: "Where do we go from here?"

The education of children is too complex and too important to be looked upon lightly. Teachers can't do it alone; parents can't do

it alone. There must be cooperation between home and school; therefore, involving yourself in school activities is not just necessary—it is a *must*—if you want the best education possible for your children.

This concept is not new. Parents have always demonstrated a genuine interest in and concern for their children's education. The parents of the poor have been kept out of the main stream of involvement. They have not been given opportunities to participate in ways which make a difference. We now have both opportunities and responsibilities—to GET IN the main stream and help make life and learning an enjoyable and productive experience for boys and girls.

For example:

Some things in school are important; other things in school are *very* important. Reading is one of the very important things; in fact, it should rank number one. Through reading, children learn to make choices—choices which will determine their future.

Children must achieve more now than ever before. Their rate of achievement is determined by tests. Whether we like it or not, test-taking is a fact of life. Test results determine college entrance, job opportunities and many other important goals. Children must learn to be test-conscious through daily classroom experiences which point toward success.

It is incumbent upon you, as parents, to see that, in our schools, first things come first.

In these our times, continuously do we hear of the many crises in our schools, in our towns, in our cities, in our state, in our country, in our world; I believe that more stress on a good education for all children, regardless of race, creed, color or *condition in life*, is the best way to cope successfully with these seemingly unsolvable problems.

It's time for action and to become more cooperatively involved. Let's go to work to the end that this troubled world may become a better world for our children, for our children's children and for every generation of children thereafter.

NCEL "GOOD GUYS" FOR COUNTY COALITION

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Camarillo Daily News on May 16, 1972, announcing that the Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory at Port Hueneme will receive the annual Good Guy Award of the Ventura County Environmental Coalition:

NCEL "Good Guys" FOR COUNTY COALITION

The annual Good Guy Award of the Ventura County Environmental Coalition will be presented to the Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory, Port Hueneme, it was announced today.

Captain Edward M. Saunders, CEC, USN, Commanding Officer, will accept the award on behalf of NCEL.

The Good Guy Award is presented by Environmental Coalition to businesses or individuals who have consistently contributed to environmental quality in Ventura County.

The Laboratory was cited for a broad environmental protection research program, including development of the Navy's Environmental Protection Data Base, development of an oil pickup suction head, creation of five environmental protection teams, development of an emergency sewage treatment kit,

and for creating an awareness of environmental quality through a series of presentations on environmental protection throughout Ventura County.

The award will be presented at the Ventura Womens' Club, 3451 Foothill Blvd., Ventura, during a dinner meeting Friday.

PAN AM BEGINS NONSTOP TAMPA-MEXICO CITY SERVICE

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, for many years one of our Nation's pioneer international airlines, Pan American World Airways, has provided our country's major air link between Florida and Mexico. Until recently Pan Am was required to operate its Miami-Tampa-Mexico City service via an intermediate stop in Merida, on Mexico's Yucatan Peninsula, while the Mexican carrier, Aeromexico, has been able to operate nonstop service between Miami and Mexico City.

This imbalance has now, in part, been rectified as a result of the Civil Aeronautics Board decision, approved by President Nixon, permitting Pan Am to offer nonstop flights between Tampa and Mexico City. It has come to my attention that Pan Am, as a result of this decision, will improve and increase its services between Florida and Mexico City beginning June 17, 1972. I enter into the RECORD the following Pan Am release entitled "Government Awards Pan Am New Florida-Mexico City Rights":

GOVERNMENT AWARDS PAN AM NEW FLORIDA-MEXICO RIGHTS

Pan American World Airways will improve and increase its service between Florida and Mexico beginning June 17 as a result of a Civil Aeronautics Board decision handed down April 18, 1972.

The CAB selected Pan Am as best qualified among several airlines that had applied to exercise new air rights that Mexico granted to the United States recently.

This means Pan Am will be able to offer nonstop service daily between Tampa and Mexico City, and daily flights between Miami and Mexico City with one stop in Tampa. Previously all flights had to make an additional intermediate stop in Merida, on Mexico's Yucatan Peninsula.

Pan Am will continue to offer service between both Florida cities and Merida four days a week.

James O. Leet, Senior Vice President-Marketing, said: "Tampa, as the western gateway to Disneyworld, will generate substantial increases in inbound traffic to the United States, and the more frequent and convenient service will also give people of the growing Tampa-Clearwater-St. Petersburg and West Coast Florida areas vastly improved access to the markets and resorts of Mexico."

Pan Am will be the only airline to offer such service.

Mr. Leet said schedules would be issued shortly, but that Pan Am planned to have its Mexico-Tampa flights arrive in the early afternoon to enable arriving passengers going to Disneyworld and other West Coast Florida resorts to continue to their destinations the same day.

"Pan Am is grateful to the Tampa Bay community for its cooperation and support in this move to improve air service to Florida's West Coast," Mr. Leet said.

ELECTIONS IN ITALY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of my colleagues the results of the elections in Italy held earlier this month.

Before this election certain elements of the American press were predicting gains by the Communists and their friends on the far left, gains by the neo-Fascists and their friends on the far right, and losses by the advocates of the nontotalitarian form of government.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, some press accounts in this country were depicting the situation in Italy as a model of the failure of democracy.

Now that the elections have been held, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate that we all become informed on the results of those elections. I am inserting at the end of this speech, a summary of those results. This summary shows that the profits of gloom had indeed misread the political climate in Italy. Their predictions were baseless.

I would also like to include copies of two newspaper articles which give objective and realistic evaluations of the elections. One is an article by Paul Hoffman which appeared in the May 14 edition of the New York Times. The other is an editorial which appeared in the May 11 edition of the Christian Science Monitor.

The results of the elections are themselves impressive, but equally impressive is the 93.1 percentage of voter turnout that produced those results. The citizens of America would do well to follow this example of voter interest and concern. Hopefully, they will also follow the example of our Italian friends by using the polls to reject the totalitarian philosophy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend and congratulate the voters in Italy for their demonstrated commitment to democracy and human freedom. I believe my colleagues will agree that they are certainly deserving of such:

BEFORE AND AFTER THE VOTE

	Post-election	Pre-election
CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES (TOTAL: 630 MEMBERS)		
Right:		
Italian Social Movement (neo-Fascist).....	51	24
Monarchist Party.....	5	6
Center:		
Liberal Party.....	21	31
Christian Democratic Party.....	267	266
South Tyrol People's Party.....	3	3
Republican Party.....	14	9
Social Democrats.....	29	29
Left:		
Socialist Party.....	61	62
Proletarian Socialist Party.....	0	23
Communist Party.....	179	177
SENATE (TOTAL: 322 MEMBERS)		
Right:		
Italian Social Movement (neo-Fascist).....	22	11
Monarchist Party.....	4	2
Center:		
Liberal Party.....	8	16
Christian Democratic Party.....	138	138
South Tyrol People's Party.....	2	2
Republican Party.....	5	2
Social Democrats.....	12	12

BEFORE AND AFTER THE VOTE—Continued

	Post-election	Pre-election
Left:		
Socialist Party	34	36
Proletarian Socialist Party	11	12
Communist Party	83	89

[From the New York Times, May 14, 1972]

ITALY: THE CENTER IS STILL HOLDING
(By Paul Hofmann)

ROME.—It took a full 24 hours after last Tuesday's election to get a clear picture of how Italy had voted in one of its most decisive electoral tests since the fall of Fascism. The computerized polling tally had proved far from successful.

But if the computer had failed its test, democracy had not. The nation, long denounced as ungovernable, had shown that it wanted strong—but not authoritarian—leadership. And in doing so it gave a new strength to the Christian Democratic Government of Premier Giulio Andreotti.

One telling sign was the 93.1 per cent voter turnout. In Ravenna, the city of Byzantine mosaics, Dante's tomb, Byronic memories and huge oil refineries, a record 98 per cent of the electorate went to the polls. What's more, there was no graver electoral incident up and down the country than a young woman in an Adriatic resort who wanted to cast her ballot clad only in a bikini and was barred by a straitlaced carabinieri.

Aside from sticking by the rules, Italy has also reconfirmed the substance of democracy. More than 61 per cent of all votes went to parties that reject totalitarian models. About 29 per cent of all voters backed the Communist party—still the strongest in the West—and its far-left fellow travelers or rivals, and 8.7 per cent rallied behind resurgent neo-Fascism, which had allied itself with the remnants of the monarchist movement.

Had elections been held two months earlier, the outcome might have been more ominous. A plot psychosis, urban guerrillas, violence by wildcat strikers and chaos in the schools, all on top of a crime wave, were then frightening the nation. While the Communist apparatus was on the defensive, anxious to hold positions threatened by ultraleftist groups, Italy seemed headed for a sharp swing to the right. The neo-Fascists were all set to profit from the anger of the Italian "silent majority."

However, the Christian Democratic Government of Premier Andreotti, uninspiring though it looked, stressed its concern for law and order. The police in nationwide sweeps rounded up gangsters and thieves, and investigating magistrates tore into the conspiratorial political underground. At the same time, the many Christian Democratic factions, usually feuding among themselves, buried the hatchet and campaigned hard on two fronts—against Communism and neo-Fascism.

Thus the much-maligned Christian Democratic party became the real star of the elections. After 27 years in government it was still going strong, lending substance to Mr. Andreotti's old quip: "Power wears out only those who don't have it."

The neo-Fascists, with 24 seats in the old 630-seat Chamber of Deputies, had hoped that the new image of respectability built by their softspoken leader, Giorgio Almirante, would increase their strength to 80 or 100 seats. They won 56. The Christian Democratic party says it can live with them but will never accept the rightists as allies. The Christian Democrats also reiterated their anathema against Communism during their campaign and this won back many anti-Communist voters who had been flirting with the rightists.

Inspired by the Roman Catholic church, the Christian Democratic party professes its determination to bring about long overdue reforms—better schools, hospitals and old-age care, more low-cost housing, improved commuter transportation, a more equitable tax structure and a better deal for stagnant southern Italy.

The divorce statute, enacted after a long fight 17 months ago, clearly isn't a desirable reform for the Christian Democrats and may now be thoroughly amended, if not repealed.

The chances are better than in a long time that strong party leadership may assert control at the forthcoming Christian Democratic national convention in the fall. If this happens, the Christian Democrats could successfully exercise one of their two options—to rebuild the center-left coalition with the Socialists that has governed Italy for most of the last 10 years, or to build a new center coalition with the moderately conservative Liberal party. In either case, a united and strengthened Christian Democratic party could negotiate terms with its allies and—at last—launch the needed reforms. Until then, Italy will be run by what is rather affectionately known as a "beach government," a Cabinet that pays the civil servants, operates the railroads, collects taxes, guards motorways and leaves Italians to their own devices during the hot months.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 11, 1972]

A SHIFT AWAY FROM EXTREMES

There is a fundamental common sense among the Italian people which proves its strength when it comes to the test. That common sense was reaffirmed in last Sunday's general elections, whose results on the whole are reassuring both to Italy itself and to Western Europe of which Italy is such an important part.

It had been feared that the elections would result in a big swing to the far right. In fact, the neofascist Italian Social Movement, in alliance with the small Monarchist Party, did make considerable gains, upping its representation in the Senate from 13 to 26 seats and in the chamber from 30 to 56. But in the overall context the neofascists did not score the big victory they had hoped for.

Far more significant was the strength manifested at the center of the political spectrum by the Christian Democratic Party, which has been the dominant party in Italian politics for the past 26 years. The Christian Democrats conducted a clearcut campaign, reasserting the principles laid down by their distinguished postwar Prime Minister, Alcide de Gasperi, and telling the Italian voters unequivocally that they would eschew any cooperation with the extreme right or extreme left.

The result was that they recouped the 5 percent loss suffered in last year's regional elections, retaining all of their 135 seats in the Senate and increasing their representation in the chamber by one seat—from 266 to 267.

While on paper the Communist Party, second biggest party in Italy, improved its showing in both houses, its ally, the Proletarian Socialist Party (PSIUP), lost all 23 of the seats it held in the lower house and the 13 seats it held in the Senate. The independent leftists also are no longer represented in either house. On the whole, therefore, the extreme left lost ground, while there was little change in the position of Socialists and Social Democrats.

Where does this leave Italy? The Christian Democrats have emerged from the elections with their reputation enhanced, but still not strong enough to govern on their own, unless they take the risk of ruling as a minority government, as in fact they have been doing since the collapse of the last Center-Left cabinet in January.

There are two coalition possibilities: a revival of the Center-Left formula or a coalition of the Center parties. Whether or not a new Center-Left government can be formed will depend to a great extent on the Nenni Socialists and their off-and-on flirtation with the Communists. Presumably the Christian Democrats will now insist that they end this flirtation if they come into the government.

The task of cabinetmaking is not going to be easy. Possibly a caretaker administration will be formed to tide the country over until after the party conventions of the Christian Democrats and the Socialist in the fall.

This would mean fresh delay in initiating the reforms to which the Center-Left parties are committed. It could open the door to more militancy on the political fringes. But the bulk of Italian voters have clearly drawn away from the extremes of right and left, and, on the whole, there is reasonable cause to be heartened by the election results.

MEMORIAL DAY COMMENTARIES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I make it a special point to thoroughly read the community newspapers serving my district. It is my opinion that this segment of journalism will continue to grow in effectiveness and public interest.

The editorial commentary in local community weeklies is steadily broadening, and I am pleased to insert into the RECORD two very fine Memorial Day commentaries; one by the Suburban Life and one by the Sun Standard, both of which were carried in their May 25 editions.

The editorials follow:

PATRIOTIC GESTURE

"It's been taking a lot of abuse lately. We are sorry that some people who are dissatisfied with some of the things happening in this country see fit to take out their displeasure on the Stars and Stripes. Sure we've got lots of problems . . . but the flag stands for an ideal that we all believe in. Let's keep that ideal before us . . . let's fly the flag proudly!"

This message is being promoted by the Committee on Political Education (COPE) along with its project of boosting patriotism and respect for the flag. An objective of COPE is to see the American flag flying from every home in the Blue Island-Calumet Park area.

With Memorial day approaching, COPE is urging area residents to "Be a Proud American fly that Grand Old Flag."

Flags at a nominal fee will be available this Sunday, May 28, 10 a.m. until 10 p.m., in the parking lot at 127th and Loomis. The Yankee Clipper set consists of a chrome color pole, Eagle head, bracket, string and flag. Bumper stickers and a brochure on ways to display the American flag will also be available.

Besides Memorial day, other times for flying the flag this summer are: Flag day, June 14; Father's day, June 18; Independence day, July 4; and Labor day, Sept. 4.

A reminder: on Memorial day, Monday, the flag should be flown at half mast until noon.

PEACE: WILL IT EVER COME?

Next Monday will bring the 104th observance of Memorial Day in this country, a time when we pay tribute to the millions of men and women who have fallen in all U.S. wars. Last year at this time we were hopeful that

1971 would bring an end to the Vietnam War and the accompanying turmoil and unrest which have plagued this land for more than 10 years.

Certainly, President Nixon has demonstrated this country's willingness to end its participation in the conflict. Unfortunately North Vietnam, the Viet Cong and their Communist allies have continued the aggression and insist on peace on their terms.

President Nixon, as he promised, has brought more than a half million American fighting men home from Vietnam. But he doesn't propose to have the remaining 60,000 left for slaughter by the North Vietnamese. Nor does he intend to leave our prisoners in the hands of the Communists.

He is seeking a peace with honor, but apparently North Vietnam dictators do not know the meaning of the latter word. Rather than abandon 16 million South Vietnamese to reprisal from a ruthless foe, he is trying to terminate the military commitments of previous Presidents in a way that will not further tarnish the reputation of our country in the eyes of nations that have looked to it as a defender of the rights of man.

In an effort to stop a Communist escalation of the war, President Nixon earlier this month ordered a blockade of North Vietnam ports until American prisoners are freed and an internationally supported cease-fire halts hostilities. Polls indicate that the vast majority of the American public support the President's action, although having no more desire for continued war than he does.

We should support the action with all our vigor and with the full cooperation of all citizens.

As we honor our fallen dead this weekend, let us also add special prayers for the thousands of men and women who are still fighting and dying for the cause of liberty and freedom. They have the right to expect the full backing of their government and their people.

We again pray and look hopefully toward Memorial Day 1973 when this nation and the world shall be at peace.

RODINO SUBCOMMITTEE FOCUSES ON POLICE BENEFITS BILLS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 1 recently held hearings on the need to provide survivor and disability benefits for policemen, firemen, and other public safety officers who are killed or injured in the line of duty.

This is a serious problem that has received little attention in the press or in this body. When seven officers were killed last year in New York in a very short period of time, there was a great public outcry to help the widows and children of these men. Now this massacre of our public safety officers has faded from the public view and as a result, has taken a back seat in the minds of legislators. The problem, however, is still very real to the forgotten widows.

Fortunately, Congressman PETER RODINO of the Judiciary Committee had no intention of letting the matter drop, now that it is no longer on the front pages of the newspapers. His subcommittee staff developed the background information and moved the various bills to provide death and disability benefits—including

several of my own—through to the hearings stage.

To underscore this problem once again for my colleagues, I would like to include Chairman RODINO's opening statement at the start of those hearings. I urge my colleagues to read the facts contained therein and join Congressman RODINO and myself in pressing for these measures of great importance to the policemen, firemen, and other public safety officers of this country.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

Today, we commence two days of hearings to consider various bills designed to provide survivor and disability benefits for policemen, firemen and other public safety officers who are killed or injured in the line of duty.

As we all know, last week was National Police Officers' week and many tributes were paid to the brave and dedicated law-enforcement officers of America.

It is tragic, however, that many of these honors were bestowed posthumously—to those who had given their lives to preserve peace and order and to protect our society. The alarming statistics relating to the number of peace officers, firemen, and other safety officials, who are slain or disabled each year, demonstrate the magnitude and severity of the problem:

In 1969, a total of 35,202 policemen were stabbed, beaten, assaulted, or wounded by a firearm.

Last year, 126 local, county and state law-enforcement officers were killed as a result of felonious criminal action—26 more than the number slain in 1970. Four of these peace officers were killed in the line of duty in my own State of New Jersey.

In 1970, 115 professional firemen died in the line of duty and 38,583 firefighters were injured. Only recently, in my own city of Newark, New Jersey, three firemen lost their lives—to protect the lives of others—while demolishing a building which was a public hazard.

Between the years 1962 and 1971, 722 peace officers died while performing their duty of maintaining order and protecting lives of others.

In the decade of the 1960's, 790 firefighters were killed in the line of duty.

In this same decade, the rate of violent crime increased by 156 percent.

These few statistics readily reveal the increasing incidence in arson and violent street crimes and illustrate the grave physical dangers which confront peace officers and firemen today.

With the ever-increasing violence in this country, the perils of police work are greatly magnified and firefighters have often become, in recent years, the targets of sniper fire.

Despite the nationwide scope of this problem, there is a great disparity among the several States as to the benefits which are provided to these courageous men and their survivors. Needless to say, in most cases the death and disability benefits which are provided are extremely inadequate. Furthermore, a study made in October of 1970 indicated that 18 States provided no financial assistance to the survivors of law-enforcement officers who are killed in the line of duty.

It is quite easy to bestow awards on these grief-stricken widows and children, but it would be far better to express our appreciation in more practical terms—by enacting legislation on both the State and Federal level to provide for their financial security.

There are few who would deny that society owes a special obligation to those brave individuals who are killed or disabled in the line of duty and, as public officials, we should be cognizant of the many sacrifices made by their families.

In fact, Congress has already assumed a limited responsibility in this regard.

In 1968, Congress passed Public Law 90-291, which provided survivor and disability benefits to State and local policemen who are killed or injured while enforcing Federal laws.

In 1970, Congress passed Public Law 91-509, which provided a lump sum payment of \$50,000 to the dependent survivors of policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia who die in the performance of their duties.

Some of the bills, which the Subcommittee is today considering, would greatly expand these provisions of law; others would establish new programs of financial assistance.

Nevertheless, all of the bills before the Subcommittee properly recognize the great debt we owe to all public safety officers for the services, protection, and acts of mercy they provide. In addition, these proposals serve to insure public safety officials that their loved ones will be cared for in the event of their death.

In the course of our hearings, we will consider three different programs designed to provide survivor or disability benefits to peace officers, firemen, or other public safety officers.

The first approach presented in H.R. 9139, introduced by a distinguished Member of this Committee, the Honorable Richard Poff, and H.R. 9177, introduced by Chairman Emanuel Celler, represent the Administration's approach to the problem. These two bills would provide a \$50,000 death gratuity to the survivors of fulltime State or local police officers killed in the line of duty. Additional versions of this proposal would extend similar death benefits to firemen, correctional officials, judges, prosecutors, and a variety of other public safety officers.

The second approach is contained in H.R. 714, introduced by another distinguished Member of this Committee, the Honorable Andrew Jacobs. This bill would provide that a sole surviving widow of a policeman or fireman killed in the line of duty would receive 45 percent of the monthly wage rate of her deceased husband. If there are surviving dependent children, the widow would receive 40 percent and each child 15 percent, but the total compensation could not exceed 75 percent of the decedent's monthly wage. This compensation would continue as long as the widow did not remarry or until the surviving children reached age 18. Compensation would also be provided in the event of a total temporary or permanent disability.

A third approach has been proposed by the distinguished Chairman of this Committee, the Honorable Emanuel Celler. He has proposed in H.R. 8316, the establishment of a Group Life Insurance and Group Accidental Death and Dismemberment Insurance Program for local law-enforcement officers. The costs of this insurance program would be federally shared and the government's contribution would not exceed one-third of the cost of such insurance. The amount of life insurance, as well as accidental death and dismemberment insurance would be \$2,000 more than the annual basic pay of the insured rounded to the next higher thousand—with a minimum of \$10,000 and a maximum of \$32,000.

From this brief description of the major proposals before the Subcommittee, it is apparent that two basic issues are presented for our consideration:

What type of benefits should be provided? and—

What occupational groups should receive these benefits?

We have arranged these hearings in order to receive a wide range of divergent views on these issues. Furthermore, I am pleased to announce that we will receive testimony from a number of our distinguished colleagues and other learned witnesses who are intimately familiar with the various problems confronting public safety officers in this country.

SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, the President on May 2 declared May Senior Citizens Month. This proclamation is well deserved because no other group of citizens has lived through more changes in America than have our senior citizens. We marvel at the achievements of our decade, but little thought is given to the advances in all areas of life that our senior citizens have witnessed.

The mode of transportation has changed from a horse and buggy trip around the block to a space ride to the moon. Medical science has brought about miracles and helped continue life at a much longer span than ever before.

The emotional changes of starting a career and family to becoming the "older man on the block" has been tremendous for our senior citizens. The feeling of living a productive, useful life sometimes begins to erode when a person retires.

My great State of Florida has the highest rate of over-65 residents in our Nation. All of the problems facing senior citizens are made very much aware to me in the daily flow of letters, telephone calls and personal visits.

A column entitled "The Vintage Years" appears in the newspapers in my congressional district and is written by Mr. R. O. Beckman. The May 11, 1972, issue of the Fort Lauderdale News carried Mr. Beckman's article entitled: "Senior Citizens Month Celebrated During May."

I would like to share Mr. Beckman's observations of this proclamation with you.

"SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH" CELEBRATED
DURING MAY

(By R. O. Beckman)

From the Administration on Aging of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare comes a news release announcing that May is again "Senior Citizens Month." It states that older Americans from Alaska to the Virgin Islands will be celebrating with dinners, picnics, awards, receptions, conventions and conferences.

"The President proclaims the month and invites all Americans to find suitable means of expressing their appreciation and gratitude to older Americans for their contributions to our society." Events mentioned in the release are hobby shows in Breckenridge, Minn.; Des Moines and Groton, Conn.; elderly speakers in high schools in Tennessee to encourage general understanding; exhibits at a shopping center in Boulder, Col.; and Nassau County, N.Y. Johns Hopkins, Duke, Brandeis, Clemson universities and Livingston college are staging conferences on aging. Awards to outstanding seniors will be presented in Homer, Alaska; Bristol, Conn.; and Fort Worth, Tex. A senior citizens ball is scheduled for St. Croix, Virgin Islands.

This year is the 10th year that May has been designated in presidential, state and local proclamations. Its observance has been more noticeable in non-conformance than in activity. It should receive special attention this year because 1972 is the year assigned to implement the recommendations of last year's White House Conference on Aging.

Nationally Congress has authorized some legislation affecting retirees but has not yet funded them. The administration news re-

lease receives little attention from communications media because thus far there are but few local programs to report.

Florida—the self-styled No. 1 retirement state with the highest percentage of over-65 residents—is not mentioned in the news release. It has long been behind some other states in recognizing the elderly. Action in spotlighting Senior Citizens Month seems delayed.

Little mention of recognition for the month was made at the national convention of the National Retired Teachers Association, at the meeting of the Florida Health and Welfare Council, both at Miami Beach, and at the Florida conference of the National Association of Retired Federal Employees in Fort Lauderdale.

Notable progress was reported in behalf of retired federal workers at the convention held last week at Pier 66. Florida chapters number 72 with a membership of some 10,000. During the year, five pre-retirement seminars were held in various areas. Resolutions were adopted urging greater comparability of annuities with government pay scales. Since 1967 federal retiree annuities have gone up a fourth to meet rising living costs. Similar provision has long been expected by Social Security beneficiaries.

Three weeks are left for our older citizens to show they're not in a state of coma. They can demonstrate their mettle by daring instead of wishful dreaming. Valor is the salt of other virtues.

LEGALIZE THE MACHINEGUN

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, there has been much public discussion and editorial comment lately about the desperate need for strict handgun control in this country. The arguments for it are compelling—I think they are overwhelming—but each time the arguments are made they seem to fall on deaf ears in Congress. For each tragedy, for each big city police chief and mayor that calls for a ban on the sale and manufacture of handguns, for each new set of statistics that outlines the relationship between the increasing number of handguns and the increasing amount of crime—the opponents of handgun control have a glib rejoinder. It is easy to get ensnared in the rhetoric from both sides.

Over the past few weeks, I have occasionally placed in the RECORD newspaper articles and editorials which indicate the growing sentiment in this country in favor of strict handgun controls. By now, it should be clear that the people of this country want to stop the national traffic in handguns, but Congress is not willing to respond to their wishes or to the decay of the big cities for which handgun crime is at least partially responsible. Because of my well-known position in favor of strict handgun control, I thought it would only be fair to place in the RECORD an example of the sentiment on the other side of the issue.

The article is by a columnist in the Chicago Daily News, Mike Royko. There are some people who think he is very good. Somebody named Pulitzer just gave him a prize.

The article follows:

LEGALIZE THE MACHINEGUN

(By Mike Royko)

The shooting of George Wallace has created still another wave of anti-gun sentiment and demands that our gun laws be toughened.

This happens every time a candidate for President is shot.

The majority of editorials and columns seem to favor increased restrictions. I am one of the few columnists who does not.

To the contrary, I would like to see the gun laws relaxed so that it would be legal for me to buy my own machinegun.

It has never made sense that a person can buy a rifle or pistol, but I cannot own the weapon of my choice.

The reason I want a machinegun is that I am a very bad shot with a pistol or rifle, due to having a prominent nose that obstructs my vision while aiming.

Therefore, I am unable to properly defend myself. But with a machinegun, I would have a fighting chance.

Some people will ask: A fighting chance against whom? What do you need any kind of gun for?

Everybody knows the answer to that. We need guns to protect ourselves against criminals, the Communist conspiracy, fiends of the night, and all the other forces that require an honest citizen to remain armed to the teeth.

First let us consider the threat of criminals.

I happen to be the sort of person who regains my coordination very slowly when I awaken.

If I awoke during the night and saw several criminals in my bedroom, by the time I got a pistol from under my pillow and took careful aim, and fired one shot, they would be at my throat, then my wallet.

But it would take only a moment for me to snatch up my machinegun, which I would keep at my side, and spray the entire bedroom with bullets without aiming. In fact, in the process I would probably spray my neighbor's bedroom with bullets, thus slaying any criminals who might be bothering him, too.

As to the threat of communism, let us be realistic. Should the United States be invaded by the Red Menace, the Yellow Peril or whatever, a handgun would be of little use.

But the Red Menace or Yellow Peril would think twice about landing on our shores if they knew 50 million of us were waiting on our front porches, crouching behind our machineguns. Consider the firepower that would represent. In only one minute, we could rattle off 30 billion bullets. That would send them packing.

Another benefit of the machinegun is that it is much safer to have around the house than a pistol.

A child can easily discharge a .32 he finds in his father's dresser. We hear of this happening all too frequently.

But it would be difficult for a child to load an ammunition belt or magazine into a machinegun. And even if he did, it would be virtually impossible for him to shoot himself. The worst that could happen is that he might shoot some of his playmates. But, then, nothing is absolutely foolproof.

Another advantage of the machinegun is that because of its size, it is impossible to conceal upon your person.

A man can walk into a bank with a pistol in his pocket, and nobody will know it. But if someone entered a bank with a machinegun under his arm, a guard would surely suspect that he was up to no good.

For years, I have been urging that the machinegun be legalized, but the various gun lobbies have been of little help.

For that matter, they have done nothing for the cause of those who believe that cannons should be legal. Not in cities, of course,

but at least in sparsely populated rural areas. There are about 3 million farms in the United States. If every farm had a cannon, the Red Menace or the Yellow Peril would think twice about invading our shores.

So I have decided to form my own lobbying organization—the National Machinegun Assn. We will fight for the rights of citizens to purchase and own machineguns. I urge all of you to write to your congressman or senator and demand they support legislation that would make this possible.

I realize that some people are going to read this and say: "But machineguns kill."

Nonsense. Machineguns don't kill. People kill.

For that matter, bazookas, mortars, cannons and nuclear bombs don't kill. People kill.

The solution is not to ban handguns, machineguns, bazookas, mortars, cannons, or even nuclear bombs, but to make the penalties for their criminal use quite severe. If an evildoer knew that a judge would throw the book at him, he would think twice about using a machinegun or a bazooka to commit a crime.

That is why the slogan of my new organization is going to be:

"Weapons don't kill. People kill. So let's legalize all weapons and eliminate people."

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT STROTZ SETS FORTH VIETNAM STAND

HON. ROBERT McCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the current proclivity of some in the academic community to pose as all-seeing, all-knowing prophets and advisers on domestic and world affairs merits thoughtful analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I seem to recall that various of these same oracles who now espouse a policy of neoisolationism were the same ones who earlier supported our involvement in behalf of economic and military support in the four corners of the world.

Mr. Speaker, it appears now that we adopted too much of their thinking in the past to our detriment. It would be doubly tragic to give too much weight to their views now.

Mr. Speaker, fortunately there are many in the academic community who recognize the balance which must exist between theory and reality—and who do not view their positions on college campuses as forums from which to seek to summarily override our legislative and executive branches.

Mr. Speaker, the recent statement of Robert H. Strotz, president of Northwestern University, in response to a request that he join with other college presidents in denouncing certain policies of the President of the United States and in answer to a request from students that he make his views on Vietnam known to them—is most perceptive. This article which appeared in the May 23 issue of the Chicago Tribune follows:

CONSIDER VALIDITY OF VIEWS ON WAR

(By Robert H. Strotz)

It has become fashionable for university and college presidents to address themselves publicly to the problem of the Viet Nam war and particularly to the most recent adventure in American strategy.

By virtue of their positions as university and college administrators their views are widely publicized by the news media. It is marvelous, the attention a university president can command when he talks on almost any subject.

What prompts these men to advising the nation on its foreign policy? There are three possible answers.

SOME ARE EXPERTS

Some of them may be experts on international relations and widely read on the subject of the Viet Nam conflict. In these times, it is then almost a moral imperative that they should speak up and profess their views and we should all listen to them; not because they are university presidents but because they are citizens recognized for their expertise on foreign policy.

Others perhaps show no more than the typical student or faculty member at their institutions. Nevertheless, they apparently feel that it is proper, in view of their ascendancy of high academic office, for them to use—I might even say "exploit"—their access to the news media to propound their private views, however amateurish these may be. There is enough sin in the process of public opinion formation that they may as well sin a bit, too.

A third possibility is a cynical one that challenges men's motives—and I mention this only as a possibility. It is that they are not necessarily expressing their convictions but are saying that which their activist students want them to say, in a manner calculated to co-opt the students into thinking that the administration is with them so that any violence resulting from vehement campus demonstrations will be addressed to the outer community rather than to them.

And if they are worried that endorsing the students' predominating view will alienate support of the trustees, alumni, and other donors, they will then express themselves with a sufficient ambiguity of wording so that what they say boils down to a few platitudes, meaning nothing, and at worst only rhetorically offensive to any of the relevant pressure groups.

LIKE IT OR NOT

Your university president, whether you like it or not, belongs to none of these three groups.

I do not belong to the first group because I am not an expert on Viet Nam. I have opinions on the subject as any educated citizen would have, and mine are rather extreme. They have been extreme from virtually the beginning of the conflict. But I do not hold them with conviction.

I am not sure I am right. In fact, I am often impressed by how much more some students and faculty know than I do. And sometimes I get confused about my own thinking. There is so much to study in so many areas, and so little time. Over the years, whenever I have expressed my rather extreme views on the Viet Nam War, I have regarded that largely as a conversation starter.

I also do not belong to the second group, and this is because of a moral principle I hold. Many of you will disagree with it, and maybe I should say it is a moral quirk. But I hope you will respect it anyway. It is that I regard it as completely improper for me to exploit the position of the presidency of Northwestern to attract widespread public attention to opinions I hold—even on morally important issues—when those opinions are as amateurish as mine are on Viet Nam.

I will express my views freely in private conversation but I will not use my office to lend public importance to views which I as a person do not deserve to receive.

I may well be prepared to express myself vigorously on issues where I feel I have something really responsible and professional to say, and in some areas would feel a serious moral obligation to do so; for example, in defending academic freedom, a matter I'm convinced I know something about.

POPULAR OR NOT

And I would then speak forthrightly, whether or not my views were popular with either students or trustees. I repeat, however, that I will not prostitute the office I fill by using it to amplify the importance of opinions I hold on the basis of only modest knowledge.

Bob Strotz is not qualified to offer substantive comment on our nation's affairs in Southeast Asia. This lack of substance, however, would not prevent attention being given to whatever President Strotz offered on the subject. I will not use my position, or the name of this University, to advance my personal proclivities, especially in areas where I am without credentials, or where the university cannot be effective.

Finally, I do not belong to that third group, which I hope is mostly mythical. I am not a ventriloquist's dummy and will not misrepresent my opinions to accommodate any pressure groups. I will not lie in order to co-opt students, and I will not pompously utter a paragraph of platitudes.

There are some things I can responsibly say about Viet Nam, tho they are of limited scope. As an administrator, I can assure everyone that tho at times there may be an element of high-jinks in campus demonstrations, students are by and large in dead earnest, filled with moral concern and frequently remarkably well-informed.

The Viet Nam business has rent our society apart and very substantially undermined the traditional patriotism of our college people. It is painfully clear that a democracy has an awfully difficult time fighting an undeclared war without overwhelming consensus. Moreover, as an economist, I can say that the war has obviously drained away vast resources for which there were other high priority social uses, but most importantly I can say, on an issue that is sometimes disputed, the war is neither necessary nor sufficient for a properly functioning free enterprise economy.

BEYOND ECONOMICS

I can discuss the war in terms of the national economy, but the issues go far beyond economics, and determinations will not be made on an economic basis.

A final topic: What can students expect of me during this abnormal period on the campus? They can expect two things:

First, I will do everything in my power to keep the university open. I have a moral and perhaps legal obligation to assure that students who want "education as usual"—what they have paid for with their tuition—will have it available to them. Some of our students dissent strongly from the conventional wisdom of the majority, and they have rights, too.

Secondly, within the requirement just stated, I will do everything I can to support the opportunity for lawful student demonstrations. I say this despite any personal agreement or disagreement with the objectives of the current demonstrations. A campus should be politically alive, and I would hope that Northwestern students in particular would have an impact on public thinking commensurate with their wisdom and concern.

I think the faculty should do all that is reasonable to accommodate to the special circumstances of students whose sense of

moral or religious obligation transcend their ability to adhere to scheduled routines—and Vice President Raymond Mack and I have urged this point of view.

Northwestern students have made it clear to all that this is an involved campus and I hope godspeed to all those who, in peaceful ways, are engaged in demonstrations—or in counterdemonstrations.

U.S. STEEL'S EDWIN H. GOTT RECEIVES HIGHEST SCOUT AWARD

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Boy Scouts of America recently honored Edwin H. Gott, chairman and chief executive of U.S. Steel, by presenting him the coveted silver buffalo award.

The award is given annually to a small group of scouters and civic leaders for their "distinguished service to boyhood."

Specifically, Mr. Gott was cited for his work in the Scout Exploring program, a teenage activity for both boys and girls.

At this time I would like to introduce into the RECORD a copy of the press announcement from the Boy Scouts of America and convey my congratulations to Edwin Gott, a man who has never been to busy to help others.

PITTSBURGH SCOUTER AND STEEL EXECUTIVE RECEIVES SCOUTING'S HIGHEST AWARD

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 19.—A Pittsburgh, Pa., civic leader and steel corporation executive will receive the Boy Scouts of America's highest award for volunteer service here tonight in the closing ceremonies of the BSA's 62nd National Council Annual Meeting.

Edwin H. Gott, chairman and chief executive officer of United States Steel Corporation and national Vice-President of the BSA, will receive Scouting's coveted Silver Buffalo Award, presented annually to a small group of Scouters and public figures for "distinguished service to boyhood" at the national level. Gott was recognized for his contributions to Exploring, the BSA's program for high school age young men and women, by sponsoring special-interest Explorer posts within his and other corporations. He is also a trustee of Pittsburgh Children's Hospital and of Carnegie-Mellon, Lehigh, and Youngstown Universities.

Previous recipients of the Silver Buffalo Award include astronauts Neil Armstrong and John Glenn, football great Vince Lombardi, Dr. Ralph Bunche, Gen Douglas MacArthur, and newscaster Lowell Thomas. Others receiving the Silver Buffalo Award this year are: Louis R. Bruce, commissioner of Indian Affairs; Harvey C. Christen, Pasadena, Calif., aircraft manufacturing executive; Louis G. Feil, Chipita Park, Colo., retired Army Corps of Engineers executive; Donald P. Hammond, Monticello, N.Y., department store executive; Albert M. Jongeneel, Rio Vista, Calif., rancher; A. L. Jung, Jr., New Orleans, business executive; Prime F. Osborn III, Jacksonville, Fla., railroad president; George W. Pirtle, Tyle, Tex., geologist; and Penn W. Zeigler, Cincinnati, civic leader.

A copy of the citation for Mr. Gott follows: Despite your burdensome responsibilities as chairman and chief executive officer of United States Steel Corporation, you have devoted considerable talent and energy to community service in line with your belief that American businessmen owe support to civic and community affairs.

High on your list of priorities has been furthering the work of the Boy Scouts of America, which you joined at the age of 13. While a rising executive in the steel industry, you renewed your commitment to Scouting in 1958 and have served as Council President and member of the Allegheny Trails Council Executive Board; a member and chairman of Region 3 Executive Committee; and, currently, as a member of the national Executive Board and Vice-President of the Boy Scouts of America.

You have given invaluable service to young adults by vigorous promotion of Exploring special-interest posts within your own and other corporations. Your fellow Scouters have recognized your many contributions to the movement by awarding you the Silver Beaver and Silver Antelope.

Your commitment to the youth of America goes beyond Scouting. You have served as a YMCA director and are now a trustee of the Pittsburgh Children's Hospital. And you have demonstrated your devotion to education as a trustee of Youngstown University; Lehigh University, your alma mater; and Carnegie-Mellon University.

At the same time, you have served your community and the Nation in many other civic endeavors. But it is as a friend and devoted worker that you receive the Silver Buffalo as a token of appreciation for your tireless involvement in Scouting and other activities for America's youth.

LAW AND ORDER

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of Locust Valley, N.Y., one of the best weeklies in America, has published some very trenchant comments concerning the recent attempt on the life of Governor George Wallace.

I think the Leader's editorial is worthy of a wider distribution than that normally reserved for a small weekly newspaper. The Leader has raised some important issues and I think that we can all profit from a careful reading of "Law and Order":

LAW AND ORDER

Once again the world has been shocked by the spectacle of a man in the hustings being shot down for no reason, apparently not even because of his political conviction. As always, when this kind of thing happens, there follows a great deal of talk about law and order, violence and what is this country coming to. During the days following the shooting of George Wallace, we have looked and listened and tried to understand what is happening. Some facts have begun to come into focus. As many commentators have pointed out, all four of the recent attackers have been what might be called borderline nuts, men who if they did not have guns could not use them. This should make it clear to everyone that there must be some kind of federal limit on the distribution of the kind of weapons that this kind of disturbed person finds so easy to obtain. The opposition to this kind of stringent regulation comes from those who claim to be concerned with the problems of maintaining law and order. One thing these attacks have shown is that law and order is not guaranteed merely by the presence of one or more policing officers. The attack on George Wallace took place in full view of the men guarding him. And this has been the pattern of other similar attacks. In fact, both the shoot-

ing of Wallace and the killing of Lee Oswald took place on the TV screen in full view of millions. Maintenance of law and order is far more complicated than police action or police restraint. It never will come to pass until our society reaches the kind of order that breeds so much respect for others that unlawful behaviour is unthinkable.

Violence does now and always has played an overwhelming role in all of history. Much of it has been carried out in the name of righteousness, in the name of God, in the name of patriotism, of family and indeed in the name of law and order. Physical violence is only the visible part of a huge iceberg. Physical violence—murder, mugging, arson—that kind of thing is so much a part of the fabric of our lives that we have come to accept it as inevitable.

Nearly 200,000,000 persons live in our nation. When this many persons live together in a free and diverse society, violence is almost certain to flare from time to time. Today it seems to most of us that there is more violence than ever. Maybe there is or maybe it is just that there are more of us living too closely packed together in a modern society to which few of us have completely adjusted. The problem now is to find the best ways to keep wanton behaviour at a bare minimum. While we seek the ways to accomplish this we must take care to insure the rights of all, the lawful as well as the unlawful, to create laws and conditions that will keep violence under control and inspire men to move ahead in positive rather than negative ways. None of this can be accomplished in a police state which always breeds violence, nor will it be done by the use of highly restrictive laws.

We no longer are a new nation searching for identity but as we have moved toward maturity our problems have become more sophisticated and their solutions far more complex than in earlier days when violence was the law. Every time we read of mindless attacks upon innocent persons, of murder, mayhem, assassination or just plain cruelty we are shocked anew. And so we should be. But as we strive to find our way to a more ordered, stable and safe society we must not be overcome by the same kind of panic and fear that always has and always will breed even more violence.

FROM RUSSIA WITH CHUTZPAH

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago our able and distinguished colleague, Mr. BINGHAM and I returned from a study mission to Israel where I experienced some of the most moving moments in my life.

The purpose of this special study mission was to gather extensive information for the House Foreign Affairs Committee which had been considering a proposal offered by Mr. BINGHAM and myself to provide \$85 million for Israel to help in resettling Soviet Jews.

Happily this provision was included in House Resolution 984 which was approved by the committee and then by the full House on May 17.

We had the opportunity to observe first hand, the dramatic arrival of Soviet Jews in Vienna enroute to the State of Israel. It was heartening to hear them speak of their hopes and dreams because

now that they have left the Soviet Union there is good reason to believe that all they wished for would someday come true.

We went right to the scene and followed the very route of the emigres—their disembarkment from planes and trains in Vienna, their interim processing and sojourn at Schonau and their arrival in Tel Aviv. We had the unique opportunity of meeting at least 200 of these refugees personally.

Not all whom I spoke to were formerly educated. Some were in fact, lawyers, journalists, and teachers, but the great majority were tailors, shoemakers, farmers, and factory workers. They did however, have a degree of commonality. They all wanted to begin a new life which encompassed spiritual as well as a cultural freedom.

I learned a great deal from these brave people. We discussed at great length what life was like in the Soviet Union and why they left their farms and homes.

We learned first hand of their experiences, of their trials and tribulations in the Soviet Union, their way of life and their oppressions merely because they were Jews—how they had been downgraded in their work and in their community life, how so many had been fired outright and penalized in one form or another merely because they were Jews and because they were determined to adhere to their heritage and traditions.

Through interpreters, we talked informally about their plights in the Soviet Union. If ever anyone had doubt of the suppression of freedoms in the Soviet Union, I wish they could have heard these refugees.

Later on in our mission we visited the absorption center in Israel where we saw the housing units where these refugees would inhabit.

One of the most serious problems faced by the influx of newcomers is the task of finding suitable housing. The building schedule of the Israeli Government provides for only 7,000 housing units to be available in 1972. These plans were drawn up in the middle 1970's when no one in his wildest dreams could imagine Jews leaving Russia.

Within the past year we have become increasingly aware of the plight of the Jewish people in the Soviet Union and have also seen an unprecedented number of Jews allowed to leave the U.S.S.R. Israeli newspapers have said that more than 5,000 arrived in 1971.

Today more than 25,000 Soviet Jews live in Israel. They constitute the largest group of refugees from the U.S.S.R. since the end of World War II. Since January of this year, nearly 2,000 per month have left Russia and while the exodus has greatly increased over the past years we cannot rest until all who wish to be free are in fact free.

The motivation for this uprising in immigration remains unclear, yet several possibilities come to mind.

First. Pressure from the United States and other countries has joined the Soviet Union to relax its policies.

Second. The desire by the Soviet Union to free themselves of those who

have caused domestic strain and international embarrassment.

Third. The belief by the Soviet Union that the surge of immigrants cannot be absorbed by Israel without weakening and straining the economy or defense of this proud nation.

Several days ago, I read a most moving and perceptive article in the recent issue of Harpers magazine concerning the plight of the Russian Jews. The article, written by Anatole Shub, one of the world's leading journalists, describes, in detail, his encounter with the Soviet Jews who have emigrated to Israel.

Mr. Shub, a former Moscow correspondent with the Washington Post, was expelled by the KGB in 1969 on the charge of "anti-Soviet writings." He is also the author of the renowned work, "The New Russian Tragedy." I think Mr. Shub's article is particularly important because his reputation as an objective and scholarly writer brings much credibility to this piece.

At this time I would like to include in the RECORD highlights of Mr. Shub's article:

FROM RUSSIA WITH CHUTZPAH

(By Anatole Shub)

ORIGINS OF A NEW EXODUS

JERUSALEM.—I arrive at 10:00 P.M.—the evening's barely starting. The apartment is small and crowded, but there's hot tea for all, and patient Russian ladies to empty ashtrays and offer cookies. The shelves are stacked with Soviet classics, as well as Russian books published only in the West. A tabletop is strewn with *samizdat* manuscripts—protest petitions, memoirs of forced-labor camps, open letters to the Supreme Soviet. A tape recorder plays satiric "underground" Moscow ballads. Visitors come and go, bringing news, plans, complaints. After midnight, the discussion turns grave; we talk of Russia, its terrible history, its problematic future. . . .

The scene could well be Moscow. It is, in fact, Jerusalem. It might also be Tel Aviv, Haifa, or smaller towns where the newest Israelis gather: the more than 20,000 Soviet Jews who have succeeded in leaving Russia the past year.

They have come with a kaleidoscopic variety of personal experiences, from electronics factories on the Baltic to forced-labor camps at Kolyma near the Pacific. Yet as I mingled among scores of these men and women in Israel, I soon came upon familiar faces—the faces of "dissident" sympathizers I had seen as a Moscow correspondent (1967-69) as we stood vigil outside the courthouses where Soviet democrats were being tried.

There, in Moscow, it was not easy to talk to Western newsmen; courage enough was required just to stand there. Here in Mediterranean Israel, not only do "Soviet people" feel free to talk about Russia—even to a foreigner with a tape recorder in a hotel room—they speak urgently, eagerly. Among them, they seem to have been almost anywhere in the vastness of the Soviet Union. One day in Jerusalem, I hear about the secret Trotsky archive in the Odessa library. Next day in Tel Aviv, it's penal colonies by the Arctic Sea. Maoist riots in Tajikistan. Baptists in the Ukraine. KGB chief Yuri Andropov's private collection of abstract art. The insiders' contemptuous nickname for Politburo dark horse Alexander Shelepin ("Zhelezni Shurik," roughly translatable as "Iron Allie"). There is nothing remotely resembling a "typical" case. If some of their stories sound like variations on *Fiddler on the Roof*, others are glosses on *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich*.

How in the world did so many, and such diverse, individuals ever join together to become—as they did in the summer of 1969—a militant, resourceful mass movement to emigrate from Russia? The hundreds then soon swelled to scores of thousands, so that all the world now knows the story of their exodus, from the protest petitions in Moscow to the jumbo jets landing the emigrants in Tel Aviv. But what about the genesis of the movement? Where had its leaders come from—and why had they led, and others followed, precisely when they did? Why had the Jewish movement become a movement just then, in 1969—not earlier, or later, or never?

A VISIT FROM THE KGB

Personal example, group protest, "legalist" strategy, "instant replay" through the Western press and radio—all these features of the Democratic Movement were to be emulated by the "Zionist" activities after 1969. However, it took two great shocks—the Mideast war of June 1967 and the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968—to galvanize the Jewish movement.

Out in Kolyma, Vitaly Svechinsky followed the Six Day War on Voice of America broadcasts coming in from Okinawa. He found great sympathy for Israel, and satisfaction at the Arab-Soviet defeat, among his non-Jewish colleagues. Precisely because the Soviet public was so cool to the Arabs, however, the official anti-"Zionist" campaign became ever more strident, with Brezhnev setting the tone by equating Zionism with Nazism. Predictably, Jews who had never been Zionists began turning toward Israel. At the end of 1967, Svechinsky decided that the days of waiting were over—the time had come for him to return from Kolyma to Moscow. There he helped organize a group of some two hundred Jews willing to struggle for the right to leave Russia.

In Kiev after the Six Day War, the underground *ulpan*, or Hebrew-school, movement started up. According to one man I interviewed, it began when an elderly scholar (a former political prisoner) taught the language to three young men, using a pre-1917 Hebrew Bible as his only text. Each of the three then went out to teach others, often in groups of ten. Within a year, *ulpan*s were sprouting up all over the country.

In Kharkov in mid-February 1968, Yefim Spivakovsky, who was working as an economist in an instrument factory, was suddenly summoned to the plant's iron-doored "Special Department" (or factory KGB branch). A KGB car had already come to the plant to pick up its chief engineer, accused of "subversive" activities. Spivakovsky, who had photos of Moshe Dayan as well as various *samizdat* manuscripts in his apartment, had been denounced to the KGB by a state-farm director with whom he had chatted at a seaside resort. The swoop was part of a nationwide crackdown on dissenters, in the wake of controversial trials of democrats that winter in Moscow and Leningrad.

