

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONTROLS NEEDED OVER CHARITABLE MAIL SOLICITATIONS

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, most Americans are unaware that as much as 80 or 90 percent of the funds contributed in response to mail solicitations are skimmed off by a variety of middlemen.

Too often, only a trickle passes through to the intended beneficiary.

This disgraceful situation was comprehensively outlined in reports published in Sunday's Washington Star and written by a Pulitzer Prize-winning investigative reporter, Miriam Ottenberg.

Miss Ottenberg points out the need for legislation, which I am having drafted, to let the donor know where his money is going when he responds to one of these appeals.

The shabby operators tend to poison the atmosphere for all charities, even the completely legitimate. Self-disclosure would hopefully force out the marginal types, to the benefit of the honest appeals which we would all want to support.

Miss Ottenberg's main article and an accompanying side-bar follow:

[From the Washington Star,
June 4, 1972]

THE PLEAS IN YOUR MAILBOX
(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Does your daily quota of mail make you feel that you and you alone are expected to alleviate all the world's miseries?

If so, it's because your name is among the millions selected by computers programmed to find potential givers to causes. Subscribing to a magazine, belonging to a book or record club, buying by mail or at some time giving to a single cause is enough to put you among the chosen.

Once that happens, you're asked to feed the hungry from Appalachia to Korea; heal the sick of cancer and respiratory diseases and some diseases you never heard of before; support your symphony, or rehabilitate wounded veterans and displaced refugees.

The mail solicitations are usually appealing and expertly done. Pitiful children eye you from the brochures. Sometimes the computer has worked your name into the body of the letter and even recalled your previous generous gift.

But do you know how much of your gift will go to those scrawny children or those maimed refugees? How much of your dollar is used to solicit more dollars through the mail? Is somebody—other than the intended recipient—profiting from your generosity?

The majority of fund-raising campaigns by mail try to pare expenses to make certain that the larger part of your gift goes to those you want to help. Some long-established, highly regarded charities have mail fund-raising drives that reportedly cost no more than 15 per cent of the money contributed.

On the other hand, The Star has found that sometimes as much as 80 or 90 per cent of your dollar may go to a professional fund raiser or consultant, to public relations men, mailing list owners and brokers, greeting

card manufacturers, envelope suppliers, printers and gadget makers.

One cause raised over \$1.2 million last year, but had less than \$75,000 left after it paid the costs of its mail campaign.

Then there are the charlatans who gobble up all the money raised and pacify the intended recipient charity with a few thousand dollars.

Since the men who try to debase the currency of philanthropy have been attracted to fund-raising by mail, Chief Postal Inspector William J. Cotter says the Postal Inspection Service has intensified its investigation of possible fraudulent use of the mails to raise money for causes.

Twenty so-called charities or promotional firms are now under investigation across the country, three have been indicted and a United States attorney is now considering prosecution of another fund-raising project.

Those are allegedly the outright frauds. Fund-raising appeals that violate no law but make more money for the promoters than for their causes have prompted Rep. Lionel Van Deerlin D-Calif., to start drafting what could be called "truth in giving" legislation. His idea is to require the printing right on the solicitation itself just how much of the money raised goes to the cause.

His proposal could have broad impact because almost \$8 billion a year is raised by mail appeals—half of it locally by church and city-wide appeals, the other half through national appeals.

Fund-raising by mail for both worthwhile and questionable causes has burgeoned since computers made it possible to focus appeals on groups with known interests.

Before computers, it was prohibitively expensive to try to sift out the names of potential givers.

For in this business, the name is the game. Your name is worth money. The owner of a mailing list might get as much as \$75 for a thousand names of known contributors like you. A list could be rented for as little as \$15 a thousand names, but average cost runs from \$25 to \$35 a thousand for a one-time rental.

A productive list—that is, one known to pull in the contributions—might be rented 20 or 25 times in a year. If you're on that kind of list, you could be introduced to that many new causes and get on many new lists. How many new lists you get on depends on your response to the causes.

For a charity, buying mailing lists is the first big expense. One cause that raised over \$1 million spent half a million on mailing lists.

The goal of buying lists is not only to get an immediate source of contributions but to build a "house list"—those who contribute this year and will be solicited again next year.

One professional fund raiser estimated that it costs 56 cents to get one new contributor but only five cents to bring back a previous contributor.

Charitable agencies have to keep on seeking new contributors because an estimated 25 percent of their previous contributors move or die or otherwise lose contact every year and their number has to be replenished.

Usually, the first year is the hardest for a new cause—so difficult that some find costs eating up every cent that comes in. But sometimes, they start small and manage to keep expenses down until they decide to seek a lot more givers.

One charitable cause in this area, seeking funds to build and operate a hospital and boys' town in Korea, borrowed \$10,000 to get started and spent \$23,153 to raise \$160,210.

Most of the money, according to the agency's statement under the District's Charitable Solicitation Act, promptly went to Korea.