The KGB interrogated Spivakovsky for three days at its downtown Kharkov headquarters, permitting him to go home each night. In the end, Spivakovsky struck a kind of deal. He promised to give up his "anti-Soviet"—that is, broadly oppositionist—activities, but firmly refused to renounce his "Zionist" hopes of going to Israel. The KGB interrogator accepted this distinction and closed the discussion with what Spivakovsky now believes was a hint of things to come. "We are studying your position," the KGB man said. "We will keep your desire in mind."

Here, in February 1968, was a sign that the Soviet policy on emigration to Israel might still be open to review. (A previous trickle of "family reunions" had been halted after the Mideast war.) It was also one of many indications that the police were more concerned about the Democratic Movement than about Zionism. Indeed, some explain the Kremlin's

later opening of the doors to Jewish emigration as partly an effort to let some steam out of the Democratic Movement. (Tsarist officials in their time had encouraged Zionism for similar reasons.)

Now, in the summer of 1969, the Jewish movement at last began to get under way. Until then, Jews had been playing more or less by the Soviet rules, applying for exit visas individually, making little effort to publicize their collective cause. But their restraint had brought limited dividends: in March 1969 emigration was virtually halted altogether (for nearly two years). The Kochubievsky trial followed, an ugly frame-up any way you read the transcript. At last now, the Jews turned to group action in the style of the Democratic Movement and on an international scale, with collective open letters and mass petitions to the United Nations, the Human Rights Commission, and other bodies. Now, too, the Israeli Government, which had been taking a hush-hush attitude, began championing the movement overtly.

Encouraged by Israeli support, hardened by the grim Soviet winter of 1969-70 (with the worst food shortages in a decade), the Jews multiplied their protest petitions and open letters. Stung, the Soviets intensified anti-Zionist propaganda and called on the KGB. On the night of June 14-15, 1970, scores of Jewish activists were arrested in a half-dozen cities. The arrests led to the notorious Leningrad hijacking trial that December, and other trials in 1971—making the Jews even more desperate. "It was now or never, do or die," says Vitaly Svechinsky. The protesters soon found their numbers greater than anyone had imagined, and their outside support formidable: not only from abroad but from the Democratic Movement. Indeed, two of the defendants at the first Leningrad trial were non-Jewish: Yuri Fedorov (twenty-seven, Russian) and Alexei Murzhenko (twenty-eight, Ukrainian), both former political prisoners, condemned anew to fifteen and fourteen years' hard labor respectively.

When the Leningrad court sentenced two other defendants to death, the international outcry forced the Kremlin to commute the sentences. Academician Andrei Sakharov, the liberal Moscow nuclear physicist, was among the first to protest. Later, his unofficial Human Rights Committee issued a broader manifesto urging the Kremlin to "stop violating the right to leave the country."

Barely a thousand Jews had emigrated during 1970. But early in 1971, as the Jews staged ever-bolder demonstrations, sit-ins, and hunger strikes, the Kremlin started giving way, allowing troublemakers like Vitaly Svechinsky and Yefim Spivakovsky to leave the country. A dangerous precedent: "troublemaking" had paid off. New activists quickly came to the fore—professors, scientists, film directors. New protests and demonstrations greeted the trials last summer. The Kremlin gave further ground . . .

Jews applying to emigrate risked immediate loss of their jobs. Permission to leave still often took months to obtain and was by no means certain. Families were split: a brother in prison, a sister in Jerusalem. Emigration cost each departing adult some 1,500 rubles (\$1,666 at the official exchange rate) in visa, transport, and other fees. Yet, by last autumn, a strange and frenzied race was on: officials at OVIR were rushing to clear the decks of applications, to show that there was no further demand for emigration. But new thousands of Jews were applying the more it seemed safe to do so. Last summer, there were only 35,000 applications; by the New Year, there were more than 80,000.

How many of the 2,150,000 Soviet Jews will eventually reach Israel is a question nobody can answer. Perhaps only one in ten. But even that many will represent a triumph of raw nerve: the only word for it is *chutzpah*.

The lives of the Soviet Jews who have reached Israel have not been without prob-

lems. There has been the predictable "culture shock" of sudden transition from the Russian language to Hebrew, from authoritarian "order" to freedom, scarcity to affluence, state paternalism to individual initiative; and from a society conditioned to think in universal terms to one that often seems provincial. "We have been uprooted, but we are not yet rooted," says Professor Mikhail Zand, a distinguished Oriental-language scholar from Moscow.

Israelis, who have been watching the "absorption" of other immigrants for over twenty-five years, tend to be blasé about the process. "In the first year," the saying goes, "all immigrants complain about absorption troubles. The second year, they begin complaining about taxes. By the third year, they're complaining about new immigrants."

Predictably, the Israeli efforts to settle the new arrivals quickly in good jobs and housing have aroused resentments—notably among the "Oriental" Jews from North Africa and the Arab East, who often have had to wait years for what some "Russians" now obtain in months. Israeli officials seem to think that keeping everyone happy is mainly a question of money. (It costs some \$35,000, they say, to absorb each immigrant family.)

Among the Soviet immigrants themselves, the most publicized difficulties involved Orthodox, rural Jews from the mountains of Georgia. Originating from small, tightly knit religious communities, they resisted Israeli attempts to disperse them, "melting pot" style, among several towns and villages. The Georgians used sitdown strikes and demonstrations to make their point. (As more than one immigrant has remarked in other circumstances, "If we didn't keep quiet there, we're certainly not going to keep quiet here.")

Although Soviet propaganda early this year claimed that 1,500 former Soviet Jews had already written complaining of Israeli conditions, and that "hundreds" had even asked to return to the U.S.S.R., this seems clearly an exaggeration; only a handful of names was mentioned in either connection. Most Soviet Jews I met seemed quite pleased to be in Israel, and those who weren't talked of going to the U.S. rather than returning to Russia. Several cut short discussion of their absorption problems with such remarks as: "Any time I get discouraged here, all I have to do is think a minute about what I've escaped from."

Soviet Jews, however, feel a deep political concern, a concern that stems from the very nature of their movement to emigrate. They have left Russia, but Russia has not left them, the activists and intellectuals least of all. Having fought their difficult struggle side by side with others resisting Soviet state power, they are appalled now by the official Israeli reserve toward the internal struggles that continue to unfold in the U.S.S.R.

Soviet Jews feel a moral debt to non-Jewish Soviet democrats who helped them at great personal risk—men like Fedorov and Murzhenko, the non-Jewish defendants at the first Leningrad trial. But Israeli authorities firmly discourage any attempts by Soviet Jews to take up the cause of their Russian friends. Funds for a Russian-language magazine were cut off, for example, because it had printed *samizdat* documents about the Democrat Movement.

The Israelis distinguish between "Zionist" and "anti-Soviet" activity for reasons of diplomacy: the Soviet authorities themselves are making the distinction, permitting "Zionists" to emigrate while sending "anti-Soviet" democrats to prisons, labor camps, and insane asylums. The Israelis go along with the distinction even when the persecuted "anti-Soviets" are Jewish. The Soviet Jews in Israel consider this shameful.

In the last analysis, differing perceptions of the Soviet Union are involved. For Israeli officials, the U.S.S.R. is primarily a great

power, whose armed forces are perched on the Suez Canal and whose assent is necessary for a Mideast settlement. In this view, the inner stability of the Soviet system must be taken for granted, and normal relations with Moscow remain a desirable goal that should not be prejudiced by "Cold War" activities.

For the Soviet Jews, however, Russia is the land of their own struggle, which they know from the inside. Their own experiences, they say, testify not only to the Soviet regime's malevolence but to its ultimate vulnerability. The Russia that fighters like Spivakovsky and Kochubievsky describe is a society in malignant decomposition—a "cancer ward" kept going by inertia, cynicism, and the residues of fear; sapped by rising anti-Russian nationalisms; sinking slowly into economic impotence; straitjacketed by a political system its present leaders dare not change. ("I almost feel sorry for them," three different Soviet Jews told me on separate occasions, discussing the leadership's various dilemmas. Kochubievsky noted that "everything they touch turns against them—watch, even the Arabs will turn on them.")

Their own movement, Soviet Jews argue, has shown that the regime will retreat when it is challenged with sufficient skill and determination. The Jews' example is bound, they say, to encourage other, perhaps stronger, resistance movements—aimed not so much at emigration (where could 46 million Ukrainians go?) as at direct confrontation with Soviet power. New surprises await Russia. "This is only the beginning," say the more ardent Soviet Jews. Only time will tell whether they are right.

THE WEAPONS DEBATE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the recent U.S.-Soviet arms accord, a stop-gap in the ever-spiraling race for strategic parity, is certainly encouraging. What the Moscow summit last week made clear is that strategic parity is not necessarily numerical parity, or, in nuclear warfare, numbers are only partially important. Henry Owens of Brookings Institute, contends in the enclosed article, that discussions of deterrence, technical judgments as to the right mix of survivability and penetration which contribute most to stability, are generally lost to sight as a result of the general obsession with numbers and that forums which focus on these issues effectively is, sadly, lacking.

It is my hope that Congress, in committee and in the floor debate over the military procurement bill, will argue that "right mix" particularly in discussions of the Navy's four capabilities, made explicit by Admiral Moorer: "Assured second strike," "Control of the sea lanes and areas," "Projection of power ashore" and "Overseas presence."

The article follows:

THE WEAPONS DEBATE

(By Henry Owen)

"It is clear that the Russians are pushing ahead with their drive for overwhelming nuclear superiority over the United States . . . Their build-up has gone so far that the United States cannot afford to play their game any longer."

This 1971 editorial from a leading Midwestern newspaper is representative of ar-

titles which have been appearing since then with growing frequency in the American press. Some refer to "Russia's frightening weapons momentum," "Russia's continued build-up of her strategic arsenal at an unprecedented rate," and "growing Soviet arms superiority." Others conclude that recent trends "indicate a real shift in the strategic balance from the United States to Russia," or that "we are in a position of extreme relative weakness and the gap is widening every day." The headlines are revealing:

Russia abused SALT Talks to build strongest arsenal world has ever seen.

Is U.S. skidding to second-rate status?

Soviet weaponry surpasses ours.

Our situation is grim.

Along with these articles has come a series of statements by private groups concerned about the shifting strategic arms balance. These articles and statements may look like a coordinated campaign, but the explanation is actually a good deal simpler: they reflect the honest concern of their authors over the growing Soviet missile build-up, a concern which is increasingly shared by many members of the Congress and other thoughtful observers.

These people are all reacting to the same basic fact: while the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT) have been going on, the Soviet Union has increased its land-based missile strength from 1190 intercontinental ballistic missiles at the end of 1969 to 1520 ICBMs at the end of 1971, which is about 500 more than the United States has. During the same period, Russia increased its submarine-based missiles from 240 to 500; it now has as many nuclear-powered missile submarines in operation or being built as the United States, whose undersea missile force has remained constant at 41 boats. As a result, the Soviet Union, which once lagged behind us, now has several hundred more long-range missiles than the United States. The kind of arms agreement which U.S. and Soviet leaders will likely conclude will not reverse this Soviet numerical advantage. That agreement will limit strategic arms competition in certain areas only, leaving it free to proceed in others.

WHAT NUMBERS COUNT?

The concern which these facts cause is natural. But that concern needs to be reassessed in light of two other facts.

First, on purely technical grounds, these numbers do not give an accurate picture of the U.S.-Soviet strategic balance. The number of independently aimed warheads available to both sides is a better measure of their nuclear strength than the number of missiles, since it's the warheads, not the missiles, which strike targets. The United States is far ahead of the Soviet Union in developing multiple independently targeted warheads (MIRV's), and has been busy installing these warheads on both land-based and sea-based missiles. The Soviets are reported to be installing multiple warheads on some missiles, but these are not independently aimed, and so they are a lot less dangerous.

While the Soviets will eventually achieve the level of technology required to develop independently aimed multiple warheads, Defense Secretary Melvin Laird tells us in his latest annual report that they "probably have not tested MIRV missiles thus far." The result is that the United States has a large and growing advantage over the Soviets in warheads, and will probably keep that lead for several years.

Second, the size of both sides' strategic nuclear force has now reached the point at which it is not clear that marginal differences in numbers—whether of warheads or missiles—are of critical importance. In the 1950s, when neither side had what is now called "sufficiency," it was of considerable moment if one side pulled ahead of the other. But since then each side's strength has increased tremendously. When Amer-

ica's current program is completed, the U.S. submarine missile force alone will have over 5000 deliverable warheads; the U.S. strategic force as a whole will have over 10,000 deliverable warheads. When you're talking about this range of figures, marginal differences in numbers are no longer the heart of the matter. Each side can destroy the other, no matter who strikes first, and this is clear to all concerned.

But these considerations tend to get swallowed up in the debate. There is an instinctive tendency to focus on a clear and simple measure of the two sides' relative strength: the number of missiles that each has, and the megatonnage that they can deliver. This generates pressure to build up U.S. forces beyond the point of political and military need, at a time when budgetary resources are scarce. Just as important, it overshadows more crucial nuclear problems, which do not revolve around the relative size of U.S. and Soviet strategic forces.

There is some analogy here to the situation which existed in Europe before 1914. Germany then had a competition in ground forces going with France and with Russia, somewhat like the U.S.-Soviet competition in strategic forces today. Each country kept the size of its rival's army under close and anxious scrutiny. If that size increased, a costly parallel increase in the other's army followed. Military budgets rose steadily as a result.

And yet, when these countries found themselves on the brink of war in July, 1914, their actions in that crisis were not in the least influenced by the numerical balance between their armies. The chief military factor which made it difficult to resolve that crisis peacefully was not that France's standing army was larger than Germany's, or that Germany's reserve forces exceeded those of France, much less that Russia's army was larger than either of the other two, but rather that all these countries' war plans were so keyed to split-second mobilization schedules that each believed victory would accrue to whoever mobilized first. Hence each felt compelled to anticipate the other in making the transition from peace to war, even before the resources of diplomacy had been fully exhausted.

Nor was the numerical balance between these countries' armies decisive in the fighting that ensued. Initial victories of Germany and Russia at the frontier in August, 1914, and these countries' defeats at the Marne and Tannenberg later in the summer, owed more to the armies' initial deployments, to the quality of their weapons (notably artillery), and to the failure of their services of supply than to any differences between their gross numbers.

Leaders on both sides would have managed better to keep the peace, and, failing that, to avert defeat, if they had worried more about these mobilization and technical problems and less about gross numbers. Today, as in 1914, important strategic problems need to be tackled if effective deterrence is to be maintained. Today, as in 1914, these problems do not have much to do with the most dramatic measure of strength: the numerical missile balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. So they get relatively short shrift in the press and in public debate.

WHAT DETERS?

The first of these problems is this question: What types of weapons systems should be deployed to maintain stable deterrence? That deterrence now obtains; neither side sees advantage in being the first to strike in a nuclear exchange. Hence, even in a grave crisis, both sides are unlikely to resort to nuclear weapons. This situation could be altered if the Soviets scored both an offensive and a defensive breakthrough. An offensive breakthrough would mean developing either sufficiently accurate multiple missiles to destroy U.S. landbased missiles or sufficiently

effective antisubmarine techniques to sink large numbers of U.S. missile-bearing submarines. A defensive breakthrough would mean deploying enough antiballistic missiles (ABM's) to blunt a reprisal by surviving U.S. sea-based and land-based forces. If both these breakthroughs occurred, it is at least conceivable that in a grave crisis the Russians might see some advantage in being the first to strike, and that the risk of nuclear war would be increased.

This danger will not be averted simply by expanding the scale of U.S. strategic forces. The danger depends more on the types of weapons available to both sides than on their numbers.

The best insurance against a Soviet defensive breakthrough is an arms control agreement which, among other things, so limits ABM's as to prevent effective ABM defense of missiles on Soviet territory. The agreement which U.S. and Soviet leaders seem likely to conclude will have this effect.

The best way to prevent a Soviet offensive breakthrough is for the United States to maintain both an invulnerable submarine missile force and an effective land-based nuclear force; then the Soviets will realize that even if they can knock out one of these forces, they will have to contend with the other. The President has proposed several measures to this end: accelerating development of an improved missile submarine (ULMS), pressing ahead with a new manned bomber, and hardening U.S. missile sites. The purpose to which these proposals are addressed makes sense. The question is whether these measures are the best way of achieving that purpose: Should ULMS development proceed now, or should it be held back until a future Soviet antisubmarine threat emerges more clearly, so that the next generation of U.S. missile submarines can be geared more directly to that threat? Is the kind of manned bomber that the Administration has in mind the right successor to the B-52, or would a somewhat different and less expensive type of plane do the job? Is hardening of missile sites sufficiently effective to warrant the expense involved? Indeed, do we need landbased missiles as well as bombers to maintain the land-based component of the deterrent, or should the land-based deterrent consist only of bombers?

There are arguments on both sides of these questions; they cry out for debate. But these arguments involve technical judgments as to which weapons will provide the right mix of survivability and penetration, and thus contribute most to stability. And these sorts of questions are a lot less interesting than the one of gross numbers to both sides of the debate about the level of defense spending. Numbers can be dramatized in charts and slogans. Technical questions cannot.

Hence these questions are likely to receive less than their due in public debate. If they are scrutinized anywhere, it will be in congressional committees, particularly the Senate Armed Services Committee, which is becoming an increasingly effective forum for rigorous analysis of defense expenditures. The fact that the Committee's chairman, Senator John Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi, tends to avoid both the glorification and the denunciation of the military-industrial complex which dominate debate elsewhere makes it easier for him to focus effectively on issues which have little ideological content. In this type of forum, however, the question of what kinds of weapons are needed to prevent a Soviet defensive or offensive breakthrough will probably be lost to sight as a result of the general obsession with numbers.

TALK

The second problem is how to ensure that the U.S.-Soviet strategic balance is not misjudged—in the United States, the Soviet Union, or the rest of the world. A widespread belief that the balance of effective

nuclear power was tilting against the United States might encourage the Soviets to adopt more adventurous policies—for example, in the Middle East. Such a belief need not rest on objective fact. The missile gap of the late 1950s existed chiefly in Soviet claims and American doubts, but this did not make it any less important as part of the diplomatic landscape. Secretary Laird refers to this risk in his annual report. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, stressed it in congressional testimony. There is no evidence now that either the Soviets or our allies judge the United States to be in a position of nuclear inferiority. But this could change.

In the short term, the United States could talk itself into a state of assumed nuclear inferiority. The current domestic debate over numbers of missiles could have precisely this effect. Soviet leaders might conclude that American despondency offered tempting opportunities for Soviet pressure. The way to prevent this is not to spend a lot of money remedying an inferiority which does not exist, but to educate our people to the fact that it doesn't exist.

The President's report on foreign policy includes some sensible remarks to this end: "Capabilities of both the U.S. and U.S.S.R.," he says, "have reached a point where our programs need not be driven by fear of minor quantitative imbalances." But the educational impact of these remarks is drowned out by other parts of that report, and parts of Secretary Laird's annual report, which describe and stress the Soviet threat in terms of numbers of missiles. These passages seem to foreshadow a call for a substantial expansion of U.S. missile programs larger than the expansion recommended by the President in his current budget. At some point, this kind of expansion may be required. But the main need now, in U.S. debate, is less to trumpet this possibility than to educate Americans about the fairly wide range within which the numerical size of U.S. and Soviet nuclear programs can vary without decisively affecting the balance of power, and the technical issues of effective deterrence which need to be faced within this range.

The President finds it difficult to talk in this vein, however, without giving offense to those large numbers of Americans who are worried about the current U.S.-Soviet numerical balance. Moreover, he has probably calculated that Soviet leaders are more likely to negotiate a succession of arms control agreements if they expect that the United States might match increases in Russian strategic forces.

On this last point he may well be right; here, as in other areas of foreign policy, there is an inherent tension between the needs of candid education at home and of sophisticated bargaining abroad.

Over the longer run, a gap between American and Russian nuclear programs could develop which, even if it were not militarily decisive, would be so large as to shape attitudes of the Soviet Union, American allies, and perhaps the United States itself. This would probably occur only if the Soviets surpassed America not only in missiles but also in independently aimed and deliverable warheads, and if the resulting differences were very large. Given the current American lead in warheads, considerable time would have to elapse until this occurred. We can put this cushion of time to good use: after partial U.S.-Soviet arms agreement this spring, we should seek a follow-up agreement which would limit other Soviet offensive weapons systems. If that agreement cannot be secured, and if Soviet strategic programs continue to escalate, that will be the time to expand our own programs.

All of which does not add up to a very impressive case for believing that the currently planned size of U.S. strategic nuclear

forces is inadequate—or, indeed, that the size of these programs is the most useful measure of their adequacy. The current furor about numbers will have done a grave disservice to national security if it obscures this fact and thus diverts debate from more pressing problems of nuclear security.

COMMUNITY BASED CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois State Department of Corrections, under the leadership of Director Peter B. Bensinger, has recently held a series of public hearings on its plans to construct several new, small, community-based correctional facilities throughout the State. This type of facility offers one of the most promising alternatives to the traditionally expensive and overcrowded prisons which have proven ill-suited to accomplish the objective of rehabilitation. At its hearing in Rockford, the Department had the benefit of hearing the perceptive views of John Anderson, Congressman from the 16th District of Illinois. I would like to insert my colleague's statement and commend it to the attention of the entire membership.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON BEFORE THE ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS PUBLIC HEARING BOARD, ROCKFORD, ILLINOIS, FRIDAY, MAY 19, 1972

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Board: I am grateful for the opportunity to appear before this distinguished Board today to testify on corrections reform. Although I am not a penologist, I do have an intense interest in this subject as a Congressman and as the former State's Attorney for Winnebago County. In this Ninety-Second Congress, I have been privileged to serve on a small, bipartisan, ad hoc Task Force on Prison Reform in the House of Representatives. So I appear before you today as an interested generalist who wants to lend full support to the efforts being made by the State of Illinois in the area of prison reform.

I am greatly encouraged by the fact that there is an increasing interest in this country in improving our corrections system. This interest is reflected not only in the increasing expenditures by all levels of government on corrections, but in the increasing involvement of community groups and individual volunteers in this area. I think our citizens (and their elected representatives) are coming to recognize that all this talk about law and order is meaningless if we do nothing about our corrections system. People are beginning to take a closer look at those crime statistics and what they mean. Nineteen out of every twenty persons sent to prison are eventually returned to society, and of those 40 percent will be back in prison within five years. Eighty percent of all felonies are committed by repeaters. Two-thirds of the 200,000 inmates in Federal and State prisons are alumni of other penal institutions. It's little wonder that President Nixon has labeled our prisons, "universities of crime." Chief Justice Burger has called our prisons "non-correcting correctional systems," and Assistant LEAA Administrator Richard W. Velde terms them a "national disgrace."

In President Nixon's words: "The American

system for correcting and rehabilitating criminals presents a convincing case for failure. No realistic program to substantially reduce crime can ignore the appalling deficiencies of our prisons and rehabilitation efforts." And Federal Prison Director Norman Carlson has said: "Jails are tanks, human warehouses. Anyone not a criminal will be one when he gets out of jail."

Psychiatrist Karl Menninger, in his book, *The Crime of Punishment*, asserts that all the crimes by jailed criminals do not equal in total social damage the crimes committed against them. He attributes this to a public which looks to its prisons for both vengeance and rehabilitation. The end result is a schizophrenic system which neither effectively punishes nor rehabilitates.

It seems to me that the President's analogy of prisons as "universities of crime" is an especially fitting one since there is ample evidence that many who enter prisons as first offenders, graduate from those institutions as hardened criminals. A Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement in 1967 reported that,

"... conditions under which many offenders are handled, particularly in institutions, are often a positive detriment to rehabilitation... Life in many institutions is at best barren and futile, at worst unspeakably brutal and degrading. To be sure, the offenders in such institutions are incapacitated from committing further crimes while serving their sentences, but conditions in which they live are the poorest possible preparation for their successful reentry into society and often merely reinforce them in a pattern of manipulation or destructiveness."

And former Federal Bureau of Prisons Director James V. Bennett has said, "It is probable that imprisonment plays a greater role than any other single factor in creating habitual criminality."

I think it is this direct correlation between prison conditions and the rising crime rate which has stirred public interest in prison reform. As a Nation we are spending about \$1.5 billion annually on corrections, and the people are beginning to realize that the only return they are getting on this investment is a higher crime rate. In effect, our investment in archaic concepts of corrections and in ancient, overcrowded and crumbling bastilles, amounts to little more than a "crime subsidy." The time has come for our society to redirect its efforts and reinvest its resources in genuinely effective rehabilitation programs.

We certainly cannot be found wanting for new ideas in prison reform. Since 1967 there have been four presidential commissions, dozens of legislative reports and over 500 books and articles all pleading for various kinds of prison reforms. As President Nixon's Task Force on Prisoner Rehabilitation reported in 1970: "The voluminous literature on the subject overflows with excellent ideas that have never been implemented nor, in many cases, even tested." The reason these reforms have not been put into effect in the past is because of the lack of public awareness of the corrections-crime correlation and the consequent lack of public financial backing for these new programs.

Hopefully, this situation is beginning to change, and I think most penologists would agree that the State of Illinois is leading the way. In 1968 we became the first State to provide governmental sponsorship for a joint halfway house-work release program, and I am proud of the fact that Rockford has one of the State's four halfway houses in the Genesis Community Center.

In 1970, the State's various correctional programs were brought under the single roof of the new cabinet-level Department of Corrections under the dynamic leadership of our Chairman today, Mr. Peter Bensinger. Governor Ogilvie proposed a comprehensive plan to reform the State's archaic corrections

system, and this has received strong bipartisan support in the General Assembly. Today the Illinois Department of Corrections employs 4,800 people; its appropriation for fiscal 1972 was \$84.4 million—a 60 percent increase over the State's corrections funding just three years ago. The Department currently operates six State institutions for adults, seven work-release centers, five community centers, 19 schools and camps for juveniles, and a variety of community-based programs.

The focus of these hearings is on the next major phase of the State's correctional master plan which is to establish several small, community-based, differential treatment facilities. I wish to lend my full support and strong endorsement for the community-based corrections concept because it seems to me this really goes to the heart of genuine prison reform. I think the university analogy is useful in this regard as well, for just as our large universities are in turmoil because they are too big, impersonal and often irrelevant to the needs of both the students and the society, so too are our prisons in turmoil for the same reasons. Instead of "megaversities" we have "megatentacles," and in both instances we are talking about institutions originally designed to help solve society's problems, which instead only contribute to those problems.

Just as we are learning the value of decentralization in other segments of our society, we are coming to recognize its value in the area of corrections. The community-based corrections concept accepts the failure of our massive, impersonal prisons, far removed from population centers, and in their place would substitute a system which would keep the offender in his community or near it, where institutions with which he is familiar, such as family, friends and clubs, could aid in his rehabilitation. It seems to me that the logic behind this concept is overpowering when you consider that 19 of every 20 persons sent to prison eventually return to society. The community-based corrections concept is designed to keep a person close enough to that society that he will be able to return to a useful and productive life, rather than a life of crime. It would do this by drawing on the resources and cooperation of the community. As Federal Bureau of Prisons Director Carlson put it: "corrections must be a part of the larger society."

And I might point out that the Federal Bureau of Prisons is putting this philosophy into practice. It is currently operating nine Community Treatment Centers around the country and has plans to increase this number to 15.

Under the Crime Control Act of 1970, the Congress authorized the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to devote at least 20 percent of its action funds for State and local corrections. Under this program, known as part E, up to 50 percent of the money could go directly to local units of government, with emphasis on the development of community-based corrections. This fiscal 1973 budget request for part E corrections grants is \$113 million, up \$16 million over fiscal 1972, and \$64 million over fiscal 1971. So, I think you can see from this that we in the Congress are also committed to increasing expenditures for corrections, with emphasis on community-based corrections.

I think it should be stressed that the establishment of community-based corrections would cause a reduction in the number of maximum security prisons. Penologists agree that only 20 to 30 percent of present inmates represent a danger to society and must be securely confined. The remaining 70 percent can be corrected in these less restrictive, local institutions, and fewer facilities will be required for the intractables.

Obviously, the key to the success of these community-based facilities will be the extent to which you can draw upon the community's

educational, social service and vocational training resources, for these will in turn determine the success of the inmate once he is released back into the community. I am confident that you will be able to plug such supportive agencies as your new Trade Advisory Board into the community-based facilities to help ensure their success.

Mr. Chairman, the correctional reforms already implemented by the State are among the most progressive and effective in the nation, and you and your department are to be commended on this. It is my understanding that you have achieved a 40 percent reduction in the adult recidivism rate over the last four years, and a 52 percent reduction in the juvenile recidivism rate. I am confident that if you proceed with the next phase of reform in the area of community-based corrections, you will experience even greater success, and your efforts have my wholehearted support.

UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY SEEKS FUNDS FOR DDSA

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week, the United Cerebral Palsy submitted a statement to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, in which it detailed its support for increased funding for the Developmental Disabilities Services Act, the major new Federal program designed to aid the mentally retarded and victims of cerebral palsy and epilepsy. The statement is a thoughtful expression of the need in this critical area for the handicapped. Also, the testimony exposes as myth many of the charges which have been leveled against the program in an effort to protest increasing DDSA. For anyone who carefully studies the development of the program and its operation, it is clear that the States have enthusiastically sought increased Federal aid and there are many desirable programs in virtually every State stalled due to the failure of the Congress to fund the program properly.

Appropriation Committees in the House and Senate are presently debating the details of the fiscal year 1973 budget. Now and in the coming weeks, the Members and those interested in the welfare of some of the most deserving and most neglected Americans should raise their voices in support of DDSA and substantially increased funding.

The following is the text of the United Cerebral Palsy testimony:

STATEMENT IN BEHALF OF UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY ASSOCIATIONS, INC.

United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Incorporated is a national organization of volunteers and professionals who work together to obtain services needed by the cerebral palsied and their families. Five-hundred thousand volunteers serve the 300 state and local affiliates in 42 states and the District of Columbia.

We appreciate this opportunity to share with the Committee our concerns regarding the President's Proposed Budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1972-1973.

THE DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES SERVICES ACT

Our priority concern is more adequate funding of Title I of PL 91-517 (The Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act of 1970) for planning, services and facility construction for the developmentally disabled with unmet needs. The President has requested \$21.7 million—for this program in fiscal '73—no increase over the amount appropriated for the program last year. The amount is inadequate. We urge the Committee to raise that figure to \$65 million.

As you will recall the Act expanded the mental retardation legislation of the 60's to target substantially handicapped cerebral palsied and epileptic individuals as well as the profoundly or multiple handicapped retarded.

We at United Cerebral Palsy are familiar with the needs of substantially handicapped people. Cerebral palsy is not a single disability. It almost never occurs alone but in combination with other disabilities. Of the 750,000 individuals with cerebral palsy two-thirds are also mentally retarded; one half have speech and communication disorders; one-third have visual disorders; one-fifth have learning disabilities.

The cerebral palsied need a host of services that cost more than most families can afford; a range of service programs that no single health agency can provide. Because many of the people with cerebral palsy have common program needs with persons having other conditions that originate in childhood and can be expected to continue indefinitely and which constitute a substantial handicap UCPA joined with other national groups such as the National Association for Retarded Children and the Epilepsy Foundation of America to sponsor the Developmental Disabilities Services and Facilities Construction Act of 1970.

This program has the potential for meeting needs which are as yet unmet—serving substantially handicapped individuals who are yet unserved.

The program addresses itself to the unmet needs of these substantially handicapped developmentally disabled individuals in three ways—by assessing the resources of other programs (such as vocational rehabilitation, special education, Title IV, A, and XVI of the Social Security Act); by directly funding the services not available from any other sources; and by providing the glue to put the various service components together in an individual program for the developmentally disabled person.

We see evidence that this first goal—to identify and assess resources from existing programs—is being implemented in the states. Developmental Disabilities funds are being used catalytically for systematic planning, coordination, service integration and gap filling. Several states are deploying funds in this catalytic manner very effectively. Many states still receiving minimum allotments have been unable to begin effective harnessing of the existing resources.

Most critical however is the shortage of funds available for goal two—provision of services not available elsewhere in the community to substantially handicapped developmentally disabled people.

President Nixon recently called for immediate action "to enable one-third of the more than 200,000 retarded persons in public institutions to return to useful lives in the community." UCPA has long endorsed the concept of community services for all the disabled as opposed to institutionalization. The DDSA program is designed to put in place community programs—alternatives to institutionalization. But substantial budget increases will be necessary to implement the President's words. His commitment to reducing institutional populations will require more than the "maintenance of

effort" budget prescribed by the Administration.

Until we have more adequate funding for this, Title I of the Developmental Disabilities Act, to provide services not available from any other resource the goal of this program will never be attained. Although we have made strides in the program in its short history of a year and one half we saw last year that \$21.7 million is inadequate for states to serve this population.

STATES ASSUME BURDEN FOR DD CARE

States are currently spending over one billion dollars in state funds for residential care for the mentally retarded—only one segment of the population covered by Developmental Disabilities program. An additional half billion dollars of state money will be spent by states for community services for the retarded in the current fiscal year.

STATE PROJECTS AWAIT FUNDING

At the present funding level 13 states receive only the minimum \$100,000. Twenty states receive less than \$250,000. Even states receiving considerably more than the minimum indicate that service needs far outweigh available funds.

New Jersey: New Jersey's approved projects in 1972 totalled \$1.8 million with only \$547,134 in funds allotted.

Massachusetts: Massachusetts' approved projects amounted to \$6 million but the state received only \$246,000 in FY 72.

Washington has estimated \$1 million program need for FY 73. Under the President's budget Washington will receive \$263,160.

Wisconsin estimated that \$1.5 to \$3 million could be effectively spent for service needs in 1973. Their allocation next year, as in 1972—\$425,408.

South Carolina's 1973 allocation under the existing budget will be \$316,718. An estimated \$1.5 million could be utilized by programs that are planned and ready to implement.

Delaware estimates \$1 million could be channeled immediately to fill service needs. Only 10% of that sum, \$100,000, will be allotted to Delaware.

It is important to note that these projects do not include costly construction items. Construction has been de-emphasized because the DDA appropriations have been so low.

However, construction of small group living arrangements for handicapped people is a very legitimate program need. And it is a need not presently met by any existing resource. When states receive more substantial Federal support, we will be able to move many institutionalized handicapped people into small group residences in the community.

An appropriation of \$65 million for this program of formula grants to states would bring a maximum number of states above the \$100,000.

UCPA is joined by the Council for Exceptional Children and its 42,000 members in urging the Committee to raise funding for the Developmental Disabilities Services Program to \$65 million in 1973.

A REPLY TO ARGUMENTS AGAINST DD INCREASES

We wish to clarify for the record several issues which surfaced when the House considered the second Supplemental Appropriation Bill for FY '72.

Arguing against additional Title I DDSA money Mr. Flood pointed to unobligated DD funds and concluded that states were incapable of spending existing DD allocations.

The blame for unobligated funds cannot be laid with the states. The fact of unobligated funds cannot be used as an indication of lack of programs ready for implementation in states. Let us examine each issue and determine the source of delays.

I. Charge. Almost all of the FY 1971 ap-

propriation, remained unobligated at the beginning of FY 72.

Reply. The authorizing legislation—PL 91-517 was enacted in November 1970 after the HEW appropriations bill for FY 71 had been completed.

FY 71 DD funds were part of a late Appropriation for FY 71 and not available for allocation to states until January 11, 1971.

Lacking Federal Regulations to govern the program, HEW delayed approval of '71 state plans until June 24, 1971—the last week of the fiscal year. In that one week 44 plans were submitted and approved on the basis of the authorizing law.

Total number of '71 state plans approved is 54. Arizona and American Samoa opted not to participate.

II. Charge. 18 of 56 state plans are approved for '72, \$15 million remains unobligated.

Reply. Some delay in submitting state plans for '72 was encountered because the law required '72 plans (and all subsequent plans) to be submitted by a State Planning and Advisory Council. The Council must include 1/3 consumer representation. Appointment and instruction of Council members required time.

As an additional impediment, conflicting instructions were issued to states by HEW concerning membership on Councils required for state plan approval. These bulletins were issued as late as April of this year. Councils are still awaiting Federal Regulations to guide them in developing state plans. Proposed rule-making regulations were published in the Federal Register December 28, 1971. To date no regulations have been promulgated.

1972 state plans are currently approved by HEW on the basis of the authorizing legislation.

III. Charge. \$900,000 of FY '71 remains unobligated.

Reply. Neither the Office of the HEW Comptroller nor the Division of Developmental Disabilities could verify this figure. However, we can report that 54 state plans allotting \$11,000,604 to states were approved for the '71 DD budget of \$11.2 million appropriated, leaving unobligated only \$102,246—allotments for non-participating states.

States stand ready and able to implement millions of dollars in DD programs. The delay in obligating the Federal funds cannot justly be said to be the fault of the states—rather the Federal mechanism.

Although our priority concern is funding of the service program under Developmental Disabilities (Title I) we would be shortsighted to neglect the urgent needs for basic and clinical research into the cause, prevention and treatment of cerebral palsy. A multitude of unanswered questions face researchers investigating cerebral palsy. At the National Institute of Health the two groups most directly involved in finding solutions to these problems are: the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) and the National Institute of Neurological Disease and Stroke (NINDS).

NICHD

Within the last year NICHD was able to fund only about half the approved research grant applications. Although the President requests \$10 million in increases for the NICHD budget (to \$126.69 million)—the bulk of this increase is absorbed by commitments to family planning studies.

Other vital responsibilities of NICHD include: child health (mental retardation, perinatal biology and infant mortality), population and aging. UCP requests that the Committee increase the NICHD budget by \$17 million committed to the area of child health.

Prevention and early care are prime program areas of UCP and its affiliates. Although we see encouraging results from early intervention with very young babies,

we are discovering that we actually know very little concerning cognitive development.

It is extremely important therefore that funds be channeled into research in this area not only to prevent secondary handicapping conditions from occurring in our handicapped babies but also to maximize the development of our normal children.

BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

UCP joins with the Council for Exceptional Children in the position expressed earlier today in their testimony on increased funding for the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. UCP shares the concerns expressed by Mr. Geer, Executive Director of the Council for Exceptional Children.

We also wish to commend the Bureau for its emphasis on early education of handicapped children. A BEH grant to United Cerebral Palsy and four other private agencies is enabling a National Collaborative Infant Project for 200 handicapped babies and their parents in five U.S. cities: Providence, Rhode Island; New Orleans, Louisiana; Los Angeles, California; Martin County, California and Iowa City, Iowa.

NINDS

Once again the Administrations proposed budget fails to provide adequate funding for the work of the National Institute of Neurological Disease and Stroke (NINDS). The \$800,000 increase proposed would be insufficient to meet the cost of living increases. There is no provision for expanded research and training efforts in this vital field of neurological disorders which cripple or kill an estimated 40 million Americans.

As a member organization of the National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders (NCRND) we urge the Committee to increase appropriations to NINDS. NCRND estimates that the present funding level is \$28 million short of the NINDS commitments to support research and training even without any expansion.

UAF

Title II of PL 91-517, the Developmental Disabilities Act provides project grant authority to plan, construct and operate university affiliated facilities (UAF's). The UAF is a center for interdisciplinary training of professionals and paraprofessionals within a model service facility for the developmentally disabled.

UAF's can be a major source for training of the new type of professional personnel needed for serving the developmentally disabled in the community. The UAF's have never been adequately funded. The President has requested \$4.5 million. The same amount appropriated last year. This amount is not sufficient for the existing 12 centers much less for expansion plans. We urge the Committee to increase this item.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Senate action on the House bill extending the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is expected shortly. The present legislation expires June 30.

The House bill, H.R. 8395, is a breakthrough for the severely disabled. In its bill, the House refocused the vocational rehabilitation system to serving physically and mentally handicapped persons and adds new incentives to priority services for the severely disabled. We applaud the House initiative and we urge this Committee to reinforce the House commitment to the severely disabled when the issue of appropriations comes before the Committee.

We have highlighted the key Federal programs affecting the lives of severely and multiply handicapped people. The Federal share of responsibility for services to these people is implicit in the authorizing legislation. We urge the Committee to report the budget increases necessary for responsive and responsible Federal participation in these programs.

PROPOSAL FOR A "U.S. BAR"

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to read in a recent issue of the American Bar Association Journal a highly informative article written by Mr. Malcolm Richard Wilkey entitled "Proposal for a U.S. Bar." It seems at times that our courts and legal system are being charged with lack of "relevancy" or initiative.

However, Judge Wilkey believes that change by setting down some new ideas on the lack of discipline in our courtrooms, and ways in which a national or U.S. bar would operate. The establishment of a uniform system of admission to the U.S. circuit and appellate courts seems in order, as does a revision of judicial supervision in regard to an attorney's conduct in court. I am pleased to insert Judge Wilkey's article as a fine example of judicial initiative in the effort to make our legal system both more just and more efficient.

The article follows:

PROPOSAL FOR A "U.S. BAR"

(By Malcolm Richard Wilkey)

At a time when more is expected of the courts than ever before and when the stresses and burdens on the entire system of justice are virtually unprecedented, the ability of the judicial system to carry these heavy burdens is sharply diminished. While the judiciary itself deservedly receives some share of the criticism, a great share can be laid at the door of the Bar as a profession.

The system is not functioning as it should, and everyone knows it. There is little layman respect for judges and less for lawyers. So many highly publicized lawyers show no respect for either judges or their fellow lawyers, why should the layman think the legal profession and judicial system deserve respect?

This lack of respect for both the judicial system and the Bar stems in major part from the undeniable fact that there is no adequate discipline of members of the Bar once admitted. Whether the lack of public confidence and respect is fully deserved is immaterial. It exists. It is obvious that as a profession we can do better, and we should take effective action forthwith as an obligation both to ourselves and to the American people.

LACK OF DISCIPLINE IS WOEFULLY APPARENT

The lack of discipline in the Bar is woefully apparent to all. The Chief Justice of the United States, calling civility "the indispensable lubricant of the inherently contentious adversary system", described current prevalent practice in his address to the American Law Institute in May of 1971: "All too often, over-zealous advocates seem to think the zeal and effectiveness, of a lawyer depends on how thoroughly he can disrupt the proceedings or how loud he can shout or how close he can come to insulting all those he encounters—including the judges."¹ The utilization of disruptive tactics is no novelty in American legal history, nor is it within the exclusive province of those on one particular extreme of the political spectrum. Rather, the use of such tactics is a recurring phenomenon. Writing in *The New York Times Magazine* of April 5, 1970, under the title "What To Do When the Judge Is Up Against the Wall",

Louis Nizer points out that in the 1944 sedition trial of thirty American Nazis and Fascists, Justice Eichler of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia died of a heart attack after seven months of deliberate courtroom disruptions by the defendants and their counsel. District Judge Harold Medina was more fortunate—he managed to survive the harassment in the 1949 Communist Party leader's trial. In 1970 in New York Judge John Murtagh was forced to suspend pretrial hearings because of the severity of the courtroom disorders caused by defendants and their counsel. The so-called Chicago conspiracy trial, arising out of the disturbances at the time of the 1968 Democratic National Convention, saw the tactics of courtroom disruption raised "to new heights of audacity".

In our present system a strange imbalance exists. In contrast to the demonstrated difficulty of the judge's controlling counsel, there is, according to Mr. Nizer, "full legal remedy for any error or misconduct by a judge. No judicial system in the world affords so many appeals to a convicted defendant to test the propriety of the judge's conduct and rulings. . . . [If] the defendants and their counsel [in the trial of the Chicago Seven] had been interested in acquittal rather than political incendiaryism, they would have blessed the judge for what they claimed was his open bias."

In the face of this recurring challenge to the fair and efficient administration of justice, an interest we all share,² it is imperative that a response be devised which will meet the challenge without inhibiting the ardent advocacy that is the hallmark of every competent defense attorney.

While greater judicial supervision in regard to attorney behavior would not be amiss in the courts of the United States, our system of justice, with its proportionately more numerous and less socially stratified legal profession as well as its highly developed protection for defendants, allows judges less scope to exercise control over attorney behavior than in the United Kingdom. James Bassett of *The Washington Post* described the British scene in an article published July 18, 1971:

"Trial judges rule their domains with velvet-gloved iron hands. Errant attorneys suffer swift and terrible consequences to their professional careers. Only barristers, rigidly trained for courtroom appearances and bound by custom to behave with exquisite decorum, actually try cases. The preliminary work is handled by solicitors and their clerks. . . . One day a barrister may be defending a case, the next prosecuting."

But as Mr. Nizer commented on Judge Medina's ordeal in the 1949 Communist Party leader's trial: "Despite [the] venom [to which he was subjected], the judge was inhibited from retorting or defending himself, because to do so might achieve the defendants' purpose—reversible error. In short, our system lacks the commonsense means to deal with judicial sabotage." (Emphasis added.)

While a statute could make the disruption of courtroom proceedings a felony, or the more frequent use of contempt citations against unruly defendants and their counsel might make "judicial sabotage" unprofitable and positively perilous, yet the solution most in keeping with the traditions of a profession would place the primary responsibility for discipline in the profession itself. Chief Justice Burger's warning voiced in his 1971 state of the federal judiciary address to the American Bar Association in New York is thoroughly justified:

"The legal profession cannot claim exemption from the proposition that those having a monopoly on the performance of vital public services should be strictly regulated to protect the public interest. A profession ought to be able to regulate itself, but the truth is that the legal profession has not

done so. I suggest that the time may come when, if the legal profession wants to avoid regulation from the outside, it must sternly regulate itself from within."

While not disputing the value of imposing disciplinary sanctions on an errant attorney, one cannot resist the conclusion that some form of screening prior to admitting him to the practice of law might have reduced the need for imposing the disciplinary sanctions after the fact. The current regime governing the admission of attorneys to practice, both at the state and federal levels, has made impossible the development and enforcement of an effective, nationwide screening process. Again, as the Chief Justice noted,

"The licensing and admission power over lawyers vested in each of the fifty state jurisdictions, ninety-three federal districts and eleven circuits, has led to a hodgepodge of standards for admission, and regulations that are desperately in need of careful re-examination. . . . This dispersal of authority over lawyers among fifty states and numerous federal courts has prevented meaningful regulation of professional conduct."

Without questioning the necessity of a state-controlled process for the admission to the state court bar in each of the fifty states, there is much that can be accomplished immediately on the federal level to improve the discipline and competence of those who seek to practice before the United States courts. At present each United States district court, United States court of appeals and the Supreme Court is the arbiter as to the persons to come before it in the capacity of an attorney. This highly individualized system of admission to federal practice, while no doubt reflecting local conditions within each district or circuit, does not encourage the development of a consistently high, nationwide set of admission and practice standards. Only by consolidating this currently divided admission process under a single aegis, to create what might be termed a "United States Bar" or "National Bar," with uniform nationwide criteria for the admission of attorneys to practice before all United States district and appellate courts, can we develop a consistently high level of self-regulation throughout the country.

The general principle of one national admission to the United States courts is under consideration by the Committee on Court Administration of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

HOW THE "UNITED STATES BAR" MIGHT BE ESTABLISHED

There are a variety of means whereby a "United States Bar" or "National Bar" might be created.

First, as the highest court in the federal judiciary, the United States Supreme Court might establish the standards necessary for admission to practice before it and other federal courts. This authority in the Supreme Court is derived from the ancient principle that since attorneys are officers of the court, the power to admit them to practice is most properly judicial, not legislative, in nature. This principle is confirmed by Article III of the Constitution: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."³

This grant of power of necessity implies the authority to exercise it. Putting together the traditional control of attorneys by the judiciary and the constitutional grant of the judicial power to the Supreme Court, one concludes that a decision as to who, in addition to the judges constitutionally mandated, might take part in the exercise of the judicial power is within the authority of the Supreme Court.

As to whether the Supreme Court has or should exercise the power to determine who may engage in the practice of law before the inferior United States courts, tradition-

Footnotes at end of article.

ally exercised by them individually, the promulgation by the Supreme Court of rules of civil, criminal and appellate procedure provides an apt analogy. The Court has, consistent with the mandate of Congress, provided a basic procedural framework for the conduct of business within the federal judiciary. This framework is not so rigid as to prohibit individual United States district and appellate courts from devising additional rules to govern the conduct of their affairs. The only stipulation concerning these additional rules is that they complement rather than conflict with those promulgated by the Supreme Court.

I believe that the ultimate arrangement should be that admission to the "United States Bar" qualifies the attorney without more to practice in all United States courts, with the possible exception of the Supreme Court, and indeed that this should be the rule now. But it also can be argued that nationwide admission should await the time when a greater percentage of the Bar has more adequate academic preparation for practice in United States courts anywhere and, more important, when that preparation can be tested prior to admission to the United States Bar, something that may not be able to be done initially.

Local diversity may require different complementary rules in different districts. For example, United States courts in Louisiana might require that, in addition to complying with the nationwide criteria established by the Supreme Court, United States Bar applicants should demonstrate a knowledge of Louisiana's unique civil law tradition. United States courts in Texas, New Mexico and Arizona might require a similar proficiency in the law of any one of the three states in light of their Spanish civil law heritage. As a different example, the United States courts in the District of Columbia, with their nationally oriented practice, might provide that admission in any of several states would be sufficient for admission in the United States courts in the District.

These local rules might be permissible insofar as they are in addition to and compatible with the standards to be created by the Supreme Court to regulate the admission of attorneys to the United States Bar. The question of when local counsel should be retained is distinct from that of admission. Local rules may, as they do now, require the retention of local resident counsel, even if nonresident counsel has been admitted to the local bar.

CONGRESS STILL WILL PLAY A ROLE

Acknowledgment of the Supreme Court's rule-making authority in this area does not mean that Congress has no role to play; rather, only that it is implicit, given the constitutional grant of judicial power to the Supreme and other United States courts, the latter to be created by Congress, that they have the power to decide who may assist them in the performance of the judicial function. Said Mr. Justice Field in *Ex parte Garland*, 4 Wall. 333, 378-379 (1867):

"The profession of an attorney and counsel is not like an office created by an act of Congress. . . . They are officers of the court, admitted as such by its order, upon evidence of their possessing sufficient legal learning and fair private character. . . . The order of admission is the judgment of the court that the parties possess the requisite qualifications as attorneys and counselors, and are entitled to appear as such and conduct cases therein. From its entry the parties become officers of the court, and are responsible to it for professional misconduct. They hold their office during good behavior, and can only be deprived of it for misconduct ascertained and declared by the judgment of the court after opportunity to be heard has been afforded. Their admission or

their exclusion is not the exercise of a mere ministerial power. It is the exercise of judicial power, and has been so held in numerous cases."

Congress has recognized specifically the existence of this power in the Supreme Court and the other United States courts established under Article III. In referring to appearances in United States courts, Congress stated in 28 U.S.C. § 1654: "In all courts of the United States the parties may plead and conduct their own cases personally or by counsel as, by the rules of such courts, respectively, are permitted to manage and conduct causes therein." However, as Congress also provided in 28 U.S.C. § 2071, "[The] rules prescribed [by United States courts for the conduct of their business] shall be consistent with acts of Congress and rules of practice and procedure prescribed by the Supreme court."

The Fifth Circuit in *Sanders v. Russell*, 401 F.2d 241 (1968), in a case involving a district court rule restricting *pro hac vice* appearances by out-of-state attorneys in non-fee-generating civil rights cases, held that individual rules of United States district courts could not frustrate the expressed intent of Congress on a substantive matter.

CONGRESS COULD ESTABLISH AN ADMISSION SYSTEM

Congress itself could establish a set of nationwide, uniform criteria for the admission of attorneys to the practice of law before United States courts, or at least before those it is mandated by Article III of the Constitution to create. However, these standards should not interfere with the duty of the courts to exercise the judicial power vested in them by Article III. While the line between these two areas is hazy, it would be possible nonetheless for Congress to standardize the qualifications for admission to practice before United States courts, at least to the extent that the standards did not conflict with or unduly impinge upon the power of the courts themselves to determine who may or may not assist them in the performance of the judicial function.⁵

The Supreme Court itself in *Ex parte Garland* confirmed that the "legislature may undoubtedly prescribe qualifications for the office [of attorney and counselor], to which [an applicant] must conform, as it may, where it has exclusive jurisdiction, prescribe qualifications for the pursuit of any of the ordinary avocations of life". The Court went on to state that the "question, in this case, is not as to the power of Congress to prescribe qualifications, but whether that power has been exercised as a means for the infliction of punishment, against the prohibition of the Constitution."

ADOPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF ADMISSION STANDARDS

Given the existence of a variety of means by which uniform standards for admission to a nationwide United States Bar might be created, what standards should be adopted and how should they be implemented? While acknowledging room for a diversity of opinion, it would appear reasonable at the outset that all current members in good standing at individual bars of United States district courts, courts of appeals and the Supreme Court should be admitted as of right to the new United States Bar. The requirement of good standing would mean simply that a lawyer is authorized now to appear in a United States district court, a court of appeals or in the Supreme Court.

For all those who do not so qualify, particularly for those admitted to practice in a state but not to the bar of any United States district or appellate court, recognition should be accorded those with experience as attorneys, albeit not in United States courts.

Given the pervasiveness of federal law in American society today, from constitutional rights to taxes, one would hope that any lawyer admitted to practice before the courts of a state but not yet to the bar of any United States district or appellate court, would possess at least a basic knowledge of federal law, especially in regard to the Constitution. Separating out now those who did not would present a super-judicial task. For those individuals, admission to practice before the new, unified bar should depend on their submitting certification from the highest court of the state or states in which they are admitted to practice, from the character committee of the bar association in that state or states to the effect that they are members in good standing, and proof of actual court practice.

For those without experience in federal law, as for those not yet admitted in any court, it seems reasonable to require an examination (in addition to the state bar examination) covering at least three subjects: the United States Constitution, federal, civil and criminal procedure, and federal administrative law. The examination should be able to test an applicant's knowledge in no more than six hours. In the light of the increasing impact of federal law in all phases of life, it would be in the public interest to ensure that those entrusted with the responsibility of assisting in the administration of justice have more than a passing familiarity with the fundamental laws and legal procedure of this nation.

Consideration of such an applicant's character in most instances should be a simple matter for those who simultaneously seek admission to the bar of a state.

In cases in which a state prescribes, equal or higher character standards than those to be established by the Supreme Court, satisfaction of the state standard would satisfy the federal criteria, provided only that the record of the state character investigation be made available to the United States Bar admissions committee. Whether this would be one national committee or organized in circuits, states or districts is a question left open here. The experience of the American Bar Association's Committee on Federal Judiciary would be one guide to the most effective organization. If a state's criteria do not meet the federal standards, the federal committee for the area involved would be empowered to conduct its own investigation.

Similarly, the question of suspension or disbarment from practice in United States courts could be determined on a nationwide basis. The Supreme Court should develop uniform criteria to govern the suspension and disbarment of attorneys from practice before the United States district and appellate courts. If an attorney deserves suspension or disbarment in one United States district or appellate court, logically he should also be suspended or disbarred in the rest. This would serve as a greater deterrent than the present system, without removing any of the protections available to an attorney threatened with suspension or disbarment who wishes to challenge the action, such as the opportunity to be heard and the right to appeal an adverse decision. It also will have the advantage of standardizing the criteria by which attorneys' behavior should be measured.

The creation of the mechanisms necessary for the operation of this new, nationwide United States Bar could be accomplished under the aegis of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts or by means of a new body established and funded by Congress. Whatever its final form, its creation would have a salutary effect on the standards, both academic and disciplinary, applied to those seeking admission and those already admitted to practice before the United States courts. To that extent the en-

⁵Footnotes at end of article.

tire judicial system would be strengthened, and the American people would be the ultimate beneficiary.

FOOTNOTES

¹ 52 F.R.D. 211.

² "Little thought seems to have been given to the fact that aside from the violation of traditional standards of professional duty, such conduct prejudices the interests of the clients, however much they may encourage and participate in it. Furthermore, it prejudices others who may be tried in the future, because members of the public are revolted by this degradation of the courts and the precious right of fair trial." AMERICAN COLLEGE OF TRIAL LAWYERS, REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON DISRUPTION OF THE JUDICIAL PROCESS 2 (1970). See also, 37 Crim. L. Rep. 1073, 2404.

³ 57 A.B.A.J. 855, 857 (1971). The American Bar Association promulgated the new Code of Professional Ethics, now adopted in most states, and also adopted the report and recommendations of the Special Committee on Disciplinary Enforcement, headed by Justice Tom C. Clark. There is now a special committee promoting implementation of the Clark Committee's recommendations.

⁴ Congress has provided in 28 U.S.C. § 2071 that "the Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may from time to time prescribe rules for the conduct of their business. Such rules shall be consistent with Acts of Congress and rules of practice and procedure prescribed by the Supreme Court." Congress also has specifically provided the Supreme Court with the power to prescribe rules of civil and criminal practice and procedure for the federal district courts. In 28 U.S.C. § 2072 Congress provides that "the Supreme Court shall have the power to prescribe, by general rules, the forms of process, writs, pleadings, and motions, and the practice and procedure of the district courts and courts of appeals of the United States in civil actions, including admiralty and maritime cases, and appeals therein, and the practice and procedure in proceedings for the review by the courts of appeals of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States and for the judicial review or enforcement of orders of administrative agencies, boards, commissions, and officers."

Congress also provides in 18 U.S.C. § 3771 that "the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the power to prescribe, from time to time, rules of pleadings, practice, and procedure with respect to any or all proceedings prior to and including verdict or finding of guilt, . . . or plea of guilty, in criminal cases and proceedings to punish for criminal contempt in the United States district courts . . .", and in § 3772 of the same title that the Supreme Court shall have similar power "with respect to any or all proceedings after verdict or finding of guilt, . . . or plea of guilty, in criminal cases and proceedings to punish for criminal contempt in the United States district courts, . . . in the United States courts of appeals, and in the Supreme Court of the United States . . .".

⁵ By analogy, an annotation on the power of state legislatures concerning bar admissions states: ". . . [I]n the exercise of its police power, in the interest and for the protection of the general public, a legislature may, with entire validity, reasonably regulate admissions to the bar, but . . . any statutory provision which, as put into effect, involves interference with, or frustration of, the courts in the performance of their duties and functions cannot be regarded as valid. Furthermore, the act of admitting attorneys is in most jurisdictions regarded as exclusively for the courts, as is the final determination in regard to the fitness and qualifications of particular persons, and the courts, acting therein, may exercise judicial power to reject an applicant for unfitness, notwithstanding he may have met the terms of existing statutes and under the provisions thereof ap-

pears fully entitled to admission. Allen, *Power of Legislature Respecting Admission to Bar*, Annot., 144 A.L.R. 150, 150-151 (1943).

HOUSING AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has before it several bills that relate to development of rural areas and we will soon be considering housing legislation affecting both rural and urban areas. One of the most knowledgeable experts in low-income housing in this Nation is Mr. Gordon Cavanaugh, executive director of a new organization funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity called the Housing Assistance Council, Washington, D.C. The Housing Assistance Council has been established to aid rural groups of the Nation to provide housing for low-income people. Mr. Cavanaugh recently addressed the Sixth Annual Mutual Ownership Development Foundation-Sponsored Housing Institute in San Francisco. Before joining this rural group, Mr. Cavanaugh was housing director of the city of Philadelphia and served also as the chairman and chief executive officer of the Philadelphia Housing Authority and president of the Philadelphia Housing Development Corporation. He was also chief administrator of the Relocation Service of that city.

As chairman of the recently organized Urban-Rural Forum made up of 90 members of this body, I feel the comments of Mr. Cavanaugh have a special significance to the members of this group and to all Members of Congress because he speaks from the vantage point of firsthand knowledge of both the rural and the urban housing problems. It is an important statement, especially timely, and I urge the attention of all my colleagues to it.

Mr. Cavanaugh's statement follows:

REMARKS TO SIXTH ANNUAL MUTUAL OWNERSHIP DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION-SPONSORED HOUSING INSTITUTE

(By Gordon Cavanaugh)

I would like to begin tonight by introducing you to the Housing Assistance Council, a relative newcomer to the housing field. HAC, as we call it, is an OEO-funded and Washington, D.C., based nonprofit corporation, designed primarily to assist sponsors of low-income housing in the nation's most rural areas. Through a combination of "seed-money" loans, training and technical assistance, we try to provide those elements essential to any successful housing project, but which are so sorely lacking outside of the urban centers. In operation only 6 months, the Housing Assistance Council has already made \$1.2 million in non interest bearing loans to 21 rural housing sponsors, both public authorities and private nonprofit corporations. This money will be used to cover the pre-development costs on approximately 2,500 federally assisted low-income housing units.

We have also established an ongoing program of technical assistance to help inexperienced housing groups plan low-income housing and guide it through the complex

federal maze. The convoluted process of obtaining federal housing assistance is a constant source of bewilderment to those of us with considerable experience in the housing field. It is enough to make less experienced groups throw up their hands in despair. As has been observed, there is a form of government McLuhanism in this area where processing is the product and housing a by-product. We would hope to make the going a little easier for them.

Finally, this month we will hold our first large scale training conferences—one in the state of Washington, which will include 70 representatives of housing groups throughout the entire state, and one in Bismarck, North Dakota, in conjunction with the Basin Electric Power Cooperative and other rural housing organizations in the Dakotas and adjoining states. Other training conferences are being planned throughout the country, and they will cover a wide range of topics of interest to sponsors of low-income housing in rural areas.

If at this point some of you are asking yourselves why I keep mentioning rural areas, or why a national housing organization such as the Housing Assistance Council works only in rural areas, it would be very appropriate, because the answer to these questions is what I would like to speak to you about tonight.

We are all aware of the "crisis" facing our cities, and that a large part of this crisis is the substandard housing that marks decaying inner-city neighborhoods all across the nation. No one was more aware of this than myself, having served as the senior housing official for the nation's 4th largest city. Not until recently, though, have I become aware of the terrible crisis that is also facing our rural areas. Like the cities, they are fighting for their very existence. And like the cities, the severe shortage of adequate housing is a large part of their malaise.

We are faced now with policy decisions that will have tremendous impact on the future development of this country. It is necessary that we work out a balanced growth plan that recognizes rural America as an important and unused alternative to the metropolitan sprawl we all complain of today. We must not allow large parts of our country to turn into what Senator McGovern has recently described as "a rural wasteland and an urban hell."

Before commenting further on what we must do, though, it would perhaps be best to share with you some of what I have learned over the past months about rural America, and especially about housing in rural America.

Contrary to the popular mythology, the quality of life in rural areas rarely measures up to even that of our worst urban areas. Medical services are grossly inadequate, as there is a severe shortage of manpower and facilities. Entire counties in the South and the Great Plains area have no physician at all.

In the area of education we again find poor quality in staffing and facilities. Rural residents spend, on the average, 2 years less in school than their urban counterparts. The proportion of high school graduates in rural areas is far less than in urban areas. But then, all of that education is not really necessary in rural areas because there are no jobs to be educated towards. The decline of the small farm and the mechanization of such rural industries as mining and forestry have thrown thousands into a rural job market that is simply unable to support them. Significantly, rural areas have one-half of the nation's poverty level families, but only one-third of the population.

Nowhere, however, is the social and economic plight of rural America better shown than in its housing. The 1970 Census of Housing shows that 59% of all substandard housing in this country is in places of 2,500 population or below, or on open land and

farms. We can measure this up against the fact that only 30% of the nation's population live in these same areas. Roughly one house in seven is substandard in rural areas, compared to one house in twenty-five in urban areas.

These figures, of course, do not include overcrowded housing. If overcrowdedness is included in the definition of substandard, urban areas do in fact have a larger share of the nation's substandard housing. But the ratio of substandard to standard houses in urban and rural areas still shows to the disadvantage of rural areas, with one rural house in five substandard as compared to one urban house in ten.

Rural areas also have a severe shortage of those vital community facilities upon which good housing depends. The Senate Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs has estimated that 33,000 rural communities lack adequate water facilities, and 44,000 lack adequate sanitary facilities. In the floor debates on a rural development bill recently passed in the House of Representatives, it was revealed that there exists a potential demand of \$12 billion for water and sewer facilities, most of which would come from our most rural communities.

Unfortunately, very little is being done to meet this pressing need. Rural areas are consistently short-changed in the distribution of federal housing and community development assistance. All recent housing statistics show very clearly that the housing needs of our rural areas, and especially our rural poor, are vastly greater than the efforts we have made thus far to meet them.

For a number of reasons, HUD rarely works outside of urban centers. HUD programs require competent housing sponsors and accessible mortgage credit, both of which are lacking in rural areas. This has led to a situation where only 1.3% of all Section 236 units have been constructed in rural places of 5,000 population or below. Of all housing produced under the 221 (d) (3) program, only 4% of the market rate and .5% of the below market rate units were in rural places of 5,000 population or below. The 1970 HUD statistical report shows that 12% of all public housing is in places of 5,000 population or less, but some of these places are inside SMSAs. Considering population increases and our own research so far, we estimate that less than 10% of all public housing is outside of SMSAs in places of 5,000 or below.

The only federal housing programs working primarily in rural areas are those of the Farmers Home Administration. But they are meeting only a small part of the need.

In 1968 an official housing goal was established which included 6 million federally assisted units constructed by 1978. An equitable distribution of these units, based on need, would place at least 3 million of them in rural areas. This demands a yearly production quota of 300,000 assisted rural units over the 10 year period.

In fiscal 1971 the total number of houses built, purchased, or rehabilitated with Farmers Home assistance was roughly 38% of the necessary 300,000 production quota. The fiscal 1972 output will be little better than 40%. If the administration's fiscal 1973 budget request for rural housing is approved, and if all funds are spent, the Farmers Home Administration will meet approximately one-half of the necessary production quota in 1973.

It is important to note that the Farmers Home programs are not necessarily providing housing for those in greatest need. The largest single program, Section 502 single family housing, provided only 4% of its total output for poverty level families in fiscal 1971.

In a number of cases, housing legislation clearly discriminates against rural areas. For example, the Farmers Home Administration rural rental housing program does not have the necessary rent supplements that can

lower monthly charges to the levels that very low-income families are able to pay. HUD multi-family projects, which serve mainly urban areas, do have an attached rent supplement program.

Urban residents can benefit under HUD's Section 115 grant program, which provides low-income persons with the funds necessary to rehabilitate their homes. No such rehabilitation grant program exists for rural residents. One is authorized under Section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949, but Congress has consistently refused to provide funds for it.

It has been estimated that \$9.00 is spent for urban housing and community development for every one spent in rural areas. And yet the figures show that the need is the same for both urban and rural areas.

We must ask ourselves what effect our apparent lack of concern for rural America will have in the long run. What will happen if we allow it to die of neglect?

It is often heard around Washington nowadays that any plan for national development must face the fact that we cannot separate the people in the cities from the people in the country. What this means, of course, is that the problems of both urban and rural areas are inextricably entwined, so much so that to neglect one is to guarantee failure in both areas.

Let us for a moment trace the patterns of population movement that have had such a tremendous effect on both urban and rural areas.

One of these patterns shows people moving from the country into the cities or metropolitan areas. Often they are unskilled and uneducated. There is nothing left in rural areas to hold them anymore, so they leave their homes in hope of jobs and better places to live. They overwhelmingly settle in the central cities, thereby aggravating already critical housing and employment problems.

Recent population figures document this migration. Between 1960 and 1970, urban areas increased their population by 19%, while rural areas actually lost 3% of their 1960 population. In every census since 1940, 2 out of 5 of our counties have lost population, and these were overwhelmingly rural counties.

If it is not the poor that leave the country, it is the young and educated for whom rural areas hold no opportunity. Their departure drains these areas of their most promising talent and future leadership, thereby undermining the possibility of a future rural renaissance.

What we are left with is even higher concentration of poverty level persons, and very little hope for improvement.

The second pattern of migration is occurring in the cities, where everyone who is able, including industry, is escaping to the suburbs. President Johnson's Commission on Urban Problems projected that 89% of the growth of metropolitan areas between now and 1985 will be in the suburbs. This is almost the same as saying that all national growth between now and 1985 will be in the suburbs. The same Commission reported that in 1965 well over half of all new mercantile and industrial establishments were being built in the suburbs, and that this trend was definitely accelerating. Confirmation is found in the report last week that the 1970 Census shows that the nation's suburbs gained six times as many jobs as the central cities in the first half of the 1960s. You can imagine what a comparison with rural job growth would show.

Those who leave the cities for the suburbs are usually the upwardly mobile or the established middle class. The poor are left behind because they are not able to afford the suburbs, and restrictive zoning practices in these places preclude the development of low-income housing. Trapped in the cities, they must then cope with an ever dwindling supply of jobs.

Thus it appears that we are facing increas-

ing concentrations of poverty and decay in both the nation's most traditional living areas—the cities and the countryside—urban and rural areas, while most development is concentrated in the suburban ring that separates the two. Somehow, this does not seem to me to be a rational development process.

What we are doing, in effect, is building up a new ring of densely settled urban areas between the older urban and rural areas that we are letting decay. The likely outcome of this process will be that in 20 years we will be still talking about the crisis of the cities, but the cities we will be referring to will be what are today our suburbs.

The crisis of today's cities, and rural areas, will by then be long past talking about.

This is not to say that the suburbs are not potentially a means of relieving some of the pressure on our inner cities, and a means of providing a better place to live for numerous low-income families. We must press on with the attempt to open up the suburbs to low-and-moderate income housing. But we must not allow ourselves to think that simply by opening up the suburbs we are getting to the root of the problem.

The problem is much larger than that.

If we are really interested in the roots of our current situation, we would realize that we cannot concentrate our efforts on any one area—city, suburb, or rural—if we are to solve the problems of them all.

Let us continue to open up the suburbs, and to expand our efforts to reconstruct the inner-cities. But let us also remember that we have a vast and rapidly decaying rural America.

Before we can get on with the work of rebuilding our cities, we must first attempt to stem the flow of people from the country side. We can make cities a more attractive place to live by making rural areas a more attractive place to live.

Ideally, though, we should not be satisfied with just keeping people in the country. We should strive to make the country a real alternative for those who are dissatisfied with urban life. To do this will require directing more of our attention, and more of our housing and community development money, to rural areas. But this does not mean taking it away from those areas that are now receiving assistance. They need everything they can get. It means increasing our program levels to include previously excluded rural areas.

Unfortunately, at this time, there is a negative reaction to subsidized housing programs in Congress. It seems that someone has convinced quite a few Congressmen that the subsidized programs are the cause of recent HUD scandals. Nothing could be further from the truth. The scandals are largely connected with unsubsidized programs, and the irregularities in the subsidized programs pale in the light of the good they have produced. But when even top-level administrators at HUD seem to be openly questioning their value, it becomes rather difficult to convince those in power that we need more not less, subsidized housing. Raising funding for housing and community development to levels commensurate with the need is further hampered by HUD's inexplicable refusal to ask for appropriations even to the level of Congressional authorizations in some instances. I urge each of you, immediately, to contact your Congressman and inform him of the positive side of the subsidy programs and of the scale of funding required for progress.

I do not mean to imply here that better housing and improved community facilities are all that are necessary to reinvigorate rural America. To do so would be naive. There must also be an on-going development of the economy to provide more jobs and easier credit. Some steps are being taken in this direction. Rural Development bills recently passed in the House and Senate included provisions for a new rural credit system, an expanded business loan program for the Farmers Home Administration, a rural revenue sharing program to the tune of \$500

million, and new incentives to industry to locate in rural areas.

This last point, incentives to industry to locate in rural areas, is very important, but there is some question whether incentives alone are enough. They have been used in the past, by the Economic Development Administration for one, with no noticeable effect. At least we should not expect that they will be enough in themselves to buck the very strong trend towards the concentration of industry in metropolitan areas. One can go to meetings on rural problems and hear the talk of tax incentives, low cost plant financing and the like and swear you were at a meeting of the Urban Coalition rather than the Rural Coalition. The time may be upon us now when we will have to consider stronger planning measures than economic incentives to overcome the haphazard economic development of certain areas of the country. What these measures should or could be is unclear at this point. But what does seem clear is that sources of decent and adequate employment cannot be allowed to move at the sole convenience of the enterprise where the social and economic costs to the urban and rural communities have become so enormous.

At any rate, housing goes hand-in-hand with economic development. Recent statements of the regional economic development commission support this fact. Take, for example, a statement found in the annual report of the Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission; I quote: "The housing problem is circular, with the lack of housing retarding economic development, and the low level of economic development withholding the resources and incentive to improve housing."

Clearly then, all of us here tonight, as specialists in the housing field, have our work cut out for us. Cooperatives, especially, can be an important tool in our housing effort. In 1968 the Douglas Commission expressed its belief that cooperative housing was an under-utilized but a potentially very valuable means of providing housing for low-income families. This assessment remains true today. Not only does the cooperative method serve to reduce costs, it also encourages a spirit of community and self-determination that can only benefit alienated low-income persons. We need more cooperative low-income housing, and we need more of it in rural areas. It is disappointing to note that only one cooperative is on record as having been built under the program of the Farmers Home Administration and only little more than a dozen developed or underdevelopment under other programs. But no matter what particular type of housing you deal with, I exhort you to remember that it is much needed in rural areas. There are undoubtedly problems to be faced in providing rural housing. The scarcity of competent housing sponsors and of mortgage credit, to mention a few. But these problems can be met. They must be met.

There are many who would argue that it is a waste of our time to try to restore rural America. They would argue that the move to metropolis is inexorable, and that we would be better off to concentrate our efforts on where people would be in the future. But this, as far as I can see, is to say that the future development of the country is out of our hands. I do not subscribe to this view. We do have the opportunity for a balanced urban growth if we are prepared to commit ourselves to its achievement.

And so I ask all of you here tonight to take the long range view; to ask yourselves the same questions I have asked tonight.

What effect will our lack of concern for rural America have on our future development?

What will happen if we allow it to die of neglect?

If the answers you arrive at are the same as mine, then ask yourselves what you, as housing specialists, can do to prevent it.

AN ADDRESS BY IRWIN MILLER, BUSINESS COMMITTEE FOR THE ARTS, METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ARTS, APRIL 17, 1972

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most valuable citizens in our country is Mr. Irwin Miller, chairman of the board, Cummins Engine Co., Inc., Columbus, Ind.

Mr. Miller is a man whose interests range widely but important among them is the field of the arts.

Few persons have been more eloquent than he in urging greater awareness of the importance of the arts in our society.

In this connection, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the text of a most thoughtful address delivered by Mr. Miller on April 17, 1972, at the Metropolitan Museum of Arts during the annual meeting of the Business Committee for the Arts.

The text of Mr. Miller's address on this occasion follows:

BUSINESS COMMITTEE FOR THE ARTS

(Address by Irwin Miller)

It has always been a very difficult thing to talk sensibly about the Arts. A reason for this is that each of the Arts is itself a unique language and hence cannot be approximated by any other language form. In this day of endless talk, and of miles upon miles of printed words, we forgot that words alone cannot express all that is contained within a man. Since the beginning of history, man seems to have been driven to the employment of every device he can conjure up to release to his fellows the limitless world of imagination and creativity and concern which is locked inside himself, and of these devices words are only one.

Even knowing this, however, it has been our custom to mistake the nature of our need for the Arts. Throughout a good deal of history the powerful have employed art as a status symbol—the mark of success and position. This applies to Francis I, to Louis XIV, the Medecis, Henry VIII, the Pharaohs, even to Pericles, and it is seen today in the kinds of public and ceremonial structures we build, as well as in the expensive art books that lie unread on living room tables. Over against this are the artists themselves—some, of course, scarcely worth the name—but others using the commissions of the powerful to make imperishable human statements to the present and the future.

There is also another use which man makes of the Arts. All too little noticed, there exists an unbroken stream of evidence of the artist who has always dwelt in each of us. The beautiful pine chairs and cherry tables that our great grandfathers made for themselves and their wives in the wilderness; dolls which mothers have always made for their children; gun stocks, cooking utensils, bed spreads, barns, saddles, hinges, locks—exquisitely made, mainly because they made the maker feel good.

The power of art is visible before us. It is visible in architecture. Buildings change the men who inhabit them. The radically different shapes of the House of Commons and the House of Representatives dictate the characteristics of political debate in Britain and in the U.S.

The power of art is convincing in music. The phrase "For as in Adam all die" looks

like outworn theology on the printed page. When sung to Handel's music, the helplessness of man before death becomes only too real. And the penultimate B natural in St. Matthew's Passion encapsulates the unbearable grief of men who finally understand they have killed their God.

Thus man, so constantly frustrated by his own nature, forever ill at ease on the planet, understands in his heart that he truly cannot live by bread alone, and forever turns to the Arts for relief from the pressures within himself.

BUSINESS AND THE ARTS

What in all this has Business to do with the Arts? There are strong voices among us who say—"Nothing at all". They assert Business has a simple legal responsibility to make money for its shareholders, and to obey the laws which govern it, and that the assumption of any responsibility beyond these is presumptuous, arrogant, and dangerous. I do not agree with this line of thought, nor do a very great number of present day businessmen, as your presence here tonight testifies.

If we disagree, however, we have a responsibility to make the opposing case. In many ways, ways which are no less real simply because they are not enforceable in law, business is a debtor. Your business and mine cannot exist or operate in a vacuum. We are dependent upon communities of men and women for markets, and for places in which to locate offices, factories, shops. And we want very much to be located in what we call good communities. The existence of good communities is of extraordinary value to our companies, even though no dollar sign appears on our balance sheets labelled "Located in Good Communities" or "Operating in Healthy Society". The real value of these items to a continuing business exceeds by many times, both in dollars and importance, most of the items which do appear in quantifiable terms.

If then the soil in which a business is planted be truly critical to its healthy survival, what kinds of actions are implied for business and the businessman?

Let us first inquire in more detail as to what makes a good community for business. Is it only a tough business-oriented police force? Or a city council that keeps taxes down and enforces pollution ordinances gently if at all? Is it a school system that indoctrinates the kids, and keeps down dissent? Or a welfare system administered primarily to cut costs? Business often sounds as though these were considered the marks of a good community—yet in practice we seek something else in the community we want to live and work in. We seek such things as friendly, prosperous people, good schools, excellent hospitals, openness to varieties of views, recreation and cultural activities, strong churches, and, above all, a population that is not divided—but is instead intelligently concerned for the present and future welfare of the whole community. These are the kinds of things we seek, and they are principal among the true marks of a good community. But such conditions and characteristics are a long time in the building—and, where they exist, they are in the main the result of hard and sacrificial work, not by ourselves, but by generations long gone. We have them for free, and so we are in debt to the past.

Now businessmen surely believe more strongly than most that people ought to pay their debts. So the question arises: How does one pay a debt to a dead generation? I know of no other way to pay such a debt than to work as well and as creatively for the building of our own society and our own communities as our ancestors did for theirs. Such a commitment may in fact be the only valid definition of Patriotism—as Tacitus says, "This praiseworthy competition with one's ancestors".

A DEBT TO PAY

If all this be true, and if in some real sense we have a debt to pay to the past, and

if we agree on the general nature of the payment, we then have to ask ourselves what specific forms that payment ought to take. A first answer is, of course, that at a minimum we should leave our society and communities no worse than we found them. We are not doing very well at this just now. Consider the fact that presently the quality of air and water is still deteriorating, cities are slipping, schools, hospitals, universities are in constantly deeper money trouble. The private sector by itself does not seem able or inclined to turn the tide, and government either turns its back or is too slow to respond. . . . May I suggest the gravity of this problem. Within only 28 years from today we will have in our nation an additional 100 million people. They will need all the facilities and services of a nation as large as Germany and France combined. And how are we responding? We are neither planning for this condition, nor are we of a mind to raise the money to equip such a nation, and time is unbelievably short. I imagine that our generation may well be judged a great deal more harshly by our posterity than we are inclined today to judge our own enterprising ancestors.

Now you are asking what does this have to do with The Arts? As we have approached this state of private material affluence in the midst of spreading public decay, we appear to have lost our way. We are not as sure about ourselves or where we are going as most generations have been. A principal complaint of Europeans about Americans has always been that Americans were cocky, and simplistically sure of automatic progress.

No one accuses us of this today. We view the future for the first time with more apprehension than excitement, and we appear to show more concern for holding on to what we have than for progress.

In our hearts I think we know two things. The first is that playing for security is the riskiest of businesses. It is a hard fact, and not debatable theology, that "He that would save his life will lose it." The times call for sacrifice and risk, and yet we have little taste for either.

The second thing is that we have about all the private material possessions we can use. But these things have brought us neither happiness, or serenity, nor peace of mind. Our young people have observed quite accurately that our second and third cars, our TVs in every room, the new house, the boat, the bank account—all these in themselves have done little to satisfy us. In pursuit and contemplation of possessions we have turned inward, and in turning inward we have become increasingly private people. But privacy has also brought loneliness, and the loss of that sense of community and belonging which is so deeply reassuring to every man and woman. So our children and we, too, talk with pathetic earnestness about our inability to communicate, and our desperate need to reach out to each other.

I am not courageous enough to try my own definition of Art. It is always safer to fall back upon a famous name. Tolstoy has said: "Art is a human activity having for its purpose the transmission to others of the highest and best feelings to which men have risen." Art is therefore best understood as attempts at human communication at the most intense level. This is transparent in the art of today. At its best, contemporary art is often the best preacher, and the visible prophet among us. At its shabbiest it is simply propaganda—but in nearly every case it represents a desperate need of one human to express a personal feeling to other humans. . . . So, in this society which is already so rich in things, the single legacy which we might best hand on to our posterity is a legacy of the spirit and mind, a flourishing of all the arts in our time such as would truly give release to the creative potential within us, that would permit us

to reach out to each other in expression of our deepest thoughts and needs, and in the release and the expression would help us find a new sense of community such as might make our lives rich and not empty, and might change our view of the future from fear to excitement.

DEMOCRACY AND THE ARTS

But egalitarian societies have not been good at supporting the Arts. If we are to be honest, we must confess that the great periods of art have occurred more often under autocrats than not. The Arts are in perilous shape in Democratic America today. We see in this country an unbelievable interest in all the arts—especially among our children, and at the same time we see financial neglect of the Arts.

The Performing Arts in particular run bigger deficits, the greater success they achieve. Private support does not keep pace with increasing costs. Ticket sales, while growing in numbers, cannot be priced high enough to cover the gap. And Government is unwilling to recognize that, as a major need of a great people, support of The Arts may rank in priority with support of schools, coastal shipping, tobacco growing, university research—and all the rest of the mixed bag of the good and bad and the indifferent into which we are accustomed to direct the flow of public monies.

For Business, then, support of The Arts is a part of our responsibility to the society which gives us our franchise. It ought not to fall under the category of non-controversial public relations, and business support of the arts is even in a sense shameful, if it is prompted only by a desire to enhance the Corporate Image.

Business should support the Arts and should work to increase support of the Arts by government and citizens because such action is an appropriate response to a peculiar and intense need of these times; because business itself has been enormously enriched by the work and the free inheritance of past generations; and because the only way to discharge this honest debt is to hand over to the future a country and a society truly responsive to the deepest needs of its people.

THE PERVERSION OF AMERICA

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, President Abraham Lincoln once remarked that he could handle his enemies; it was his friends that he worried about. Perhaps we might chuckle if it were not for the fact that the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln escapes the limits of time, and never were those words more true than today.

It is tragic that on the one hand we must guard against government so powerful that it becomes despotic—and yet, must a people be so "free" and a government so weak that society is stripped of every means by which to defend and preserve itself? In recent years, some Americans have become obsessed with their freedom—they have in their own minds distorted the purpose and intent of our constitutional Bill of Rights to convert them into a license by which to practice every form of perversion and socially irresponsible behavior. The opinion makers, that is, the liberal public offi-

cials, the liberal-dominated news media, and the ivory tower crowd at our schools and universities, have subjected the American people to a cacophonous concert of criticism and an assault upon our institutions that has not been rivaled by anything since the Civil War. This intellectual Pearl Harbor is both infamous as it is dangerous, and the reckless rhetoric that has spewed forth has undermined our Nation to a degree and in a way thought impossible only a few short years ago.

Just how topsy-turvy and alarmingly warped our national sense of values has become is well identified by an excellent article written by Jenkin Lloyd Jones—Abraham Lincoln must surely be rolling in his grave that we are spending recklessly our Nation he fought so hard to preserve. The article follows:

U.S. NEWS IS GOOD FROM RUSSIAN VIEWPOINT

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

TULSA.—If I were a Soviet strategist I would think this:

The good news now coming out of America is almost unbelievable, and the possibility that the United States will shake itself to pieces never before looked so bright. Consider these happy items:

On May 5 the American Association of University Professors voted to condemn the regents of the University of California for firing Prof. Angela Davis, the avowed Communist.

For our purposes, it is important to establish that citizens of the decadent democracies have no other choice than to pay Communist teachers to radicalize youth and advocate the violent overthrow of these states.

On May 1 the New York Times was given the Pulitzer Prize for publishing the secret Pentagon Papers which revealed official government disquietude with the Vietnamese war. There was some huffing and puffing about this by the Pulitzer trustees, but the jury award went through.

From time to time in the future our side may find it useful to steal and publish secret government documents. The fact that The Times not only got away with the Pentagon Papers' publication but was actually given a prize for it should eliminate any danger of troublesome prosecutions in the future.

On April 28 the United Methodist conference in Atlanta turned down by a vote of 534-405 a minority report that objected to branding the President as a "war criminal" and offered a vote of confidence in "the many thousands of Americans and Vietnamese who gave their lives for a cause." Instead, the conference adopted a resolution confessing America's "complicity in violence and death," and its "crime against humanity."

This was even better for our purposes than the actions of the Berrigan brothers or the defense fund for Angela Davis voted by the Presbyterians last fall. Organized religion in America need no longer be frontally attacked as an "opiate of the people." Indeed, before it self-destructs it is probable that it may be more useful to our side than otherwise.

America's growing image before the world as a flabby giant that has lost the will and the capability of self-defense is most helpful to us. On May 6 the young Marxist hijacker who ordered a plane from Los Angeles to Havana stated that "the skies of America will not be safe until the United States ceases its aggression in Indochina." He added that the President, himself, is marked for death.

This ability of single terrorists to cow American authorities and to impose the most fantastic orders upon American citizens has greatly lowered American prestige in the eyes of the world.

The electronic media in America continue to perform well. When the capitalist lackey, J. Edgar Hoover, died on May 2 one television

network spent as much time interviewing his detractors as it did his mourners. This he deserved for his embarrassing book, "Masters of Deceit," and his long hostility to our movement.

Our friends continue to improve their ability to command national coverage of their commotions and disruptions. Plans are going forward satisfactorily for carefully staged riots at the two national political conventions this summer that will give the world the impression that the American political process is about to be submerged in chaos.

The belief by our theoreticians that no society can survive utter licentiousness is apparently being proved in America. Pornography, drugs and promiscuity are rampant and the "underground press," which generally supports our ideology, is ever in the forefront of the battle to spread permissiveness.

One can hardly fail to look forward to the day on which American hooligans and idlers will get the shock of their lives when we can impose our healthy disciplines upon them. But, in the meantime, they serve.

The American motion picture industry is behaving splendidly, avoiding inspiration and conditioning American youth to the belief that it lives in a rotten society. It must be noted that the actress, Jane Fonda, who has urged military desertions and told her young admirers, "Don't knock communism until you've tried it," was recently given the highest motion picture award.

Best of all is the growing prospect of over-coming America without the necessity of risking war at all. What has been described by the American historian, Dr. Daniel Boorstin, as the "national vice of self-hate" is very real.

There is a chic of treason among many American intellectuals who studiously overlook our rapid naval and missile buildup and demand the unilateral disarmament of the United States.

Thus, while most Americans are asking each other: "Who will be the next President of the United States?" perhaps the real question is: "Who will be the last President of the United States?"

THE AGENDA FOR TOMORROW

HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. du PONT. Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege and opportunity to represent the people of Delaware in the Congress for the past 18 months. It has been an exciting, frustrating, and challenging experience. During that time, I have participated in the deliberations of the Congress and observed its strengths and weaknesses as it grappled with the problems of our Nation and world.

Before the heat and tumult of the next political campaign descends upon us, I think we should take a moment to reflect upon the progress of the 92d Congress, and the agenda for Government over the next 2 years and beyond.

Perhaps the greatest shortcoming of American politics—and the greatest obstacle to progress in government—is the dominance of rhetoric over substance. It is true on the campaign trail. It is true in the Halls of Congress. Headlines are more often the goal than helping people. We have come to accept rhetoric as a substitute for reason, promises in place of performance, and semantics as more important than substance.

In that sad fact lie both the disappointment and the challenge of a career in contemporary American politics.

We must cause the political and governmental structure of this country to focus on the real agenda of government confronting our people. This is not a time to launch America on another round of rhetoric. It is time, indeed, for sound performance, for attention to the job. Vince Lombardi used to say that success in football is a question of blocks and tackles. The same is true in government. The problems of America do not need further sensationalizing; they do need the quiet application of compassionate commonsense.

The agenda for the future begins with the host of important projects laying dormant before a Congress too busy listening to its own words to hear the people:

Meaningful reform of our financial and budgetary process to restore fiscal integrity in America. Elimination of the soft fiscal policies that led us to inflation and unemployment must rank as the most important task facing the Congress today.

All of the many proposals brought before the Congress are worthwhile in some sense, but until the budget is brought under control, Congress must learn to say no.

Revenue sharing, to bring government closer to the people—and farther away from the impersonal bureaucrat in Washington who knows little and cares less about your needs.

Welfare reform, to replace a system which everybody agrees does not work—with a system designed to use work incentives to swell the payrolls and reduce the welfare rolls.

Meaningful help for the elderly, the real victims of inflation. The legislation has all been filed: to lift the earnings limitation from social security payments; to increase social security benefits across the board and put them on an automatic cost-of-living escalator; to put all prescription drug costs under medicare; to provide a shield against the expenses of catastrophic illness, for old and young alike.

Such a list is not intended to say that Congress has done nothing. On the contrary it has major achievements to its credit; the special office of drug abuse in the White House; the Water Quality Act; extension of the franchise to 18-year-olds, campaign spending reform; the Conquest of Cancer Act.

But matched against its pressing agenda, the performance of this Congress has been disappointing to me, and that is not simply because it has been so slow to act on measures before it. More distressing is that the Congress, and government in general, have not yet perceived many of the major items on the agenda of America's future:

First, "What is America's role in this world to be?" Surely the "paying any price, bearing any burden" rhetoric of the early 1960's is one of the casualties of the Vietnam war. But if we are not to be the world's policeman, what is our role to be—and in what kind of world structure should we strive to play it?

Will our post-Vietnam foreign policy

continue to be activist, or will it become an ad hoc policy, helping those who are "good," and leaving the rest go? Or will it become Neanderthal, withdrawing from reality into fortress America, unconcerned with the problems of the world, and insulated by protectionist tariffs?

These are the questions of tomorrow.

Nowhere has the Nixon administration been more attuned to the agenda of the future than here. The Guam Doctrine, the overtures to mainland China and the new hope in United States-Soviet relations have helped to reshape both the world order and America's role in it.

But it is a mistake for Congress to abstain from this process—and for the administration to ignore it. We got into Vietnam without consulting the people; as we get out, let us make sure that does not happen again.

Second. What are we going to do about bigness in America? The depersonalization of our lives is at the heart of America's crisis. Government is too big. So is business. So is labor. So are our cities. Human beings are reduced to numbers—and are given indifferent treatment by salesmen, bureaucrats, employers, and even neighbors. The goal of improved quality of American life requires a reversal of the massive trend toward the computerization of human beings.

And what of growth? Shall we attack the depersonalization of our Nation by stopping its motor? Shall we freeze in all the inequities and freeze out all the improvements of the free enterprise system by adopting a zero growth policy? I say no—that neither in the name of ecology nor equality should the cornerstone of the future be the status quo. But these, too, are questions for tomorrow.

Three. Finally, the one vital concern that should be on the congressional agenda but is not, is the desperate need to find a new sense of integrity in public service. If there is a crisis in America, it is a crisis of public trust.

I fear that Washington has no clear-cut definition of corruption, or ethics, or right or wrong. This is not a comment on individuals, or political parties, it is a comment on America's politics.

We must find the way to inject a sense of purpose back into our political life—and to make morality not just a personal belief but a national commitment. That means for Washington the recognition that it must lean over backward to prevent not just impropriety, but also the appearance of impropriety.

"Leadership with Integrity," was my slogan 2 years ago. It is even more relevant today. If the people do not trust their government—government cannot function.

These are the challenges I see before our political system, the real agenda for tomorrow—and I want to help work on it.

Of course there is much to be done, but that is no reason for despair. That is no reason to heed the prophets of doom who say that all is wrong with America, who say that we are evil because we are not yet perfect, corrupt because we are not yet pure, and that all the sweat, toil, and sacrifice that went into the building of America is for naught, because the building is not yet done.

All is not right with America—but much is; and what is not, we will correct.

There is no simple solution that will make our problems disappear; we must solve the problems of the 1970's just as we solved the problems of the 1770's, with the work of our hands and the sweat of our brow. What is needed is not rhetoric, but the quiet application of compassionate commonsense.

FREDERIC COUDERT PASSES

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, with the passing of Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., affectionately known to all of us as Fritz, we have lost a very distinguished citizen.

Fritz Coudert served in the House with distinction for 12 years. He will be especially remembered for his work on the Judiciary Committee.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the item that appeared in the New York Times of May 23, 1972, announcing his untimely death. He was a gentleman and a great legal scholar in the fullest sense of the term.

FREDERIC COUDERT JR., 74, DEAD; REPRESENTED EAST SIDE IN HOUSE

Frederic R. Coudert Jr., six-term Republican Representative from the East Side of Manhattan, died Sunday at Presbyterian Hospital of congestive heart failure. He was 74 years old.

Mr. Coudert, one of the city's old-line Republican leaders in the 1940's and 1950's, did not seek re-election in the 1958 campaign. Mayor Lindsay began his political career when he won the battle for the vacant seat in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Coudert's last political activity was chairmanship of the Buckley-for-Mayor Committee in 1965, when William F. Buckley Jr. ran against Mr. Lindsay. Successive illnesses in recent years had kept him away from the family international law firm, Coudert Bros.

Frederic Rene Coudert Jr. was born here on May 7, 1898, scion of a leading family. He was a great-grandson of Benjamin F. Tracy, secretary of the navy in the cabinet of Benjamin Harrison.

During World War I, Mr. Coudert was a first lieutenant in the 27th Division with the Allied Expeditionary Forces in France. He received his B.A. from Columbia College in 1918 and a degree from the Columbia Law School in 1922, when he was a Kent scholar.

Mr. Coudert worked as an assistant United States Attorney and lost in a contest with Tammany Hall for district attorney in 1929. He was a state senator from Manhattan from 1939 to 1946, gaining attention when he headed a subcommittee seeking out Communists in the public schools.

As the representative of the Silk Stocking 17th district, where he first won in 1946, Mr. Coudert established a generally conservative record. He sponsored bills seeking to limit government spending to income, to require Congressional approval before troops could be sent abroad and to limit the power of the President to initiate foreign wars. All of the measures were assailed at the time by liberals.

Mr. Coudert was returned with increasingly small margins against his perennial Democratic opponent, Anthony B. Akers. In 1954

CXVIII—1212—Part 15

he won by 314 votes out of nearly 100,000 cast.

After his retirement from Congress in 1958, Mr. Coudert served on Governor Rockefeller's first state commission to investigate the affairs of the city.

Mr. Coudert's first marriage, to Mary K. Callery, the sculptor, ended in divorce in 1931. He was married to the former Paula Murray in October of that year.

Mr. Coudert had homes at 988 Fifth Avenue and in Oyster Bay, L.I. He was an enthusiastic racing yachtsman. Among the honors he received was the French Legion of Honor and Columbia's University Medal for distinguished public service. He was a past president of the Federation of French Alliances in the United States.

Among his clubs were the University, Century, New York Yacht, Pilgrims, Sky, Racquet and Tennis, Piping Rock and Seawanhaka Corinthian here and Chevy Chase in Washington.

In addition to his wife he leaves a son, Frederic 3d; a daughter, Mrs. William C. Rand Jr.; two brothers, Ferdinand W. and Alexis C., and six grandchildren.

The funeral service will be held at St. James' Episcopal Church, Madison Avenue and 71st Street, tomorrow at 11 A.M. Interment will be private.

HEAD TAX ON AIRLINE PASSENGERS

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have introduced legislation which would prohibit State and local governments from levying a "head tax" on airline passengers. My most recent proposal, H.R. 2337, is currently pending before our Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

As a result of the recent decision by the U.S. Supreme Court upholding the imposition of such taxes in New Hampshire and Evansville, Ind., Nos. 70-99 and 70-212, decided April 19, 1972, I have joined together with my friend and colleague Congressman BROCK ADAMS in pressing for the favorable consideration of my bill or a similar measure, H.R. 14847, which Congressman ADAMS, myself, and others have introduced. Timing is of the utmost importance at this juncture since several cities and States are already moving to impose such head taxes as a result of the Supreme Court rulings.

In this regard, Hon. Paul R. Ignatius, former Secretary of the Navy, and now the executive vice president of the Air Transport Association, recently delivered an address entitled "Let's Not Lose Our Heads Over Head Taxes" before the Aero Club of Washington. Because Mr. Ignatius eloquently addressed the multiplicity of issues involved in this question, I believe his speech deserves the attention of all Members of the House and Senate. Accordingly, I insert his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

LET'S NOT LOSE OUR HEADS OVER HEAD TAXES
(By Paul R. Ignatius)

I am pleased to have this opportunity to meet with you this afternoon. The Aero Club of Washington provides a pleasant and useful

forum for the aviation community to meet from time to time to discuss matters of importance to air transportation. Certainly one item of interest to all of us—as citizens, as representatives of aviation as governmental officials, or as legislators—is taxes. In view of this, I want to devote my remarks to the recent Supreme Court decision on use or service charges for enplaning passengers—or "head taxes" as they are often called—and the implications of the decision.

Big tax decisions come along from time to time and sometimes they produce unexpected results. It was a tax issue after all that led to the Magna Carta in 1215. If your memory is good or if you've been helping your kids with homework lately, you'll recall that the English barons were being taxed to finance crusades, knights were taxed for what was called "shield money," and certain levies were imposed on towns and their inhabitants. As King John began to lose his war in France he cried out for more taxes. Finally, the nobles and the Church joined forces against the king, refused to pay taxes, and brought forth one of the most important documents of Western Civilization, the Magna Carta.

Our own history, of course, is studded with tax disputes. In 1765, for example, the British government required tax stamps on all papers, including newspapers. The American colonists opposed the measure and caused its repeal.

Eight years later the British tried again with the Tea Act of 1773 which turned out to be an indirect tax on a number of imports, including tea. It was greeted with a very special kind of tea party.

The only tax in our country that ever led to out-and-out rebellion was a tax on whiskey. In 1794, the fledgling U.S. government—which doesn't seem to have learned very much from the British experience—placed a tax on stills. The tax was resisted, riots broke out, and it was necessary to send the militia into Western Pennsylvania to restore order.

The head taxes that the Supreme Court recently declared constitutional will not occupy a place in history as colorful as the taxes I have mentioned. They won't lead to shining documents like the Magna Carta, or to tea parties in improbable places like Boston Harbor, or to rebellions in the far-off hills of Pennsylvania. But they are nevertheless important—exceedingly important—to the communities that propose to enact them, to the traveling public, and to the progress of aviation.

On April 19, 1972, the United States Supreme Court, in a seven to one decision, with Justice Douglas dissenting and Justice Powell not participating, upheld the constitutionality of use and service charges imposed upon airline passengers at the Evansville, Indiana, airport and by the State of New Hampshire.

The Evansville-Vanderburg Airport Authority, operator of the Dress Memorial Airport in Evansville, had enacted an ordinance establishing a "use and service charge" of one dollar for each passenger boarding a commercial aircraft at the airport. The ordinance further required the airlines to collect the use and service charge and remit the money to the airport authority, minus six per cent to cover the airlines' administrative costs to make the collection.

In the other case, the State of New Hampshire amended its revenue statutes to require every scheduled airline using any of the State's five publicly owned and operated airports to pay a service charge of one dollar for each passenger boarded at these airports. The one dollar charge was applied in the case of aircraft with a gross weight of 12,500 pounds or more. To cover commercial aircraft smaller than conventional airliners, a service charge of fifty cents was imposed for each passenger boarding an aircraft with a gross weight of less than 12,500 pounds.

The action upholding the two levies is a

watershed decision because it came after years during which the courts had ruled that such taxes were unconstitutional burdens on interstate commerce. Let us look at some of the things the Supreme Court said:

"In either case," the Court said, "it is the act of enplanement and the consequent use of runways and other airport facilities that rise to the obligation. Our inquiry is whether the use of airport facilities occasioned by enplanement is a permissible incident on which to levy these fees, regardless of whether the airline or its passengers bear the formal responsibility for their payments."

The Court then reviewed its earlier decisions on highway tolls to determine whether the Evansville and New Hampshire charges met certain standards of uniformity, fairness and reasonableness and concluded that they had. The Court further concluded that "there is no suggestion that the Indiana and New Hampshire charges do not in fact advance the constitutionally permissive objective of having interstate commerce bear a fair share of the costs to the states of airports constructed and maintained for the purpose of aiding interstate air travel."

Then the Court looked to the future with a concluding comment drawn from an earlier decision: "at least until Congress chooses to enact a nation-wide rule, the power will not be denied to the State[s]."

Little more than a month has passed since the decision, but already there are signs of proliferation nationwide of locally imposed head taxes upon the nation's airline passengers.