The next year, when the agency tried to grow, it turned to mailing lists and sent out a wide appeal. It collected \$975,000, but expenses totaled \$368,000.

"I was disappointed when the auditors told me how much it cost," said the non-professional fund-raiser. "We tried to keep costs down. I didn't think it would be so high."

He works out of a basement office, pays his help—much of it part-time—little more than the minimum wage and himself lives in a medium-low income home. Through his efforts, his brother-in-law, a priest in Korea, was able to build a 150-bed hospital and is now building a boys' town.

"I know you can raise funds for less than 50 per cent of what you taken in," he said, "but if we try to grow the same amount every year, it's going to be expensive every year."

A fund-raising appeal doesn't use just one mailing list, but many. To try to find the right list for that particular appeal, the fund-raiser may rent as many as 30 or 40 lists, using about 5,000 names from each.

The fund-raiser will be testing not only the names but the copy for the appeal, whether the package gets results. He may find the mail isn't the right vehicle and he'll turn to some other form of fund-raising. But if it clicks, he'll proceed with the mail appeal, using the most productive 10 or 12 lists.

All this testing costs money and sometimes a new appeal hasn't got it. Some appeals borrow the initial sum, use money from the test to pay it back and get the funds to finance a wider appeal.

Occasionally, a fund-raiser will advance the money for the test—particularly if he dreamed up the project in the first place and the people he interested in the cause are naive enough about fund-raising to sign contracts most favorable to his interests.

In the realm of how much a fund-raising campaign costs, the fund-raiser may be the next big expense item. He may work for a fee based on how much he produces and how much time he puts in. Or he may take a 15 percent mark-up on the cost of the appeal package he has put together. Or he may ask for and get both a retainer and a better than 15 percent mark-up on all the costs of the campaign except postage.

If the fund-raiser also owns the mailing lists he uses, he may get not only the rental fee for the mailing lists but also a 20 percent broker's commission on the top of his other charges. But few fund-raisers collect that many ways.

A Massachusetts fund raiser with 30 national accounts said the lowest fee he charges is \$3,600. His highest was \$24,000 but he produces over \$30 million in contributions on that appeal.

A charitable agency may do its own fund-raising but get the advice of a consultant on the wording of the use, when to send out the appeal and appeal material, what mailing lists to how often, even whether to use stamps or a non-profit machine stamp.

To save agencies the cost of buying mailing lists, this consultant recommends using the telephone book for mail solicitations. The Washington agency following this advice reported that its fund-raising costs run about 40 percent of what it takes in and its major costs are labor and postage.

Despite the barrage of appeals now flooding the mails, this agency reported that it is getting slightly more through its fund solicitations than five years ago without any

increase in the number of appeals it makes a year.

If you're like most givers, you give because you know and admire the work of a charitable agency, because a cause attracts you or its message strikes a chord of sympathy, or because the fund-raiser sends you something and you feel guilty about accepting it without putting something into the pot.

Sometimes several of these reasons apply. Yes, you want to help the Indians or crippled veterans or hungry children everywhere or refugees from wars.

You want to help fight disease, even one you never knew existed. You're religious, patriotic, sensitive and besides you can always use another ballpoint pen or greeting cards or key chain.

That's how some fund-raisers and millions of \$1 and \$2 contributors figure.

However, The National Information Bureau, a non-profit membership group which reports on organizations soliciting money nationally for health and welfare causes, contends that unordered merchandise such as address labels, ties, handkerchiefs and pens "prey on the guilt feeling of a sensitive public" and send up the cost of fund-raising. The only people who really profit, according to this view, are the gimmick manufacturers.

A consultant whose fund-raising accounts include an Indian foundation said the mailings that include a premium draw a better response than the ones without it. Of the money that comes in, he said, between 65 and 75 percent goes directly or indirectly to the Indians.

He gave this estimate of the cost of your "gift" from the Indians: Names stickers, three or four cents; Christmas cards, three and a half to six cents; key rings, six to eight cents in the quantity bought by the fund-raiser; Easter and Christmas seals. A half cent to two cents.

He estimated that the cost of these mailings can run from 15 to 40 per cent of the total contributed, depending on how expensive the "gift" is and how well people respond.

The priest who runs the Indian foundation said that for every \$10,000 he puts into schools, bridges, roads, wells and other projects for the Indians, the Indians provide the labor and state and local governments put up another \$20,000 so the money he gets with his offerings of key rings and other trinkets, goes a long way.

Since it takes money to raise money, you know that not all of your dollar will go to the charitable benefits for which it is intended. But how can you be sure that most of your contribution will go there?

That's what Rep. Van Deerlin wants spelled out in legislation. Among other things, the bill he has in mind would require disclosure on the mailing piece of last year's ratio of cost to funds received; if it's the first year of operation, any contract specifying what charges will have to be met; any clause requiring that the solicitation would continue until all the costs are met; a disclosure that a "mail drop" is being used if the mail is not addressed to the home office of the organization sponsoring the fund drive.