Less than a week after the decision, the *Daily Journal* in Elizabeth, N.J. called the decision a "financial bonanza" to Elizabeth and Newark. Public officials began talking about such taxes for Detroit and San Diego. And ordinances imposing head taxes on airline passengers have already been drafted and put forward by Dallas and Philadelphia.

It is apparent already that the tax proposals will come in many shapes and sizes. Philadelphia would impose a tax of two dollars on an airline passenger each time he gets on or off an airliner there. Thus, the range has already widened from a fee of 50 cents for a passenger flying out of a New Hampshire airport in a small commuter plane to \$4 for a roundtrip passenger originating and terminating in Philadelphia.

And there are also signs of a disquieting development in the aftermath of the Supreme Court decision, namely to view the use or service charge not as a means of meeting the cost of airport facilities but for general purposes. In this connection, the Mayor of Philadelphia was quoted in the press a couple of weeks ago as eyeing the head tax as a means of improving the city's "dismal" financial picture.

There is no question about the problems the mayors of our cities face in finding the financial resources to meet the cost of the services they must provide. David Broder, the distinguished journalist, made the point persuasively in a new book. Broder tells of a trip by mayors of 17 of the nation's largest cities to dramatize the staggering financial problems confronting cities today. The mayors told of rising deficits, the move of affluent, substantial taxpaying families to the suburbs, the decline of property as a tax base and a desperate search for new sources of tax revenue. Broder concludes: "... this was no ordinary junket. For the stark, simple message the mayors were trying to drive home was that their cities were on the brink of bankruptcy and collapse."

In view of this it is not surprising that the Court's recent decision would kindle the interest of communities throughout the country in a new, and unexpected source of tax revenue, not just for the cost of airport facilities but for other financial needs as well. It is important, then, that all of us interested in aviation understand the situation that confronts us.

First, it seems to me that the enactment of airport head taxes throughout the country can have a disruptive effect on air travel. The airlines use 531 airports serving hundreds of cities and counties in the 50 states. Presumably, any of these jurisdictions could impose a head tax of varying amounts and of varying types.

When, where, and how would the tax be collected? Can one political subdivision collect the tax for another? Can a travel agency collect the tax for a number of governmental entities and make the proper remittance? Would a passenger flying non-stop pay less taxes than a person on a multi-stop flight? How would the tax be imposed on the connecting passenger? Would flight crews be taxed?

There are other questions that come to mind but the ones I have raised are sufficient to demonstrate, I believe, that the enactment of local head taxes throughout the country would be an administrative nightmare.

But there is a larger question, I think. Is the head tax needed at all?

A head tax on an airline passenger is presumably a service charge or a user charge to help defray the cost of the airport facilities he uses. This concept is repeated time and time again in the Supreme Court's decision.

Head taxes upon airline passengers designed to meet financial needs unrelated to airports are not, in fact, service charges or user charges. Thus, they would be outside the limits of the Supreme Court decision. You can be sure that the airlines will litigate any ordinance that taxes the air traveler for the purpose of meeting costs unrelated to airports.

Our focus then should be on airport needs, and the concept that the air traveler should contribute to the cost of the facilities he uses is a sound one. It is, in fact, the basis of the uniform national plan that is embodied in the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970. This important piece of legislation, as you know, created a trust fund for financing airports and airways improvements nationwide. The fund is supplied by user charges already imposed upon airline customers.

Airline passengers, through an eight percent federal excise tax on their tickets will pay approximately \$550 million into the Airport/Airways Trust Fund in the fiscal year now ending. Other money was paid into the trust fund by air freight shippers, by the airlines, through levies imposed directly on them, and by general aviation.

Altogether this will produce a total of almost \$700 million paid into the fund in this fiscal year. The trust fund is expected to receive more revenue each year as air travel expands, reaching a total of \$1.5 billion by 1980.

This is a lot of money. It is enough money to build the new airports we will need, to make necessary improvements in existing airports, and to finance the cost of airways improvements.

If this is the case, why should local communities be interested in local head taxes for financing airport costs? The answer is that under the 1970 Act the local airport sponsor is required to match the trust fund monies made available, and in some instances this has proved to be a difficult undertaking.

Senator Cook of Kentucky has recently addressed this problem by introducing an amendment to the Act that would increase the trust fund contribution from 50% to 75%. As a matter of fact, the Air Transport Association has advocated a 90/10 share arrangement, the same formula used for financing the Interstate Highway System. Under either Senator Cook's 75% suggestion or the ATA's 90% proposal, the burden on the local community would be substantially reduced. Indeed when the local income from airport concessions is taken into account, the financial burden on the local community for airport development costs would appear

to be quite bearable under either the 75% or 90% approach.

Thus, head taxes for meeting the cost of airport facilities are not needed, since the 1970 Act is designed to take care of the problem in a uniform, systematic manner. If the present 50/50 share arrangement is unduly burdensome on the local community, the Act can be amended to provide a greater share from the Trust Fund.

Many Congressmen who helped draft the 1970 Act have voiced grave concern about the prospects of a multiplicity of local head taxes. Senator Cannon, for example, said last week that:

"In 1970, while the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Finance were considering this (airports/airways) legislation, it was our firm intent that the federal excise tax be the only tax on passengers in air transportation. While the Supreme Court has said that Congress did not preempt this field in 1970, it was certainly our intention, in my opinion to do so."

About a week earlier, on the House side, Representative Adams struck the same note when he said: "... air travelers are already being uniformly taxed for airport facilities. An additional head tax by each airport would be, in effect, double taxation on our air travelers."

Bills have been introduced in both houses of Congress to prohibit the imposition of state and local head taxes on interstate air passengers. The House measure is sponsored by Representatives Adams, Jarman, Moss, Metcalf and others. The Senate bill is sponsored by Senators Magnuson, Cannon, Pearson and Cook. Hearings will be held in several weeks.

Passage of these bills will make crystal clear what Congress thought it had already made clear, namely that the 1970 Act was intended to preempt the need for taxes of this sort. If federal preemption is clearly established through enactment of these bills, and if the Trust Fund share is increased to 75% or a higher figure, the head tax problem will disappear.

Congress should take both steps—simultaneously and quickly.

Preemption would keep user charge imposition, collection and disbursement under a uniform national plan. Changing the matching fund formula would ease the local burden and get needed airport projects moving more quickly.

"... at least until the Congress chooses to enact a nationwide rule, the power will not be denied to the State[s]," the Supreme Court has said. Congress has moved promptly to take the necessary action and it is important that the legislation be passed at once to prevent locally enacted head taxes from disrupting the national air transportation system.

It was Edmund Burke who said: "Taxing is an easy business—any projector can contrive new impositions; any bungler can add to the old; but is it altogether wise to have no other bounds to your impositions than the patience of those who are to bear them?"

Let's consider Burke's warning.
Let's not lose our heads over head taxes.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

REMARKS OF ADM. I. C. KIDD, JR.,
AT McALESTER, OKLA., ARMED
FORCES DAY CELEBRATION

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to include a fine and thoughtful speech delivered by Adm. I. C. Kidd, Jr., USN, Chief of Naval Material during the Armed Forces Day ceremonies observed in my home town of McAlester on Saturday, May 20, 1972. Admiral Kidd stressed so many points in his speech that need, in my opinion, to be emphasized. I am pleased, therefore, to share his address with my colleagues. The address follows:

A FEW GOOD THINGS ABOUT THE UNITED STATES

(By Admiral Isaac C. Kidd, Jr., USN, Chief of Naval Material)

It is a particular pleasure for a deep-water sailor such as I to return to the Heartland of this great country of ours. Three years ago I was privileged to visit Oklahoma City where I received a most hospitable welcome. On that occasion I learned that even though Oklahoma is nearly the inland center of these United States, you people are putting in so many lakes that Oklahoma already has one of the largest shorelines of any state in the Union. Now in Katusa, you've opened the furthest inland deep-water port in the United States, indeed an accomplishment. And, of course, as is so frequently the case far from salt water, Oklahoma has a very proud naval heritage. Four sons in Oklahoma were honored with Medals of Honor for service in this Navy and Marine Corps of ours during World War II. Over a dozen native Oklahomans have been named Flag Officers in the Navy. Seven serve currently on active duty—including Admiral Ralph Cousins, my immediate boss, the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, who is a native of Eldorado. This Navy of yours has named five destroyers in honor of natives of this state, and of course we are all very proud of our 41st Ballistic Missile submarine—USS *Will Rogers*.

But it is not only the people of Oklahoma who have forged your indelible naval traditions. U.S. Navy ships have been named for seven of your rivers, seventeen of your counties, and ten of your cities. And who can forget the valiant battleship *Oklahoma*? As a matter of passing interest, she was a member of the First Battleship Squadron which my father commanded when he lost his life on the 7th of December, 1941. On the morning of that day, *Oklahoma* was moored in Pearl Harbor outbound the battleship *Maryland*. Almost immediately after the first bomb struck Ford Island, *Oklahoma* was hit by three torpedoes in rapid succession. There was little or no time for proper damage control; and of course she began to capsize. This rapid list prevented all but one or two machine gun batteries from firing.

Then, while capsizing, she was struck by two more torpedoes. *Oklahoma's* men were strafed as they attempted to crawl over their rolling ship; others made it safely aboard *Maryland*, and helped man her anti-aircraft batteries. Though nearly a quarter of *Oklahoma's* officers and men were killed or missing, a large number were saved by heroic efforts of rescue crews—some working as long as 60 hours without sleep to get their shipmates out. Workers, many of whom were civilians, cut through the hull of the overturned ship and rescued 32 trapped crew members.

Yet, *Oklahoma* survived all this damage, was salvaged, and by the end of 1943 was being refurbished in drydock. She was not restored to duty, however, since the tide of war in the Pacific turned by that time. Nevertheless, the heroism and dedication of the officers and men of *Oklahoma* remain an inspiration to everyone still privileged to serve in Naval uniforms.

Recently, another group of Oklahomans, veterans from the World War II submarine *Batfish*—a sub that once sank three Japanese submarines in only four days—have helped keep alive memories of heroism at sea. For this, to you, we are eternally grateful.

But my purpose this evening is broader than recalling memories of the past. In order to continue to live in freedom, you and I must constantly examine the present and Not only do these wonderful people continue make ready for those unforeseen challenges that await us all in the future.

Such challenges are being met by your Naval Ammunition Depot here in McAlester. to do a superb job in meeting their primary mission, but for the second year in a row, this Depot has won the Navy-Marine Corps Resources Conservation Award. This is based on top performance in forestry operations, fish and wildlife management—and I saw your ducks this morning!—and the development of outdoor recreational areas. Each of you is rightly proud I'm sure of this achievement and I share your pride.

I wonder, however, how many Americans are given the opportunity to share this sort of accomplishment with us? It is perhaps one of the most unfortunate, but one of the most certain, facts of history—that by the yardsticks of mass media, "good news" is generally "no news." Normally the circumstances which attract wide public attention are focused on the bad, the bizarre and the big. Difficulty rather than achievement, controversy rather than resolution, fills our newspapers and too frequently our airwaves.

This negativism is common not only in stories about our military services and American industry, but in matters affecting this entire nation of ours. For example, how many of America's population are aware that:

More than 200 million American citizens are not going to be arrested this year!

More than 115 million Americans maintain formal affiliation with some religious denomination!

More than two million American teachers and professors are not going on strike!

More than two million, three hundred thousand men and women serve you honorably—on active duty in the armed forces of this nation of ours. I'm privileged to share this platform this evening with several of these wonderful men and women we honor this Armed Forces Day.

Among this two million, three hundred thousand:

Less than 5% will ever become absent without leave for any reason!

Less than one-tenth of one percent have sought political asylum outside this country!

These are rather remarkable figures considering the headlines that you and I are obliged to read from time to time. Yet information of this sort seldom receives wide public attention. Consequently, this evening, I am not going to offer platitudes about the importance of national defense, nor stress the sacrifices of the members and families of members of the American Armed Forces. These are matters of record. Instead, I would propose to touch upon a few basic accomplishments of our United States. What could

be more logical on Armed Forces Day than to salute the nation our Armed Forces protects? That's really what it's all about. Literally, the only reason we have a Department of Defense is to protect the American people. If the United States was not a "have nation," if we did not possess strong spiritual values, great natural resources, substantial material wealth, and unique technological skills that others envy, then there might be no need to defend against anyone. There would be nothing to covet.

Let's look at our nation as a whole. The United States has roughly 7% of the world's land area and a bit less than 6% of the world's population; yet you and I produce over 35% of the world's goods and services. Contrast these figures with the People's Republic of China. Although slightly larger than the United States with 25% of the world's population, the Chinese produce a scant 4% of the world's goods and services. Thus a nation with four times our population produces only one-ninth as much as you and I do. Your farmlands yield 13% of the world's wheat, 46% of the corn, and 21% of the world's meat products. Our factories produce a flow of goods equal to the output of not only the Soviet Union but all of Western Europe put together.

Or consider family income. In the 20 years between 1947 and 1967, the median income for the American family increased by 76 percent. During this same period the number of middle income families nearly doubled, and the number of American families with incomes over \$10,000 more than tripled.

Minority families are also progressing rapidly economically. The number of non-white American families living at the poverty level was reduced some 50% in only eight years. During this same period of time the number of non-white middle income families more than doubled.

You may believe prices are lower in other nations. Perhaps this is true. Angelique and I have traveled far and wide and have seen many countries and different standards of living. But contrast the average American worker in 1969—who earned about \$460 monthly in take-home pay—and his Soviet counterpart—who in recent years I've gotten to know rather well at exceedingly close range, sometimes closer than I would have preferred. These Americans of ours worked 6 minutes to earn enough to buy a 1 pound loaf of bread, 4 minutes for a pound of cabbage, and 20 minutes for a pound of butter. Our Soviet counterpart—that same Soviet worker worked twice as long for his bread, 17 times as long for his cabbage, and more than 7 times as long for his pound of butter. The ratio is similar for most other commodities.

Now it's true, subway fares and phone calls are about even, and the Soviets work less to earn a haircut—39 minutes to our 46 minutes, maybe that's why so many of our youngsters have such long hair; I don't know. And I must admit a Russian need work but 11 hours for a modest three-room unfurnished apartment, while an American has to work 38 hours for a similar unit. Apartments in the Soviet Union, however, are very difficult to locate—and the practice of more than one family sharing an apartment remains common. It is exceedingly cozy.

How about education? Twenty years ago 2½ million people were enrolled in colleges and universities in the United States. Today we have over seven million. Twenty years ago, in higher education men outnumbered women about 2½ to 1; today the male leads 3 to 2.

The United States is second only to Canada in percentage of total school enrollment. Twenty-eight percent of all Americans, and nearly 31% of all Black Americans are in school right at this time. In the Soviet Union only 25% are in school . . . in the United Kingdom only 15% are in school.

Another key measure of national accomplishment is health. The life expectancy of

you or me has increased from 50 years in 1910 to 70 years in 1960; and it's still going up. Yet, perhaps it is unfair to contrast American productivity with other nations. So let's look at two examples within the United States itself.

In 1914, an American worker had to work almost 7 hours to earn enough to buy a shirt. In 1969 he could earn a better shirt in less than 2 hours.

In 1914 he worked an hour and a half for a pound of butter; in 1969—19 minutes. I could go on and on with this type of statistic, but do you read them in the newspapers in the "what's good about our country" column?

Rioters and demonstrators may get the headlines—very often do—but the decent hard-working American still goes his quiet way and as that wonderful and inspirational leader of yours and of mine—speaker Albert said so much better than I earlier this evening—this quiet American goes his way, making his country the envy of the world—for our standard of living, but more significantly, for our freedom of choice. And that's why the likes of I and Colonel Bennie Davis, are in uniform, because we think it's worth protecting.

More than any other factor, I believe these Armed Forces of yours are probably going to be essential for sometime to come, to guarantee the freedoms that we take so much for granted . . . to guarantee the right to strike or to dissent, among other things. I spent a good part of a morning two weeks ago talking to some students at the University of Louisville. It was rather unpleasant for about an hour and a half until I finally got the message across to them that that's why I was there . . . to let them know that my job, one of many, was to guarantee their right to make life unpleasant for me. And, you know, after about an hour and a half we began to communicate. And I really put my big foot in my mouth that time too. I sort of broke the ice because I was calling on these youngsters to get up and ask their questions. Some didn't want to ask questions. They wanted to make speeches. But I called on this youngster . . . and identified her as the blonde-haired young lady in the steel-rimmed glasses in the second row. This young man got up and said, "I'm not a young lady." It was an honest mistake.

Too many overlook the fact that the military does not make national policy. The American people through their elected representatives do that. We in the military services simply carry out your wishes to the best of our ability.

It is estimated that the People's Republic of China spends about 12% of their gross national product on military programs. Moreover, the Soviet Union has long allocated about 13% of their annual GNP to military needs. In contrast, during FY 1972, the United States used only 7% of our GNP of our GNP for national defense.

Since our GNP is higher than either of these nations, our defense budget is greater than theirs. Yet virtually half of our defense dollars must be devoted to personnel related costs—both military and civilian. We don't know the exact cost proportions for Soviet or Chinese personnel, but clearly they're lower than ours. As a result, each of their defense dollars provides more actual weapons than our own.

Whether in Southeast Asia or in fleets or bases around the world; whether in strategic bombers flying at staggering altitudes; or in submarines hundreds of feet below the surface of the sea I believe I can state unequivocally that we have the very finest group of young Americans in our military services at this time that we have ever had. Quite frankly, we also ask more from them than before—intelligence, technical knowledge, education, and a willingness to sacrifice more than probably you and I had to when you were in uniform some years ago and I was a junior officer.

Their duties require not only skill, but courage and stamina to perform tedious, taxing, difficult, and sometimes dangerous jobs as a matter of routine. These fine young people represent our most vital national resource and let's not forget it for one second. Yet—for the first time in our history—American fighting men are too frequently facing these challenges without the usual acknowledgements from those of us at home. They must sacrifice without the kind of support they have so regularly deserved and been accorded. They must serve while being derided rather than dignified. And this makes my blood boil. Would that it were possible to bottle McAlester's outlook on life and spoon feed it to those of the nation in need.

As the active, dedicated Americans you are, I realize these matters concern you—as they concern those of us privileged to serve you with great pride in uniform today. Your presence this evening testifies to your concern, and may God bless you for it. Only through enlightened public opinion can we generate the support so essential to any military force serving in a democracy.

Moreover the individual Soviet or Mainland Chinese has no role in determining his contribution to his own national defense. He cannot choose between guns and butter, guns instead of butter, butter instead of guns, or neither guns nor butter. These choices are made for him.

In offering a more positive view of our nation this evening, I do not wish to be overly optimistic. Certainly we face many challenges as a nation. We must solve the riddles of the farm, the city, the suburb, and preserving our natural environment. But one basic truth transcends all these challenges.

Without a continuing absolutely certain guarantee that you and I are going to be able to continue to enjoy the way of life to which we have become accustomed there probably can be little assurance that we can count on improvements on any front! These armed services of yours provide the free environment which enables dedicated Americans such as you to meet the challenges of the present and the future while we go about our business.

This evening we are privileged to honor more than two million young men and women in uniform. As their representative tonight, I have an almighty heavy burden because they are due so much more than you or I alone can give. They wear a uniform which too often has become a popular target for neo-subversives dealing in discredit. I know you share my feeling that these outstanding young people represent a couple of million more very good reasons for concluding that you and I have an awful lot going for us in this country.

These United States of ours are pretty rugged and highly elastic. This has been proven. We have met so many challenges in the past. We have prevailed in each. The record of our accomplishments is legion. We must be sure that we continue these tasks with an attitude of constructive optimism.

In conclusion I would ask that you and I join mentally in a toast proposed by Stephen Decatur over a hundred years ago which means so much to me as I trust to you when he said:

Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations, may she be always in the right; but our country, right or wrong.

DAMASCUS MARKS MEMORIAL DAY

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, it was my privilege to participate in a

moving service in Damascus, Md., to commemorate Memorial Day. The program was arranged by the American Legion Post 171 in Damascus. Luther Burke is the post commander and Buck Gladhill made many of the arrangements for the memorial service.

I would like to commend the citizens of Damascus and all the people who worked so hard to make this service a success. Participants included Rev. Lorne Burton, Franklyn O. Hayes, the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the Cub Scouts, as well as a choir from the Damascus, Woodfield, and Cedar Grove Elementary Schools. Rev. Father Walter J. Norris and Rev. Frank M. Depro also participated. The true meaning of Memorial Day was felt by all of those present at this impressive ceremony which ended with the traditional volley and taps by the Washington Blue Rifles.

PRESIDENT NIXON SPEAKS TO RUSSIAN PEOPLE

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, praise for President Nixon's historic speech to the Russian people last Sunday is pouring in from across our great Nation, and from throughout the world.

The St. Petersburg Times, the major daily newspaper in the Eighth Congressional District of Florida, has long been one of the President's most persistent critics—yet even the Times laid aside partisanship to join in the nearly unanimous applause for Mr. Nixon's moving and effective address.

Here, for the consideration of the Congress, is what the St. Petersburg Times had to say in its lead editorial on May 29:

AN ELOQUENT, EFFECTIVE SPEECH

President Nixon's TV address yesterday to the Soviet people, also broadcast live in this country, was an effective demonstration of the power of communication as a force for peace.

On this historic first occasion that an American president has spoken directly to the Russian people, Mr. Nixon was at his best.

His unashamedly sentimental approach and his simple, direct and unadorned language are bound to have had deep impact upon his audience. The power of such communication—slicing through centuries of social differences, different economic systems, different cultures—simply boggles the mind. In the future, it promises to be a vastly constructive force because the hopes and goals shared by the American and Soviet people apply to all of mankind. Modern communication, like political negotiation, will help lift from man's shoulders the burdens of arms, ignorance and fear.

The President did not mention Vietnam directly, but he talked generally of restraint. The connection probably escaped most Russian viewers. Many Americans no doubt thought of Vietnamese children when he said, "Let us do all we can to insure that . . . all the children of the world can live their full lives in friendship and peace."

That the Soviet leaders allowed the President to speak to the people revealed a confidence promising policy stability. It would be interesting for one of the U.S. networks to

offer equal time to party leader Leonid Brezhnev.

The President's address was a fitting climax for a summit conference that finally controlled the nuclear missile race.

NORTH CAROLINA MASTER PLAN

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have offered some constructive criticism to the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission. I feel the need for putting it in the Record so that Members of Congress who have to consider appropriations and possible new approaches may do so from the standpoint of experience and valuable information.

Mr. Speaker, for the Record today I am presenting the "North Carolina Master Plan," an article appearing in the Newsletter published by the American Bicentennial of which Mr. John Harr is the editor. This is an independent and private group seeking to influence some wiser decisions and more adequate programs for the proper commemoration of the bicentennial.

The North Carolina master plan sets a precedent that is very desirable for us to consider in some form as we pursue the challenge that remains for us to properly commemorate our 200th anniversary:

NORTH CAROLINA MASTER PLAN

The most significant effort thus far to deal with the really difficult elements of Bicentennial planning—the ideals, and principles which alone can give the Bicentennial true meaning—was made public recently in North Carolina.

It is a "master plan" which provides a "unifying philosophy and framework" for activities throughout the state in a Bicentennial Era that is defined as lasting from 1972 to 1989.

The plan has been warmly endorsed by North Carolina's Governor, Robert W. Scott, who referred to the approach as "clear and flexible" and as one that ought to "make history come alive and relate itself to the present and future." It was the product of a long, hard effort by the 23-member North Carolina ARBC, led by Chairman Hector MacLean, a former State Senator, and Executive Director Richard F. Gibbs.

Although many of the specifics necessarily refer to local subjects, it is the "unifying philosophy" on which they rest that gives the plan a stature far beyond that of a local product, one that should receive widespread attention in other states and at the national level.

The North Carolina document is remarkable in that it exhibits not only a deep sensitivity to American history, but also a genuine passion for liberty and a concern for present-day problems and future needs.

It holds that the primary goal of the Bicentennial should be to effect "a renaissance of the spirit of the American Revolution," and that this must be "more a product of action than of simply words and gestures." Other premises hold that "the highest form of honor which can be paid to the people of the Revolutionary generation would be to put their principles into action in our own lives," that "all Americans are the real beneficiaries of the American Revolution," and that this

entails an obligation to pass on the benefits of that legacy "at least undiminished" to future Americans.

Based on these premises, the plan in an overall sense seeks to "re-enact" the American Revolution—to consciously set in motion processes and "principled action" that will engender a "repetition of the Revolution in the present-day lives of North Carolinians. This, in turn, leads to the title of the plan: "American Revolution II—A Living Commemoration."

Key to the idea of making possible a "repetition" of the spirit of the Revolution is the time-frame staked out by North Carolina ARBC for the Bicentennial Era—from now until 1989. This is in contrast to the national ARBC which is due to terminate by law in 1983 (200th anniversary of the end of the Revolutionary War)—and possibly to President Nixon who, in a television address last year, appeared to suggest that the Bicentennial would end in 1976.

The North Carolina view is that the proper time span should include not only the years of ferment leading to the Revolutionary War and the War itself, but extend to the point when American liberties achieved Constitutional safeguards. This would be 1789—the year of the adoption of the Constitution, inauguration of the first President, convening of the first Congress, and the first sitting of the Supreme Court.

This offers a four-part time sequence for the Bicentennial, each of which would reflect the same spirit that prevailed during the same time period 200 years ago:

1972-76: a time for ferment, of reconsidering basic questions, of setting goals;

1976: a year of commitment;

1976-89: a period of "competition" in which Americans would work to achieve goals and try to live up to the ideals of the Revolution and the genuine needs of their time as well as their forebears of 200 years ago did;

1989: the finale, a year of "tremendous celebration," assuming that the foregoing processes have worked, goals have been achieved, and a genuine spirit of rededication has emerged.

Within this context, the myriad ideas, proposals, structures, activities, and processes which fill out the rest of the North Carolina master plan suddenly seem to have a special relevance and meaning. They range from a "goals for Dallas" process to a Bicentennial Calendar, from county and college Bicentennial Commissions to new curricula for the schools, from the use of mass media to increased historical research.

However, goal-setting is likely to be the major process in the North Carolina plan as it becomes operational. There is a newly-formed State Council on Goals and Priorities. The hope is that local governmental units will also set up goal-setting machinery.

The master plan proposes that a "North Carolina Bicentennial Congress" be held in the City of New Bern on Aug. 25, 1974. This would commemorate the 200th anniversary of the meeting of the first North Carolina Provincial Congress in New Bern, and provide for local progress reports, "especially the ones involving goal formulation."

TRY IT, YOU'LL LIKE IT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been somewhat of a controversy and criticism over the operation of Amtrak. It is my belief that, having reorganized

railroad passenger traffic through this vehicle, Congress should exercise a bit of patience in addition to legislative oversight so that the problems to be overcome in railroad passenger service can be successfully dealt with.

A very thoughtful editorial commentary in support of Amtrak was carried by WBBM Newsradio in various editorial broadcasts on May 19 which I believe to be a proper commentary on Amtrak's operation:

TRY IT, YOU'LL LIKE IT

Amtrak is under attack. Mismanagement, poor financing and bad routes are some of the complaints. Well, we just rode the train to Springfield and back, and much to our surprise, we enjoyed the whole thing.

Amtrak's slogan is: We're making the trains worth traveling again. From the standpoint of convenience, comfort and on time service, we agree.

Amtrak's "Prairie State," running between St. Louis and Milwaukee through Chicago, reminded us of the crack trains of years past . . . reclining-seat coaches, a dome car and a diner. Another train on the same route, the "Abraham Lincoln," offers reserved parlor cars and drawing rooms—echoes of luxuries past.

Airplanes and cars no doubt will continue to corner the transportation market, but WBBM suggests you try Amtrak. All trains use the remodeled Chicago Union Station, and fare reductions have just been announced on certain Eastern routes. You might be surprised to find what a relaxing experience it can be—to enjoy the roominess of the train and the pleasure of sitting down to a complete dinner with full beverage service, and best of all, the delight of seeing the American countryside at ground level.

Amtrak may have its problems, but at least, from the standpoint of service to the individual traveler, railroads have come a long way back.

B'NAI B'RITH WOMEN PASSED RESOLUTION ENDORSING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AND OTHER LEGISLATION TO AID THE ELDERLY

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the Record the text of a resolution passed in March 1972 by the B'nai B'rith women in support of an increase in social security benefits as well as in support of a variety of other legislative measures that affect older Americans:

RESOLUTION: SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS AND LEGISLATION FOR THE ELDERLY

B'nai B'rith Women has traditionally been committed to the very real needs of the elderly in our communities, both in programs and in assistance. Our interest stems from our belief in the dignity of human beings of all ages, most particularly for those citizens who have contributed much to our lives and culture, but who because of their age, are no longer able to enjoy the full benefits of society.

We voice our concern, therefore, on the inadequacy of present Social Security programs and funding. Because of the exceedingly high cost of living today, many recipients find themselves living just above pov-

erty-level. Despite the welcome assistance of medical-care programs, our elderly are frequently unable to meet their personal needs.

We commend the Congress for its efforts to raise the Social Security benefits, not just for the elderly, but for others who benefit from these funds such as widows, orphans, and the handicapped. We urge the adoption of measures to substantially increase this allocation which permits our elderly citizens to lead lives of independence and dignity.

We also urge that measures be adopted which would expand the Older Americans Act, strengthen the role of the Administration on the Aging in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, provide work service and employment centers, mental health programs, community facilities for recreation, and low-cost plans for nutrition, housing and public transportation.

We also commend programs which seek to undertake research on the aging process and its ramifications; and recent efforts to identify and assist the elderly Jewish poor.

Our Jewish heritage has been enriched by those who have preceded us, and who have given us so much from their lives. It is in this spirit that we express this resolution.

CITIZEN PATROL REDUCES SUBURBAN NEIGHBORHOOD VANDALISM

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, a year ago juvenile vandalism reached such alarming proportions that the residents of a suburban Portland neighborhood decided to do something about it. Led by one area resident, Pat O'Neal, about 70 fathers began patrolling the streets in an attempt to reduce crime.

The Portland Oregonian story by Kathleen Piper details the success of this citizen effort, and I commend it to my colleagues:

CITIZEN PATROL REDUCES SUBURBAN NEIGHBORHOOD VANDALISM
(By Kathleen Piper)

Home owners plagued by juvenile vandalism might take a tip from the neighborhood west of Portland and surrounding Tualatin View Grade School.

There, 70 fathers patrolling two at a time have substantially reduced property damage, theft and other pranks of minor and major import, according to their organizer, Pat O'Neal, who lives at 9940 SW Taylor St.

"We began on April 9 of last year," O'Neal said Sunday. "We had had just about everything that could happen in this neighborhood short of murder."

Children were out after curfew at night. The school was vandalized. Juveniles annoyed neighbors by riding their motorbikes up and down the streets and on lawns.

Finally, Jack Burke's Country Store at 8998 SW Leahy Road was burglarized with \$18,000 damage and was put out of business temporarily.

"It became obvious to me that we didn't have what you call a neighborhood," O'Neal said.

He said the Washington County Sheriff's Department was so understaffed, it could not respond to reports of vandalism until days had lapsed.

"There were only three county patrol cars and two state cars in the whole county then," O'Neal said, "and the state cars merely patrolled traffic on the Sunset Highway."

Washington County Sheriff Warren B. Barnes said Sunday, he was wholeheartedly in favor of the citizen patrol.

Barnes agreed that there has "definitely been a reduction" in crime in the area, but he could not say to what degree.

"We feel that they have accomplished an awful lot and probably saved an awful lot of property from being damaged. They have routed out a couple of burglars, too," Barnes said.

Barnes said passage of a county serial levy has enabled the addition of two more night county patrol cars and after July another will be added.

Following an incident involving one of his children, O'Neal was spurred into forming the patrols.

"I interviewed every applicant for up to two hours," he said, "because I wanted to learn his philosophy. We would not accept anyone who wanted to employ guns or strong arm tactics."

The group grew to 17 and met with the sheriff. "We learned that in order for us to get anything accomplished, we were going to have to help the sheriff," O'Neal said.

The patrol was assigned each night, with two fathers from different parts of the four-square-mile area working together in the patrol car. Personal automobiles are used. The pair would patrol during the night, from approximately 1 p.m. to 2 a.m. The hours were not rigid, however.

O'Neal claims the incidence of vandalism and other related problems has shrunk from reports of two per week to only two per month. "And now when we call the sheriff's office, a car is here within minutes," he said.

O'Neal said close cooperation between the sheriff's office and his group has evolved from the patrol plan. The patrolling fathers keep careful logs of what they see during their nights on duty. Anything suspicious is reported to a sheriff's detective, who then checks it out. "It benefits both us and the sheriff," O'Neal said.

The program has also fostered a growing community spirit, O'Neal said. The fathers who work together on patrol have an unusual opportunity to communicate, he said. Neighbors who would ordinarily "just sleep here" are getting to know each other.

Since the patrol was formed, no vandalism to the grade school has occurred.

O'Neal emphasized that the approach is preventive. "We try to work through the parents. We try to keep the kids out of trouble."

"It's good to know," he said, "that instead of sitting around complaining to your wife or your neighbor, you can do something about the problems."

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING THE ESCALATION OF WAR

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of discussion lately about how much support the President's recent escalation of the war in Vietnam has received from the public. In this connection, I think it is very worth noting that the Boston City Council recently adopted a resolution condemning that action, and expressing the strong desire that the President reverse his policy and bring the war to a speedy close. I believe that in passing this resolution, the city council of Boston was performing its solemn responsibility to represent their constituents, and I wish at this point to commend them for speaking out, and to insert their resolution in the RECORD:

CITY OF BOSTON

IN CITY COUNCIL

Whereas, Americans have been fighting in Southeast Asia for an unreasonable number of years; and

Whereas, 56,000 Americans have lost their lives in this effort; and

Whereas, it has been shown in the past that brinkmanship politics is not conducive to the long-range goal of peace which we all seek; and

Whereas, it has been shown in the past that escalation of the American effort in Southeast Asia has proved itself to be counterproductive and not in the best interest of the American people; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Boston City Council condemns the recent escalation of the war in Southeast Asia and urges the immediate withdrawal of all American forces from Southeast Asia upon the release of all American prisoners of war; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent by the City Clerk to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

In City Council May 15, 1972. Adopted.

THEY ESCALATED THE WAR

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, since the North Vietnamese began their massive invasion of South Vietnam there has been a lot of nonsense spoken and written to criticize the policies of the Nixon administration and to accuse the President of escalating the war when he responded to the aggression by increasing and improving our bombing policy and also by mining the key ports of entry to North Vietnam.

An editorial appearing in the May 23, 1972, edition of the Peoria Journal Star cuts through that nonsensical and misleading rhetoric in an effective fashion and I insert the text of the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THEY ESCALATED THE WAR

When Nixon's trip to Moscow was scheduled things were pretty quiet in Vietnam, and there was every sane and reasonable cause to figure that responsible leaders on both sides would keep it quiet or make it still quieter.

Instead, today, the fighting in Vietnam involves the largest collision of main forces on both sides in the history of that war.

How did that happen?

Everybody knows how it happened although there are some who choose to leapfrog over its beginnings.

It happened because Moscow and Hanoi entered into collusion to produce the largest overnight escalation in the killing and crisis since 1968, and with obvious intentions of surpassing 1968 in violence.

They plotted a sudden and surprise switch from guerrilla techniques to a massive assault by the entire North Vietnamese regular army, led by staggering artillery and rocket barrages laying down a carpet for squadrons of the Russian's best tanks and paving the way for the advance of the North Vietnam's best infantrymen.

That offensive was a complete switch. It was prepared and lavishly armed during the full inspired by Nixon's withdrawal policies. It exploded all across the border "front" at the exact moment when one would reasonably expect restraint.

Even more significantly, Nixon set the initial example of "cooling down" the war and asked Moscow to respond in a like spirit for peace. Instead, they obviously did just the opposite. They tried to see how much military advantage they could exploit from the de-escalation of the war on our side.

Spectacular success was a possibility—and would have exploited Nixon's visit in two ways: for military victory in Vietnam and to put the U.S. at a severe disadvantage in the Moscow negotiations.

It has a third advantage and purpose. It put Nixon the spot at home—whatever way he reacted.

It is somewhat ironic, and a symptom of how far the "anti-war" emotions have gone from beyond reality, that when Nixon responded with countering the North Vietnamese introduction of tanks, and massive rocket and artillery weapons and supplies, with mines and air action—to permit the South Vietnamese infantry and the North Vietnamese infantry to fight on fairly even terms—the U.S. was promptly accused of escalating the war.

That is patently nonsense.

It is as absurd as the constant charges—in the face of both repeated public statements from the start and overwhelming evidence in action—that the U.S. was seeking a military victory and that the "only answer" is a "political solution."

It is now pretty obvious who has been seeking a "military victory" outright and who has continually shunned the "political settlement!" It is Moscow and Hanoi, clearly. When we de-escalate—they escalate. When we counter, we are accused of responsibility for the new levels of mayhem!

This level of explosive war was clearly and flatly introduced by Hanoi. It wasn't us. It was in the face of action and efforts in the opposite direction by us.

One would think these who have decided on being critics—regardless of the events and actions of the other side—ought to at least face the barest of facts.

Another fact deserves recognition by now. Since it was they and not we who decided to "rock the boat" and see what happened, it was Moscow taking risks with "peace." That is where the responsibility lay, and when Nixon put it on them as he announced the mining, he was saying simply: "You initiated the new major war situation, and it is your responsibility to accept the consequences of balancing it. It is time for some restraint on your side."

Significantly, there has been restraint in Moscow . . . but only after they took their gamble and tested us! They always seem to want to see if they can "get away with it" first.

That hardly encourages the persistent doctrine that they are always ready to be reasonable and we are not—and that if we let them "get away with it," they would be restrained and reasonable.

THE \$55,000 CROP SUBSIDY LIMIT, A FAILURE

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the \$55,000 crop subsidy limit enacted last year by Congress has been a complete failure,

resulting in virtually no Federal revenue savings, according to a recent report by the General Accounting Office.

The GAO report has revealed that \$55,000 payment limitation resulted in savings to the Federal Government of only \$2.2 million, not the approximately \$68 million that the GAO had previously estimated that should have been saved.

The GAO report noted how corporations and wealthy individual farmers had been able to avoid the \$55,000 per crop subsidy limit through various legal maneuverings, such as leasing part of their land or through forming different types of partnerships or corporations. The GAO stated that—

Although the payment limitation adversely affected some individuals and benefited others, it had no significant effect on . . . government expenditures.

The report also revealed that 77 percent of those farm producers who received more than \$55,000 in 1970 crop subsidy payments changed their farming interests or operations for 1971, presumably to evade the crop subsidy limit.

Some of the examples of legal maneuvering to evade the crop subsidy limit cited in the GAO report included: California corporation, which was paid about \$2.5 million in crop subsidies previously, was divided up to allow 53 different individuals to receive Federal payments of \$2.5 million in 1971, and thus evade \$55,000 per individual crop limit for not farming. Another case the GAO cited was a New Mexico farm, which should have received the maximum amount of \$55,000, but was organized as a partnership between a father and his two adult sons. Under the Department's regulations the father and two sons each received \$22,300, a total of \$66,900 and no savings resulted.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Agriculture Department pays around \$3 billion annually in direct payments to producers participating in cotton, wheat, and feed grain programs. In 1971, Congress enacted a \$55,000 limitation that any one farm producer could receive under each of these programs in order to eliminate enormous Federal payments to already wealthy farmers and corporations. However, it is clear that the Agriculture Department has done very little to prevent farm producers from evading the clear intent and purpose of this legislation. These wasteful overpayments to wealthy farm producers and corporations could have been used to help the family farmer struggling to survive.

Weak legislation by Congress and even weaker enforcement by the Agriculture Department have resulted in the failure of the \$55,000 crop limitation. Unfortunately, Congress is apparently not very interested in closing some of the loopholes contained in the legislation itself. But, until Congress does legislate on this issue again, it is the Agriculture Department's responsibility to enforce the law as well as possible. Along these lines, the GAO recommended that the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service, which administers the crop subsidy program:

First. Establish procedures to obtain information on all farming interests of

each program participant so that ASCS can apply the payment limitation fully and fairly.

Second. Provide for systematic review by ASCA headquarters of the decisions made initially by the ASCA county and State committees.

Third. Clarify and expand instructions to county committees.

I am hopeful that the Agriculture Department will need GAO's advice and will attempt to more vigorously enforce the intent and purpose of the \$55,000 per crop subsidy limit.

**JOHN DREISKE—OUTSTANDING
JOURNALIST**

HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, John Dreiske, one of Chicago's outstanding journalists and political editor for the Chicago Sun-Times, wrote his last column for that paper on Friday, May 26, 1972. He has now retired after devoting a lifetime to reporting and analyzing political news.

I met John Dreiske for the first time in 1945 and for over 25 years I have admired the fairness in his articles which brought to those in my city and to those outside of my city a keen understanding and insight of our American political system. In writing his column, Mr. Dreiske has always informed the reader of the facts and has always displayed firm impartiality regardless of the individual, the political party, or the branch of government that was receiving his scrutiny.

Mr. Dreiske's retirement leaves a tremendous gap at the Chicago Sun-Times, and it is my understanding that he will not be immediately replaced by another columnist. He will be missed not only by his associates at the Chicago Sun-Times, but by all those in our community who have had the opportunity to know him. He is indeed a man highly respected and affectionately regarded.

Having graduated from Northwestern University in 1929, John went to work on the editorial staff of the Chicago Tribune. Thereafter, he served with the Detroit Mirror, the Chicago Herald Examiner, and the Detroit Times. In 1936 he went to work for the Chicago Times and from 1938 to the present time he has been working for the Chicago Sun-Times. He served as an instructor at the Medill School of Journalism, Northwestern University, and is a member of the Illinois Legislative Correspondents Association.

While he will be missed on the political scene, as well as at the offices of the Sun-Times, nonetheless John Dreiske has earned his retirement, and Mrs. Annunzio joins me in extending to him, his devoted wife, Margaret, and their children, John and Karin, our sincerest best wishes for a healthy and happy retirement.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the last column written by John Dreiske for the Chicago Sun-Times as well as an editorial which appeared in

the Friday, May 26 edition of the Chicago Sun-Times entitled "Farewell to Dreiske":

POLITICAL EDITOR'S LAST HURRAH
(By John Dreiske)

Well, so it has finally come down to this. With the production of this last of some 5,280 columns regularly appearing in The Times and The Sun-Times for 30 years, I will have retired.

As I take the traditional and very corny trip down the sunset side of the hill of life, there comes back to me clearly the feeling of high confidence I felt when I went to work for the Chicago Tribune in 1929.

I recall, too, that feeling of confidence and that sensation of being a budding king of the hill when first I walked into the State House at Springfield to cover my first General Assembly session in 1943, one year after becoming political editor.

On that day, I was accompanied by two of the finest people in the world, two reporters, the late Charles N. Wheeler of The Daily News and A. L. (Tod) Sloan of the then Chicago Herald-American.

These two gentlemen brought me up in the rugged hurly-burly of Illinois and Chicago political writing and taught me some holds that saved me from scoop disaster in many a critical situation.

Those confident early years in what, friends, is a very rough business soon passed. In those years, I knew a helluva lot more about politics than I do today. The world was my cocky. And now that world has crumbled.

But the fact that this particular career is ending is not bad news. I'm glad I made the decision to not stick around longer than three days past my 65th birthday.

Never felt better in my life and the same goes for Margaret. The final year has been a good one and that's the note on which I had always hoped to call it quits.

But that particular birthday Tuesday rang the bell for me and there came a sudden urge to sit down in a different chair and look at my life.

I can't do this, however, without scanning the many years that have passed, the last 36 spent with the same newspaper organization.

One random thought is that The Sun-Times is a terrific newspaper for a columnist with attack tendencies to be employed by.

I have in this column space written some of the damndest things about certain people whom I thought had it coming, but there was nary a whimper or column killed even when those people were well wired to our executive hierarchy.

One executive whose very good friend took a drubbing in a column dropped by my desk the next morning and, laughing, said, "Well, I see you took care of my buddy today!" And that's all there was to it.

I'm told they're not going to name a new political editor for a while and that there's not going to be a local political column for a while.

I'm kind of glad about that in a way. No bright young character is going to take over immediately and show me up with immediate contrast and much more talent.

As I write this last column, the phone is ringing, the mail has arrived and their messages roll back the years. One writer recalls a column I wrote about him 25 years ago when he was a candidate. Another writes, "I cut my teeth on politics through your column."

The staff and the executives of this newspaper have parted me and flattered me. Their fellowship—which has survived many a tense deadline crush—has been lasting and will never be forgotten.

Good-by.

FAREWELL TO DREISKE

John Dreiske says farewell to his readers on page 52 today and we regretfully must say farewell to one of the great Chicago journalists. For the past 30 years Dreiske's column prying below the surface of Illinois politics and prodding the politicians has been must reading for anyone interested in the operation of state and local government.

Dreiske saw his first duty always to inform the reader. He played no favorites among Republicans or Democrats or among political figures he admired and those he distrusted.

Thirty years of rubbing shoulders with the political lions and the political rats has hardly changed Dreiske, the man. His exquisite blend of dry wit and enthusiasm has kept him on even keel from his first column to his last.

His colleagues at The Sun-Times will sorely miss his good company, his fund of knowledge and his ever-ready helping hand.

THE ROAD TO LEXINGTON AND CONCORD

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the most famous Revolutionary War poem of them all opens with lines especially significant:

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard 'round the world."

In hindsight it is easy to see and be critical of the many aspects of the British Army in those days that were not exactly strong points. However, the "embattled farmers" of Concord and Lexington, and for that matter the entire population of the American Colonies in 1775, were not quite so aware of the weaknesses as they were of the reputation the British soldier had won for himself—and rightly so.

The first clash was between these "embattled farmers" and British regulars, but ever since the founding of the colonies 150 years before, Americans had had to fight to survive. The road ended when the unskilled and unready colonists took on the world's mightiest military power. But it had begun and had gone on with many a twist and turn, when the first white man had set foot on the North American continent. The story is as much a part of our Revolutionary War history as anything could be.

Rev. Joseph Doddridge, on militia, commented:

They were soldiers when they chose to be so. And when they chose, they laid down their arms.

Boiling Water may well have prescribed the ceremonies. King's regulations called for a salute to the commander in chief, three ruffles on the drum, officers to salute, other ranks to stand at rest arms. Boiling Water, so named by the remarkably prescient Mohawks when he had lived among them and taken a squaw at one time in his checkered career, was better known as Charles Lee, since June 17, 1775, by res-

olution of the 2d Continental Congress a major general in the "army of the United Colonies." He had come up from Philadelphia with George Washington and since he had begun his military career at age 12 with a commission in the British Army and at one time had served under the King of Poland as well, he probably knew more about such ceremonies than any man present.

Almost as if the Muse of History decreed the day should not be observed at all—July 3, 1775, was the 21st anniversary of Washington's humiliating capitulation to the French at Fort Mifflin in the French and Indian wars—there is a curious blank spot about the day. The story of a ceremony under the Cambridge elm did not even appear until 1837 and is definitely apocryphal.

Perhaps none of the New Englanders thought it was worth noting; perhaps they were suspicious of the Virginian; perhaps they merely had the cautious, wait-and-see attitude of all armies on all levels when a new commander takes over. James Stevens, posted at Cambridge, did note in his diary that:

Nothing heaping extroderly we preaded—paraded—three times.

Paul Lunt was at Prospect Hill and recorded that Washington reviewed his regiment there and Noah Chapin at Brookline said the generals were there, too.

Other than that, nothing—in newspapers, diaries, letters, nor memoirs. That is most unfortunate; the sight of the militia ringing Boston, reconstructed years later by Col. William A. Ganoe in his "History of the United States Army," cries out for an eyewitness account:

Was ever a commander presented with a more motley throng? In the same companies were blue coats faced with buff, black coats faced with red, and hunting shirts of brown trimmed with fringes, streamers and scarlet needlework. The townsman, clad in gay hues and covered with coat or blanket, touched elbows with the woodsman wearing his dull homespun. A company of Stockbridge Indians in feathers, paint and nakedness vied in color with the Connecticut dragoons in vivid red coats not unlike the British. There were long trousers, overalls, and breeches with or without gaiters or with fringed leggings of deer-skin. Stuck in the triangular hat were gaudy sprigs of various sizes and shapes. Irish, German, Scotch, Puritan and Quaker contrasted their Caucasian faces with the shiny African in his powdered wig, while graybeard and child stood side by side. Even the officers had no distinctive uniforms.

Militia, to a man as uneven in appearance as was the 168-year period of colonial militia history behind them that had begun with the founding of Jamestown in 1607. The record they would set in the years ahead would be equally as uneven. But now the colonies had a war on their hands. War meant fighting; fighting meant militia; standing armies were anathema.

So, Congress resolved, on July 18, 1775, that—

It be recommended to the inhabitants of all the united English colonies of North America, that all able bodied effective men, between sixteen and fifty years of age in each colony, immediately form themselves into regular companies of Militia.

Settlement of the North American continent had been a military operation from the first. Asking the average American to cite any two names from the colonial period would probably produce John Smith and Myles Standish. The king provided no soldiers—indeed, he provided very little save charters and grants. The colonists were thrown on their own devices. Military drill became a way of life. Unpreparedness, as the colonists were to learn from time to time at excruciating cost, meant disaster. Strangely enough, in England, the militia system was dying out at the same time. The civil war had shown Cromwell the necessity for standing armies and Charles II was to depend upon them exclusively. The English regular army establishment is dated from his reign, and the militia almost faded completely until the middle of the 19th century.

Indians were not the only threat. Since the defeat of the Armada in 1588 England had been safe from invasion and was to be free of that fear until the time of Napoleon. But the early settlers in Virginia feared a repetition of the Spanish massacre of the Huguenots at Fort Caroline, in Florida, in 1565. The alarm was sounded at Jamestown, several times, that Spanish ships were approaching, and appearance of a French ship off Boston in 1643 meant a hurried call to arms.

So, arms and the man, above all; Captain John Smith's "Check List for Virginia-Bound Colonists" listed:

Arms for a man; but if half your men be armed, it is well, so all have swords and pieces. 1 armor complete, light. 1 long piece five feet and a half, near musket bore. 1 sword. 1 belt. 1 bandolier. 20 pound (s) of powder. 60 pounds (s) of shot or lead, pistol and goose shot.

The militia system itself varied from colony to colony but did retain certain elemental features of the old English method. A compulsory levy of the male population, drilling a certain number of days yearly, for summons in an emergency, was basic. Size of units differed; geographic bases varied widely; some units elected officers, other appointed them. The militia did reflect the economic and social structure of the colony with rank generally being on a par with social status. Each man had to provide his own weapons and ammunition, clothing and food, and reserves were maintained for those too poor to buy muskets.

Colonial warfare was not cheap. Cavalry was included but it was expensive; Massachusetts restricted cavalry service to those with property worth at least 100 pounds sterling. General expenses were met by quotas on individual counties and it was up to the counties to get the money any way they saw fit, by borrowing or by special taxes. In 1645 the Virginia General Assembly met the expenses of 80 men for an expedition to Roanoke by a levy of 38,000 pounds of tobacco to pay for boats and supplies. Pay alone amounted to 8,000 pounds of tobacco. Some money came in the form of fines for infractions of militia discipline, which was strict.

The load could be crushing. King

Philip's war—1675-78—left a debt of 100,000 pounds sterling, a stupendous sum for the day. And not only in money: During the war, 16 Massachusetts and 4 Rhode Island towns were wiped out, and it was said 6 percent of all New England men of military age were killed. It was 20 years before the destroyed villages were resettled and 40 years before the frontier advanced again.

But the colonists could become lax, and pay a great price for it. The early Virginia colonists drilled faithfully, for awhile, then felt the Pochahontas-John Rolfe marriage would bind the Indians and keep them peaceful. While Powhatan lived, it did, but he was succeeded by his brother Opechancanough who hated the English and waited for his chance to strike.

It came on Good Friday, March 22, 1622, 4 years after Powhatan's death. The Indians came into the white settlements, peacefully at first, pretending to sell provisions, then suddenly fell on those about the houses and swept on into the fields; 350 were killed at the first attack. Jamestown was saved only by being warned by a friendly Indian boy named Chanco. The terrified colonists asked the King for—

certain old cast Armes remayning in the Tower and the Mynories; which though they were altogether unfit and of no use for modern service, might nevertheless be serviceable against that people, whereunto his Majestie for the better strengthening of that Plantation graciously condescended.

The King obliged; what was sent was put to good use in the 2 years that followed, even though disease was sweeping the colony and at one time only 180 men were fit to fight at all, and of these but 80 were suitable for actual combat. John Rolfe was among those killed, but so complete was the colonists' victory that except for a rumored attack in 1627, which never occurred, and another uprising in April 1644 that killed 300 English before it was put down, Virginia had no more troubles with the Indians on a large scale for the rest of her history.

Defense, in colonial days, at least on the surface, was every man's duty. But as so often happens, every man's duty has a way of turning into no one's responsibility. The most complete tabulation of laws and regulations of colonial times governing militia came up with 777 laws, or provisions, touching on defense. Of 608, 200 laws and 369 provisions bear on some form of compulsory service. Of the provisions, 122 delegate authority. The remaining 247 are the only ones containing anything touching on compulsion and not all of them actually compel someone to serve.

The oft-drawn picture of colonial America as a garrison-state fades at once when it is noted on balance 200 laws had compulsion aspects but 213 dealt with exemptions.

The expedition against Louisbourg, during King George's war, the War of Austrian Succession, 1744-48, was the high-water mark of militia endeavors for the entire colonial period. Shot through with elements of luck and black comedy, one French witness later wrote of it that:

It was an enterprise less of the English nation and its King than of the inhabitants of New England alone.

The Peace of Utrecht had not settled boundary questions in North America. Outbreak of the War of Austrian Succession was first heard of by the French. Their fortress at Louisbourg was the strongest in all North America, the only French naval station on the entire continent, a haunt of privateers, and commanded the entrance to Canada. Supposedly impregnable, it had taken the French 25 years to fortify it.

Determined to strike first, a French raiding party swept down on the fishing village of Canseau in Nova Scotia. Its garrison surrendered on condition they would be sent back to Boston. They were, eventually, but first were taken to Louisbourg while the French made another raid, which failed, against Annapolis Royal. It was a mistake to take captives to Louisbourg. The fortress was not nearly as strong as its reputation had it, and Lt. John Bradstreet, captured at Canseau, reported its weaknesses to Gov. William Shirley.

Governor Shirley put it up to the legislature, the General Court, which met in secret. A committee was appointed to consider the plan, and reported adversely, but the secret was out. Supposedly the security leak was due to a member of the committee, more pious than discreet, who prayed so loudly and fervently for divine guidance that he was overheard through the walls of his room. The Boston merchants asked the court to reconsider, and this time the proposal was approved.

Shirley asked for help from all of the colonies. Connecticut sent 500 men; New Hampshire 450; Rhode Island refused men, being irked at Massachusetts over a boundary dispute, plus the rough treatment given Roger Williams by the Puritans still rankled; New York contributed 10 cannon, and Pennsylvania and New Jersey sent supplies. In Massachusetts 3,000 men were raised, and Shirley asked the Crown for naval aid from Commodore Peter Warren's fleet in the West Indies.

This time the Crown responded. Warren in a 60-gun ship accompanied by three 40-gun vessels was dispatched to Massachusetts. The expedition took on the air of a crusade; Rev. Samuel Moody, minister of York, who would go as senior chaplain, picked an ax which he intended to use in the churches to smash the heathen idols of the anti-Christ. This prompted a letter from Deacon John Gray of Biddleford:

Oh that I could be with you and dear Parson Moody in that church to destroy the images there set up and hear the true Gospel of our Lord and Saviour there preached!

There was one skeptic, at least. Benjamin Franklin wrote from Philadelphia to his brother in Boston:

Fortified towns are hard nuts to crack; and your teeth are not accustomed to it. Taking strong places is a particular trade, which you have taken up without serving an apprenticeship to it.

The expedition landed with practically no contest about 3 miles west of Louis-

bourg, on May 1. First stroke of luck: The French felt they could not hold the Grand Battery, so abandoned it after spiking the guns, 28 42-pounders and two 18-pounders, with much ammunition. The New England blacksmiths got out their tools and went to work, and when cannon from Louisbourg opened fire on the battery, to their surprise they were answered by their own guns.

Then came the second break. A French supply ship was swept up by Commodore Warren, and now the besiegers found themselves completely supplied, courtesy of the French. A demand for surrender was refused so now shelling of the town began in earnest. Before the siege was over, an estimated 9,000 cannon balls and 600 bombs were lobbed over the walls and only one building was left untouched. The French had not expected a land attack and their main battery faced the water. The cannon could not be moved and were useless. Then Warren scooped up a warship, this one rendering 64 guns, 560 prisoners, and munitions.

Then the army got its first setback. One participant was later to write that there was so much rum in evidence that it reminded him more of commencement day at Harvard than a military expedition. An attempt to storm the island on which another French battery was situated failed because of the 800 men detailed to go, too many showed up drunk. A second attempt did get ashore, then someone who had been at the rum barrels again called for a cheer. The French were alerted; 60 were killed and 119 captured, marking failure to the second attempt and depressing the army.

By the middle of June everyone was getting impatient and a major land-sea assault was planned, but before it could be launched the fortress surrendered. The French flag was left flying; several merchantmen were enticed into the bay, where they were taken by Warren's ships, with total prizes over 1 million pounds in value. Half went to the Crown; half to the naval captains; nothing to the troops. They had hoped for plunder of the place, but surrender terms forbade it:

Sabbath Day ye 16 June. They came to Terms for us to enter ye Sitty tomorrow, and Poore Terms they Bee too.

A great Noys and hubbub amongst ye Soulders about ye Plunder; Som Cursing, som a Swarein.

Glorious victory though it was, it made no real impact on the outcome of the war, and the disgust of the colonists knew no bounds when at the end of the war it was given back to the French, in exchange for Madras in India.

Whatever the Crown had hoped for when it had called the Albany Congress of 1754, it was disappointed. And there was no time to lose. The British fleet was twice the size of the French but where Britain had 18,000 troops under arms, the French had around 175,000. When George II addressed Parliament on November 14, 1754, he did not mention the Colonies by name, but when he referred to protecting "those possessions which constitute one great source of their wealth," Parliament took the hint.

Parliament voted money. Two under-strength regiments were already on orders to sail for Virginia; the idea was that they would be filled out with men, levies, furnished by the colonists, and they would also be supplied by the colonists. Maj. Gen. Edward Braddock was appointed to command the regiments, and also to act as nominal commander in chief of all the military forces in the colonies, hopefully to bring about some unity.

Braddock had the usual dislike of the Regular for Militia. Noted Benjamin Franklin:

He had too much self-confidence; too high an opinion of the validity of regular troops; too mean a one of both Americans and Indians.

All Braddock found was apathy, unwillingness, and outright refusal, as far as getting supplies was concerned. Washington himself said the locals "ought to be chastised." Reports of the mess came to Walpole's ears in England and elicited the caustic comment that Braddock seemed to be in no hurry to be scalped. Then in stepped America's first supply sergeant.

Benjamin Franklin was serving as Postmaster General of Pennsylvania, and came, with his son, to Braddock's camp at Fredericktown—Frederick, Md.—ostensibly to arrange for communications between Braddock and the colonial Governors. The Pennsylvania Assembly had agreed to pay for this service. The Assembly thought Braddock hated Quakers on account of their beliefs; actually, he hated them because he was certain they were trading with the French. In any case, Braddock was commander in chief and Pennsylvania felt it would be well to stay in his good graces.

Braddock and Franklin took to each other. Franklin found him fuming in impatience, waiting for the return of the men he had sent out through Virginia and Maryland to secure wagons. Franklin was about to leave when the foragers came in, with but 25 wagons and many of them unserviceable. Braddock exploded. At least 150 wagons were required, and it was all the fault of the Ministry for sending him to that god-forsaken place where there was absolutely no chance of getting the provisions needed, and as far as he, Braddock, was concerned, the expedition was ended right then and there.

Franklin said it was too bad Braddock had not landed in Pennsylvania, because up there almost every farmer had his wagon. Braddock turned to him like a drowning man grasping a rope:

Then you, sir, who are a man of interest there, can probably procure them for us; and I beg you will undertake it.

Franklin wrote down the terms he thought would be necessary, Braddock agreed to them, and advanced Franklin 800 pounds for their hire. Franklin's appeal to the people in York, Lancaster, and Cumberland counties mentioned the easy money to be made, then:

The king's business must be done; so many brave troops, come so far for your defense, must not stand idle through your backwardness, to do what may be reasonably expected

from you; wagons and horses must be had; violent measures will probably be used, and you will be left to seek for a recompense where you can find it, and your case, perhaps, be little pitied or regarded.

Franklin had to advance 200 pounds more of his own money but in 2 weeks had secured 150 wagons plus 259 pack-horses.

The advertisement promised payment according to the valuation, in case any wagon or horse should be lost. The owners, however, alleging they did not know General Braddock, or what dependence might be had on his promise, insisted on my bond for the performance, which I accordingly gave them.

And not only did Franklin get wagons and packhorses for the general. Dining one evening with some regimental officers, the colonel told Franklin of his concern for the subalterns, "who were generally not in affluence and could ill afford, in this dear country, to lay in the stores that might be necessary in so long a march, through a wilderness, where nothing was to be purchased."

Franklin's son had been a subaltern himself at one time, and he drew up a list of what he thought would be most appreciated. Franklin wrote to a committee of the Assembly "who had the disposition of some public money" and enclosed the list. To the delight of the officers, along with the wagons and pack horses, there arrived in the camp 20 additional horses, each containing a parcel of:

Six lbs. loaf sugar, 6 lbs. good Muscovado do., 1 lb. good green tea, 1 lb. good bohea do., 6 lbs. good ground coffee, 6 lbs. chocolate, ½ cwt. best white biscuit, ½ lb. pepper, 1 quart best white wine vinegar, 1 Gloucester cheese, 1 keg containing 20 lbs. good butter, 2 doz. old Madeira wine, 2 gallons Jamaica spirits, 1 bottle flour of mustard, 2 well-cured hams, ½ dozen dry'd tongues, 6 lbs. rice, 6 lbs. raisins.

Horse and parcel were presented to its new owner.

Braddock was delighted and asked for more help in sending provisions out after the expedition had left; he was to say of Franklin that in the man he had found "almost the only instance of ability and honesty I have known in these provinces." Franklin put out an additional 1,000 pounds of his money in filling this task. A few days before Braddock's defeat he did return to Franklin an order for that sum; there was more to be paid on the next account, but it never was.

Things had not gone too well after Braddock's defeat. When Governor Shirley learned the role of commander in chief had fallen on him, he was preparing two moves in New York on his own. The first would be aimed at Niagara, with himself as commander; the other would be for Crown Point, with William Johnson, whom Braddock had appointed Superintendent of Northern Indian Affairs, to act as temporary major general.

Then Lord Loudoun arrived in New York on July 23, 1756, accompanied by an aide, two secretaries, his mistress and 17 servants. He came under the most comprehensive plan yet for military unity in the colonies. He could ask the colonies for recruits, money, quarters and transport, and request the aid for provincial troops, but he could not compel them. And five

of the most central colonies had 60 percent of the population yet by their charters were not under direct control of the Crown. Yet, it was from these colonies than the main source of manpower would have to come.

Loudoun's normal bad temper was not helped by his first meeting with Shirley:

I got from Major-General Shirley a few papers of very little use; only he insinuated to me that I would find everything prepared, and have nothing to do but to pull laurels, which I understood was his constant conversation before my arrival.

Shirley had not done too badly. Around 7,000 men were under arms. Most of them were under command of Gen. John Winslow, appointed by Shirley, at Half Moon, up the Hudson from Albany at a point where rapids prohibited further navigation. Men were in outposts at Fort Edward, and at Fort William Henry, which was to be the jumping-off front point for Ticonderoga.

French and Indians swarmed through the woods, picking off the unwary and the laggards. In early June Colonel Fitch at Albany had written to Winslow:

Friday, 11 o'clock: Sir, about half an hour since, a party of near fifty French and Indians had the impudence to come down to the river opposite to this city and captivate two men.

Winslow's reply:

We daily discover the Indians about us; but not yet have been so happy as to obtain any of them.

At Fort William Henry, on Lake George, Col. William Bagley was driving his men to build three sloops and a miniature armada of whaleboats for the planned assault on Ticonderoga. Winslow kept urging him to hurry; Bagley responded:

Shall leave no stone unturned; every wheel shall go that rum and human flesh can move.

Two weeks later he wrote Winslow:

I really must confess I have almost worn the men out, poor dogs. Pray where are the committee, or what are they about?

Bagley, too, was troubled by raiders and his scouts were not much help:

There is a vast deal of news here; every party brings abundance, but all different.

And later he reported:

I constantly keep out small scouting parties to the eastward and westward of the lake, and make no discovery but the tracks of small parties who are plaguing us constantly; but what vexes me most, we can't catch one of the ——. I have sent out skulking parties some distance from the sentries in the night, to lie still in the bushes, but the flies are so plenty, our people can't bear them.

Over at Fort Edward, Col. David Wooster was not having any more luck; so far, he wrote to Winslow, he had not been able "to give those villains a dressing."

But the colonists were learning partisan warfare. Roberts and his Rangers slipped through the forest to within sight of Ticonderoga for a scouting mission. What they saw was not encouraging. The 7,000 men under arms would not be too many for the job.

Shirley's plan would have cut New France in half and it might well have succeeded if he could have gotten things moving. But intercolonial friction had

crushed these hopes. The army should have moved in April; it was not ready until August.

William Livingston of New Jersey summed up the mess:

The colonies are nearly exhausted, and their funds already anticipated by expensive unexecuted projects. Jealous are they of each other; some ill-constituted, others shaken with intestine divisions, and, if I may be allowed the expression, parsimonious even to prodigality. Our assemblies are diffident of their governors, governors despise their assemblies; and both mutually misrepresent each other to the Court of Great Britain.

For all of Shirley's work, Loudoun still found chaos among the troops. Of the army, 27 percent was on the sick list. Fort William Henry had five to eight burials a day, and Capt. Edmund Wells wrote in his diary:

Sept. 12 I am feeling very poorly indeed.

Sept. 17 Counted 90 graves in the burying ground at Ft. Edward in 5 weeks.

Sept. 18 Three more persons buried. I am very ill.

Sept. 19 Too poor to attend divine service. A hundred graves today.

Sept. 21 112 graves. Three of my men deserted.

Desertion was a fright. At one time in September 200 men left. General Winslow asked Loudoun permission to try the gallows—

Although Hanging among the Americans has never as yet been Practised can't but think a Little is necessary.

Loudoun would have none of that, as he knew the value of a body in uniform, live, and not dangling from a rope. He suggested enlistment for life in the West Indies, instead. But this went against the colonial grain. Connecticut, for instance, pardoned returning deserters and they suffered no more punishment than docking of their pay for the time they were gone.

The army was supposed to be around 8,700 men but was not close to it. New York had sent only one-third of its complement and Massachusetts was 1,100 short, refusing any more until the other colonies came through. Loudoun had hoped to enlist Americans into the British regulars. This had been successful; for a time, up until 1756, British recruiting parties had lived in a wonderland and old-world styles of recruiting swept the colonies from Maine to the Carolinas.

In addition there was the wide disparity between what a man received from a militia enlistment—not to speak of the length of time—and what the British soldier earned. After deductions from his pittance of a wage, the British soldier came out with maybe 3 or 4 pence daily. The Massachusetts troops received 10¼ pence, plus sugar, ginger, rum, and molasses as additional luxuries and a marching allowance three times that granted the regular.

By the end of the year, both sides withdrew into winter quarters. It was no problem for the French, as the uncomplaining inhabitants of Canada looked upon forcible quartering of troops in their homes as merely something to be expected and lived with. Not so in the Colonies. Most of the British regulars

were in Philadelphia, New York, and Boston. Loudoun demanded free quarters; this was the custom in England. There was something to be said for his request since after all the regulars were there for the colonists' benefit.

The colonies did not see it that way. Philadelphia did let them use the public houses but there was not nearly enough room for all and argument arose between the Governor, who backed Loudoun, and the Assembly, which did not care whether they had shelter or not. The winter dragged on; many soldiers were lying on straw in outbuildings, sick, and dying from exposure. Loudoun erupted; either shelter would be given or he would send down another entire regiment and quarter the whole lot in private homes, with no arguments taken. The Assembly relented.

In New York the privates were put in barracks but the officers were left to shift for themselves. Loudoun demanded something for them. The city council was afraid of inciting the populace and the mayor tried to argue with Loudoun. Roared the Earl:

God damn my blood! If you do not billet my officers upon free quarters this day, I'll order here all the troops in North America and billet them myself upon this city!

To show he meant it, he arbitrarily assigned six men to the home of Oliver DeLancey, brother of the late Acting Governor. DeLancey swore at them; this got him six more, compliments of Loudoun, and very likely a reminder there were many more where those came from. The city took the hint and raised a fund to provide lodgings. In Boston there was no difficulty; the troops were put up in Castle William and given what they needed.

Loudoun planned to assault Quebec in 1757 and asked the four New England provinces for 4,000 troops. He got four different proposals in return. Finally the Colonies did agree to Loudoun's figures but although the troops were promised by March 25, none were ready. Where Governors were agreeable, Assemblies balked. In the south, there was delay; Pennsylvania and Maryland came through with nothing at all. New Jersey sent only half; only New York was ready with the required number, on time.

In spite of all this, Loudoun was to finally impose some degree of military unity on the Colonies. Under him, for the first time, the commander in chief was able to order troops to go wherever he wanted them on the frontier. He also increased the strength of Rogers' Rangers to several companies and made them part of the regulars. But the Colonies did not like him; they had grumbled at his request for 4,000 men yet when Pitt asked for 20,000 the following year, with the Colonies to bear only the expense of clothing and pay, the Assemblies voted all he wanted. They were helped along, no doubt, by Loudoun's removal and by Pitt's assurances that Parliament would pay some compensation for the expenses they were to bear.

In less than 20 years the troops that had fought side by side would shoot at each other. For the British soldier, warfare was his way of life. For the Amer-

ican colonist, it was an unpleasant interruption of his regular routine.

The Continental Congress was to have thrust upon it, by Lexington, Concord, Ticonderoga, and Bunker Hill, the greatest concentration of military-political power ever wielded by a national legislature. It was endowed with the vaguest and most uncertain authority at its creation, yet, events of the times, and expectations of the people of the colonies, decreed that it take up, albeit somewhat unwillingly, the total responsibility for creation of the American Republic.

Three of Adams' letters show, after a fashion, the gradual awareness of what was coming to pass. With schoolboy exuberance, he would write to Abigail on May 29, 1775, that:

... The military spirit which runs through the Continent is truly amazing. This City turns out 2000 Men every day. Mr. Dickinson is a Coll.—Mr. Reed a Lt. Coll.—Mr. Mifflin a Major. He ought to have been a Genl. for he has been the animating Soul of the whole.

Coll. Washington appears at Congress in his Uniform and, by his great Experience and Abilities in military Matters, is of much service to Us.

Oh that I was a Soldier!—I will be.—I am reading military Books.—Every Body must and will, and shall be a soldier.

On June 17, again to Abigail:

The Continent is really in earnest in defending the Country. ... I have found this Congress like the last. When We first came together, I found a strong Jealousy of Us ... but the longer We sat, the more clearly they saw the Necessity of pursuing vigorous Measures.

By July 24, again to Abigail; the full impact had struck:

The Business I have had upon my Mind has been as great and important as can be intrusted to One Man, and the Difficulty and Intricacy of it is prodigious. When 50 or 60 Men have a Constitution to form for a great Empire, at the same Time that they have a Country of fifteen hundred Miles extent to fortify, Millions to arm and train, a Naval Power to begin, an extensive Commerce to regulate, numerous Tribes of Indians to negotiate with, a standing Army of Twenty seven Thousand Men to raise, pay, victual and officer, I really shall pity those 50 or 60 Men. ...

In line with the unexpected, Congress first duties were predominantly military. In line with the matter of unpreparedness, the delegates had, collectively, among them, only the skimpiest of military experience to draw upon:

George Clinton of New York had served as lieutenant of rangers in the Fort Frontenac expedition of 1758.

Eliphalet Dyer of Connecticut had been appointed a captain of militia in 1745; he became major in 1753; as lieutenant colonel he led a Connecticut regiment at Crown Point; in 1758, as colonel, he had a regiment of Connecticut volunteers raised for the defense of Canada.

Edward Biddle of Pennsylvania had been appointed ensign in the provisional army in 1754; he rose to captain before he resigned in 1763.

Nathaniel Folsom of New Hampshire was a captain in Colonel Blanchard's regiment during the French and Indian wars and had served as major, lieutenant

colonel, and colonel of the 4th regiment of New Hampshire volunteers.

Francis Lewis of New York had gone to Canada with General Mercer, as an aide, during the French and Indian wars. Captured at Oswego, N.Y., he had been taken to France as prisoner.

Richard Caswell of North Carolina had commanded the right wing of the North Carolina militia, under Governor Tryon, at the Battle of Alamance River in 1771, where the Regulators, backcountry insurgents, were defeated.

Henry Middleton of South Carolina had been appointed an officer of horse of the provincial forces in 1743.

Robert Treat Paine of Massachusetts had served as a chaplain of troops on the northern frontier in 1755.

And, of course, George Washington, standing out from the rest in his buff and blue uniform of colonel of the Fairfax County, Va., militia. He had more experience than the rest of them put together, but was sour on the military, was not convinced of the need for armed resistance, and had not even drilled militia for 15 years.

There was among the colonial militia a wealth of tactical skill and experience gained in the French and Indian War, not to mention numerous border skirmishes with Indians, or civil rebellions such as Caswell had experienced. But most of this had been gained fighting on the side of the Crown, with the resources of the British Empire at their sides or backs. Events had put these resources facing them, over leveled musket barrels. For the Americans, their plight was summed up by Freeman in one sentence:

Staff, command, army, equipment, supplies—all these had to be created from nothing!

Yet, the "embattled farmers" stood—sometimes—and ran away—sometimes—as they had done before. Some of them made very good soldiers. Some of them made middling to fair soldiers. Some of them made poor soldiers.

But they got the job done.

PRIVATE HELP

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, James N. Sites, a consultant to the USIA, a director of the Town Affiliation Association and a vice president in charge of the Washington office of a major public relations counseling firm, has suggested some ideas for private, people-to-people communications on behalf of a better and more peaceful world.

This is Mr. Sites' commentary in the May newsletter of the National Capital Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America, Inc.

The commentary follows:

PRIVATE HELP

(By James N. Sites)

A professional communicator can hardly rub up against the foreign scene today with-

out coming away with the conviction that America now needs private assistance as never before if we are to have any real hope of attaining international stability and building a better world. Public relations people especially are in a unique position to contribute such help.

Last September I had the opportunity to serve as public member on a U.S. Information Agency inspection mission to Sweden (partly because my wife is from Oslo and we've virtually commuted to Scandinavia over the past 25 years). And I came back with precisely this feeling. That current world conditions demand we do a far better job of opening up wider channels of private, people-to-people communications.

Everywhere in my exploration in Sweden, as well as in Norway and Denmark, I was struck by the critical depth of changed attitudes toward America in general and toward U.S. foreign policy in particular. Years of bitter criticism of our Indochina agony seems to have injected a permanent poisoning into the attitude stream of responsible segments of public opinion throughout the world.

Even close foreign friends were found seriously questioning our motives and methods. The old mystique of an America that is infallibly good and fair in its dealings with others seems to have been destroyed forever. Government credibility is particularly challenged. (Obviously, this mystique could never have been wholly valid in all cases in the first place. But so long as people generally did not question it seriously, it served U.S. diplomacy remarkably well.)

With the decline in U.S. influence on other nations' actions and the demise of automatic acceptance of U.S. policies, our foreign relations activities must be played on an entirely new stage. More than ever, the state of foreign public opinion toward American policies becomes the decisive factor in shaping foreign government decisions.

Most urgent from the PR professional's viewpoint, however, hyper-critical attitudes abroad seem to this observer to call for expanded and more effective use of non-government resources in informing overseas publics and key foreign target groups. As almost any informed foreigner will tell you, this nation's greatest asset—its most persuasive spokesman—is the individual American. And expanded exchange programs are the surest way to bring this asset into greater play.

Fortunately, a great deal is already being done through both private and government channels in this respect. As examples, the USIA helps bring many foreign newsmen to the U.S., and the State Department's International Visitors program has introduced many key foreign leaders to America. However, the volume could and should be vastly increased outside government channels.

I returned from abroad last fall convinced that professional organizations and private groups of all sorts could play a much more important role in the ongoing battle for the hearts and minds of people. It is not difficult to arrange exchange programs—for professional expertise and problem-solving information, as well as for people—among communications leaders and journalism educators, among labor officials and business interests, among culture-oriented people and such key professionals as lawyers, doctors, economists, sociologists and city planners.

One practical channel for achieving this end lies in the "Sister City" program of the Town Affiliation Association, which now includes over 380 U.S. communities in regular exchanges of people and materials with counterpart communities around the world. At least 20,000 people traveled under TAA auspices last year. As a TAA volunteer, I can attest to the fact that help from PRSA members and chapters would be welcomed, both in generating local publicity and in helping

foreign visitors get a depth picture of the varied aspects of American life.

TAA recently received the endorsement of major U.S. news groups for implementing a worldwide Journalist-to-Journalist exchange program. Once underway, this will provide new opportunities for public relations professionals to cooperate on common goals with American press and civic leaders in Sister Cities throughout the nation.

In summary, today's tumultuous world has created great need for expanded private participation in foreign affairs. Interested public relations people can obtain information on joining this effort from TAA at 1612 K Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006, or, in regard to other groups, from the Office of Private Cooperation, Bureau of Educational & Cultural Affairs, Department of State, 2201 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20520.

SAGINAW, MICH., IS DOING SOMETHING ABOUT URBAN DECAY

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk these days about urban decay, and a lot of money being spent on finding a cure for this malaise commonly found in our major urban centers. One such project is currently underway in Saginaw, Mich. Although Saginaw is not in my congressional district, the man who planned this innovative project, Mr. Gray Graham is a constituent of mine from Waterford, Mich.

Mr. Graham first outlined his bold and imaginative plan before the Detroit Yacht Club several years ago. There were no takers at first; the idea simply did not conform to traditional thought when it came to renewal projects. But he persisted, and ultimately found willing allies in Saginaw, who saw the plan as a practical way to bring new life to their city.

I believe Mr. Graham and his associates have perfected a format for the development of urban renewal areas in our country. Proof of the pudding, so to speak, is a program currently under construction in the city of Saginaw, Mich.

What makes the Saginaw project so unique?

First. Ten local businessmen agreed to finance a feasibility study for a new downtown mall, and provided the capital required for equity and/or front working monies.

Second. Saginaw city officials and department heads cooperated to the fullest which encouraged the investor group.

Third. A total redevelopment plan was designed, to be rebuilt in stages, before an early land acquisition was requested from HUD. Because of the Saginaw system, a merchant will open his new facility the same day he closes his old. Then the old facilities are demolished and space provided for other tenants.

Fourth, in order for any new shopping area to succeed a major or anchor tenant is needed. In Saginaw, a local, independent department store did not forsake downtown for a new mall just outside the

city. A long-term lease was signed and other tenants secured.

Fifth, now for the financing. Three Saginaw financial institutions agreed to underwrite the project by providing the construction loan and a \$5 million mortgage. With financing secured on the first phase of an estimated \$40 million project, construction began November 1, 1971.

Mr. Chairman, I commend Mr. Graham and his associates for their non-conformity in leading the way toward the eventual rebirth of downtown America. A man with a practical plan has succeeded in Saginaw, and I have great hopes that other cities in Michigan and throughout the country will benefit from Saginaw's example.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD at this time the original speech as given before the members of the Detroit Yacht Club in 1967, as an example of original and innovative thought. I would hope that other communities with problems similar to Saginaw's will benefit from this idea.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS OF GRAY GRAHAM, DETROIT YACHT CLUB, May 5, 1967

Much discussion has centered recently around the declining importance of our nation's cities' business districts as retail centers. With business moving to the suburbs, retailing in many of these central business cores is at an all time low.

The major problem presently facing the central business districts, including Detroit, is its failure to meet the demands (i.e., parking, easy accessibility, etc.) of the new social order created by the mobility of the automobile.

All of our country's major cities were built before the turn of the century during our horse and buggy era. In 1910, for example, there were 7,000 vehicles in America, compared with 90 million today. Yet, in our central business districts today, we still have essentially the same streets and the same layouts for driving that were used by the buggy.

Detroit has, however, like most other cities, created a network of expressways to move the automobile in and out of the city, but, by virtue of this convenience, it began the rape of the central core area and its neighborhoods and created a mass exodus to the suburbs. This exodus will continue until the central city core and its neighborhoods rise up to meet the challenge of suburbia. This challenge can only be met by creating facilities and conveniences that will keep the middle and high income classes from fleeing the central city, and by making the "downtown" climate one where all can live and work in harmony.

The exodus to suburbia is creating in Detroit and other major cities throughout the nation a chaotic condition—one where the poor begin to outnumber middle and higher income groups, one where the tax base withers and the demand for city services increases, i.e., police, fire, welfare, health, and so forth.

But let us not forget that the plight of our center cores and their neighborhoods will soon be shared by suburban communities unless they, too, wake up to their responsibilities.

Today, there is an obvious need for the alteration of many Metropolitan and Urban Business Districts to salvage them from a present state of functional obsolescence—the doorway to blight. Blight is a disease. Just as physical diseases spread and destroy, blight does, too. It destroys the taxable value of the land it strikes.

Blight can be controlled and prevented in the same way that many diseases are prevented—by isolating the problem and treating it. To do this requires action by new facilities. New facilities will generate a new climate, a new spirit, and a new prestige.

The Spira-Mart is a bold and imaginative new concept, combining civic-cultural-recreational—and living facilities—with retail areas that have adequate parking and efficient expressway transportation facilities.

Due to limited acreage and high land costs in the central urban cores, the Spira-Mart concept is designed to make optimum use of available areas by building upwards—in short, a vertical neighborhood. Within the Detroit designated model city boundary, the Spira-Mart should be seen as a civic and public spirited enterprise rather than just a strict commercial venture because the Spira-Mart will become the center of neighborhood life. With urban renewal, we will have social renewal—indeed, human renewal.

The power of the Spira-Mart concept is its diversity and its ability to meet the needs of a particular neighborhood. It is, of course, assumed that every neighborhood will require a commercial area with adequate services. The neighborhood means people and people demand certain facilities and conveniences, all of which will be available around, within, or atop a Spira-Mart complex. One area may require a junior college atop the parking decks, while another may need a hospital or medical-dental clinic.

The Spira-Mart masters the horizontal street by creating vertical areas with total accessibility via parking decks and high-rise facilities. Thousands of people and businesses would return to the central core and its neighborhoods if adequate and proper living facilities were available to them at prices they could afford along with educational, recreational, entertainment, and cultural opportunities.

The Spira-Mart is designed conceptually and physically with the community and its taxpayers in mind. How new monies are raised within a city will determine which way that city will grow, how it will develop and where new businesses and industries will be located. How new tax monies are raised has a major influence on how the central core will increase in population, how much it will cost its citizens to live in it, and whether or not that city will remain or become a desirable place in which to live and work. Some cities, including suburban communities, could soon actually become unlivable because of high taxation.

Just recently, a noted architect here in Detroit said that "Detroit has said 'no' to high-rise living." I cannot accept this statement. First, where in Detroit do we have high-rise living that the majority of people can afford? I believe, in fact I am convinced, that there is a tremendous market in the downtown center core and its designated neighborhoods for high-rise living facilities designed for single persons, for young married couples, and for the retired. I believe that an adequate price range of housing must be made available in downtown areas within walking distances, or at least within a minimum taxi range of employment, or near an express bus line or rapid transit system. Different price range dwelling units could be available atop the Spira-Mart and its parking decks or in adjoining clusters in order to provide a more balanced economic and social life.

I am convinced that thousands of people would enjoy and prefer a downtown or neighborhood life as we have described with convenient educational, recreational, cultural and entertainment facilities for our increasing leisure time. All of these things will be available with the Spira-Mart complex.

I am further convinced that several Spira-Mart Complexes could and should be built in the City of Detroit at strategic locations,

all linked together with the Kern Block development via an express bus system, and with each using parking decks provided by the municipal parking authority to serve not only the neighborhood but the city transit system as a whole.

If elected city officials in Detroit could unite on the Spira-Mart concept for neighborhoods, and if city departments would participate to their fullest, private capital and individual know-how would work together with federal funds to make this great city of Detroit the "Model of the World."

With the right attitude of elected and appointed officials, with the continued freedom of communication through the press, radio, TV and positive tongues, I know that leaders can unite to help change the metropolitan night mares into pleasant neighborhood dreams. These leaders can come forward from all walks of life—civic, governmental, business, cultural, religious, and educational. Nothing is more powerful than a spontaneous development of the mind. I say to the City of Detroit Keep the citizens you have and bring back many of those who have departed. I also say Look at all of the ancient great cities that are now dust or ruins. Look at the great civilizations throughout history that were. Remember, everything is people. People are the central city. The Spira-Mart is designed for people. It is not merely a shopping center developed around the prime needs of the automobile.

Design of the SPIRA-MART has been years in the making, and could not have been accomplished without knowledge of people, their attitudes their habits, their desires, AND the need of certain conveniences, all of which add up to the dignity of man and his full-life in our metropolitan cities—his desire just to be someone, to have dignity and pride, to have a respectful address.

Since the beginning of time, man has been centralized because of his right to be human, to be with people—for protection, for enjoyment, for work and for competition. The caveman, the cliff dwellers, the villagers, the city were built around a central gathering place, the old Village Square. The wagon trains that pioneered this great nation would camp in circles for the same purpose.

To design the SPIRA-MART we studied and researched schematics from ancient ruins of the Greeks, Egyptians, Romans, the medieval square of Austria, the Oriental bazar types of trade and travel from the middle and Far East; the American pedestrian oriented environment such as penny arcades, boardwalks, amusement parks, carnivals, zoos, downtowns and today's shopping centers.

We studied many methods of merchandising, ways of servicing stores, all different ways of parking, and a criterion of 21 factors for service, convenience, recreation, entertainment, living conditions and protection.

The SPIRA-MART will master the horizontal street! The Spira-Mart will create new cities within a city. The Spira-Mart will upgrade neighborhoods. The Spira-Mart, because of its multi-land uses, helps our cities grow up, not out.

The Spira-Mart will accommodate as much on a 12-acre tract as we have today on 120-acre developments. The Spira-Mart is designed for 100,000 sq. ft. of retail area or 1-million sq. ft. and, from government, all we need is cleared land at a reasonable price and faith and credit to construct adequate parking decks where needed.

We believe the SPIRA-MART is the only means whereby the small independent merchant can afford to remain in or relocate in a modern downtown.

Friends, coming together is a Beginning; working together is progress; staying together is success!

In closing, may I quote from the Book of Proverbs, "... Where there is no Vision, the Peoples Perish."

ARIZONA STATE STUDENT CHOSEN NSPA DISTINGUISHED SCHOLAR

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, it is always encouraging to see America's young people excel. It is also refreshing to see that recognition of those qualities of scholarship, perseverance, and the like are rewarded with attention. These two factors are dramatically combined by the recent award of the National Society of Public Accountants' 1972-73 Distinguished Scholar Award to James H. Strassels, of Phoenix, Ariz.

Chosen from among over 500 applicants from across this Nation, Mr. Strassels was one of 22 recipients of a \$200 academic scholarship awarded by the National Society of Public Accountants.

In addition to the scholarship, Mr. Strassels will receive a plaque in recognition of his selection as the most outstanding accounting student applying for consideration.

Mr. Strassels is a student at Arizona State University.

The NSPA Scholarship Foundation is a project initiated in 1969 by the 13,000-member National Society which represents independent public accountants. The purpose of the foundation is to provide financial assistance to deserving college and junior college students who indicate a firm intention of pursuing their accounting studies to a successful conclusion and then entering the profession of public accounting.

The other 21 students receiving scholarships this year include:

NAME, HOMETOWN, STATE, AND SCHOOL

Stanley Moschella, Lexington, Mass., Northeastern University.

Emma N. LeSaint, Bridgeport, Conn., Sacred Heart University.

Bruce W. Jester, Houston, Del., University of Delaware.

Robert B. Nolan, Philadelphia, Pa., Villanova University.

Audrey S. K. Chan, Silver Spring, Md., University of Maryland.

Kenneth M. Tweedy, Hopewell, Va., University of Richmond.

John E. Green, Boone, N.C., Appalachian State U.

Michael L. Warden, Winston-Salem, N.C., Winslow College.

David L. Moskol, Milwaukee, Wis., University of Wisconsin.

Harold A. Runkel, Brooklyn, Mich., Davis Junior College.

Robert L. Bean, Maryville, Tenn., University of Tennessee.

Danny S. Duncan, Bardwell, Ky., Murray State University.

Jeanne M. Rooney, Cameron, Mo., Central Missouri State.

Ervin Stieglmeyer, Rochester, Minn., Winona State College.

Richard R. Miller, Houston, Tex., University of Houston.

Judy G. Johnson, Albuquerque, N. Mex., New Mexico State U.

John D. Poe, Medicine Lake, Mont., University of Montana.

Bernardette W. Huston, Willow, Alaska, University of Alaska.

John L. Miles, St. George, Utah, Brigham Young University

Charlene D. Lacad, Honolulu, Hawaii, Kaplani Community College.

Lawrence K. Y. Chang, Honolulu, Hawaii, Chaminade College.

THE MOSCOW SUMMIT AND "PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE"

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the summit meeting in Moscow has been heralded by many as the beginning of a new era of "detente." The United States and the Soviet Union, we have been told, are now about to enter an age of "peaceful coexistence," and the cold war as we have known it in the years since World War II is soon to become a thing of the past.

This analysis, however, ignores the fact that when the term "peaceful coexistence" is used by the Communist leadership of the Soviet Union it represents a concept far different from the one conjured in western minds.

Discussing the Moscow summit and the Soviet policy of "peaceful coexistence," the highly respected South African journal, *To The Point*, notes that—

"Peaceful coexistence," which is the capstone of Soviet foreign policy, presupposes peace between the superstructures only while the systematic conflict at the base level continues unabated. The Vietnam war, which is a "war of national liberation" is an entirely legitimate element of peaceful coexistence. It is an attempt by the "peace-loving" (within the socialist system there is no class exploitation and thus a condition of "peace" prevails) forces of Vietnam to replace the capitalists, "reactionary" superstructure of the Thieu Government with a socialist controlled superstructure.

While Soviet rhetoric has changed in recent years, the unfortunate fact is that the Communist goal of world domination remains. It seems to the Communist leadership that such domination can more easily be achieved through "detente" than through violent upheaval and, in this sense, the softer rhetoric may be more dangerous than the menacing rhetoric of the past.

In an article entitled "Nixon Woos The Bear," *To The Point* notes that—

The men whom the American President will meet in Moscow are men of a different style and manner than Stalin or Khrushchev, but their ultimate objectives are no different and the power at their disposal is vastly superior to anything possessed by their predecessors. Nothing has changed their messianic belief that a social system which denies man his free agency is the only possible route to his temporal salvation and that beyond this nothing matters.

Those who believe that the Communist goal of world domination has abated would do well to consider the material in this article, which appears in the May 20, 1972, issue of *To The Point*. The text of this article follows:

NIXON WOOS THE BEAR

Ten days before he was due to embark on his second exercise in summitry with the communist world, President Richard Nixon

ordered a marked escalation of the Vietnam war: Haiphong harbour to be blockaded, Hanoi bombed, and inland communications disrupted as far as possible. Immediately a big question mark loomed over the president's Moscow trip. Washington observers nevertheless remained convinced that there was no real probability that the damaging of Soviet ships in Haiphong harbour would cause Russia to call off the Nixon visit because, they said, "the Russians do not allow their higher policy to be jeopardised by mere incidents".

To be sure, Moscow used the occasion of the shooting down of the U-2 spy plane in 1960 as the ostensible reason for breaking up the summit conference which had been convened in Paris, but this was plainly the excuse and not the cause for their action. The Soviets had hoped in 1960 that their military bluff following the launching of the first Sputnik would be sufficient to overawe the West into withdrawing from Berlin, which would have given the world socialist order a tremendous psychological boost.

But the US position had clearly hardened in advance of the summit and the Soviets had been given to understand that the US knew that the military balance was still overwhelmingly in its favour and that it would not be forced or talked out of Berlin or any other of its vital interests. To avoid embarrassment, the flamboyant Khrushchev raged and stormed about an incident that he would gladly have allowed to pass had the prospects for diplomatic success been at all bright.

DIFFERENT APPROACH NOW

But a different situation exists today. The Soviet definition of the term "peaceful coexistence" has been starkly and painfully underlined by the all-out North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam. Yet neither Russia's provision of military equipment to North Vietnam nor the massive US aerial and naval response against the invaders would seem to jeopardise the determination of both governments to proceed with a meeting which each feels to be in its own interests. For both sides in the cold war *realpolitik* seems to be the order of the day.

The American president's assessment of his Soviet antagonists was bluntly set forth in his annual report to Congress on the state of US foreign policy, delivered in February. "The USSR tends to view external tensions as the inevitable corollary of conflicting social systems," the report declared. "Soviet diplomacy, therefore, is prepared to accept international tension as normal and, too often, to view negotiations with the United States as a form of harsh competition from which only one side can gain advantage." Communist Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, for his part, defined USSR foreign policy in a major address on March 20 as "implacability in ideological struggle combined with readiness to develop mutually advantageous relations with states of the opposite social system."

"An improvement of relations between the USSR and the United States is possible," Brezhnev went on, "but, of course, not at the expense of some third countries or peoples, not to the detriment of their lawful rights and interests. Such is our invariable position."

President Nixon thus should go to Moscow with no illusions. Brezhnev offers none. By referring to the conflict of social systems, the president shows that he has a basic grasp of the Soviet view of the world situation. This is a remarkable step forward for any U.S. administration.

The Kremlin outlook to which the president referred is predicated on the assertion that the socialist socio-economic system, based upon public ownership of property, is in a war to the death with the capitalist

socio-economic system, based upon private ownership of property. This war of the "bases" was formally declared by the Communist Manifesto in 1848. It is irreconcilable and will go on until the world socialist system is completely victorious. The specific struggle is for control of the "super structures" of each system, which are the nation-state governments. This struggle may be peaceful, as is the progressive takeover now occurring in Chile, or it may have to be violent, depending on the "correlation of forces" between the contending systems. At the head of the capitalist system stands the U.S. government controlled by Wall Street and at the head of the Socialist system stands the U.S.S.R., controlled by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

THE VIETNAM FACTOR

"Peaceful coexistence", which is the capstone of Soviet foreign policy, presupposes peace between the superstructures only while the systemic conflict at the base level continues unabated. The Vietnam War, which is a "war of national liberation" is an entirely legitimate element of peaceful coexistence. It is an attempt by the "peace-loving" (within the socialist system there is no class exploitation and thus a condition of "peace" prevails) forces of Vietnam to replace the capitalist, "reactionary" superstructure of the Thieu Government with a socialist-controlled superstructure. U.S. military intervention in order to prevent this regrettable but understandable from the Soviet standpoint and need not stand in the way of the pursuit of a business-like *modus vivendi* between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S., provided, of course, that the U.S. recognizes the U.S.S.R.'s right to extend her own military aid to the socialist forces of North Vietnam.

Moscow's clients are on notice, however, that nothing must be allowed to jeopardize the interests or the security of the military-technical base of the world socialist system, namely the Soviet Union, whose military power serves as the guarantor that the capitalist system will not attempt to save itself by resorting to a war of military annihilation against the socialist system in the same vein as Nazi Germany's attack in 1941. So long as capitalism still exists and remains powerful, this is ideologically regarded as an ever present possibility. Soviet military forces are charged with the responsibility of not only deterring such an attack but of winning any war should the imperialists nevertheless unleash one. Consequently, the Soviet Union needs a military force equal to, and if possible superior to, any possible adversary.

LEADING FROM STRENGTH

This is the general frame of reference under which the two sides will enter the summit talks. The Soviets want no war with the United States and they want reasonably normal relations with Washington. But they feel they are leading now from a position of great strength, since their recent strategic military buildup has placed them in at least a position of military equality with the U.S., and their political power and influence has expanded accordingly. They will make no concessions in providing aid to the world socialist system, particularly to those on the fighting front in Vietnam, unless to do so would involve an unacceptable risk of war with the U.S. But they have only now been confronted with any such risk.

MEMORIES OF PEKING

Nixon's previous discussions with the Chinese will hang heavily over the Moscow meeting. The Soviets, of course, did not like the President's Peking visit. They could not and did not complain about the normalisation of relations between the U.S. and China because this corresponds to the rules of peaceful coexistence as they define them. But they are

suspicious that a deal was worked out at their expense and recognise an effort to play off China against the Soviet Union when they see one. They are ready to castigate the Chinese for any faintheartedness in support of the North Vietnamese as evidence of a betrayal of the cause of socialism.

"Many diverse views and conjectures are being expressed concerning the Peking meeting," said Brezhnev. "Views remain views, but the decisive word, I repeat, will be said by facts, actual deeds. We are in no hurry, therefore, with final assessments. The future, perhaps the near future, will show how matters stand, and we will then draw appropriate practical conclusions."

Some believe this statement was a tip-off to the fresh communist offensive in Vietnam, in which the Chinese attitude would prove revealing. There have been reports that President Nixon sought to obtain in private a Chinese willingness to try to dissuade Hanoi from launching the big offensive that was obviously in preparation, possibly as a *quid pro quo* for a more accommodating U.S. position on Taiwan.

Premier Chou En-lai is known to have had a meeting with the North Vietnamese leaders shortly after his talks with Nixon. What seems certain is that the Soviet Union, for its part, saw no reason for avoidance of embarrassment to the president on the eve of his visit to Moscow. Whether or not the Soviet leaders connived with Hanoi on the question of exact timing, their material and verbal support for the "war of liberation" in Vietnam is fully in accordance with the principles of systemic conflict.

President Nixon finds himself in no position to get them to modify this policy unless he himself is willing to throw the possibility of a direct military collusion between the U.S. and U.S.S.R. into the equation.

This is precisely the dilemma that the president and his advisors have been wrestling with as he prepares for his Moscow trip under the heavy shadow of a possible collapse of his Vietnam policy. The capitalist world already labours under the inherent strategic disadvantage that it cannot carry the systemic conflict into the enemy's camp.

Khrushchev's dictum that "what is mine is mine, what is yours is open to negotiation" has always been tacitly accepted by United States policy makers. President Nixon's principal objective, therefore, is to further narrow the definition of peaceful coexistence by persuading the Soviet Union to exercise restraint in the military component of the systemic conflict.

He would like to exclude the "war of liberation" from the communist arsenal and to obtain some further limitations on Soviet military involvements in places like the Middle East, South Asia and Cuba. He may offer various carrots such as increased trade with the U.S.S.R. as an inducement, but he also needs a stick in the form of a definite risk factor to the Kremlin if they do not comply.

MAINTAINING A FOREIGN POLICY

This is undoubtedly the reason why the president overruled the majority of his advisors who cautioned against striking Hanoi and Haiphong with the argument that he could not maintain a viable foreign policy if he did not. He had to demonstrate his resolve to the Soviets.

It will be serious enough if South Vietnam is overwhelmed by armed attack. This will prove to be a great victory for the "war of liberation" and cannot fail to encourage those elements within the socialist system who favour the violent approach to the overthrow of the capitalist superstructures.

But the prospect that it will be finally accomplished by more or less conventional invasion backed by large quantities of Soviet tanks and artillery is forcing Nixon's hand.

If a North Vietnamese victory is accomplished primarily by virtue of the assistance given by the Soviet Union, and US counter-assistance to the South Vietnamese proves insufficient to stem the advance, particularly because of any lack of will by Washington, then Nixon will carry very little clout in his Moscow negotiations.

The president had stated in advance the subjects that will be under discussion in Moscow:

An initial strategic arms limitation agreement;

The problem of the Middle East and the failure so far to reach a peaceful settlement.

The general problem of East-West relations in Europe with specific focus on a possible European security conference.

Other world friction spots with the obvious focus on Vietnam; and

Areas of possible bilateral co-operation.

The topic most certain to produce at least some kind of agreement concerns SALT. It has become quite apparent that the negotiators for both sides have reached a general meeting of minds on at least the matter of anti-ballistic missile (ABM) limitation.

Based on their earlier positions, however, this will require considerable compromise and it remains to be seen who will do most of the giving. The Soviets have an operational ABM ring around Moscow and may have the capability to upgrade their extensive Tallinn air defence system in the Western USSR to an ABM system. The US so far has no operational ABM sites to defend its Minuteman offensive missile system.

The whole question of strategic arms limitation is an extremely tricky one because of the complexities of the arms race and the uncertainties of overall Soviet strategic objectives. If the Soviet leadership calculates that strategic superiority is an achievable and useful goal then their motives in any arms limitation agreement must be highly suspect. President Nixon must weigh caution against the heavy political pressure he is under on his home front to bring back an agreement.

THE INTRACTABLE MIDDLE EAST

The Middle East remains a virtually insoluble problem. Egypt's President Sadat hurried to Moscow for yet another conference with the Kremlin chiefs in advance of Nixon, presumably to try to head off any US-Soviet agreement detrimental to Egypt.

The communique, which acknowledged the right of the Arabs to regain their lands by "other means" than negotiation, suggests that Sadat received considerable satisfaction. He preceded the trip with the announcement that Egypt had given the USSR naval bases, for the first time, and again put himself in a timetable box by proclaiming that Egypt would recover its lost territories within a year, and would do it by war.

The Soviets have so far shown themselves quite reluctant to risk a military confrontation with the US over the Middle East, but their objective of solidifying their own position in the area and eliminating that of the US remains unaltered. It will be very surprising if the president achieves any change in Soviet policy on this area.

The tone for the discussions on Europe will be dependent on whether the Eastern treaties have been ratified by the West German Parliament and on whether Chancellor Brandt's *ostpolitik*, on which they are based, is still intact. The principal Soviet goal is the convening of a European security conference which would undoubtedly be aimed at the neutralisation of Western Europe and recognition of the communist *status quo* in Eastern Europe.

THE OLD POLARITIES REMAIN

The men whom the American president will meet in Moscow are men of a different style and manner than Stalin or Khrushchev, but their ultimate objectives are no different

and the power at their disposal is vastly superior to anything possessed by their predecessors. Nothing has changed their messianic belief that a social system which denies man his free agency is the only possible route to his temporal salvation and that beyond this nothing matters. They are as determined as they have ever been to carry this system to the whole earth, and their conviction that the socialist system will finally triumph worldwide is undiminished.

The greatest mistake that any Western statesman can ever make is to suppose that communist rhetoric is nothing more than that—a mere semantic fog to mask great power ambition. It may come as a great surprise to much of the Western intelligentsia (they will, in fact, simply not accept it) but the communists do believe in communism and can be counted upon, always, to act accordingly.

Nixon in Moscow will find himself up against some very harsh competitors who know exactly what they want. He has stated the choice he expects to present to them: "Whether the current period of relaxation is to be merely another offensive tactic or truly an opportunity to develop an international system resting on the stability of relations between the superpowers." The American side will be greatly interested in trying to discover the answer to this question in Moscow.

The Soviet answer will be dictated by the requirements of the strategy of peaceful co-existence. But it will be motivated by the dynamics of the implacable death struggle between hostile social systems.

WINNING ESSAYS OF JOHN F. SULLIVAN SCHOLARSHIP WRITING CONTEST

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Electrical Industry Trust sponsors a creative writing contest among San Francisco high school students. This contest is known as the John F. Sullivan Scholarship Writing Contest and was held this year between February 6 and March 26.

The general theme was, "You have been in school during the 1960's and have witnessed many changes in the character of San Francisco, a truly urban city. Assuming you are clairvoyant, describe San Francisco as you envision it will be in the 1980's."

One hundred and fifty students entered their essays in this contest and I would like to share with my colleagues the essays of the three top winners.

First prize, a \$1,000 college scholarship went to Theresa Wynne of St. Rose Academy for her essay, "San Francisco—A Truly Urban City?"

Second prize, a \$500 college scholarship went to Amy Hershstein of Lowell High School for the essay, "San Francisco: the Third Hundred Years."

Third prize, a \$250 college scholarship went to John Mora of St. Ignatius College Preparatory for the essay, "What Was Ten Years Fifty Years Ago?"

I commend each of the winners and wish them well.

I am placing in the RECORD at this time, the full text of the winning essays.

SAN FRANCISCO—A TRULY URBAN CITY?

(By Theresa Wynne)

The premise put forth in the essay rules states, "You have been in school during the 1960's and have witnessed many changes in the character of San Francisco, a truly urban city . . ." Let us examine that statement.

If this statement is indeed true, then it must follow that Washington, D.C., is also a "truly urban city".

San Francisco dates its onset to the late 1700's, but remained a small seaport town reached only by ships sailing from the Orient, or around the "Horn". This kept San Francisco a relatively small hamlet until the gold rush of 1847-1849, when, because of its excellent port facilities it reached the status of a true city.

Let us compare San Francisco today with Washington, D.C., a city that had reached city status some forty or fifty years before San Francisco. Can we prognosticate the future of San Francisco in the 80's by a glimpse of the Washington, D.C., of the early 70's?

What about Washington, D.C. today? It has many of the attributes of San Francisco. It has a multiplicity of things to do and things to see and it ranks above San Francisco as a tourist attraction with its famous parks, monuments, and scenic beauty in or near the city. It has a heritage that antedates San Francisco's by almost a hundred years. Whereas San Francisco's main industries are finance and tourism, Washington's are government and tourism.

But what of the Washington, D.C. of today? The population of the city of Washington, D.C., is now approaching 90% blacks. The population of the city's public schools approaches 97% blacks.

Washington's educational standards in the public schools rank in the lowest percentile in the country.

The once beautifully kept and preserved homes of even the Georgetown area are now rundown and have deteriorated more in the last ten years than they did in the preceding century.

I am not racially biased and have no desire to place the blame for the Washington of the 70's on any race or color. I am stating facts as they exist.

Washington, D.C. is a city only during the daylight hours. Its crime rate including armed robbery, rape, and murder almost lead the nation. The Washington Urbanite uses his city safely only during the hours from seven in the morning until seven at night. The rest of the time his home seems an armed fortress from which he emerges only with apprehension. It has been said that Washington is the only place where the bank robbers are mugged on the way to their get-away cars.

The percentage of people on welfare compared to the productive people in the city of Washington is probably the highest in the nation. The city is kept running by federal grants, since so few people are actually paying taxes.

From being the showplace of the nation, Washington has deteriorated to a filthy, unkempt, morass.

The majority of productive people in the city during the daylight hours leave the city the moment the quitting bell sounds, not to return to the city from suburbia until daylight when they are forced to return to earn a living.

The country's memorials are now guarded twenty-four hours a day as a caution against vandalism. The new Kennedy Center on the Potomac has had to be closed because vandals almost completely destroyed it in less than a six month period.

People who go to visit Washington, D.C., leave in a depressed state of mind after they have been subjected to the municipal transport system, the fear of traveling by car after dark, the filth of many of the public areas and buildings, and the realization of the

depths that their capital city has failed. I, too, felt this way.

Is this then the future of San Francisco of the 80's?

Let us examine some of the changes within our city in the past ten years . . . the 60's.

In the 60's the ghetto areas tripled, welfare increased in the same proportion, the ratio of productive people to unproductive people continues to decrease yearly. Our crime rate, despite occasional dips, has continued to rise. Golden Gate Park, once safe day and night, now is unsafe at night and barely safe during the day. The rapidly increasing tax base has driven productive and fixed-income citizens to the suburbs, leaving the rich, the poor, and the singles within the city.

Studies show the progressive deterioration in the educational standards in the public schools in the city.

Will San Francisco continue along this route toward becoming in the 80's that which Washington is in the 70's? What factors might save San Francisco from this urban blight?

What about the remaining productive people in the City? Are they of the same mold as the people who have deserted Washington, or are the people of San Francisco the possible roadblock to the decline and fall of San Francisco?

The Embarcadero freeway stands as a permanent monument to the wrath of the true San Franciscan. It is the only freeway in the world that leads to nowhere, since to complete it would have meant that San Franciscans would have had to give up their Fisherman's Wharf, and their view of the Marina. They said, "The price is too high, take your money, stop the freeway, save OUR San Francisco."

In the "truly urban city" high rise buildings are a sign of city health. What are the San Franciscans' opinion about this? Ask the Rockefeller's, Hunt's and the other high rise financiers how easy it is to build them in the city of San Francisco today.

Will the Chinese ever leave Chinatown . . . will the Italians ever give up North Beach . . . will the San Francisco 500 ever give up Pacific Heights . . . will the military leave the Presidio . . . will the Irish leave the avenues . . . will the people preserve John MacLaren's park . . . will the cable cars ever stop "reaching for the stars"?

Do the people of San Francisco look upon their city as a robot to be controlled by them, or as a warm, viable, almost human, object of their love and affection? Is this love affair between occupant and city the roadblock to detour San Francisco from becoming a "truly urban city" in the mold of Washington, D.C.?

What are the signs that this dire prediction may not come to pass?

Most San Franciscans look at the changing skyline and echo the primordial screams of Herb Caen. Where do most of the members of the most powerful conservation club in the world, the Sierra Club, reside?

What city of today has its most famous street undergoing a face lift when it really was only starting to show signs of age? What city has eliminated the car from its major recreational area on Sunday in order to bring the family back to the park? What city has as one of its major industries the renovation of its old homes in order to keep its character intact? What is happening to the price of land and homes in the city despite the previously mentioned drawbacks to city living?

What city of 750,000 has kept its population at that level for the entire decade of the 60's? What city of that size has . . . a major symphony, opera, and ballet season . . . a conservatory theatre and a civic light opera . . . a professional football and baseball team . . . a world famous livestock showplace . . . three major art galleries, a zoo, aquarium, and planetarium . . . ten major golf courses

. . . facilities to house 25,000 delegates to major conventions at one time . . . ten of the best hundred restaurants in the country . . . free concerts for 10,000 people every week during the Summer . . . a natural seaport . . . and is surrounded on three sides by water, where even the bridges are things of beauty. What city has Mother Nature's vacuum cleaner come in "on little cat feet" each night and sweep its atmosphere leaving city air that is definitely "non-urban." . . . What city would permit 40,000 of its inhabitants to lead homosexual existences without harassment and ostracism?

It is my contention that San Francisco is not a truly "urban" city, but is instead a truly "cosmopolitan" city. Urban means, according to Webster, "Of, relating to, characteristic of, or constituting a city". Is this San Francisco, or is "cosmopolitan" a more apt description? Cosmopolitan means according to Webster, "Having world-wide rather than limited or provincial scope or bearing . . . international sophistication . . . and is composed of persons, constituents or elements from all or many parts of the world".

What then will make San Francisco of 1984 the antithesis of George Orwell's megapolis? It is my clairvoyance permitted by the other premises in this essay rules that permit me to predict that in the 80's the San Francisco skyline may, and will, change, but the spirit of its people will never change, and relationship between those people and their city will go on like Anthony and Cleopatra, a love story for eternity.

SAN FRANCISCO: THE THIRD HUNDRED YEARS (By Amy Herstein)

The city of Saint Francis, originally founded in 1776, has survived rule by four governments, vigilante groups and corrupt politicians, has braved natural disasters which might have rendered other cities ghost-towns, and has seen social change come in both its violent and non-violent forms. Yet San Francisco has become neither repressive nor anarchic. Like most cities, San Francisco has had many problems owing to its cosmopolitan nature, but that same varied nature not only has given the city a rich cultural life, but also has made San Francisco a tolerant city in intolerant times.

There is a tendency on the part of would-be clairvoyants (including) science-fiction writers and prophets of doom) to predict extremes of the future. Thus, a travel brochure of 1985 might advertise:

"Come to San Francisco, the city heated by atomic power, where pollution is eliminated by a translucent dome—the largest of its kind—covering the city. Charter one of our electric carts, or let the moving sidewalks do the walking for you."

A politician might paint a picture of utter gloom:

"San Francisco is still the city that 'knows how'. It knows how to squeeze money out of slum tenants, it knows how to cut education funds, it knows how to let the rich find tax loopholes, and it knows how to run the board of supervisors inefficiently. Vote for me John Doe, and I will correct all this."

An enthusiastic San Francisco might see the 1980's as the time for San Francisco's glory—and decide to have the city secede from the United States and become an autonomous haven for (choose one), (A) anarchists, (B) fascists, (C) anybody at all.

Finally, there is the man who predicts the imminent disaster that could come true: earthquake.

The real San Francisco of the 1980's will probably contain elements of all these visions of San Francisco. The 1980's will not be a decade in which our problems will be totally solved, but we will take great steps toward solving them.

Being a practical clairvoyant, I won't speculate on the scientific miracles that will be invented, since they take a long time to be designed and constructed for every day use. But the social character of the city, which is its life force, will certainly change in the 1980's. Here is how a child of the 1960's envisions the changes.

In the last ten years, San Francisco has lost 40,000 people; in all probability the city will not gain them back. Although many families have moved, San Francisco is not yet a "singles city", nor will it be one in the 1980's. The minority and immigrant populations of the city have grown and will continue to do so. This growth pattern is characteristic of large cities, but San Francisco will not be an urban ghetto in 1985 if it revises and expands its educational system and economic aid programs.

A growing immigration population means that more attention must be paid to those who speak English as a second language. In the 1980's, expanded bi-lingual programs and cross-cultural programs will dramatically increase all San Francisco's awareness of its many ethnic groups. A growing minority population means minority representation. There will be more Blacks and Chicanos in city government; the Oriental population of the city will continue to make its voice heard. In fact, the 1980's may be the decade of the Asian-American. In the sixties a few Asians ran for public office, and in the seventies the first massive protest was registered. In the eighties, the Oriental community will make its power felt.

The continued increase of per capita income of most San Franciscans will change the buying and housing patterns of the city, although a large amount of aid will still be needed for low-cost housing, employment and education programs.

Educational opportunity will change the economic and social aspects of the city. Educational reform will be a prime concern of the 1980's. A child going to a public school in San Francisco will have attended an integrated school; since the integration program will have been in existence for fifteen years, the problems will have been ironed out. Not only will the achievement level of the students rise, but so will their knowledge of the city and its various ethnic groups. Children who have worked, played and learned with the children of other ethnic backgrounds will have fewer adjustment problems in high school; they will also carry their friendship and understanding of these other groups into their adult lives and will promote better understanding of all races. And in getting a better fundamental education, all children will have a stronger interest in, and a better chance of, pursuing higher education.

The process of education itself will change. Assuming there will not be a lack of funds, San Francisco will experiment with different types of education. A partially central, partially district school system will allow for specialized schools. Because all high schools will be centrally located, students will select a "home" school, but will work in conjunction with the schools that specialize in a particular field. Using the college system of longer classes, students will attend the specialty school three days a week and have time to commute from one school to another. The other two days would be used for other courses, or for work programs.

There would be continuing programs involving students and the community. To see what fields interest them, students will work for a certain amount of time. For example, those interested in zoology will work at the zoo, those who want to go into construction will join a crew, and those who are interested in special education will work in a center for the handicapped.

Students wanting to learn another language will have the option to choose an exchange program within the city; they will

live for a term, with a family that speaks the language the student is learning. Or, a student could choose a "total immersion" course at an advanced level, in which all the student's classes would be taught in the language he was studying.

Children who have found their education meaningful will be less apt to commit crime. Furthermore, an education that prepares its students for entry into the working world will produce a generation whose skills will preclude the unemployment now facing young people.

The children born in the fifties and sixties in San Francisco will have witnessed a generation of social protest; those born in the seventies will be educated in the ways the reformers fought for. What impact will these children have on the social and political aspects of San Francisco?

By the time 1985 rolls around, students now graduating from high school will be able to hold city offices. If this generation is true to the causes it espouses, and it gets in power, there will be a number of changes in the physical and social makeup of the city.

The concerns of the eighties will not be dramatically different from those of the sixties; if changes are not made in the seventies, the problems will be intensified in the eighties. Perhaps the first thing a "young administration" will do will be to make the city safe from natural disaster. The eighties will be a decade of buildings which are as fire-safe and earthquake proof as possible. The city government will legislate the use of only nonpolluting cars, and certain taxes will be levied on those industries contributing to pollution. All manner of incentives to make the city more beautiful will be promulgated.

The aforementioned educational reforms will be instituted, as well as special programs to encourage small and minority-owned businesses.

Poverty, injustice, unemployment, urban blight and crime will not be eliminated in San Francisco in the 1980's. But they will be lessened, thanks in a large part of revised educational systems and economic aids. The social conscience of the city will grow. And San Francisco will continue to be a beautiful and exciting city in which to live.

WHAT WAS TEN YEARS, FIFTY YEARS AGO?

(By John Mora)

In its growth a city is very much like a young child. From her birth she reaches out: wanting, taking, leaving, growing. In her eager search for instant immortality she accepts all in the name of progress. With an accelerating sprawl, her tentacles reach out in search for the resources to aid in the continual expanding boom. Growth continues until a death-wish is envisioned, which encircles further unwarranted progression. At this point the city reaches adolescence, and must come to a conclusion upon her destiny: to grow and choke within herself, or to strive for a progressive, yet checked, future. The transition from youth to womanhood follows many problems. Many are caused by the early thrust for total progressivism, while others are formed within the womb of her present culture. Even in her mellowing maturity she faces many adversities, yet her solutions to these problems becomes the key to her sovereignty among the great cities of the world.

San Francisco's growth has been extremely limited by her conforming boundaries. The youthful excitement which was once the Barbary Coast's is lost within the reality which has prevented further urban expansion. All too suddenly San Francisco saw her growth hindered by her mother, the Bay and the seas which partially surround her. This self-realization led to a sobering maturity; yet, left her the problems of adolescence which had unpurposely passed her by. She sought her destiny and to the present seeks her in-

dividuality within a forest of sprawling giants.

The prison which checks San Francisco may become her blessing. Unlike many of her counterparts, she has not the ability to sprawl unquestionably. While other cities spread, she is caged. The sprawls now attributed to blooming metropolises may become in part the death of the city as the cultural and residential nucleus. What becomes of rapidly expanding communities is the degeneration of the inner city, and in all likelihood the decay will increase daily in similar proportion to the new growth. In the end there will be the skeleton of the city caused by the urban nomadic impulse, solely leaving the remnants of Troy by outlined communities. San Francisco, however, has not the ability for further expansion. This stunting of the city's circumference allows for internal rather than external retribution. The result will be the redevelopment of the sections of the city which were the byproducts of our primary expansion, as San Franciscans hastily attempted to restore the devastated hulk of a city torn asunder by nature. The first step on the long line to restoration has been taken on the Market Street Project which will leave us one of the truly beautiful avenues of the world. Thus, our inability for further expansion will allow San Francisco personal fortification from within.

The first step towards San Francisco's "Renaissance" will be the resetting of the exodus of her populace, a problem facing major cities throughout our country whose residents are fleeing the blight and congestions of the decaying core, seeking the greener pastures of suburbia. The suburbanite is becoming disenchanted with the mile after mile of look alike gingerbread houses in impersonal "communities", and the twinkling magic of the new San Francisco will call the expatriate back. An equilibrium will be reached and there will be an increased demand for housing within a desirable environment. This will lead to the construction of high density developments which will be completed with a more conscientious attitude towards land planning, allowing the preservation of open space as is logically possible. High density, however, will not necessarily dictate high rises. A more satisfactory solution would be the extensive use of the "low rise", five and six story developments being held in conjunction with the redevelopment of the rundown districts. This would in turn rather than entangling us within another string of track houses would untie the knot that chokes San Francisco's throat.

In every community transportation and communication must be the axis for cultural, industrial and residential improvement. Of all feasible forms of transportation in the 1980's BART will definitely have the foremost impact upon San Francisco and therefore the Bay Area. As a result of this new link there will become an office-commercial-residential corridor that will line the BART route. This will have a similar effect on the Bay Area as the L.A. freeways have had in joining Southern California into one conglomerate empire, without the detrimental side effect of wide use of the combustion engine. At this point San Francisco will become the hub within a tightly knit cluster of urban communities all within a short train's distance from any singular point. Our unavoidable leadership role will lead to unavoidable necessity for the high rise. This does not necessarily mean the "Manhattanization" of San Francisco, since one can avoid the bleakness attributed to the mountainous edifices constructed for the sole purpose of office space. Through careful regulation parts of the downtown will be diversified from the dilapidated hotels to the aesthetic building which will aid in the formation of a new skyline which will not distract from the serenity of the views that bless San Francisco.

There is an uncertain future for a man who lives in the past. One cannot achieve by repeating history, but rather by dwelling into the future. It is a blind man who faces tomorrow with yesterday; a blind city which expects to thrive as it was, and is, and hopefully always will be. We cannot live solely on past glories we must go beyond admiration, for a fool admires, while a man of sense approves.

VIETNAM—THE PUBLIC IS NOT FOOLED

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been saying that the people of our country are sick and tired of this war and want out.

The administration would like to create an impression quite to the contrary. Like all other escalations, they would like to think the public believes that the mining of Haiphong Harbor is a way to end the war, not to expand it.

Well, the people have been fooled by the politicians running this war long enough—and they are beginning to catch on.

I insert at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Bob Aronson of WDAY radio and television in Fargo, N.D. Mr. Aronson's remarks are quite revealing in light of the clamor to back the President—right or wrong—into the dismal swamp of more escalation, more war. His letter follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., May 22, 1972.

DEAR SIR: Please pardon this impersonal way of communicating, but because each member of the congressional delegations of the Dakota's and Minnesota will be receiving a copy of this, I have no choice.

I am the host of "Viewpoint" a telephone talk show on WDAY radio each day from 8:45 to 10:00 A.M. As in other parts of the country the war in Vietnam has long been a hot topic. As you know President Nixon recently announced the mining of Northern Vietnam harbors along with interdiction of foreign shipping and increased bombing of the north. He coupled that announcement with a proposal that would have us out of Vietnam in four months if our POW's are returned.

Now to the point of this letter. Giving the preceding information to the audience, impartially and without editorial comment, I asked for signed postcards expressing either Confidence or No Confidence in the president's action. In three days I received about 11 hundred replies from over two dozen surrounding counties. In some cases two or more members of a family expressed their opinion on a card so our total number of replies was 1174. The breakdown was as follows. 397 people expressed confidence in the president's action while 777 said No Confidence.

Now I'm not trying to pass this off as a scientifically conducted public opinion survey, that it is not. But, of those people who responded to my query these are the results. Furthermore coming from a rather conservative area, I think it is a rather significant commentary.

I don't expect that these figures will have any great impact on the administration, but please feel free to use them in any way you desire.

Sincerely,

BOB ARONSON.

RESOLUTION OF ALASKA LEGISLATURE REGARDING TRANSPORTATION

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, as you know, one of the continuing difficulties confronting the State of Alaska is the availability of transportation which is capable of fulfilling the tremendous needs of a State as large and diverse as Alaska. Two recent resolutions by the legislature of the State of Alaska bring out specific problems in this area.

The first relates to the requirements of the Airport and the Airways Development Act of 1970 regarding airport operating certificates. In this resolution, the legislature makes clear the established need of the State of Alaska for increased Federal participation in the financial support for the improvements which are necessary to meet the requirements of that act.

In the second resolution, the curious situation relating to discriminatory Alaska-to-Europe airfares is illuminated. In that resolution, the legislature asks only that the Alaska-to-Europe excursion fare should be at least the same rate as that enjoyed by persons departing from Seattle. Of course, it is obvious that the rate should be substantially less. The resolutions follow:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 135: RELATING TO THE FINANCING OF THE IMPROVEMENTS OF AIRPORTS IN THE STATE OF ALASKA

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the State of Alaska has the responsibility for one of the largest number of fixed airports of any single entity; and

Whereas the requirements of the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970 regarding airport operating certificates will require extensive construction and improvement of airports in Alaska; and

Whereas Alaska has unique problems due to the remote location of many of its airports and the high cost of construction in the state; and

Whereas the cost of these improvements will constitute a severe hardship and economic burden on the State of Alaska;

Be it resolved that the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to enact legislation increasing the share of the United States cost of approved airport development projects in the state under the Airport and Airways Development Act of 1970 to 95 per cent of the allowable project costs.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable John A. Volpe, Secretary of Transportation; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman, Senate Commerce Committee; the Honorable Harley O. Staggers, Chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; 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.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 133—RELATING TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AIRLINE EXCURSION FARES FROM ANCHORAGE TO EUROPE

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas there is a published excursion fare

from Seattle to the major cities of Europe if one stays not less than 22 days nor more than 45; and

Whereas Alaska has not been granted such a fare and this results in a highly discriminatory and inequitable situation for persons who board European-bound flights in Anchorage; and

Whereas this discrimination is best illustrated by the fact that a passenger boarding a flight in Seattle and making a direct connection on a flight to Europe over the Pole and back pays \$208 less than a person boarding the flight in Anchorage; and

Whereas there is no reason apparent why Alaskans should not be granted the privilege of visiting Europe under at least the same published excursion fare rate as that enjoyed by persons departing from Seattle;

Be it resolved by the Alaska Legislature that the International Civil Aviation Organization and the Civil Aeronautics Board are urged to take all immediate and necessary action to grant Alaska a published Anchorage-to-Europe rate for a 22 to 45 day stay.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; the Honorable Secor D. Browne, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; the Honorable Bernardus T. Twight, Secretary-General, International Civil Aviation Organization; 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.

WASHINGTON REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN BOB PRICE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my policy to publish a weekly news report to keep my constituents advised of my activities in their behalf. The following is the text of my latest Washington Report:

SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM DECISION

I support the President's decision to mine Haiphong Harbor and to cut off supply lines to North Vietnam, and I believe that a majority of Americans agree that this course of action is both correct as well as long overdue.

In support of the President's efforts to end the war and in order to show the Communists that the American people do support the President through their elected representatives in Congress, I co-sponsored a House Concurrent Resolution which states that, when adopted, it would be the sense of Congress that a complete withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam should be accomplished within four months after—

(1) the establishment of an internationally supervised cease-fire throughout Indochina, and

(2) the release of all American prisoners of war held as a result of the present conflict in Southeast Asia.

The President's proposal lets the Communists know a couple of things in crystal-clear terms—first, that we are willing to withdraw our forces but second, that we will do so on our terms and not as the result of military defeat at their hands.

The proposal is reasonable and one that I believe the Communists would do well to accept since, in my judgment it is as generous an offer as we are going to make.

COTTON GROWERS ASSISTANCE BILL

I introduced legislation last week that would permit cotton growers who are victims

of crop losses due to causes beyond the control of the producer to use the average county yield for that crop year in figuring participation levels in the USDA's cotton program during the next three years.

Producers are already protected from losses to their cotton crops if the loss is due to natural causes. My amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act would extend assistance to producers whose cotton loss is due to man-made causes that are accidental.

In view of the high costs and risks and low profit margins associated with agricultural operations these days, I believe this bill would serve the interest of cotton growers by protecting their established yields, and I hope it will receive prompt, favorable attention by the Congress.

SURE CURE FOR A KILLER

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, the May issue of Reader's Digest contains an excellent article on blood transfusion and its nemesis, serum hepatitis. The author, Mr. James R. Miller, shows the hazards of commercial blood, which has been proven 10 to 70 times more likely to infect the recipient than volunteered blood.

Mr. Miller recognizes that commercial blood banks have sprung up to fill the gap left by our shortage of volunteer donors, and he urges each citizen to give blood regularly.

If enough people read this article and take its advice, many of the problems in blood transfusion could be solved immediately. Unfortunately, a much more intensive educational effort will likely be necessary to inform the public of the need for more voluntary blood donors. The National Blood Bank Act, H.R. 11828, which I and 86 of our colleagues have introduced would provide for such an effort and would bring some badly needed supervision to blood banking in the Nation.

I commend the article from the Reader's Digest to my colleagues' attention:

SURE CURE FOR A KILLER

(By James R. Miller)

Serum hepatitis is a liver-ravaging disease that attacks an estimated 60,000 Americans a year, kills about 6,000, and is sharply on the increase. For its treatment there is no effective medication, and for its prevention no proven vaccine. Yet it could be virtually wiped out—and soon—if more of us were willing to volunteer a gift of blood. For the disease is spread mainly through transfusions of contaminated blood—most of it from commercial blood banks.

Each year, some two million Americans are injected with whole blood or various blood components. Usually, the blood used is safe. But about three percent of those transfused develop serum hepatitis.

At onset, with its fever, aches and nausea, the disease suggests a bad case of flu. But within a week the telltale jaundice appears, signaling liver damage. The more fortunate victims are exhausted and incapacitated for weeks or months, often hospitalized. But in about ten percent—particularly persons over 40—the liver destruction is so great as to cause death. Serum hepatitis is not to be confused with "infectious hepatitis." Both are liver inflammations, but the latter, which

is spread by contaminated food or water and in person-to-person contact, is the milder of the two. It is rarely fatal.

Although scientists are hard at work to develop a vaccine for serum hepatitis, most researchers think it will take from five to ten years to come up with a reliable one. Consequently, an intensive effort is now being made to test blood before it is used in transfusions.

The blood of hepatitis carriers contains a factor called Australia antigen (first found among Australian aborigines). There are five or six techniques for detecting this antigen, but even the best is no better than 25- to 30-percent sensitive. Says Dr. Saul Krugman, of New York University Medical Center, "I would rather be given untested blood volunteered by a friend or relative than tested blood from a commercial source." It is clear, then, that until such time as we have a vaccine or a dependable test we can vanquish serum hepatitis only by getting rid of contamination in our blood banks.

Why do we face such a problem? The answer can be found in our haphazard system for collecting blood. In most areas, blood banks rely on paid donors as well as volunteers. They have to, because there is a chronic shortage of blood from volunteers, particularly in our large population centers.

Of the eight million pints of blood collected in the United States last year, about half came from volunteers and half from paid donors. The portion from paid donors is steadily increasing. The vast majority of these donors are "professionals," who for a weekly or monthly fee sell their blood to commercial blood banks, hospitals and pharmaceutical firms. The rest are "walk-ins," who sell wherever and whenever they can.

Most walk-ins come from Skid Row, where unsanitary conditions and drug addiction prevail. (Serum hepatitis enters the bloodstream through a break in skin or membrane. Drug addicts who share contaminated needles account for many new cases.) They sell their blood, often repeatedly, because they need the price of a bottle, a fix or a meal. They are the main suppliers of the commercial blood banks, which pay them \$5 to \$10 a pint, then resell to hospitals for \$25 to \$35 a pint.

The impact of paid donors can be devastating. A report published in the magazine *Transfusion* shows that, in a New York City test from mid-1969 to early 1970, the serum-hepatitis antigen rate in blood from commercial banks averaged 12 times higher than that in blood from volunteer sources. Many commercial banks try to screen their donors. They check them against health-department lists of known or suspected disease carriers. In addition to local lists, there is now the nationwide Red Cross Donor Surveillance Register, recently established in Alexandria, Va. Computerized and available to all collecting agencies, it receives weekly reports on known or suspected hepatitis carriers and maintains a master list which is fed back regularly to the agencies. They ask them if they ever had hepatitis, malaria or syphilis. They observe them carefully for signs of alcoholism, jaundice and needle punctures. But health-department lists are never complete, and straight answers to health questions are not easy to get from people who need cash badly.

Can we do anything to protect ourselves? Yes, we can stop serum hepatitis where it most often starts, by drying up the supply of high-risk blood from commercial blood banks. But we should know how to proceed. Commercial blood banks are now filling a need for blood created by our own inaction. If they should be put out of business tomorrow, the threat to patients who need blood would be far greater than the threat now posed by serum hepatitis. Thus, the answer is for us to volunteer enough free blood to remove the excuse for commercial blood banks' operation. Ninety million Americans are qualified by age group and

physical condition to give blood. If as few as 10 or 12 million gave each year, there would be no need to rely on commercial blood—and there would be no shortages.

Blood giving is safe: anyone (except pregnant women) between the ages of 18 and 65 and in good health can donate blood without risk as often as four times a year. It is easy: a single prick of the needle is the only discomfort. And the whole procedure takes only half an hour.

There are some 9000 nonprofit blood banks in the United States, 6000 of them run by hospitals. The American Red Cross, largest and most experienced blood collector in the country, operates 59 regional blood centers, with 1646 participating chapters. These blood banks and agencies can be located via your telephone book, or through your family doctor or local hospital. All you need do is mark a date on the calendar, then go and give.

Our resolve to volunteer may be strengthened if we ponder three remarkable records. In Great Britain, all blood donations are voluntary and made with no reward beyond a cup of tea. There is no shortage of blood, it costs the recipient nothing, and serum hepatitis is practically unheard of. In Seattle, known around the world for its centralized nonprofit agency which collects tests, processes and supplies the 32 hospitals in the area with 100-percent volunteered blood, the serum-hepatitis rate is much lower than that of the country as a whole. In Connecticut, where all blood donations for the past 22 years have been voluntary and have been collected by the Red Cross, the incidence of post-transfusion serum hepatitis cases is about one tenth the national rate.

Great Britain, Seattle and Connecticut have no better testing methods than any other communities, and no monopoly on altruism. They simply made up their minds that they wanted good blood, and established systems that encourage people to give it. Surely we have it in us to match such performance on a national scale.

RAPPORT, INC.

HON. NORMAN F. LENT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 13, I had the pleasure of attending an open house of Rapport, Inc. of Bellmore and Merrick, N.Y. Rapport is a community-supported drug education program and, under the leadership of its president, Mrs. Joan Herman, it has a great deal to be proud of.

I have long been an advocate of drug education to teach young people the dangers of drugs before they experiment and become irrevocably involved. Some of my colleagues may be interested in the activities of Rapport:

It runs a storefront facility where "rap" sessions are held for teenagers. These sessions are led by experts in the field of behavior, and over 100 students attend them each week.

It sponsors a recreational program for all senior high school students on a continuing basis each week. Activities include athletics, movies, music, dancing, discussion groups on diversified subjects and informal conversation.

It sponsors an elementary recreation program utilizing many high school students in a supervisory capacity.

It schedules programs for community

organizations emphasizing the role of parents in preventing the misuse of drugs.

It arranges "koffee klatches," conducts workshops, seminars and "rap" sessions for concerned adults.

It offers a "hot-line" service for those who have a drug problem.

Rapport seems to be working because both the adults and the students in the community believe in it. Last year over 2,000 adults participated in Rapport's door-to-door fund raising drive; nearly 1,500 students per week participate in its recreational program; and several hundred cases are handled each year through the "hot-line" service.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that Rapport's program is working in my district, and I would strongly recommend the establishment of similar programs in other communities throughout the country.

JOHN J. NASCA PRESENTS A CHALLENGE TO CHANGE

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, John J. Nasca, president of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce—a chamber that has been fighting to improve the Buffalo economy under tremendous pressure, gave a great speech recently before the civic luncheon sponsored annually by the Buffalo Kiwanis Club. John Nasca is a leader who is not afraid to stand up and say what needs to be said in order to improve his community and country. His speech deserves the attention of not only New Yorkers concerned about a more progressive business climate but all who want to help create more jobs and greater prosperity for our people.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this time John J. Nasca's outstanding speech. "A Challenge To Change":

A CHALLENGE TO CHANGE (Remarks of John J. Nasca)

Thank you. As one of the rotating sponsoring organizations, the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo is to be commended for perpetuating the civic luncheon. And you in the audience are to be commended for your support of an event which is a unique showcase of community leaders, people who care about making this metropolitan Buffalo area even greater than it already is.

In working with these leaders and asking for their assistance, I have found that most of them—if challenged severely enough—respond with a capability that surprises even themselves. That's what I'm going to try to do today—challenge you and the rest of this community to reach out toward ambitious goals, and create a stable climate of change.

If that sounds incongruous, I don't intend it to be. Suggested changes of any kind in a plodding community are traumatic, and usually are greeted with a wringing of hands. Suggested changes in a dynamic community, though, are examined in their proper perspective because dynamic communities have to change to stay vibrant.

And so, translated into descriptive community terms, a stable climate of change can be defined as flexible, responsive and open-minded, but a community with a solid base from which to operate.

In past years, guest speakers on this occasion usually have touched on the highlights of the past year, statistics, and forecasts for the future. I will, too, but most of my remarks are intended to stimulate thinking and possibly to suggest new directions and priorities.

I am, as you all know, an unabashed booster of Buffalo. I push hard for the area because I believe in it and its future. Today, I begin to push harder with a challenge to change.

The economic equilibrium wasn't the steadiest in Buffalo in 1971 but a lot of positive things happened. The auditorium was expanded into one of the showplaces of major-league sports, and we finally committed ourselves to a new stadium.

Planned community developments are springing up in the suburbs and on the west side, rapid transit moved closer to reality although it still lacks sufficient funding, and a nearly 90 million dollar health care facility is under construction near Meyer Memorial Hospital. All steps in the right direction.

The strides of progress, though, sometimes aren't stretched as far as they could be. We would challenge business and industry to furnish more expertise to assist public administrators with the latest business techniques of management controls. And we challenge public administrators to call upon business experts who, up until now, have been a virtually untapped resource. I am suggesting that local business and industry provide a pool of loaned executives for this purpose. And I am also recommending that heads of companies who believe in the proposed Little Hoover Committee to review all possibilities for further efficiencies and economies in state government should, if possible, make available a high-ranking executive to serve on this committee for 12 or 18 months. Names submitted will be forwarded to the governor for appointment to the committee. The only way this state can bail itself out is to establish long range fiscal goals set by experts.

Legislators have to change their attitude about the state budget and make do with what they have. That's what business does... why should the state be different?

All these schemes for trying to wipe out the State's deficit—the deferral of State aid payments and revenue sharing among them—are only stopgap measures which put off the crisis for a few months. Unless the State stops spending, we'll be in the same fiscal mess a year from now. Public officials must face up to the disparity between needs and available resources.

How expensive is it to do business in New York State? Taylor Instrument of Rochester recently calculated the cost of setting up a new division in a variety of locations and projected what the net profit would be in each one based on fixed annual sales of 6½ million dollars. At the present location, the net profit would be 2.2 per cent; at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, it would be 4.9 per cent; at Roanoke, Virginia, 6 per cent; at Charlotte, North Carolina, 6.1 per cent and at Fayetteville, Arkansas, 7.3 per cent. Draw your own conclusions.

The only way to overcome these deficiencies is to offer firms inducements to locate—and to stay—in New York State.

Start by revising the State law to increase the tax investment credit from its present level of 1 per cent to 5 per cent. The State says that the investment tax credit in 1969—the latest year for which information is available—meant a saving to business and industry of 5½ million dollars. In 1970, the figure is expected to amount to 6 million dollars.

If this investment tax credit were to be increased to 5 per cent, this would result in a total saving of 30 million dollars for business and industry, and would be a substan-

tial form of encouragement to firms already located in New York State to remain and expand here. New jobs will be created and new revenues generated.

And the tax laws also need revising to exempt production equipment—such as Bethlehem Steel Company's open hearth furnaces—from property tax so that firms will be competitive within their own industry.

Profits in New York State are particularly hard to come by because in many cases, the costs of goods produced in this State are higher than goods produced elsewhere. Unemployment insurance in New York State and workmen's compensation account for a substantial portion of the cost of doing business. On top of these items is an inflated tax structure which almost makes us non-competitive. All of this needs reviewing, and not in a let's-go-through-the-motions sequence.

Another thing. When will wages again be equated with productivity? Maybe we should take a longer look at how we can motivate people so that their productivity increases, especially in the public sector where increasing productivity is at the heart of any drive to slow the costs of urban services.

We need to look more closely at the new technology available in such labor-intensive areas as trash collection, police and fire departments, park maintenance and recreational services. In some cities, for example trash collections cost \$49 per ton, yet the same functions can be performed by private collectors at \$17.50 per ton.

Maybe this labor-management syndrome where each plays a dispassionate role needs change. Maybe employers should realize that employees, too, have a vested interest in the company and maybe, with the same reciprocal open-mindedness, employees should be more cognizant of an employer's problems.

And maybe city and county government should look to programs like PERT—performance evaluation, review techniques. Areas where management science can be applied in government are numerous, and it's up to us to single out these areas. With management science comes not only more efficiency at a reduced cost, but it can be structured so that incentives are included at every level, and there are no dead ends. I would challenge that the public sector stress incentive programs and managerial flexibility to make better use of its work force.

Until now, I haven't touched on chamber of commerce projects which we think will contribute to metropolitan Buffalo's growth.

But I do want to make mention of them without going into detail, except on the first item. I'm referring to our advocating the construction of a new jetport and rehabilitation of Greater Buffalo International Airport. Present facilities when properly improved will be adequate until 1980. By then, we will need a new airport.

We are not here to quibble over site location, only to emphasize that we think the airport should be located in Erie or Niagara County. And we would strongly urge that the studies be completed quickly so that construction can begin within the next six months.

Also at the chamber we are:

Developing a program to aid area industries entering international trade.

Starting to implement a tourism program to attract—and retain—visitors.

Promoting a large-scale cleanup campaign. Considering formation of a business political action group.

Suggesting a review of Erie County building codes and subsequent establishment of uniform licensing for remodeling contractors and general contractors.

Surveying the local labor supply to determine needs of area businesses, to project a foreseeable skill shortage and to help remedy it by identifying employment growth industries.

Organizing special seminars-workshops to aid small businessmen.

Calling personally on executives of companies who have indicated interest in expanding or relocating in the Buffalo area. Some 50 local business leaders have volunteered to make the calls, giving the Chamber of Commerce—free—a 2 million dollar team of super salesmen.

This is only a smattering of our specialized activity. Our constant activity is acting as watchdog to protect the interests of our members and of the community.

Like recommending change when it comes to the Taylor law so that the taxpayer is adequately represented at the bargaining table... and contracts are hammered out instead of handed out.

A recent survey by the Bureau of Labor Statistics showed that many public employees receive higher wages and more benefits than their privately employed counterparts. When this climate exists, it's hardly an incentive for business and industry to expand and/or locate here.

A moment ago I referred to trash collection and its cost. Trash collection is only the first part of what has become one of our prime environmental problems, and that is solid waste disposal.

Business realizes that control of pollution from a variety of sources is a definite part of doing business. In tackling the problem of pollution control, we can make use of the Erie-Niagara Regional Planning Board study of all disposal methods by employing the latest scientific, engineering, managerial and computer techniques. We must also explore the re-use of materials through innovative recycling methods and by making use of available land and equipment.

By treating environmental cleanup as a personal campaign, you'll be surprised at the satisfaction you'll get just from doing your small share. A simple project like setting aside empty bottles and taking them to a recycling collection depot makes you feel as though you have at least made an effort to improve the environment.

Packaging grass clippings and other litter, cleaning sidewalks, washing your car, keeping your house neatly painted, and reducing noise to a level which does not rock your neighbor off his summer lounge chair are other small but thoughtful contributions which can instill pride in the community and help clean up the environment.

(Pause.)

In the next ten minutes of my talk, I'm going to touch on areas affecting our pocketbooks and suggest some fiscal remedies which we think make sense.

Aware that the Nation's bill for education went from 27 billion dollars to 70 billion between 1960 and 1970, I propose two partial solutions to the problem.

1. That the State's education and legislative leaders give serious study to a deferred tuition plan for public and private colleges in the State.

2. That local school districts consider adopting a 12 month school year.

Regarding the deferred tuition plan: If such a plan were adopted, then tuition would be charged as a loan against the individual student, who would then repay the loan only after graduating and reaching a specified income level.

The benefits? The State university would be in a position to increase tuition to an amount more accurately reflecting its true cost; no student would be denied a college education because of financial inability to meet that cost; the State university would no longer be selling a "cut rate" tuition in competition with private colleges.

In addition, the billions saved could be used to expand sorely needed education facilities such as medical schools; because repayments of the loans would be based on earnings in any given year, only those who

could afford repayment by whatever standard established would be called upon to repay.

Regarding the 12-month school year, which, incidentally, probably could muster up plenty of lobbying support if mothers of school age children were approached in late August, when the tremors set in. The school year would be expanded to 200 days and vacations would be staggered for individual groups so that during any learning period, a portion of the students would not be in attendance. If 20 per cent of the student population were on vacation at all times when a school was in session, the school would need only 80 per cent of the space and equipment necessary under the existing system. Experiments with the continuous learning year have proved that it provides more efficient education by eliminating the retrogressive impact of long summer vacations.

The Fleischmann Commission's report on the quality and cost of financing elementary and secondary education will be released in the near future. We will be watching it closely and hope its recommendations will help stem the rising costs.

As a more immediate step, I will meet with all school superintendents on January 20 to discuss cooperative measures so that business and industry will have a closer effective relationship with the educational sector.

Our public and private colleges must establish closer working relationships so that their facilities can be operated more efficiently. Surely, empty dormitory space and empty classrooms in some private colleges could be utilized by public colleges, a businesslike move which would favorably influence businessmen upon whom the colleges depend for financial contributions and advice. And surely we must reconsider curriculums which put too much emphasis on the liberal arts and not enough on technical training.

In the last few minutes of my talk, I challenge the city and the county to put their fiscal houses in order by exercising restraint and re-examining their priorities. We recommend that the new county executive take a hard look at budget allocations, and we are confident that substantial reductions can result from the expertise which he has put into practice as a businessman. If you recall, the Erie County budget calling for a 48 million dollar increase to 266 million dollars was criticized by the Chamber of Commerce.

We are also recommending that Erie County's fiscal year be changed from a calendar year to one which will coincide with the New York State fiscal year starting April 1. Instituting this change will not only eliminate the necessity of making the budget public immediately after election but will reduce the change of the budget being passed by a lame duck legislature. And it provides a better estimate of the State-aid monies because it corresponds to the State fiscal year.

When speaking of fiscal responsibility, I challenge each of you to make your views known to your elected representatives about spending. If the Federal Government were to seize all individual income over 25 thousand dollars a year, there would be only enough additional money collected to run the Government four days. If all income over 10 thousand dollars a year were taken, the Government could continue at its present rate for 24 days.

On the State level, if the total State payroll were discontinued for the next 12 months, the State still would be unable to erase the projected State deficit of 1.5 billion dollars through March, 1973.

Does this tell you something about our spending programs?

Please keep in mind, though, that adversity often produces a rebirth of activity. It can happen here, and we must make it happen here. We must weld various interests into a unit of disciplined action so that we all benefit.

Someone once said, "a city is fundamen-

tally a state of consciousness" and I wholeheartedly agree. Cities can be healed, streets can be clean, neighborhoods can be safe, government can operate with efficiency and compassion.

You might be saying, "I am only one out of a million" but you are one. It means promoting smiles and happy talk. It means bringing a new spirit into offices and shops, replacing the "what's in it for me" attitude with a feeling of "how can I give more of myself to this work?"

It means voting for principled public servants and helping in their campaigns. It means creating a treasure map of a prosperous, orderly, clean, honest and safe city and then doing everything you can in mind and action to make that dream a reality.

All right, we have laid in on the line. We at the chamber are going to continue to promote—and prod—the metropolitan Buffalo area because we believe in it—and in its future.

Of all our assets, we think the most outstanding one is our people. With that introduction, we present the latest advertising program to acknowledge what makes us great.

Ladies and gentlemen, "You are Buffalo." (Lights dim, stage curtain opens to show billboard, and first radio spot plays while screen is lowered and newspaper ad is flashed on the screen. Newspaper ad will be removed and lights go up as soon as second radio spot is finished. Then speech resumes.)

These were two of our six radio spots, our billboard ad and one of our newspaper ads. You will be seeing and hearing a lot more about this program. But please don't just look at it and hear it. Think about it.

And think about your stake in this community. You, and your organization, and your business firm, and your neighbors, and your friends can be the forces who skyrocket this community to a pedestal of greatness.

Thank you for your patience and for your attention. Good afternoon.

SAFETY FIRST CLUB OF MARYLAND CELEBRATES 16TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, the Safety First Club of Maryland, of which I am a member, had the opportunity of hearing an address by Ejner J. Johnson, administrator of the Maryland State Motor Vehicle Department, delivered at their 16th anniversary "Leader in Lifesaving" banquet.

Since these remarks are of paramount interest and significance to Marylanders as well as citizens in other parts of the country, I would like to take this opportunity to insert Mr. Johnson's address at this point in the Record:

REMARKS BY EJNER JOHNSON

Judge Edgar P. Silver, William J. Ryan, David Gordon, Maurice R. Shochatt, Reverend Clergy, Distinguished Guests and Ladies and Gentlemen:

The other day, after I had returned home from my office, I received a call from Washington, D.C. The caller—Dr. William Haddon, now President of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety and, formerly, the first Director of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, this Country's top ranking safety agency.

Since Bill Haddon became president of the

Insurance Institute, he and I discuss various safety projects from time to time and, using his research resources and personnel and the Maryland Motor Vehicle Administration's records, we study the efficacy of new programs and the efficiency of existing ones.

Knowing that I had served as chairman of Governor Mandel's Task Force to develop a system of Periodic Motor Vehicle Inspection and aware of the difficulty the proposal encountered at the State Legislature, Bill was anxious to advise me of recent findings in Maryland.

A study, he said, made by the Insurance Institute in cooperation with Johns Hopkins University and the Maryland Medical Examiner's Office revealed that at least 600 deaths occur Nationwide as a result of defective auto exhaust systems.

Bill said that he personally thought the figure of 600 deaths was conservative; that more likely at least 1,000 people, mostly youngsters, die each year while sitting in parked vehicles in the open air—not in garages—simply because the exhaust system is defective and deadly carbon monoxide fumes are permitted to seep into the passenger compartment.

Who dies? The hunter who crawls into the back seat of his station wagon seeking an hour's sleep before dawn and who leaves the engine idling and the heater on for warmth.

Who dies? The late-working salesman who, after a few drinks, elects to park on the side of the road rather than drive and leaves his engine idling and the heater on for warmth.

Who dies? Your daughter and my son and their two friends who park to say goodnight after a date.

Perhaps the greatest tragedy is that a few months ago, we had the opportunity to end this senseless destruction and we rejected it.

And, considering the reception that was given to the periodic motor vehicle inspection proposal developed by Governor Mandel's Task Force at the last session of the General Assembly, I doubt seriously that the program will be enacted in the near future.

I have always shunned the evangelical approach to the General Assembly; rather, I have preferred to develop a body of evidence, an overwhelming array of facts, to support a proposal designed to benefit society by reducing deaths and injuries on our highways.

But we live in a society where man is becoming increasingly insensitive to his fellow man and perhaps it's time once again that we become our brother's keeper.

We live in a society that will permit an inexperienced young man to drive a school bus loaded with high school football players with faulty brakes and faulty transmission to the top of an 11,000 foot mountain in Colorado and then express its regret and sorrow when six young men get killed.

We live in a society here in Maryland that will permit 400,000 unsafe and potentially unsafe drivers to operate on our highways simply because re-examination of all drivers once every four years is an inconvenience.

We live in a society which tolerates a system of teaching driver education in our public schools that is geared to the economic interests of public school driver education instructors and not to the needs of our children; that actually denies 58 per cent of Baltimore City school children who are eligible for driver education the opportunity to take the course because the cost is too high.

We live in a society where manufacturers are more interested in bumpers for cosmetic rather than safety reasons; where labor is more interested in permitting a professional driver to accumulate 30 points on his driving record in a two year period—the equivalent of ten reckless driving convictions—than it is in the development of programs designed to make the roads safer for professional and other drivers.

We live in a society where the insurance industry spends millions of dollars in public

service advertising encouraging citizens to support State compliance with Federal highway safety standards; which spends hundreds of thousands of dollars sending lobbyists to Annapolis to testify on no fault insurance proposals and other industry matters and then fails to send even one representative to support bills on driver re-examination or periodic motor vehicle inspection or driver education or a proposal tightening the existing law to control the drinking driver.

We live in a society where dump truck operators are more interested in the cost of covering a load with a tarpaulin than they are in the rock flying through your windshield.

We live in a society that has placed a higher priority on prestige license plates than it does on human life and we have to change that.

The question, then, is: What can we do? Perhaps of paramount importance is the continued development of evidence to support those programs that are beneficial to public safety—evidence so overwhelming that opposition to the programs no longer is significant enough to block an idea whose time has come.

In the past, there is no question in my mind that most supporters of highway safety programs ran into difficulty simply because they lacked the evidence to support their contentions. Generally, highway safety programs were enacted because common sense dictated that the program would save lives. Proponents of the program wanted it simply because they "felt" it was a good program.

This is no longer adequate.

Unquestionably, the greatest benefit which this Nation has derived from the passage of the National Highway Safety Act in 1966 is the increasing emphasis that is being placed on research.

This research has led to Federal requirements that automobiles be equipped with such items as collapsible steering columns, side marker lights, windshields that don't cut and tires that don't blow out.

This research has led to the development of a significant body of evidence to support the 16 highway safety standards developed by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and with which Maryland and all other states must comply.

I know now that driver re-examination will improve Maryland's highway safety posture because studies in New York and Massachusetts indicated that 22 and 23 per cent of those states' driver populations flunked the first driver re-examination.

Apply that percentage in Maryland and you can see why I suggested that there are 400,000 unsafe drivers operating on our highways at this moment. Pennsylvania enacted driver re-examination to end situations in that state similar to the ones where an elderly gentleman, almost blind and being guided while driving by an eight year old boy, struck a tree and was killed.

The problem we faced with driver re-examination in Maryland is the fear that many of our citizens—mostly the older ones—harbor. To them—re-examination means a loss of license and isolation because over the years we did not have the foresight to develop a balanced system of transportation; mobility to many means motor vehicle and loss of license means loss of mobility.

Re-examination does not mean automatic license loss. Many of the drivers who failed the examination in New York and Massachusetts did so because they did not realize that their eyesight had weakened. With corrective lenses, the license was restored but with the appropriate restriction. Some, in New York, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, secured the return of their privileges but with the restriction permitting daylight driving only.

It is true, however, that some did lose their privileges and undoubtedly, this created hardships. But I am quite sure that many people—including the sons and daughters of

those whose driving privileges were not restored—breathed a sigh of relief.

These people were removed from Harm's Way and so—to a very large extent—were drivers who shared with them the highways of New York, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

There are 12 drivers in Maryland who are 100 years of age or older.

There are one quarter of a million drivers in Maryland 65 years of age or older.

Half of our driver population, including since two weeks ago, your Motor Vehicle Administrator, is 40 years of age or older.

None of us are required to be re-examined because Maryland is a mail order state. Simply fill out the form, send in two dollars and you are on your way.

Driver re-examination is the only effective tool I know of that will permit the Motor Vehicle Administration to identify an unsafe driver before rather than after a highway death or injury.

Under existing law, I must rely on letters from concerned relatives or notes from dedicated law enforcement officers and judges. Mostly, however, I learn too late by reading in the newspaper, as I did last week, that a man in his eighties and his wife were killed instantly after their vehicle travelled through a stop sign and was struck broad-side by a police car.

I think we can do better than that.

In answer to the question—What Can We do?—I offer the following:

Support actively the legislation that will end the existing system of mail order license renewals once every two years and replace it with a four year license issued only after the applicant has successfully completed an examination of eyesight at least.

This proposal was considered at the last session of the General Assembly, passed the House of Delegates and got two-thirds of the way through the Senate before being killed. It had the active support of but one group—the Senior Citizens of Maryland.

What else can be done?

Unquestionably, alcohol is still the leading cause of deaths on the highways of the Nation. Alcohol, in some way, contributed to half of the almost 55,000 highway fatalities in 1971.

The misuse of alcohol by drivers and pedestrians results in 28,000 deaths and approximately 800,000 crashes in the United States each year. The relative probability of a fatal crash at .10 per cent blood alcohol concentration is about eight times that when there is no alcohol in the blood. When the blood alcohol level is at .15 per cent, the probability of an accident is more than 25 times that of no alcohol present in the blood.

The aim of both Federal and State highway safety agencies is directed primarily toward the problem drinker. These individuals represent about seven per cent of the driving population that is believed to cause approximately one-third of all driving fatalities.

It is not my intent here to suggest that the drinking driver be treated as a criminal. Quite the contrary. The drinking driver is a medical problem and our attempts should be geared toward identifying the drinking driver and attempting to rehabilitate and not punish him.

The knee jerk reaction of the typical highway safety buff is to suggest a crackdown on the drinking driver by stiffer fines, jail sentences and longterm loss of driving privileges which, in my opinion, are all the wrong things to do.

Historically, the stiffer the penalty, the more difficult it becomes to obtain a conviction.

The basic thrust of our efforts to control the drinking driver is aimed at identification and rehabilitation, no punishment. If penalties become more severe, if laws are enacted mandating the denial of driving

privileges for long periods of time regardless of progress toward rehabilitation then convictions become more difficult to obtain and identification of the drinking driver equally more difficult.

Not long ago, I had the privilege of addressing a group of law enforcement officers who were about to become involved in the Alcohol Safety Action Project currently underway in Maryland. In the question and answer session, one officer complained because all individuals convicted of operating motor vehicles while their abilities were impaired by alcohol were not given automatic 60-day suspensions of their driving privileges, the maximum permitted by law. The question dismayed me, somewhat, because it illustrated, once again, the widespread notion that driver license revocations and suspensions were punishments in addition to the fines or jail sentences meted out by the Courts. In fact, they are not. Suspensions and Revocations are tools used by the Motor Vehicle Administrator to encourage efforts at rehabilitation.

At the Motor Vehicle Administration, our aim is to first identify the drinking driver and then to remove him from the highway during the period of time that addictive counselors attempt to effect his rehabilitation. If rehabilitative efforts fail, the revocation remains in effect; if they succeed, then driving privileges are restored with the appropriate restriction and with constant monitoring by MVA's Medical Advisory Board to guard against a relapse.

A revocation of privileges which continues in effect can quite properly be construed as a failure on the part of a Motor Vehicle Administrator and not on the part of the troubled drinking driver. I have no patience with motor vehicle administrators who constantly boast of suspensions and revocations as if the number measured effectiveness. It is more accurately a measure of lack of effectiveness.

What can we do?

Well, certainly we should all support the proposal to reduce the level of intoxication in Maryland from .15 to .10 per cent and the level of driving while impaired from .10 to .08, which will be considered by the Legislative Council this summer.

In so doing, the State's ability to identify the drinking driver will be greatly expanded. In July of 1969, two significant highway safety laws became effective in Maryland. The first required that, as a condition of obtaining a driver's license in Maryland, a person must give his written consent to submit to a chemical test for blood alcohol should he be arrested for driving under the influence. The second law established the crime of driving while impaired. Prior to July 1969, the monthly rate of convictions for driving under the influence in Maryland was 219. Since that time, the monthly rate has increased to 421—almost double.

By reducing the level of intoxication to .10 and driving while impaired to .08, our ability to identify an even greater number of drinking drivers will be significantly enhanced.

Perhaps we should also seriously question the wisdom of a law that mandates the withdrawal of privileges and, thus, results in fewer convictions and hampers our ability to identify the drinking driver.

While I am not prepared to recommend such a course of action at this time, I do suggest that it be given serious consideration at a time in the future when the State has a sufficient number of addictive counselors and a solid program to chart a course of rehabilitation for the drinking driver.

What else can we do?

Let's re-examine our driver education program to insure that it is adequately funded. Studies by Governor Mandel's Task Force indicated that a substantial portion of the

funds for driver education were derived from fees on students.

Isn't it ludicrous that our driver education program has reached such a state that we charge students a fee to learn not to kill one another. And isn't it even more ludicrous that many students can't afford the fee and are denied instruction that may save their lives.

Let's re-examine our driver education program to insure that it's available on an equitable basis to all children in Maryland. Why should a child in Howard County have to pay \$40 for a course that is available free in the schools across the line in Montgomery?

Why should children in Baltimore City and Anne Arundel County pay more than \$30 for a course that's available free in Dorchester?

Let's also re-examine driver education to insure that it is doing its job. Isn't it odd that this program has been in effect for so many years and yet there isn't a single solitary person in the entire country who can offer solid testimony that driver education saves lives despite insurance company claims to the contrary.

Hopefully, the Legislative Council will be examining task force recommendations on driver education and perhaps the legislation to correct these defects will fare better in the future than it has in the past.

I suppose from my remarks that many of you feel that the highway safety effort in Maryland has as many holes in it as those defective exhaust systems we can't detect because we lack periodic motor vehicle inspection.

Actually, in relation to sister states, Maryland does pretty well—we rank fifth in the Nation in the fewest number of deaths per 100 million vehicle miles travelled and we scored what one newspaper described as a B-plus in an evaluation of a program by the United States Department of Transportation.

But we can and we should do better.

Because of the recent emphasis on research, we are developing the facts that, heretofore, we lacked. Perhaps we should regain a bit of the evangelical zeal that characterized the efforts of our forebearers.

Perhaps a combination of the two will work. It's the least we can do.

THEY'LL MARK 50TH MILESTONE WITH DRIVE TO AID RETARDED

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I was edified to read recently in the Newark News of the admirable manner in which Dr. and Mrs. Jack Schaffer of East Orange, N.J., are observing their 50th wedding anniversary on June 4. They have asked that this memorable event be celebrated by contributions to the "Rose and Jack" scholarship fund of the Essex unit of the National Association for Retarded Children. What in fact could be more golden than brightening the lives of retarded children?

I know that our colleagues will join me in commending Dr. and Mrs. Schaffer upon their action which reflects the generous and compassionate spirit that has guided their lives. I congratulate them upon their remarkably full and useful careers and wish them many, many more years of happiness together.

The article in the Newark News follows in full:

THEY'LL MARK 50TH MILESTONE WITH DRIVE TO AID RETARDED

(By Elizabeth Weller)

Golden gifts are traditional for 50th wedding anniversaries, but Dr. and Mrs. Jacob Schaffer of 320 S. Harrison St., East Orange, who will arrive at the marital milestone June 4, want cash.

They ask that the money be contributed to the "Rose and Jack" scholarship fund of the Essex unit of the National Association for Retarded Children. The fund helps provide summer vacations at Camp Hope, Hanover, for retarded children.

Camp Hope, established about 10 years ago, offers an educational-recreational program. Language, arts, motor perceptual activities, music and swimming programs fill the days. Many of the staff members are trained and experienced in special education.

The Schaffers hope to boost the number of scholarships available through donations given at their anniversary celebrations. One will be held at the home of their daughter, Mrs. Leonard Howard of 8 Winding Way, West Orange, on June 4; another at the Schaffers' home on June 11.

Helping retarded children has been a favorite project of the couple. They were involved in the founding of the Essex County Association for Retarded Children, a parents' group. Formally organized in 1950, it was the second such group established in the country.

"We have a retarded child," Mrs. Schaffer said. "She is in a private institution in Pennsylvania, but I wanted to learn how other parents coped."

Under the group's influence, a recreation center for retarded teen-agers, which offered day trips, dances and other activities, was started in Temple B'nai Abraham, Newark, in 1950. Similar centers now exist in Bloomfield and East Orange as well.

The mothers in the newly formed group also started a school aids workshop, producing button and lacing boards to teach retarded children how to dress themselves, and teaching them how to use commonplace items like dishes, glasses, dresses and combs.

The organization also opened an occupational training center in a storefront in Valley Road, Maplewood. The center has since grown with the aid of the Cerebral Palsy Center in Belleville. It is now located in a former factory building in Orange.

A day care center in East Orange is another outgrowth of the group's efforts. Here, children who are not adaptable to public school are taught cooking and handicrafts and, Mrs. Schaffer said, "are accepted and loved."

The group's activities prompted the organization of the Essex County Association Clinic for Retarded Children, 62 Walnut St., East Orange, which offers diagnosis and advice to parents through a psychiatric staff.

The Schaffers, both born in Newark, were married in Temple B'nai Abraham on June 4, 1922. She is the former Miss Rose Nussbaum.

Dr. Schaffer, a past president of the Essex County Dental Society, is an alumnus of the University of Michigan, where he was a member of the Omicron Kappa Upsilon fraternity. He is a member of the National Academy of Dental Medicine, the Newark Dental Club and the Alpha Omega Dental Fraternity. Some years ago he developed a dental technique for relieving the symptoms of punctured eardrums.

Mrs. Schaffer, an artist, has work in the permanent collections of the Montclair, Rutgers College and Springfield (Mass.) museums and the Smithsonian Institution, as well as other places around the country. She has been the recipient of many awards and is listed in Who's Who in American Art and in Who's Who, American Women.

SEX DISCRIMINATION IN BANK LOANS AND CONSUMER CREDIT TRANSACTIONS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mrs. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article in the May 6, 1972, Business Week entitled "Women Now Want Credit Liberated." This article is just one more indication that there is a real need to reform laws that give support to antiquated attitudes about women and financial transactions of all sorts.

The article follows:

SOCIAL ISSUES—WOMEN NOW WANT CREDIT LIBERATED

When Barbara Fox, an assistant professor of business administration at Boston's Simmons College, married Robert Ash last July, she dutifully asked her creditors to change the name on her accounts from Barbara Fox to Barbara Ash. Some ignored her, others sent her new cards imprinted Mrs. Robert Ash, and still others sent credit applications—to be filled out by her husband. Bankamericard and Master Charge went a step further. They wiped out her credit. "I simply stopped receiving bills," says Mrs. Ash. But Mr. Ash did not stop receiving bills. Bankamericard and Master Charge opened new accounts in his name (although he had his own old accounts), complete with the balance of his wife's former accounts.

Mrs. Ash's story will be one of many told by wives, widows, divorcees and the organizations that represent or sympathize with them at hearings May 22 and 23 before the National Commission on Consumer Finance, a unit established by the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968. The witnesses want banks and retailers to grant women credit in their own right instead of insisting that the accounts depend on their husband's credit.

BILLIONS OF DOLLARS

With \$27-billion outstanding in retail and bank credit cards last year, large sums of money are clearly at stake. Representative Bella Abzug (D-N.Y.) has drafted a bill that would prohibit national banks, federally insured savings and loan associations, and federal credit unions from discriminating on the basis of sex or marital status. And several proposed state laws seek to apply the prohibition to both financial institutions and retailers. Such bills would make it easier for widows, divorcees, and working wives to get credit, thus presumably increasing sales but possibly complicating the policing of credit. Even without legislation, retailers fear, just talking about discrimination may shift consumer allegiance from institutions that withhold direct credit from women to those that grant it.

At this point in history, there are far more of the former than of the latter. "Under the law in most states today, any woman who is married, has been married, or who may even get married will find that credit, like domicile, follows the husband," says Mrs. Lynn Litwiler, national task force director on taxes and credit for the National Organization for Women. NOW will be represented at the commission hearings, together with the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Labor Dept., and the American Civil Liberties Union.

CREDIT AFTER DEATH

Some of the testimony may have a grisly tinge. Miss Jean Stapleton of the Los Angeles chapter of NOW plans to pass along the tale of an elderly neighbor who was unable to obtain credit after her husband's death because nothing was in her name. "So she keeps

using her dead husband's credit cards," Miss Stapleton says. "Apparently a man who's been dead for a year has better credit than a woman who is alive and working."

Divorced or separated women also encounter trouble. Says a Chicagoan: "After my husband and I had been separated for eight months, I applied for a Union Oil credit card. My father had to sign as responsible for my debts in order for me to get an account." Ten months later, the same woman was turned down for credit by Sears-Roebuck, Standard Oil, and J. C. Penney. "I refused to lie about my marital status because I have always been responsible for my own debts," she says. "But I can't establish credit if they won't give me accounts."

MARRIAGE COUNSELING

One of the few controlled experiments in the field of credit discrimination was conducted by the St. Paul (Minn.) Dept. of Human Rights, which selected a man and woman with identical financial and personal credentials (including the fact that each was the sole support of the family) and dispatched them to the area's banks to borrow \$600 for a used car. More than half the banks refused to lend the woman money without her husband's signature or consented only as a special favor after a good deal of elaborate explanation. Several bankers even expressed concern about the marriage, asking the woman why she wanted to buy a car without her husband's consent.

The man had better luck. Many of the banks that had refused to waive the cosignature requirement for the woman agreed to do so for him.

Mrs. Michael Battles, a Labor Dept. attorney, conducted her own informal survey by applying for credit at all the major retailers in Tyson's Corners, a Washington, D.C., suburban shopping center in Virginia. Though she earns more than \$19,000 a year and pays her bills promptly and in full, she drew turndowns from the Hecht Co., Woodward & Lothrop, and Lord & Taylor. "Naturally," says a spokesman for the Washington, D.C., Credit Bureau. "No store in town would give her credit in her own name. That's the policy."

BAFFLING LAWS

Even where that is not the policy, word does not always seep down to the credit office. "We absolutely, positively do not discriminate," says Robert Bruton of the Bank of Virginia's Springfield office. "We'll grant credit to a married woman, to anyone who is creditworthy."

But economist Linda Helman of South Arlington, Va., found otherwise when she and her student husband applied for a Master Charge card at the bank. Mrs. Helman says bank officials told her that they could not take into account her \$11,000 salary in determining their ability to pay (unless she were a nurse or teacher), and her husband's income under the GI Bill was clearly inadequate. "They didn't even bother to check our credit rating," Mrs. Helman says.

Although some retailers will give a married woman her own credit card under pressure, most concede that they don't like it. "One type of account per family is recommended for less confusion," says a Sears official.

Other retailers say they are unsure of the laws concerning a married woman's financial responsibilities, an explanation that gets an unsympathetic response from women's rights activists. "As a general rule, a man is responsible for his wife's debts, but I know of no law that absolves a woman of responsibility for her own debts just because she is married," says one woman attorney. "In Illinois a married woman is just as responsible for her husband's debts as he is for hers. And no Illinois retailer bases a man's credit on his wife's income."

THE MS. BUSINESS

Off the record (and occasionally on), creditors cite other reasons for denying married

women their own credit: They might quit work to have babies or when their income was no longer needed at home. Both reasons made better sense before so many women became permanent, intentional members of the work force, say women's rights activists. Some retailers also fear that a married woman who wants to establish credit in her own name has something to hide—such as a deadbeat husband.

Although villains will unquestionably outnumber heroes in the testimony presented by women's groups, there are indications that an egalitarian approach to credit is beginning to emerge, especially in the New York area. George Beatty, president of B. T. Credit Co., a subsidiary of Bankers Trust-New York Corp., which holds the bank's BankAmericard franchise, says flatly: "We treat all potential cardholders alike. If they have incomes of their own, they stand on their own."

And at Bloomingdale's, a New York department store, James Kassas, director of accounts, reports that the store is working on a policy for women who apply for credit as Ms. "We aren't quite sure about all this Ms. business," says Kassas. "But if a woman has her own financial power, she should have her own account."

TWO COMMENTS ON THE SOVIET UNION

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring two recent articles about the Soviet Union to my colleagues' attention.

The first is from the May 8, 1972, issue of a fine British newspaper, *The Manchester Guardian*, and concerns Soviet activities against the dissident "human rights movement."

The second article appeared in the *Washington Post* on May 28, 1972, and contains excerpts of an interview with George Kennan, a former American Ambassador to Moscow and well-recognized Soviet expert. Ambassador Kennan comments on the evolution of U.S.-Soviet relations since the Second World War.

The two articles follow:

[From the *Manchester Guardian*, May 8, 1972]

SOVIET DISSENTERS REFUSE TO YIELD TO REPRESSION

(By Abraham Brumberg)

The apparent calculated attempt by the Soviet authorities, launched towards the end of last year, to stifle dissident activities, has not been a great success.

Its latest manifestation this weekend was, more than anything, a sign of the underground's resilience. It involved searches by security police of 14 homes in Moscow, most of them in connection with issue No. 24 of the *Chronicle of Current Events*.

The *Chronicle* records the fate of those who fall foul of the authorities for activities regarded as anti-Soviet, information which is seldom made public officially.

When the previous issue of the *Chronicle* came out, in January, it was widely feared in the West that we had seen the last of this remarkable periodical, which had been appearing with uncanny regularity since April, 1968. The widespread searches, arrests, and interrogations which took place at that time (and which are reported in this issue), were clearly aimed at plucking out this irritating thorn from the Soviet flesh.

Its present appearance, therefore, must

surely be taken as evidence both of Soviet failure, and of the singular courage of the "Human Rights Movement," in size as well as in scope, issue No. 24, dated March 5, 1972, compares favourably with the preceding numbers. Comprising 23 typewritten pages, it contains further information on the trial of Vladimir Bukovsky in January and of its aftermath—including the texts of various protests both within and outside the Soviet Union; reports on further arrests and on conditions in Soviet labour camps; on the persecution of Catholic believers in Lithuania and on the efforts of Jews to emigrate to Israel.

The institution of *samizdat*, (underground publications) too, continues to thrive. Among recent works listed in the *Chronicle* are a 400-page book called "Practical Metaphysics," Solzhenitsyn's "Autobiography," a collection of documents on psychiatric hospitals for political offenders, a translation—rich in implications—of a *Le Monde* article on the collaboration of French intellectuals with Hitler's regime during the occupation of France, and a work of fiction based on the Jewish emigration movement, as well as a Newsletter of the Exodus, which contains numerous documents bearing on the same subject.

In addition, the *Chronicle* mentions the continued appearance of two new periodicals—No. 2 of *Review* (which, judging by the table of contents, is a historical and political journal with a decidedly liberal bias), and No. 4 of *Veche*—the *samizdat* organ of the new breed of Soviet Slavophiles.

In sum—to quote the motto that appears on every single front page of the *Chronicle of Current Events*—"the movement in defence of human rights in the Soviet Union continues."

A letter, dated October 14, 1971, addressed by a number of political prisoners in the Soviet Union to the Danish Communist newspaper *Land of Folk*, also testifies to this. At first glance there seems to be nothing extraordinary about it. Similar statements outlining the grim conditions in Soviet prisons and "corrective labour colonies" have appeared in the past, some of them, in fact, composed by the authors of this letter: Yuri Fedorov, Nikolay Bondar, Gennady, Gavrilov, Aleksandr Chekhovskoy, Nikolay Ivanov, Vladimir Pavlenko, and Yuri Galanskov.

What distinguishes this statement is the defiant assertion by the principal signatories that they will remain dedicated Communists, and the ample evidence, adduced in the letter, of a continuing "challenge from the Left" to the Soviet regime. There is no doubt whatever about the author's sincerity; as members of small illegal organizations seeking to establish "true communism" and "real democracy" in the Soviet Union, they behaved with remarkable courage at their respective trials, refusing to plead guilty, rejecting the help of defending counsel, and boldly affirming their political views.

Sentenced to long terms, in prison, camps, and exile, they have continued to insist on their rights by staging hunger strikes and other forms of organized protest (all described, incidentally, in the clandestine *Chronicle of Current Events*).

It is, therefore, no mere tactical ruse that these young idealists now address their "comrades in Denmark and other Scandinavian countries," comparing the liberty denied to Communists in the Soviet Union with those enjoyed by Communists in "capitalist countries." The latter are attacked for regarding "the very thought of judicial persecutions of dissidents in the USSR as . . . outlandishly impossible," and for doubting that in "the concentration camps of Mordovia and the Vladimir prison there are not only dissidents, but also people who have been placed there for their Marxist Communist convictions."

Drawing a parallel between the persecution of Soviet Communists with that of Danish Communists under the German occu-

pation, the letter asserts that "in no other country are dissidents treated as mercilessly as in ours." In support of this it says:

On August 8, 1971, *Izvestia* reported that an Athenian court found 19 out of 25 defendants innocent, and the others, having been found guilty of disseminating underground newspapers and pamphlets, "were sentenced to various terms of punishment; three years, 10½ months, and so on."

For similar deeds we are sentenced, as a rule, to five to seven years of deprivation of freedom under strict regime, sometimes supplemented by a term of exile up to five years.

Soviet newspapers have announced that Angela Davis gave to one of her visitors a letter addressed to the Committee of Soviet Women. When we receive visitors, we are not allowed to deliver as much as a simple personal letter.

Soviet newspapers have reported that a mouse was found in Angela Davis' bed. In our barracks mice are a common occurrence and wards in the therapeutic department of the central hospital are overrun by rats.

Soviet newspapers have indignantly reported that Jackson was killed during his attempted escape from prison. We Soviet Communists, political prisoners join you in condemning such outrages. But in the Mordovian concentration camps many a prisoner has been killed from the watch towers, and not only while attempting to escape.

It is noteworthy that the other three signatories (whose record of courage has been equally impressive), while "not adherents of Marxist teachings," and while "not subscribing to some of the postulates of the 'open letter,'" nevertheless signed, as a gesture of solidarity with their "comrades," and "as a protest against the difficult conditions of political prisoners in the USSR" in general.

It is also noteworthy—though hardly surprising—that this impassioned plea has thus far not been published in any Communist newspaper in the West—although it is of unquestionable authenticity.

UNITED STATES AND RUSSIA: NO CAUSE FOR CONFLICT

(By George F. Kennan)

The conditions to which Soviet policymakers had to address themselves in 1947 have changed drastically over these 25 years.

In 1947, the Soviet Union, though seriously exhausted by the war, enjoyed great prestige. Stalin's hold on the international Communist movement was monolithic and almost unchallenged. There was still, in the major Western countries and to some extent elsewhere, a strong contingent of pro-Soviet intellectuals and fellow-travelers who were amenable to Soviet influence and could be counted on to give general support to Soviet policies. All around the Soviet frontiers, on the other hand, there was great instability. This applied to East Asia as well as to Europe and the Middle East.

For the Soviet leadership, this presented both opportunity and danger: opportunity for taking advantage of this instability, danger that if they did not do so others would. Their foreign policy, in these circumstances, was directed to two main objectives: one, the elimination, to the extent possible, of all other great-power influence—and this meant primarily American influence—everywhere on the Eurasian land mass, so that the Soviet Union would overshadow everything that was left, in power and prestige; and, two, the achievement and consolidation of effective strategic glacis [slopes on the outside of fortifications] in east, south and west.

Compare that with the situation the present generation of Soviet leaders has before it today. The international Communist movement has broken into several pieces. They retain, beyond the limits of their own military-occupational power, the overt loyal-

ty of only a portion of it. This is a not insignificant portion; but the facade of solidarity can be maintained, today, only by extensive concessions to the real independence of the respective Communist parties. Meanwhile, a great deal of the erstwhile liberal following in other countries, disillusioned by Soviet repressive measures at home and in Eastern Europe, has lost confidence in Soviet leadership. As a military power, the U.S.S.R. has great prestige—greater, in fact, than in 1947—but as a political power it has less than it did then.

STABLE SURROUNDINGS

The instability in the areas surrounding the Soviet Union has in part disappeared. The Chinese and Japanese have put an end to it in East Asia. Economic recovery, NATO and the movement toward unification have largely done so in Western Europe, although there are disturbing symptoms of an underlying instability in Western Germany, and a state of semi-chaos in Italy that is only slightly less alarming because it is chronic.

The East Asian glacis was largely taken away from them by the Chinese. The Middle Eastern one they are gradually gaining, but it is precarious, undependable, and expensive to keep. The European one, i.e., the satellite area of Eastern and Central Europe, they continue to hold (Yugoslavia excepted) either by occupying it or by overshadowing it militarily. It is flawed by a certain potential instability in the form of the positions taken by the Romanians; but it has won acceptance in the West, and does not appear, at the moment, to be seriously threatened. It may be said, generally, that the southern and western glacis are fulfilling their function, as does the remaining one—Outer Mongolia—in East Asia; and the Soviet leaders undoubtedly derive from this fact a certain heightened sense of security.

The effort to expel American influence and presence from the Eurasian land mass has also been largely successful, though rather by the force of circumstance than as a response to anything the Russians themselves have done. Yet the result is only in part satisfactory from the Soviet point of view. In Northeast Asia, the Americans never did play a role, except in South Korea and Japan; and they have now largely forfeited their influence over the Japanese. On the other hand, Russia now finds herself confronted there by two local great powers—China and Japan—both capable of making more trouble for her in that region than the Americans ever did. In the Middle East, the American presence and influence are pretty well eliminated everywhere except in Israel, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia.

As for Western Europe: the American guaranty remains, as does the American military presence. Moscow would still like to eliminate both—just to be on the safe side. But the need for doing so has been reduced by the general Western acceptance of the Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe. And the agreements concluded with the Brandt government will relieve the Soviet leaders of their greatest single anxiety: that of an association of American military power with a *revanchiste* and revisionist Western Germany.

POLITICAL INSECURITY

If, then, today the Soviet leaders have a sense of military insecurity, it is not—for the first time in Russian history—primarily with relation to stronger forces just beyond their land borders, but rather in relation to the nuclear weapons race, which is a subject in itself. The Chinese inroads on their international prestige and on their influence in the world Communist movement have really hurt and alarmed them, because they leave them no alternatives except isolation or alliance with capitalist countries, which could undermine the legitimacy of their power at home. They are also insecure at home, be-

cause they are dimly conscious, as was the Czar's regime 70 years ago, that they have lost the confidence of their own intellectuals, and don't know how to recover it. Finally, there is the continuing hostility of the populations in most of Eastern Europe to the Soviet hegemony, a hostility which even with full control of the media over 25 years they have not been able to overcome.

What, in the face of these environmental conditions, are their policies? These no longer represent a unified whole, or reflect any unified concept. The party priesthood exerts itself mightily to recover ground lost to the Chinese in the foreign Communist communities. The Foreign Office pursues a policy of detente with France and Germany and Italy in order to prove to the Chinese that Russia has an alternative to good relations with them, and can easily arrange for security on her western front.

The military-industrial complex, as real there as in Washington, struggles to match the cultivation of nuclear weaponry. The hotheads in their military establishment appear to be obsessed with the hope of breaking the long-standing supremacy of the Anglo-Americans on the high seas, and this strikes me, incidentally, as the most irresponsible and dangerous, at the moment, of all Soviet undertakings, comparable to the Kaiser's effort to out-balance the British in naval forces before World War I.

These policies present a sharp contrast to those of 1947. The Soviet-American conflict has been largely removed geographically from the Eurasian land mass and relegated to the struggle for the control of the high seas and the fantasy world of nuclear weaponry. A great part of the energy of Soviet foreign policy is today devoted to the effort to "contain," politically, another Socialist state—China. The anti-American propaganda and the competition with the United States for favor and influence in the Third World continue; but this is more of a force of habit than a policy, and the few successes achieved to date have come from American mistakes far more than from Soviet brilliance. "World revolution" has simply faded out of the picture as a concrete aim of Soviet foreign policy.

In general, the situation of the Soviet Union is such that were it not for the dangerous nuclear and naval rivalry, the outside world, and particularly the United States, would have little more to fear from Russia today than it did in 1910. The ideological factor makes itself felt today almost exclusively in the Soviet relationship to the French and Italian Communist parties, which, if they were to come into power, would easily destroy NATO and upset the power balance in Europe. But these parties are reflections of long-term internal crises within the respective countries, and their influence cannot be treated as primarily a problem of international relations.

A KAFKAESQUE ENCOUNTER

What all this means for Soviet-American relations is this: that the United States, having accepted the Soviet domination of Eastern Europe as well as the situation in all of Asia other than its southeastern extremity, has today, for the first time, no serious territorial-political conflict with the Soviet government, the one exception being the Middle East. But the Middle Eastern situation is, by common agreement, not worth a war between the two powers, and both hope to avoid its leading to one.

This means that today the military rivalry, in naval power as in nuclear weaponry, is simply riding along on its own momentum, like an object in space. It has no foundation in real interests—no foundation, in fact, but in fear, and in an essentially irrational fear at that. It is carried not by any reason to believe that the other side *would*, but only by a hypnotic fascination with the fact that

it could. It is simply an institutionalized force of habit. If someone could suddenly make the two sides realize that it has no purpose and if they were then to desist, the world would presumably go on, in all important respects, just as it is going on today.

There is a Kafkaseque quality to this encounter. We stand like two men who find themselves confronting each other with guns in their hands, neither with any real reason to believe that the other has murderous intentions towards him, but both hypnotized by the uncertainty and the unreasoning fear of the fact that the other is armed. The two armament efforts feed and justify each other.

Admitting that it is unreasonable to expect either side to disarm suddenly and unilaterally, one must still recognize that this curious deadlock, devoid of hope, replete with danger, is unlikely to be resolved just by carefully negotiated contractual agreements. These latter will have to be supported by reciprocal unilateral steps of restraint in the development of various forms of weaponry.

If one could begin to work this process backward, and eventually reduce the armed establishments of the two countries to something like reasonable dimensions—for both have, of course, ulterior military obligations and commitments as well—then there is no reason why the Soviet Union should be considered a serious threat to American security.

Should this happen, however, the United States would do well not to indulge itself in unreal hopes for intimacy with either the Soviet regime or the Soviet population. There are deeply rooted traits in Soviet psychology—some of old-Russian origin, some of more recent Soviet provenance—that would rule this out.

Chief among these, in my opinion, are the congenital disregard of the truth, the addiction to propagandistic exaggeration, distortion and falsehood, the habitual foulness of mouth in official utterance. So pernicious has been the effect of 50 years of cynicism about the role of objective truth in political statement that one begins to wonder whether these Soviet leaders have not destroyed in themselves the power to distinguish truth from falsehood. The very vocabulary in which they have taught themselves to speak, politically, with its constant references to the American "imperialists" and "monopolists," is confusing and offensive, and constitutes in itself a barrier to better international understanding.

A MIDDLE GROUND

Add to this the hysterical preoccupation with espionage, the continued fear of foreigners and efforts to isolate the Soviet population allowed to play in the conduct of Soviet diplomacy, and one is obliged to recognize that it is simply unrealistic for Americans to look for any great intimacy or even normalcy, as we understand it, of relations with the Soviet Union. As is also the case with China, though for somewhat different reasons, relations can be reasonably good, but they must also be reasonably distant; and the more distant they are, in a sense, the better they will be.

What we need mostly to do is to free ourselves from some of our fixations with relation to the military competition—to remind ourselves that there is really no reason why we and the Russians should wish to do frightful things to each other and to the world—and to address ourselves vigorously, and with some degree of boldness, to the enormous danger presented by the very existence in human hands, and above all the proliferation, of weapons such as the nuclear ones.

Somewhere between the intimacy we cannot have—either with the Russians or the Chinese—and the war there is no reason for us to fight, there is a middle ground of peaceful, if somewhat distant, coexistence on which our relationship with the great Communist powers could be considerably safer

and more pleasant than it now is. We cannot make it so by our own efforts alone; the Russians and Chinese have to help. But we could do better, in a number of respects, than we have been doing.

WILLIAM SEACH HONORED

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today is traditional Memorial Day, and an appropriate time to pay honor to our Nation's veterans. One such veteran whom I would like to single out for special notice is William Seach, of Weymouth, Mass.

Last week Mr. Seach turned 95, and for the first time in many years, was unable to march in the Town's Memorial Day parade. He is the Nation's oldest Medal of Honor winner, and while time has slowed his steps, his mind is as sharp as anyone's.

The attached letter, from Lt. Seach to the Weymouth Veterans Committee, is one that I am sure will be of interest to my colleagues, and to all who admire patriotism and persistence. I know I speak for us all when I wish Mr. Seach the very best in the future, and thank him for his service to his country in the past.

The letter follows:

To: Comrade James E. Coyle, Chairman, and Members of Weymouth Joint Veterans Committee

From: Comrade William Seach

DEAR COMRADE COYLE: I thank you and the members of the Weymouth Joint Veterans Committee for the great honor you desire to confer on me for the 1972 Memorial Day Parade and ceremonies.

Regarding the Chief of Staff, I respectfully suggest that deserving comrade be appointed as Chief of Staff. If you wish, my name could be placed beneath his as the Honorary Chief of Staff which will be understood to mean that the word "Honorary" designates a title of honor only.

It may be interesting for you and our comrades to learn that since the fall of last year, I am now the oldest Medal of Honor winner still living. I will be 95 years old on May 23rd of this year. Also, as a veteran of the Spanish-American War of 1898, the Philippine Insurrection of 1899 and the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, for the first time in history, one individual is the last surviving Medal of Honor winner covering three separate Foreign wars. (I am also a veteran of the Haitian Campaign of 1915, and of World War I, 1917-1918.)

Two hundred and fifty-eight Medals of Honor were won during the three wars between 1898 and 1900, by men serving in the Army, Navy and Marine Corps. Of those 250 Medal of Honor winners, I am the only recipient living. The Medal of Honor was awarded me, as you know, for service in the Boxer Rebellion in China in 1900. The inscription, engraved on the reverse side of the medal, reads, "For Conspicuous Conduct in the presence of the Enemy in Battles of the 13th, 20th, 21st and 22nd of June, 1900, while with the Relief Expedition under Vice Admiral Seymour . . . William Seach, Ordinary Seaman, U.S.S. Newark."

It is possible that the Town of Weymouth, Massachusetts, may be the only town in the United States that is credited with three Medal of Honor winners, each active in a

different war, each representing a separate branch of our Military services, and each with schools named in their honor. They are:

1. William Seach, Ordinary Seaman, U.S. Navy, for conspicuous conduct in four battles, while with the Relief Expedition to Peking, during the Boxer Rebellion in China; 1900. (Now living.)

2. Ralph Talbot, 2nd Lieutenant, U.S. Marine Corps, a fighter Air Pilot against German fighter Air Pilots "for conspicuous conduct in Air Battle October 8, 1918, World War I." (Later killed in an airplane accident.)

3. Eldon H. Johnson, Private U.S. Army, 15th Infantry. For conspicuous conduct in battle; killed in action May 16, 1945 in France, World War II.

On Veterans' Day, 1950, Weymouth honored her three Medal of Honor winners at the Town Hall, with appropriate public ceremonies, by placing on a wall of the Council Chamber framed enlarged photographs of each winner, with individual citations.

I am honored that you have asked me to participate in the annual Memorial Day parade in Weymouth on May 29, 1972. For the first time in many years, I am not sure that my health will permit me to be present on that occasion. For that reason, I feel that you should not make the usual arrangements.

If it is possible for me to be present on that day, my daughter Carol Seach Donovan will see that I join the parade and she will let you know if I am present at the parade starting point. I prefer to remain in her car, however.

Thank you again for your consideration and for your kind letter. I want you all to know that I appreciate it very much.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM SEACH.

BUSINESSMEN SUPPORT UNITED STATES-RUSSIAN TRADE EXPANSION

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, next to the agreement on strategic arms limitation, the agreement to establish a joint United States-Russian commission to develop mutually advantageous trade relations will probably be the most important achievement of the President's trip to Moscow. It is interesting to note that the President who has achieved this major breakthrough in relations with the Soviet Union built his political career on his opposition to communism.

Already, many business firms in the 14th District of Ohio are anticipating the expansion of United States-Russian trade. This is the subject of an article in the Akron Beacon Journal of Sunday, May 28, which I shall insert in the RECORD following these remarks. A common thread running through the remarks of these businessmen is their view of expanded East-West trade not only as an opportunity for profits but also for reducing international tensions and improving understanding.

It is also appropriate at this time to give due credit to a distinguished American business leader who took the initiative over a decade ago to point out to his fellow citizens the importance establishing improved trade relations with the

Soviet Union. At the time this gentleman, Mr. Cyrus S. Eaton, first advanced this idea, he was roundly criticized in many quarters. Now that the validity of the idea has been generally accepted and is being promoted by no less a person than President Nixon himself, it is only right to accord to Mr. Eaton belated recognition for his exceptional foresight and uncommon common sense. I can think of no more appropriate way to do this than to introduce into the RECORD his remarks last April 20 at the annual meeting of the shareholders of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway. I include following the article from the Akron Beacon Journal: [From the Akron Beacon Journal, May 28, 1972]

AREA FIRMS PLEASED BY RUSS TRADE PACT
(By Larry Froelich)

The first breakthrough in trade negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union a few days ago is likely to open up some fertile business opportunities for industry in the Akron area.

One of those persons pleased with the news that a joint commission will be formed to develop mutually advantageous trade relations was Art Lewis, managing director of the international division of Diebold Inc. of Canton.

Diebold is best known for its bank vault and security storage systems, but the Russians have been looking at something else, according to Lewis.

"We've been approached by people from the Soviet Union about our more sophisticated record retrieval equipment," said Lewis. "As might be expected in any bureaucracy, they are interested in faster ways of handling paper."

"Most definitely, we're very much interested in trading with them," he added.

And generally speaking, Diebold is not alone in seeing a lucrative market for its wares behind the Iron Curtain.

"I personally feel there is a market for us in the Soviet Union," said William C. Richards Jr., president of Bellows-Valvair, "because they're going to buy the machinery they want from someone. So why not us?"

Richards said the Russians are likely to look first at machine tools, automated and food processing equipment, and rubber extracting machinery. "And in our line, I'd say they'd look at the hydraulic and pneumatic systems we make for machine tools and automated processing equipment."

A spokesman for one large tire machinery manufacturer here said his company "very definitely welcomes trade with Russia because they have a substantial and fast-growing tire industry."

Added this official: "We've had the business since our European licensees have been supplying millions and millions of dollars worth of our American-designed equipment to the Soviet Union. Now we could do it on a more direct basis and, I think, we could be competitive with the Europeans since their labor costs have been rising at a faster rate in recent years."

Through a spokesman, B. F. Goodrich said it "has long favored the expansion of trade between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in non-strategic goods and services. We regard such trade as more than a potential source of increased profits. It also represents an effective means of reducing tensions and improving relations between the two countries." Goodrich also noted that America's balance of payments will benefit from increased trade with the USSR.

"In accordance with U.S. Government trade policy, our chemical division is continuing to sell certain types of synthetic rubber and plastic materials in the Soviet Union and we are hoping to expand this business. Interna-

tional BFG Co. is exploring various possibilities for export sales to Russia," the company added.

Spokesmen for Firestone and General Tire said they felt there was considerable opportunity for them in Russia but are waiting to see what type of trade agreements evolve. Babcock & Wilcox Co. in Barberton issued a similar statement.

In Des Moines, a spokesman for Massey-Ferguson said his company favored "anything that generally eases trade." Massey-Ferguson's Industrial and Construction Machinery division is located in Northampton Twp.

"As a matter of fact," added the Massey-Ferguson official, "we will be exhibiting the largest (agricultural) combine made in the U.S. next September in Moscow."

However, it is more than just goods and services which will be the magnet drawing U.S. and Soviet Union businessmen together because the Russians are thirsting for technology.

"From our knowledge," said Leonard Turk, president of NRM Corp. in Akron, "a lot of U.S. technology is being used in Russia today, supplied to them by licensees of U.S. companies. I don't think there's any question we'd like to do business with them more directly."

NRM manufactures machinery for the rubber, tire and plastics industries.

Yet as a number of the companies pointed out, there's more to it than just the business and profit angles; there's an equally vital opportunity to ease world tensions through better understanding.

"Sports has been way ahead of us in developing international understanding," commented Bellows-Valvair's Richards. "But now business has a golden opportunity to do the same thing athletes have been accomplishing for years and years."

REMARKS OF CYRUS S. EATON

Our very able and dedicated President will bring to you a full report on your company. That is what you will be mostly interested in, because stockholders are concerned about how much their company earns and what dividends it pays. As I said, our President, who is exceptional, will tell that story.

May I add that I think no other great corporation in America has an abler and more dedicated team than the one that is running your railroad. No matter how competent and dedicated the management may be, however, they have to contend with conditions beyond their control. For instance, taxation, the policies of labor leaders, contact with state and federal governments, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the S.E.C., which controls the issuance of securities, The Treasury Department and many other departments of the government are exercising more and more influence in American business. No matter how able the management, therefore, business still has to contend with these problems, mainly emanating from Washington.

Because of my interest in public utilities, some of them located in the Washington area, I have been going to Washington regularly for 65 years. I have known all of the Presidents during that time, as well as the Secretaries of State and Commerce, other top officials, and leading members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Sometimes I have been at odds with our government. I have felt that our industry and other institutions in America deserves to do business with all the world, and for 25 years I have been constantly urging the establishment of trade relations with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. I am delighted and flattered that President Nixon has made his trip to Peking, and is now planning to go to Moscow. I believe that this change of policy has great potential for us.

One may ask how it may be advantageous for us to have understanding, friendship and good relations with the Soviet Union. They have many things we can use to great advantage, and there are many things they can use from our factories and farms. Remember that, geographically, the Soviet Union is two and a half times as big as the United States, with immense natural resources that we need or can use.

Seventy years ago, the East Ohio Gas Company brought natural gas to Cleveland, the first large city in America to use that fuel. Now every city in America uses natural gas, but our domestic reserves are dwindling and more and more supplies will have to be brought from abroad. The Soviet Union's reserves of natural gas equal those of all the rest of the world combined. How are we going to get that gas to America? As it must be moved over long Arctic areas and then by ship in liquefied form to American ports, many problems must be solved. This includes pipelining the natural gas to liquefaction plants, the building of special super tankers to transport the liquefied gas over lengthy ocean routes, and the installation of terminal facilities in America. We can use Soviet gas to great advantage and at the same time we can sell the Soviets many of our products.

I have been consulted constantly on the development of the Soviet Union's natural resources. The Soviets come to me because I have always felt that we will make more progress by befriending them than by denouncing them, regardless of our different political and economic systems. We have to remember that half the world, whether we like it or not, is now communist.

I am looking forward with pride and joy to improving relations between our country and the communist nations of the world, even though on occasion we may have disagreements with them. We are all uneasy about the unhappy events in Vietnam, but I am hoping that sorry chapter of our history will soon be concluded. If the President will keep his promise to go to the Soviet Union, that will pave the way for trade with that great nation.

It will be a memorable day in my life when the New York Daily News, our newspaper of largest circulation and the most vigorous denouncer of communism, uses power produced by Soviet natural gas to run its presses. I will also be delighted when the cold warriors of Washington cook their breakfast by natural gas brought in from the Soviet Union.

As you realize, I am young and inexperienced, but I am optimistic. I hope that mankind will avoid the terrible fate of destroying itself and will determine to live in peace. I am sure the cutting down of our astronomical expenditures for military equipment and of our armed forces that are stationed all over the world, followed by a reduction of taxes and the establishment of trade with every nation, will be highly beneficial to all of us generally, and to the C&O and B&O in particular.

**CITIZENS OF LAUREL, MD., THANK
DIRECTOR OF OFFICE OF EMERGENCY
PREPAREDNESS**

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of Laurel, Md., I would like to take this opportunity to publicly thank Gen. G. A. Lincoln, Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, for his help in Prince Georges County's

efforts to clear flood debris from the Patuxent River near Laurel.

I personally urged General Lincoln to review the matter, as did county and Laurel officials, and he recently agreed to have the Army Corps of Engineers remove the uprooted trees and brush which were deposited in the river by the 1971 flood disaster.

General Lincoln's action is a vital interim step in our efforts to prevent future flooding of the Laurel area. It should ease the immediate danger as we work to put into effect a long-range plan which will solve flooding problems not only in Laurel but throughout the Patuxent Basin.

The Office of Emergency Preparedness approved the use of Federal emergency funds to clear up the river debris on August 17, 1971, following severe summer flooding in the Laurel area.

Under OEP regulations emergency debris clearance must be completed within 3 months, but work had not been started as of December 17, 1971, because of restrictions imposed upon the Prince Georges County Council by the new county charter.

OEP granted a 3-month extension, but as of February 28, 1972, the work still had not been started because of continuing difficulties imposed by the charter, and OEP announced it was withdrawing funding for the project.

County and Laurel town officials and community leaders then asked me to intercede with OEP to keep the debris clearance project alive.

I went to work on the problem and the result was the commitment from General Lincoln to clear the flood debris.

In a letter written to inform me of his decision, General Lincoln said:

Some large uprooted trees and other loose debris remain caught on living trees and brush growing on gravel bars and along the banks of the river.

This type of debris could be picked up by future floods and lodged against a bridge or other debris, possibly resulting in blockage of the river channel and increased damages.

Due to this remaining threat, I have requested our Region 3 office to authorize removal of those uprooted trees and brush which were deposited by the 1971 flood disaster.

Since this debris should be removed as soon as possible, the Corps of Engineers will be directed to perform the necessary work . . . Prince George's County will be required to furnish necessary rights-of-entry, along with certain assurances, but the actual work will be accomplished by the Corps of Engineers. I am assured that this work will be accomplished promptly.

Again, let me say how grateful I and the citizens of Laurel are to General Lincoln for his swift and decisive action in clearing up the flood debris along the Patuxent River.

ARMENIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, usually, when we hear the term "captive nations," we think of the nations in Central

Europe that are situated on the other side of the Iron Curtain. They include such countries as Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the Baltic Republics, as well as a number of others.

We tend to forget that the sun never sets on the captive nations—they are located not only in Europe but in widely-separated parts of Asia and in the Caribbean Sea. People of every race and religion are captives of imperialistic communism. Some have been prisoners in their own lands ever since World War II, while others have been slaves of Communist oppressors for more than half a century.

Last Sunday the inhabitants of an Asiatic nation that has been a colony of the Soviet Empire since 1921 recalled their brief period of freedom. It was on May 28, 1918, that the Armenians declared their independence from Russia and Turkey. Their freedom proved to be short-lived, however, as they were soon taken over by the Soviet Union. The Turkish part of Armenia had been all but depopulated by a series of massacres. Many who survived the various attempts at genocide migrated to other parts of the world, including the United States. While they are not numerous, those who began life anew in America are loyal and industrious and have made important contributions to their adopted country.

Mr. Speaker, other vast empires have disintegrated and there is no reason to believe that the Soviet Empire is immortal. Some day it, too, will follow its predecessors into oblivion. From the ashes there will arise many free nations, reborn after years of oppression and persecution. Among them will be Armenia.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN SCOTT AT MEMORIAL DAY CEREMONIES

HON. WILMER MIZELL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. MIZELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to enter into the RECORD the text of a speech delivered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) at Arlington Cemetery on Memorial Day.

Representing President Nixon at the annual memorial services, our colleague, Mr. SCOTT's remarks were eloquent, timely, and very moving.

In addition to giving well-deserved praise to the men and women who gave their lives in the service of the country and for the cause of freedom, Mr. SCOTT admonished the rest of us to honor their memory in our everyday lives. He said:

In order to maintain our heritage and to perfect our American system, we need responsible citizens, both veteran and non-veteran, to be active in the affairs of government, teaching pride of America within our homes, our schools, our churches, guiding youth in character-building organizations, being active participants in community affairs.

This, he said, would be the greatest tribute to the gallant men and women

who paid the highest possible price for our freedom.

I commend Mr. SCOTT's remarks to my colleagues' attention and insert them in the RECORD at this time:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN SCOTT AT MEMORIAL DAY CEREMONIES AT THE TOMB OF THE UNKNOWN SOLDIER IN ARLINGTON

We have heard wonderful music and songs to honor those who have sacrificed their lives for our country. Let me compliment you gentlemen on your fine performances. We are near our finest national shrine, the Tomb of the Unknowns, yet no ceremony we can devise, or no monument we can erect can be as meaningful as the simple fact that we meet here today in freedom. This is the true monument to their sacrifice and to the American spirit that for the past two centuries has opposed tyranny and today is opposing oppression once more.

Our freedoms were won almost 200 years ago. During that conflict 4,400 Americans died in battle and many thousands more risked everything they possessed to win our right to govern ourselves and to establish a form of government of our own choosing, free from outside direction.

Since that memorable time, almost a million Americans have died in an attempt to give those same rights, at one time or another, to almost half of the peoples of this earth.

These young men have not died for territory or for American privilege, but to help establish in the world the concept that no nation shall take over another nation by force. And today Americans are dying in South Vietnam to prevent the take over from the north and to preserve the right of a small nation to a government of its own choosing.

The American soldier in all of our wars, to his everlasting glory, has never forgotten that he is sacrificing and dying for human beings and human dignity. Wherever he has gone, the American soldier has, in the wreckage of war, in friendly country and in occupied enemy land, helped the wounded, the orphan, the disabled, the aged, the widow and the defeated enemy soldier.

In the midst of war, American soldiers have set up schools, orphanages, hospitals. They have adopted youngsters. You would find them teaching in schools or volunteering in youth programs. This in the midst of war and in the postwar occupation.

A grateful nation has attempted to compensate returning veterans and widows, and orphans of those who didn't, by providing a number of benefits. Among these are:

Education and job training under the G.I. Bill enacted after World War II, and extended to the Korean and the Vietnam veteran.

Disability compensation to veterans and survivors of all wars in which our nation has engaged is provided on a continuing basis, as are pensions for those veterans in financial need.

Home loan guarantee by the government has enabled thousands of young veterans to purchase their homes.

We also have hospitals for sick and needy veterans which are unmatched anywhere in the world.

Burial benefits have been provided, including those here at Arlington National Cemetery. Our committee on Veterans Affairs, however, has recognized the restrictions on burials and has recently approved a measure to transfer administrative control over national cemeteries to the Veterans Administration. This bill provides for a comprehensive study of the cemetery system by the Veterans Administration and for its recommendations to be made to the Congress early next year on the need for additional cemetery construction and future policy for burial of deceased veterans.

But we owe more to these patriots than

merely to care for the survivors and their dependents.

In order to maintain our heritage and to perfect our American system, we need responsible citizens, both veteran and non-veteran, to be active in the affairs of government, teaching pride of America within our home, our schools, our churches, guiding youth in character-building organizations, being active participants in community affairs.

Small radical elements within our society receive far more attention than their numbers warrant, but without active participation in the affairs of government by the great masses of responsible Americans, the radical may grow in influence. Therefore, in our own self-interest and in our national interest, we should participate and urge others to be active in maintaining our national heritage, in preserving the spirit of America.

Patriotism—love of country, reverence and respect for the concept of nationhood—is needed for a healthy nation. This requires more than a formal Memorial Day service. It requires the active participation of all of us, confidence in ourselves as individuals and as a nation, to strive for excellence and to succeed.

As we meet today, the President is abroad on a mission of peace. He has travelled to Moscow and Peking for talks, to thaw hostilities and suspicions that breed incidents and confrontations. He holds no illusion that the communist world will adopt our democratic form of government, and certainly we will not adopt theirs; but our hopes and prayers are with him as the President journeys within the communist world, seeking a pathway to peace, attempting to blunt antagonisms and to devise a formula that will prevent another major armed conflict.

All thinking people must yearn for a means of settling differences between nations other than on the battlefield.

If we are to truly honor our departed comrades, we should strive to preserve that government for which they fought and dedicate ourselves to bringing about a question of peace which all men crave, from President to humblest citizen.

As we look upon the graves of the Unknown Soldiers and the rows of headstones that surround us, we must be determined to work for peace—for a time when the lion shall lie down with the lamb, and neither shall be afraid.

THE ATTEMPT TO WEAKEN THE NATIONAL WORKER SAFETY AND HEALTH LAW

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been bombarded recently by one of those campaigns which has become a familiar phenomenon. In this case, the letters are an attempt to scuttle some of the provisions of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, which is a magna carta of workplace environmental excellence for the 57 million workers covered by the law. The law has been in effect for only 1 year, and it has suffered from a great deal of criticism from all sides.

Before anybody rushes to amend the law, I suggest they study the analysis of the proposed amendments prepared by the Ralph Nader Task Force on Job

Health and Safety, issued only a few weeks ago.

I insert "Counterattack on OSHA: The Curtis Amendments" with my remarks.

COUNTERATTACK ON OSHA: THE CURTIS AMENDMENTS

The first serious attempt to bring about a legislative crippling of OSHA emerged from objections to the Labor Department's jurisdiction over businesses never before subject to effective regulation of any kind. On February 29, 1972, Senator Carl T. Curtis, a conservative Republican from Nebraska, introduced a series of amendments ostensibly designed to relieve "pressures" on small businesses and farms. In reality, the proposed bill (S. 3262) goes much further, seeking to gut the current standard-setting process and imposing cumbersome burdens upon the Department of Labor. Because of the possibility that S. 3262 is the forerunner of a broader counterattack on OSHA, the major recommendations of the bill merit critical exposure.

The Curtis amendments totally exempt from OSHA firms with fewer than 25 employees and "small farmers," defined as farm owners or operators predicting the use of no more than 25 man-years of compensable farm labor during the year. Of all the various legislative proposals leading to the ultimate enactment of OSHA, only the Javits-Ayres bill contained a similar (but narrower) exemption for small firms (3 or fewer employees) and small farms (employing fewer than 500 man-days of hired farm labor).

The exemption principle found very little support and was excluded from even later Republican versions of the Act. The life and health of an employee of a small business or farm should be worth as much as that of a worker in a giant manufacturing enterprise. Senator Curtis has not yet produced a scintilla of evidence to show that the actual economic burden imposed by OSHA on small businesses and small farms justifies removing a substantial number of workers from the vital protection afforded by the Act.

The proposed amendments would also extend technical assistance, including outright grants, to employers with fewer than 100 employees, for the purpose of helping them comply with standards. Why taxpayers should subsidize job safety and health expenditures is unclear. The Act, and Labor Department regulations thereunder, presently provide employers with opportunities for compliance assistance. The Small Business Administration is authorized to make loans to facilitate compliance with OSHA. The Labor Department's Compliance Manual sets out guidelines for the furnishing of educational, technical and promotional advice to employers. Thus, besides being an unwarranted giveaway, the Curtis bill is duplicative. If there is a problem here, it lies in the Labor Department's failure to publicize adequately the availability of these resources.

The Curtis amendments also extend to employers with fewer than 100 employees a one-year delay for meeting consensus standards. These standards result from agreements reached by industry-controlled private groups. Unless Senator Curtis can offer evidence of hardship upon small businessmen out of proportion to the human costs these standards seek to eliminate, it is difficult to imagine why these small employers need the extra time.

Out of approximately 13 amendments proposed by Senator Curtis, only three deal with small businesses. The remainder involve broad changes that could affect every employer and worker covered by the Act.

(1) Under the National Labor Relations Act it is an unfair labor practice for employers to set up or sponsor employee committees that interfere with the employees' right to self-representation. This means that in a non-union plant, the employer would

violate the law if he created committees of workers in an attempt to impede union organizing activity. Senator Curtis' bill proposes that safety committees be exempted from the National Labor Relations Act. This exemption would enable employers to organize employee safety committees for the purpose of blocking union efforts to organize workers in the plants.

(2) The Curtis amendments propose to require the Secretary of Labor to determine the applicability of all existing and future OSHA standards (except emergency temporary standards) to "each class of business concern within each industry or form of business," and to determine as part of each standard who is and who is not covered. An alternative to imposing this heavy administrative burden on the Labor Department is to develop a system of notification that goes beyond mere publication in the Federal Register.

(3) The Curtis amendments would make cost a prominent factor in setting standards, by requiring the Department of Labor to estimate the average and maximum cost per unit to the average employer affected, and to make a finding that such employers would be economically able to comply. The burden would be on the government to gather cost data from the corporations, an undesirable change from the current procedure, which puts the onus on the companies to come forward with evidence of excessive cost or technological infeasibility if they wish to challenge a new standard.

(4) The proposed bill would allow employers to raise a number of defenses to citations for violations of OSHA including: failure to receive 30-days actual notice of consensus standards (this would require the Secretary of Labor to notify personally all firms covered by a particular standard); and the excuse that the standard violated would not have "effectively constituted an improvement of occupational safety and health." This latter provision would allow cited employers to argue the merits of a standard in the course of an enforcement proceeding, and thereby delay and hinder enforcement to a totally unwarranted degree.

(5) The bill would permit the Labor Department to enter into voluntary compliance agreements with employers, and hence waive or defer sanctions. This would invite a repeat of the history of enforcement of the Walsh-Healey Act and of the state job safety and health laws. The amendment makes no provision for any employee participation in these deals, and given the attitudes of the present Occupational Safety and Health Administration, there is no doubt that this sort of change would bring enforcement of OSHA to a screeching halt.

(6) The Curtis bill provides that failure to comply with an OSHA standard shall not be admissible as evidence of negligence in a civil action. Of course the workmen's compensation statutes preclude suits based on negligence for employees covered by the statutes, so that this provision would have no effect upon the majority of American workers. But most agricultural workers and many employees in small businesses are not covered by workmen's compensation. If one of these workers is disabled by an occupational accident or disease, his only remedy at law is a civil action against the employer based on negligence. The pernicious impact of the Curtis amendment would be to prevent the worker from proving in court that his disability resulted from the employer's violation of a federal safety or health standard, despite the fact that the purpose of the standard was to prevent the very accident or disease that disabled the worker.

(7) OSHA presently provides for the replacement of consensus or existing federal standards as new standards are proposed and adopted. Senator Curtis would have the gov-

ernment bear the costs of employer compliance with a new standard if it "could have reasonably been adopted at the time the replaced standard was adopted." What this does is levy the taxpayers for the Labor Department's failure to promulgate standards more rigorous than consensus or existing federal standards in the first two years of OSHA's applicability. The Act enables the Department of Labor to put into immediate operation consensus or existing federal (e.g. Walsh-Healey) standards without hearings or other administrative or judicial review, so that workers covered by the Act could immediately benefit from the protection afforded by these standards. Now Senator Curtis would turn this legitimate purpose on its head and penalize the government for not leaving these workers unprotected while new standards were being developed and then approved through a lengthy administrative rule-making process!

In the guise of relief for the small businessman and small farmer, the Curtis amendments would water down OSHA in several important respects. The quiet way they have been introduced and their innocuous appearance underscore the imperative need for vigilance on the part of the unions and their allies in Washington.

This is especially true in light of Assistant Secretary Guenther's incredible comment at the March 22, 1972, meeting of the National Advisory Committee on Safety and Health, when he categorized the Curtis amendments as a "middle-of-the-road approach."

AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS ON VIETNAM AND THE WAR POWERS CRISIS

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful analyses I have seen of the relationship of the war in Vietnam and the powers of the President is an address by the distinguished senior Senator from New York, the Honorable Jacob K. JAVITS, at the commencement exercises at Canisius College, Buffalo, N.Y., May 20, 1972.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of Senator JAVITS' address on this occasion:

VIETNAM AND THE WAR POWERS CRISIS

(By Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

Once more the Vietnam war has forced an intense crisis upon our nation. On the battlefield, the unexpected progress of the latest Communist offensive may threaten the very survival of the South Vietnamese government. It has certainly called into grave question the viability of President Nixon's "Vietnamization" policy. This crisis in Vietnam, caused by the military action of the Communist forces, is now also accompanied by a grave crisis within the United States brought about by the actions President Nixon has announced in response to these developments in Vietnam.

President Nixon has ordered U.S. air and naval forces to conduct the heaviest bombardment of military targets of North Vietnam in the history of that war, and has now supplemented those measures with the mining and blockade of the ports of North Vietnam. This massive reescalation of U.S. combat involvement in the Vietnam war is the culmination of a series of events which have posed a major challenge to those—like myself—who believe that the Vietnam war has been as grave a foreign policy blunder as we

have seen in our nation's modern "peace-time" history.

CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS POSED BY VIETNAM ESCALATION

Yet, transcending even the military crisis respecting the Communist offensive and President Nixon's military response, our nation has been thrown into a grave constitutional crisis by the unilateral nature of the President's decision—and by the philosophy of the Constitution's meaning which he has expounded in explaining and justifying his decisions to the nation.

It is on this aspect of the crisis that I wish to concentrate today. I do so because I am the principal sponsor of the War Powers Act which was adopted by the Senate on April 13 by a vote of 68-16. The War Powers Act is a unique legislative measure to endeavor to restore the constitutional balance which was intended by the Founding Fathers to be maintained between the President and the Congress in respect of making war. This balance—written, I believe, into the Constitution—has been upset—and now essentially inverted—by post World War II practice, culminating in the Vietnam war.

For, the War Powers Act—which has not yet been adopted by the House of Representatives—while excluding this Vietnam war from its procedural provisions, nonetheless has direct relevance to the present crisis. In this respect, I am in profound agreement with the May 16 editorial statement of the New York Times on this subject which said:

"Congressional failure to challenge the President's power grab would let stand a precedent that could undermine for years to come the constitutionally mandated Congressional checks on executive war-making. To argue that Congress has no option but to support the President in an emergency, even if that emergency is enormously enlarged by his own arbitrariness, is certainly not what the Founding Fathers had in mind when they gave the Congress exclusive authority to declare war."

PRESIDENTIAL VIEWS ON NATION'S WAR POWERS AND CONSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS

It is evident from his statements that President Nixon has a radically different view of what the Constitution calls for respecting the nation's war powers. On April 26, the President stated his view as follows:

"If the United States betrays the millions of people who have relied on us in Vietnam, the President of the United States, whoever he is, will not deserve nor receive the respect which is essential if the United States is to continue to play the great role we are destined to play. It would amount to a renunciation of our morality, an abdication of our leadership among nations, and an invitation for the mighty to prey upon the weak all around the world."

Speaking in Texas a few days later, President Nixon elaborated his view in the following words:

"While I had my political differences with (President Johnson), and he with me, I am sure he would agree that each of us in his way tries to leave that office with as much respect and with as much strength in the world as he possibly can—that is his responsibility—and to do it the best way that he possibly can. . . . But if the United States at this time leaves Vietnam and allows a Communist takeover, the office of President of the United States will lose respect and I am not going to let that happen."

The effect on the constitutional powers of the Congress flowing from President Nixon's doctrine of the Presidency—which does not differ from President Johnson's—in my judgment, are deeply disturbing. I find no basis in the Constitution, and no basis in our Nation's history, for equating our national morality with the degree of "strength" and

"respect" commanded by the President. And the President's prescription that it is the "responsibility" of each incumbent to aggrandize the Presidency as best he can is the "responsibility" of each incumbent to aggrandize the Presidency as best he can is at odds with our whole constitutional system of separation of powers and checks and balances. If I did not have as much faith as I have in the President's feeling for democracy I could say in its barest terms it is a doctrine for successive Presidents reminiscent of the "Divine Right of Kings."

Alexander Hamilton, though regarded as an advocate of strong executive authority, in *Federalist* 75, defended the constitutional division of the war powers in the following terms:

"The history of human conduct does not warrant that exalted opinion of human virtue which would make it wise in a nation to commit interests of so delicate and momentous a kind as those which concern its intercourse with the rest of the world to the sole disposal of a magistrate created and circumstanced as would be the President of the United States."

The words of Abraham Lincoln on the Mexican War in 1848 when he was a member of Congress are also pertinent:

"The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons. Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This, our Convention undertook to be the most oppressive of all Kingly oppressions; and they resolve to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us."

PRESIDENT'S POSITION ON VIETNAM

In his April 26 address, President Nixon articulated his Vietnam policy with remarkable candor, stating it as: ". . . our overall goal of ensuring South Vietnam's survival as an independent country"—in addition to protecting our forces which are still there.

With respect to the current fighting, the President said "Our air strikes have been essential . . . in assisting the South Vietnamese in their efforts 'to protect their homes and their country from a Communist takeover.' He further said: "I have ordered that our air and naval attacks . . . be continued until the North Vietnamese stop their offensive in South Vietnam."

I believe it is also pertinent to note that the President said his plan to withdraw an additional 20,000 U.S. ground troops "has the full approval of President Thieu."

It seems clear from the President's own words that our Vietnam disengagement policy—for which he has sought and deserved so much credit—is conditioned by a first and a second mortgage—one held by Saigon as above and the other held by Hanoi—agreement on a cease-fire.

It is possible that the current combination of ARVN ground forces and massive U.S. air and naval forces will succeed in inflicting a decisive battlefield defeat on North Vietnam's Communist forces in the struggle now raging—and I hope this proves to be so. Such a victory would free us to withdraw under the President's prescription.

However, current battlefield reports and past history indicate that this outcome is uncertain. The more likely prospect is at least some more years of additional fighting by the South and North Vietnamese forces—but with at least U.S. air and naval forces providing the margin of survival for the South Vietnamese government. The question then arises, is our commitment to the Government of South Vietnam open-ended? Can we be mired there without regard to our necessities at home and abroad for as long as Hanoi chooses to press attacks and as long as Saigon alone cannot fend them off. And, the

President's silence on a residual force of U.S. troops on the ground in Vietnam can only mean we will continue to insure a policy of underwriting the government of South Vietnam with our own trip wire.

VIETNAM AND NATION'S WAR POWERS

I agree with President Nixon that the overall position of the United States everywhere in the world is at stake. But I differ on what needs to be done. In my judgment, it demands a complete withdrawal from Vietnam, rather than a reescalation of the U.S. combat role and a further extension of the President's apparent undertaking to ensure the survival of the government of South Vietnam. We have done all that any nation could do in Vietnam to help an ally—it is not our war. We have done more than can be justified in terms of our national interests and priorities.

President Nixon is now in Moscow to negotiate a number of major agreements. I have great confidence in the President's skill as a negotiator and I would do nothing to impair his effectiveness in these crucial sessions with the Soviet leaders. We must all pray for his success because in a real sense the very survival of the human race could be affected by the outcome.

By their very nature, the negotiations in Moscow involve the bargaining and compromising of the various goals of both nations. From a global perspective, we have every right to trust that while President Nixon may seek Soviet cooperation in the achievement of his objectives in Vietnam he has a clear perspective of the far more vital U.S. national interests in Europe, the Mideast, the arms race and trade.

In my judgment, it is in the overriding national interest of the United States to set a date for the total U.S. disengagement and withdrawal of our forces from Vietnam this year. That necessity, and that decision, must take priority over the understandable bent of President Nixon and his military advisors to assure, if they can, the military success of the government of Vietnam.

I am prepared to be quite blunt about that. It is not in the interest of the United States to allow the ARVN to be overrun, and the Thieu government to be overthrown by this current North Vietnamese offensive. But we have already done in Vietnam all that any nation could ever do for an ally in terms of our own casualties and treasure spent, let alone in the division of our country. And, we have helped to establish a heavily armed one-million man force (and an airforce) with a capability at least as great and probably much greater than that of North Vietnam. Now we can do no more in the fighting without serious jeopardy to our national interests at home and abroad. We can be sure of the fact that if the South Vietnamese people and government want a country, they can have it, because we have equipped them for the purpose. But for us the time has come to get out completely. We cannot continue for the indefinite future to underwrite the survival and security of South Vietnam.

From beginning to end, the Vietnam war has been a "Presidential" war which under the practice since World War II is synonymous with "undeclared" war. All the key decisions have been Presidential decisions, based on claims of authority asserted to be inherent in the President's role as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces and as the essential "conductor" of the Nation's foreign policy—and in essence to omit the Congress.

The very concept of a Presidential war is alien to our Constitution and our Nation's historical traditions. Yet, in practice, the momentum of the "Presidential" war procedure is very powerful. Four years ago Presi-

dent Johnson, who had been elected in 1964 by the greatest plurality in our Nation's history, was forced out of politics by the Frankenstein's monster he had created in Vietnam. Yet President Nixon, while he has done so very much more to wind down the war, is still contending for the same kind of Presidential power to wage undeclared war which undid President Johnson. And, this alleged Presidential power to wage undeclared war will continue unless we can devise a methodology for controlling it—and preventing the initiation of new "Presidential" wars.

THE "WAR POWERS ACT"

The War Powers Act corrects the basic flaw of the post-war practice by restoring to the Congress and to the people a meaningful role on the question of war or peace.

The War Powers Act makes ample provision for emergency action by the President. Its unique feature is that, in doing so, it builds in an automatic stop-loss feature necessitating affirmative Congressional action within thirty days. If the President takes emergency action putting the armed forces into hostilities, he must immediately make a full report of the circumstances, authority for, and expected scope and duration of, the military measures he has initiated. If the President is unable to obtain the concurrence of Congress to extend his authority, he must terminate his actions at the end of thirty days. The bill has strict provisions to prevent filibuster or other delays.

The War Powers Act cannot create national wisdom where there is none. But it can insure that the collective wisdom of the President and the Congress will be brought to bear on the life and death questions of war and peace. The Pentagon Papers and the Anderson Papers have shown us how dissenting and questioning viewpoints can be screened out or excluded altogether from the Presidential decision-making process. The real danger to our security today is not that the Congress might hamstring the President; the real danger is that Presidents can—and do—shoot from the hip. If the collective judgment of the President and Congress is required to go to war, it will call for responsible action by the Congress for which each member must answer individually and for restraint by both the Congress and the President.

SUMMARY

In summary, we are faced with the dual task of ending an on-going "Presidential" war while also finding ways to prevent future "Presidential" wars. The War Powers Act deals with the second of these two considerations. But it is closely related to the first part of the question also. The War Powers Act grew out of the Vietnam experience and the difficulty of getting a handle on undeclared war in an *ex post facto* way through a fund cut-off. But, in greatly clarifying the problem and the basic constitutional issues, the War Powers Act, in my judgment, has now made it possible and likely that the Congress will deal effectively with the ongoing Vietnam war, too. The consensus in the Senate is stronger than ever and a new ferment is clearly evident in the House of Representatives.

The year 1972 is likely to prove to be a decisive year in our Nation's history respecting the basic constitutional issue of committing the Nation to war. I believe that the constitutional crisis which has gripped the Nation over this question will be ended by effective Congressional action.

In closing, I must state my conviction that this resolution of our national dilemma over Vietnam by getting out will not bring on the consequences predicted by the President. On the contrary, I believe America will be infinitely strengthened both at home and abroad.

FIRST INTO CHINA

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's recent trip to mainland China opened up a new era of communication and hopefully, understanding. The isolation and ignorance which have characterized United States-Chinese relations for decades have finally come to an end. Excellent opportunities exist now to build upon the President's trip and to open new horizons of learning and knowledge and mutual respect.

I recently came across a wonderful article in Air Line Pilot written by Marty Martinez entitled, "First Into China." This article deals with the airline crews that preceded the President into China as well as those which formed part of the Presidential party. This article brings to light a unique American experience in developing relations with the Chinese. I wish to commend Air Line Pilot magazine for its development of this topic, and to insert this article into the RECORD:

FIRST INTO CHINA

(By Marty Martinez)

President Richard M. Nixon's visit to the People's Republic of China gave millions of Americans their first glimpse at the inside of that country via television. It also gave a few airline pilots who preceded the President the chance to see first hand what capabilities exist for commercial air service at the country's two major cities, Shanghai and Peking.

They found that, in general, facilities for such service are somewhat behind U.S. standards, but adequate. There was a noticeable lack of air traffic. But ground crews were highly trained and efficient, and their equipment, while not modern, was well maintained and in good condition.

In all, three carriers were involved: TWA, Saturn Airways and Pan American World Airways.

Captains C. Marvin Horstman and William A. Dixon, both TWA management pilots, flew a Boeing 707 and transported 61 television technicians and 84,000 pounds of their equipment needed to cover the presidential state visit.

A Saturn Hercules turboprop, flown by Captain Sam Terry and First Officer John Dayhuff (since upgraded to captain), carried the equipment for the TV satellite ground station.

Pan Am used two 707s with double crews, to transport the newsmen who accompanied the President. At the controls of the first of these two aircraft to touch down were Captains Sam Hunt and Arthur Nappel.

According to Captain Dayhuff, the flight was anticipated with great gusto by the entire Saturn crew. They received a thorough company briefing before departure from the West Coast and again at Andersen Air Base, Guam. There they were provided with a facilities chart prepared by the General Administration of Civil Aviation of China. It contained detailed air traffic control regulations, air routes, instrument approach charts, radio communication and navigation facilities information.

One of the navigational requirements imposed by the Chinese was that the final leg of the flight be directly from U.S. soil to the People's Republic of China, bypassing any overflight of Taiwan. Consequently, the jumping off point for the flight was Guam.

"Our route to Shanghai," Captain Dayhuff explains, "was via Remora intersection, Shehshan, Hengsha and Lungsha. We were required to cross Shehshan at 3,000 meters (9,843 feet) while Hengsha and Lungsha were crossed at 1,500 meters (4,921 feet). The 10-kilometer-wide corridor that we flew from Remora to Shanghai, measured out to 171 miles."

The Saturn crew's first radio contact with Shanghai came while the aircraft was still some 1,700 nautical miles away. Using a frequency provided to it at Guam, the Saturn crew made HF contact with a woman controller who provided periodic weather reports in "good" English.

"Our instructions," Dayhuff notes, "called for us to make radio contact with Shanghai no later than 85 kilometers (52 nautical miles) from Shehshan to give our ETA for that check point and to get an OK to enter Shanghai's control area. By then we were on VHF frequency 118.1 and radio contact was excellent."

Prior to departure, the crew had been told that both Shanghai and Peking airfields do not have UHF and that only HF (AM) and VHF communications are available. All radio contact within the country is on the 118.1 VHF frequency, including the air traffic control center, approach control, radar advisories, tower and ground communications. There were a few times when there were two or more of these transmitting simultaneously.

For the most part, the procedures followed are those of the International Civil Aviation Organization, even down to the English words used and the phonetic alphabet. An ICAO flight plan was filed for entry into China and similar forms were used for flights within the country and when leaving it. The one major difference is that the metric system is used in providing flight path deviations, cruising altitudes and for weather reporting. Conversion tables were carried, however, so crews experienced no difficulty.

The approach to Shanghai is aided by a strong ADF, ILS and radar vector capability to both runways—18 and 36. The frequencies of the middle and inner markers and ILS are the same for both runways. But only one set is compatible with ICAO equipment and was reliable. The tower contact was reported as "excellent."

"Our approach to Shanghai was for landing on runway 36, using a rectangular pattern. We picked up the ILS on 110.3. After landing we made a 180-degree turn at the end of the runway and exited on the middle taxiway as the tower directed us to the hardstand area. There the airport officials had every thing in readiness," Dayhuff says.

It was scheduled as a two-hour stop, just long enough to pick up a Chinese navigator and radio operator for the Shanghai-to-Peking leg, get an update on the weather and refuel.

"The welcome was certainly one of the most ceremonious I have ever experienced," Captain Dayhuff recalls. "The entire crew was taken into the terminal building, introductions were made, tea served and a little time was spent getting acquainted. In a short while, our maintenance crew left with its Chinese counterparts to oversee the refueling and departing procedures while we received a very elaborate weather briefing."

During the refueling, the Chinese ground crews tested the fuel before putting it in the aircraft. It tested to the equivalent of JP-1 and JP-4. The trucks carried approximately 8,000 gallons and were equipped with dual single point refueling hoses. Lavatory and trash services were also available.

Once airborne for the Peking leg, the crew discovered that its two Chinese guides were also very competent. "We flew at 9,000 meters (29,500 feet)," Dayhuff says, "and had five position reporting points: Wushih, Pihshien, Tsinan, Potoow and Tawang-chuang. The

total flight distance was 617 nautical miles. The only VOR station we encountered on the flight was at Wushih. All other fixes were ADF, but they were good and strong.

"En route the Chinese navigator stood behind Captain Terry. He proved very capable. Radar mapping was used continuously. Likewise, the radio operator seemed quite familiar with our equipment. He could tune HF and VHF quickly and tuned in the ADF stations for us as well. It was obvious that he had done his homework."

Both the Chinese crew members taken aboard revealed that they had studied English for four months in preparation for their duties. And, as it turned out, they managed to eliminate the language barrier fairly well. Their cheerful demeanor throughout proved that they were also enjoying themselves tremendously, according to Captain Dayhuff.

The Peking and Shanghai terminals and field layout are identical. After the Peking facility was constructed under Soviet supervision, the Chinese took the blueprints to Shanghai and duplicated the facilities down to the last taxiway. The 10,000-foot runways, although slightly rough, present no hazard and the taxiways were found to be wide enough to accommodate the U.S. aircraft. While Peking has an ILS, it is not compatible with ICAO equipment, consequently, the approach facilities used are ADF and radar. Like Shanghai, the middle and inner markers for both runways have identical frequencies and identifiers.

While the navigation and communications facilities reminded the pilots of the equipment they used just after World War Two, the most surprising aspect of flying into China was the nearly complete absence of flying activity. Captain Sam Hunt, commenting in the Pan Am employee newspaper, noted: "Here were great big airports with runways exceeding 10,000 feet, huge terminal buildings, and nobody around. There were very few planes at the airports. All were Russian-built, apparently VIP planes. I think in the three trips in and out of China we saw one airplane in the air. There was no air traffic."

As at Shanghai, the approach to Peking presented no problem for the Saturn crew: The aircraft landed on runway 36 and again had to make a 180-degree turn and taxi back to the other end of the runway. Along the way a Chinese guard motioned for the aircraft to stop, although the tower was insisting that it keep moving. "We stopped, but only for a moment as the guard quickly motioned us on," Captain Dayhuff says.

"We were then directed to an off-loading area remote from the terminal building. The signalman was using ping-pong-type paddles, red on one side and green on the other, to wave us in.

"A large crowd was waiting for us. They were all dressed alike—Mao jackets, pants and caps—so it was difficult to tell the officials from the workers. The temperature was about 3 degrees and although we were all dressed warmly, our hosts insisted that at least the maintenance crew put on the heavier Mao-type coats they had waiting for us."

After a welcoming ceremony, which included the stamping of passports, the crew was taken to its quarters. Captain Dayhuff described them as similar to military BOQ's. They contained two-man bedrooms with a bath. Adjoining the bedrooms was a common living area that was well stocked with tea, mixed beverages, fruit candy, cigarettes and political literature in English.

Individual movement of crew members was unrestricted as was ground photography. At both Shanghai and Peking, trips into the city were offered, but time didn't permit taking advantage of the invitations. For the most part, the crew could only take advantage of the facilities available at the airport, which included a small gift shop. "By

U.S. standards," said Dayhuff, "it was austere. It contained handicraft items, vases, candy, toys and cigarettes. I was impressed by the fact that the Chinese had banking facilities at the airport to handle our money exchange. It simplified our shopping."

During its stay the crew was the center of curiosity, but the people kept their distance. None came up to shake hands, for example. Still, they were more than willing to pose for pictures, except for members of the army. "The military people didn't like to have their pictures taken," said Dayhuff. "They would turn away. Unlike the civilians in the area, the army troops were grim and stern looking."

The highlight of the brief stay may well have been the food. Every meal, including breakfast, was served in several courses. The evening meal consisted of some 20 courses. "We sat around a large round table with a huge lazy susan in the middle," Dayhuff recalls. "I tried everything and just when I thought I was all finished, the trays would be filled again with a different type of food. You name it and it was there: duck, fish, beef, vegetables, soup, apple turnovers, just everything."

About the overall experience, he says: "It was about the most excited I've ever been about taking a trip, and I wasn't disappointed. It was the most interesting flight I've ever been on."

Dayhuff, like the rest of the crew, was disappointed at not being able to take advantage of the invitation to visit the cities of Shanghai and Peking, but he hasn't given up hope. There may yet be other shuttle flights to that country in the near future and he plans to volunteer.

SAVE THE BOOKS CORPS

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as an honorary chairman of the Save the Books Corps, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House the valuable work which Mr. Walter Sysak and his many coworkers are providing by sending discarded schoolbooks to children throughout the world at no cost.

Ours is a nation that has consistently opposed the book burners of the world. Therefore, I find it particularly significant that this organization not only preserves, but distributes textbooks to other nations.

This volunteer effort which has such a positive impact in our relations with other nations has sent some 225,000 volumes worth more than \$1 million to 39 countries throughout the world. Many of the books have also been sent to deprived areas here in the United States. When one considers the number of books and the amount of effort necessary to raise funds for shipping them, the dedication of this organization becomes obvious.

On the eve of the 11th anniversary of the Save the Books Corps I want especially to commend Mr. Sysak, president of the corps, for his vision in starting the program, his dedication to its successful operation, and his desire to devote so much of his time and energy to a project which unquestionably makes our world a better place in which to live. I

congratulate him on 11 years of excellent work. I would also like to note the considerable contributions of Bernadette O'Brien and Tim Sullivan to the organization. I wish the Save the Books Corps continued success in the future.

ANOTHER HANDGUN/ANOTHER POLICEMAN DEAD

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, a Chicago policeman was murdered yesterday afternoon when he tried to stop a robbery attempt. He was shot to death with a .22 caliber pistol—a Saturday night special—the weapon of choice for virtually every street criminal in this country. Patrolman Robert Gallowitch was the first Chicago policeman killed in the line of duty this year, but across the Nation 44 officers have already been killed—all but 12 with handguns. Last year 100 policemen lost their lives this same way because of a handgun.

This kind of tragedy is going to happen time and time again until Congress does something about the national traffic in handguns. We ought to ban their sale and manufacture, as other civilized countries did long ago. Handguns have one basic purpose, and that is to kill or maim other human beings. Had those robbers not been able to buy a handgun, Officer Gallowitch would be alive today. That deadly handgun gave them the "courage" to shoot it out with the police. With a knife or a broken bottle or just their fists, they would not have been so brave.

The death of Officer Gallowitch is a tragedy. But there is an even greater tragedy that Congress will not put a stop to it by banning the sale and manufacture of handguns. The shootings of Governor Wallace in Maryland and a policeman in Chicago get the headlines, but the same thing happens with much less notoriety to almost 10,000 Americans every year. Is not it about time we tried to stop it?

I insert an article from the Chicago Tribune that describes the tragedy of a Chicago policeman at this point.

ANSWERING ROBBERY CALL: COP, 30, FATALLY SHOT; 2 BEING HELD

(By Patricia Leeds and David Young)

A 30-year-old Kensington District policeman was fatally shot yesterday when he approached two men who police say were preparing to rob a jewelry store at 8649 S. Cottage Grove Ave.

Patrolman Robert L. Gallowitch died in Jackson Park Hospital five hours after the shooting while a team of doctors headed by Dr. Morris T. Friedell, the hospital medical director, fought to save his life. Gallowitch's heart stopped five times, four times in the hospital while his wife, Joan, a former nurse at the hospital, and fellow policemen maintained a vigil. The operation took place in the emergency room because Gallowitch was too critical to move to an operating room.

Police said Gallowitch, who had been on the force 17 months, was in a one-man patrol car when a burglary alarm went off in the

jewelry store. Gallowitch and two other policemen in one-man cars sped to the scene, with Gallowitch going to the rear and the other two to the front.

As Gallowitch stepped from his car he was shot in the abdomen. Frederick C. Lancaster, 21, who gave two addresses, 2951 S. King Dr. and 7805 S. Phillips Ave. was shot in the right arm and left leg by Gallowitch.

Patrolmen Kenneth Josephs and Paul McGrath, an evidence technician, raced to the rear and apprehended Lancaster, who is being held in connection with the shooting with a .22 caliber pistol. The other assailant fled on foot. A man believed to be Lancaster's accomplice was later arrested in his home.

The alarm had been sounded by the jewelry store owner, Jack Wittgren, who saw two suspicious-looking men approach the rear of the store in an Illinois Bell Telephone Co. installation truck.

Police said the two men, who apparently planned to use the truck as a ruse to approach the store and then cut the cables to the burglar alarm, had taken the truck from the driver, George Clark, 20, of 623 E. 63d St., while he was at 2042 E. 72d Pl.

The assailants handcuffed and blindfolded Clark and put him in the rear of the enclosed truck and drove to the jewelry store.

Gallowitch, an Army veteran and graduate of Washington High School, had a son, Robert, 6, and a daughter, Michele. Lancaster was treated at the same hospital and then taken to Cermak Memorial Hospital in the County Jail complex.

Gallowitch's death ended the career of a fine policeman, said his watch commander, Lt. Kenneth Alexander. Said Alexander, as he paced the floor of the hospital, "He was a helluva kid."

Gallowitch is the first policeman killed this year in the line of the duty.

HARRIMAN CHARGE RINGS HOLLOW

HON. ROBERT MCCLORY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. MCCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the misleading pose of W. Averell Harriman, former Ambassador to Russia, as an objective nonpartisan expert on foreign policy deserves close examination.

In my personal view, Mr. Harriman has resorted to flagrant partisanship in his public statements which are both unbecoming a former diplomat and which subject all of his views to the closest scrutiny. Harriman's bitterness toward President Nixon—particularly in the light of the President's successful and historic missions to Peking and Moscow—resulted in a recent charge that he was "against Nixon" because "it was impossible for him to tell the truth."

In commenting on Harriman's own concealment of the truth, the distinguished dean of the Washington Bureau of the Chicago Tribune, Willard Edwards, composed an article which appeared in the Tuesday, May 23 issue of the Chicago Tribune. Mr. Edwards' article follows:

HARRIMAN CHARGE RINGS HOLLOW

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—Former ambassador to Russia W. Averell Harriman, a political

activist despite his 80 years, explained to a group at a recent cocktail party why he is so bitterly opposed to President Nixon.

"What I've got against Nixon is that it's impossible for him to tell the truth," Harriman said.

As he was speaking, Dr. Francis L. Lowenheim of Rice University was prying another "top secret" label off a World War II message which, for unknown reasons, had remained in the Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N.Y., unused and unseen by scholars for 27 years until its recent declassification.

This message, from Harriman in Moscow to President Roosevelt in Washington, is dated April 2, 1945. It seemed to provide evidence bearing on Harriman's fitness to assess veracity in public figures. He is not above suppression of the truth for long periods, this new disclosure indicates.

Loewenheim is the indefatigable historian who, two months ago, unearthed a similarly buried "top secret" message from Roosevelt to Prime Minister Churchill, dated April 6, 1945. That revelation of FDR's determination, just before his death, to get "tougher" with Russian Premier Joseph Stalin, attracted world-wide attention.

The Harriman message's existence had been noted by the State Department in 1967.

But only a 75-word "excerpt" was published. It provided so little information that there was room for wonder why Harriman marked it "personal and top secret for the President."

The unpublished remainder of the message, some 500 words in length, is now available for study as a result of Loewenheim's efforts. It sheds light on an issue carefully hidden from the American public at the time and ignored in most accounts of the beginning of the cold war.

This is the issue of Communist treatment and use of prisoners of war. No subject commands more interest as the United States seeks to terminate its conflict with North Viet Nam.

The extraordinary feature of the newly disclosed message is that Russia, an ally, insisted upon treating American prisoners of war, liberated from German hands, as if they were hostages captured from an enemy. The Russian military prevented American officers from visiting them, opposed their repatriation, and kept them in harsh confinement.

In Harriman's angry words to Roosevelt, Russia was "trying to use our liberated prisoners of war as a club." Americans, particularly the wounded and the sick, were suffering hardships, he said. They were hungry and starving at a time when the U.S. was pouring vast quantities of vehicles and food into Russia.

Harriman recommended, in reprisal, that the Russians be deprived of access to liberated Russian prisoners in France. This suggestion was forwarded by Roosevelt to the War Department. There is no record of what happened to it.

"The Soviets decide to do things, not to obtain our good will, but because they think their interests are being served," Harriman warned Roosevelt. "Conversely, the things we do to assist or please them do not obtain good will from them. Failure to stand our ground is interpreted as a sign of weakness. It is my belief that if we adopt firm measures, the Soviets will pay more attention to our requests. If we delay adoption of this policy, I am convinced that we will have greater difficulties as time goes on."

Such words obviously had the ring of truth. But the State Department, always fearful of Russian sensitivity to criticism, chose to delete them in 1967 when it made voluminous disclosures of other "top secret" correspondence of the 1945 period.

Harriman, who now is assailing Nixon for not telling the truth, acquiesced in this censorship. He was agreeable to continued suppression of a truthful warning voiced 27 years ago which would still be hidden except for Loewenheim's pertinacity.

The historian said he hoped that President Nixon, arriving in Moscow today, had had access to the message.

"He might do well," he said, "to ponder its meaning for our own time. And so might the rest of us."

RETIRED PENTAGON NAVAL OFFICER REVEALS SECURITY CLASSIFICATION ABUSES AND THE SYSTEMATIC WITHHOLDING OF INFORMATION FROM CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee's hearings on the Freedom of Information Act is now focusing on the access by Congress to information from the executive branch and the operations of the security classification system.

As part of this phase of our hearings, the subcommittee today heard particularly revealing testimony from an outstanding U.S. naval officer, Gene R. La Rocque, rear admiral, retired, who spent some 31 years in the service of our country as a commissioned officer of the U.S. Navy. Commissioned in March 1941, Admiral La Rocque was at Pearl Harbor during the Japanese attack on December 7, 1941, and served in the Pacific theater during World War II in destroyers. He participated in 13 separate engagements.

Following World War II, he commanded two destroyer escorts, a cruiser, a division of destroyers, and a destroyer flotilla. Later, he served with the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean as commander of a task group.

Since 1957, he has been stationed at the Pentagon where he served on the strategic planning staff of the Navy, on the strategic planning staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and was assistant director of strategic plans, Navy Department.

He is a graduate of the Naval War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and in 1969 was awarded the Legion of Merit by the Navy Department for his work in strategic planning.

Mr. Speaker, our subcommittee has received considerable testimony about the high degree of overclassification and needless classification of documents for national defense protection. Some witnesses have estimated at between 75 to 99 percent of such documents should not be classified at all. We have also heard accounts of how top Defense Department officials have deceived the Congress by half-truths, the withholding of vital information from Congress, while selectively "leaking" other previously classified information to influence a congress-

sional decision on a weapons system or on an appropriation item. Documentation for such accounts, however, has always been elusive, because of the tight discipline imposed.

Admiral La Rocque's expert testimony is extremely important, because it documents fully these types of accounts. His experience is recent, since he retired on April 1, 1972; moreover, he served in a high official capacity for 15 years in the Pentagon until his retirement and spanned a half dozen Secretaries of Defense under four presidential administrations. Thus, his statements must carry great weight and deserve careful attention.

Here are a few brief examples:

In the military the best way to prevent disclosure of information is to classify it. Classification is made for a variety of reasons. First, to prevent it from falling into the hands of a potential enemy; this is legitimate but accounts for only a small portion of the material classified. Other reasons for classifying material are: to keep it from the other military services, from civilians in their own service, from civilians in the Defense Department, from the State Department, and of course, from the Congress. Sometimes, information is classified to withhold it for later release to maximize the effect on the public or the Congress.

Frequently, information is classified so that only portions of it can be released selectively to the press to influence the public or the Congress. These time released capsules have a lasting effect.

Regrettably, far too much material is classified; much of it just because it is easier to classify than not. You cannot get into trouble by over-classifying; only by failing to classify. And, it is easier to maintain secure files if all material is classified. In that way, only one set of files need be maintained.

Classification is also very simple; all one needs is a typewriter or a Secret stamp. In most offices, the secretaries or the yeomen establish the classification. And since most typed matter is not signed, no one ever knows who classified the material or for what reason. There is no central record of what was classified, by whom, when, or for what purpose.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder that the security classification system as administered by Executive order during the past two decades has broken down. It has proven unworkable, unmanageable, and in my judgment as based on our hearings, is not capable of protecting those truly vital defense secrets that should deceive the highest level of protection. That is why I have introduced legislation to create a statutory system to replace the Executive order approach.

The full text of Admiral La Rocque's revealing statement is presented for the enlightenment of our colleagues:

STATEMENT OF GENE R. LA ROCQUE

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of this committee! Your invitation to appear before this committee is appreciated and I am pleased to be here. I wish to congratulate this committee for its past success and its continuing effort to ensure a free flow of information within our society.

We cannot have a democratic society if the people and the people's representatives

in the Congress do not have access to the information necessary to make sound judgments.

For the past 31 years it has been my privilege to serve this nation as a commissioned officer of the United States Navy. I plan to continue service to my country as a private citizen. For this reason I have assumed the position of Director of the Center for Defense Information here in Washington, D.C. The Center is an independent organization conducting analyses of Defense Department policies, both current and projected. The results of these analyses are being made available to the public through the media, business groups, labor groups, church groups and any citizen group or individual who desires them. We also make the results of our analyses available to the executive branch and legislative branches of the government when requested. Also, as an educational organization we try to portray in understandable terms some of the more complex defense issues.

My experience in the dissemination and classification of information has been entirely within the Defense Department. Perhaps it would be useful for me to explain the attitude I have found in the Defense Department on information dissemination and offer some suggestions to increase the flow of information for our national benefit.

As a general rule most officers recognize their responsibilities to provide the public and the Congress with accurate, timely information. Unfortunately, the nature of a military organization makes it easy for an individual to avoid this responsibility. Since everyone has an officer senior to him, each person is reluctant to release any information, as it may not be in accord with his boss's views. This is said in no way to denigrate officers, as the system functions best when there is a high level of loyalty. This loyalty is also an essential quality for promotion.

In the military the best way to prevent disclosure of information is to classify it. Classification is made for a variety of reasons. First, to prevent it from falling into the hands of a potential enemy; this is legitimate but accounts for only a small portion of the material classified. Other reasons for classifying material are: to keep it from the other military services, from civilians in their own service, from civilians in the Defense Department, from the State Department, and of course, from the Congress. Sometimes, information is classified to withhold it for later release to maximize the effect on the public or the Congress.

Frequently, information is classified so that only portions of it can be released selectively to the press to influence the public or the Congress. These time released capsules have a lasting effect.

The ritual begins each spring with the Pentagon implying that a potential enemy is developing a very threatening weapon, "but unfortunately the exact details are classified." These incomplete statements are the stock in trade at appropriations time to persuade the Congress to authorize military appropriation. Last year it was big holes in the ground in the Soviet Union. This year it is evidence of a Soviet ship under construction which might be a carrier or a merchant ship.

Regrettably, far too much material is classified; much of it just because it is easier to classify than not. You cannot get into trouble by over-classifying; only by failing to classify. And, it is easier to maintain secure files if all material is classified. In that way, only one set of files need be maintained.

Classification is also very simple; all one needs is a typewriter or a Secret stamp. In most offices, the secretaries or the yeomen establish the classification. And since most typed matter is not signed, no one ever knows who classified the material or for what

reason. There is no central record of what was classified by whom, when, or for what purpose.

It has been a matter of concern to me that the Congress, charged with raising and supporting our armed forces and for declaring war has increasingly been denied the very elemental information necessary to make these decisions. I find it difficult to understand why the representatives of the people, the Congress, accept this situation.

There is an attitude among some officers that the Congress cannot be trusted with classified information because of the penchant of some to tell all to the public. In the Pentagon's lexicon, they are "bad security risks." If this attitude prevails in the military and if Congress fails to assert itself, civilian control of the military will further erode. There are some simple, workable steps, compatible with our Constitution, which could reduce the amount of classified material and consequently make more information available to the public and to the Congress.

First, each paper, document, or article classified should bear the name and rank of the person making the classification.

Second, each person authorized to classify information should be so authorized in writing.

Third, it should be clearly established that it is the obligation of the Department of Defense to provide Congress with adequate and pertinent information regardless of classification, which the Congress needs to base its decisions to raise and support armed forces

and to declare war. Each member of Congress by virtue of his position should be provided all such information in order to carry out his duties under the Constitution.

Fourth, establish a section of GAO, or an independent board with maximum security clearance, to examine on a continuing basis the security system in the Defense Department.

Fifth, require classification of documents be limited to those affecting national defense—rather than national security, a broader and more ambiguous concept.

Sixth, require the Secretary of Defense and his major subordinates to appear before Congress and respond to questions whenever a majority of the Congress so requests.

Seventh, require the President, as Commander in Chief, to appear before a joint session of Congress and respond to questions whenever a majority of Congress so requests.

In a 1969 memo to the Heads of Executive Departments and agencies, the President gets to the heart of the problem of free flow of information within our government; The President's memo states, "The policy of this Administration is to comply to the fullest extent possible with Congressional requests for information". No pretense is made of an effort to keep the legislative branch informed, but only to respond to the "fullest extent possible" to questions. The problem is that the people and the people's representatives in the Congress frequently don't know what questions to ask. Some of the burden for informing the Congress should be shifted to the Executive Branch of the Government.

MASSACHUSETTS WOMAN LAWYER HONORED

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 30, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts Association of Women Lawyers recently elected Miss Doris R. Poté, an outstanding attorney, as its president for the year 1972-73. Miss Poté was graduated from Radcliffe College, cum laude, Suffolk University Law School, J.D., and Harvard Law School. She received one of the highest scores on the Massachusetts Bar exam. She serves her alma mater, Suffolk University Law School, as registrar, and at the same time is an assistant professor of law, teaching courses in consumer protection and urban law. Her activities and interests vary from the Boston Center for Blind Children, where she is legal counsel, to her position as trustee of Consumer Protection Affairs Foundation, Inc.

The members of the Massachusetts Association of Women Lawyers can certainly look forward to an exciting and memorable year under her leadership.

SENATE—Wednesday, May 31, 1972

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. HAROLD E. HUGHES, a Senator from the State of Iowa.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, we thank Thee for every day Thou dost give us to live. We thank Thee for gloomy days and bright days, for days of striving and earnest contest, for days of pressure which drive us to prompt action, for days of reflection when life comes into clearer focus, for days of rest and quietness, for days of prayer when the curtain of sense and time are drawn back and we are in Thy presence, one with the Infinite and Eternal. Give us grace, wisdom, and strength for all the days and for every experience. Thanks be to Thee for this day to be lived to Thy glory and for our fellow man. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. HAROLD E. HUGHES, a Senator from the State of Iowa, to

perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HUGHES thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 30, 1972, Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably, with amendments, on May 30, 1972, the bill (H.R. 13188) to authorize appropriations for the procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments, and to authorize the average annual active duty personnel strength for the Coast Guard, and submitted a report (No. 92-819) thereon, which was printed.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 30, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HUGHES) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF THE EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of the Exchange Stabilization Fund, for the fiscal year 1971 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.