Assistant United States Attorney Seymour Glanzer, chief of the fraud section in the prosecutors' office here, agrees with Van Deerlin on the need for legislation.

"If we had a law requiring complete, full and accurate disclosure of fund raising," he said, "we would have the means to police the activity and protect the public from being exploited by unscrupulous fund raisers."

The public, he contended, is being manipulated and if givers wake up and find themselves being cynically exploited, all charities will suffer.

Until Van Deerlin gets his law, if you want to know more about a charity before you

give, you could inquire at the District's Business License and Permit Division at 614 H Street N.W., where charities soliciting in the District are supposed to register and give their financial posture—how much the appeal cost them and how the money got is being used. Unfortunately, as The Star found out, a number of charitable drives are exempt from registration and others are a year behind in providing their financial statements.

[From the Washington Star, June 4, 1972]

How To JUDGE APPEALS

The National Information Bureau says there's no easy answer to wise giving but contributors should be wary. Don't give to a cause, however appealing, until you know something about it.

Since any non-profit organization is operating in a goldfish bowl, the bureau points out, it should really respond to your request for a financial statement and information on what it's doing with your money.

What you want to know is what the contributed funds were spent for and what was accomplished. If you can't get an up-to-date statement, that's reason enough not to give.

Here are the bureau's standards for a reputable organization seeking funds from the public.

1. An active and responsible governing body serving without compensation.
 2. A legitimate purpose that doesn't duplicate the work of another sound organization.
 3. Reasonable efficiency in program management and reasonable adequacy of resources, both in men and material.
 4. Evidence of cooperation with established agencies in the same or related fields.
 5. Ethical methods of promoting and soliciting funds.
 6. No payment of commissions for fund-raising. No mailing of unordered tickets or merchandise with requests for money in return. No general telephone solicitations of the public.
 7. Annual audit preferably using uniform accounting standards and prepared by an independent certified public accountant showing all revenue and expenditures in reasonable detail. New organizations should provide an independent CPA's statement that a proper financial system has been installed.
 8. A detailed annual budget translating program plans into financial terms.
- If you want to make sure your money for charitable causes will go where it will do the most good, you might try and use the bureau's yardstick yourself.

ROTARY GETS JOBS FOR VETS

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, one of the most promising new efforts in the Nation in support of the veteran JOBS program is underway in the Delmarva Peninsula, which embraces my own State of Delaware and parts of Maryland and Virginia, as well.

The program is a joint effort among Rotary District 763, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, and the National Alliance of Businessmen's Metro operating out of Wilmington, Del.

The "Hire A Veteran" program has been recognized by the general assembly, and I join in commending all the organizations involved for their interest and dedication.

I especially wish to mention Col. Edward T. Campbell, Delaware's veterans employment representative; Mr. Raymond H. Hecht, NAB metro director for Wilmington; and Mr. Robert R. Wood, Jr., district governor of Rotary District 763, for their work on this program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of commendation adopted by the Delaware General Assembly and an article about the program which appeared in the May 1972, issue of the "Jobs for Veterans" report.

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

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

(Commending Rotary International District #763, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Dover Air Force Base and the National Alliance of Businessmen—Jobs for Veterans Program for their unlimited support of President Nixon's six-point program of jobs for veterans.)

Whereas, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the 126th General Assembly are delighted to learn of the outstanding cooperative effort of the service organizations, veteran departments and business groups, in the State of Delaware; and

Whereas, Rotary International District #763 has undertaken the year from March 1972 to March 1973 to place the full strength and emphasis of the members of that fine organization in a program providing jobs for veterans; and

Whereas, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans are continuing their employment program for veterans and expanding their activities in Veterans Job Marts and Information Centers; and

Whereas, the National Alliance of Businessmen—Jobs for Veterans Program has closely associated itself with Rotary International District #763 and with the above mentioned veterans organizations in searching out job opportunities, securing pledges and insuring qualified placements of veterans; and

Whereas, personnel of the Dover Air Force Base are conducting an ongoing program known as Project Transition and cooperating with the above named service, veteran and business organizations, to insure jobs for veterans; and

Whereas, personnel of the Veterans Employment Service, United States Department of Labor, have been active in coordinating the various efforts and activities of the above named groups in obtaining gainful employment for veterans; Now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Delaware, with the approval of the Governor, as attested by his signature appended hereto, that the General Assembly does hereby commend the above mentioned organizations for their leadership in the State of Delaware, in the cooperative program that is now being emulated in Rotary Districts throughout the United States.

Be it further resolved that this resolution be entered on the Journals of both the Senate and House of Representatives and copies be sent to the Presidents, Commanders and Directors of the above mentioned organizations.

THIRTY ROTARY CLUBS WILL UNCOVER 400 JOB SLOTS

One of the most promising new efforts in the nation in support of the jobs for Veterans campaign is the Rotary's tri state "Hire A Veteran" program on the Delmarva Peninsula on the eastern side of Chesapeake Bay. The area—which comprises Rotary Dis-

trict 763—includes all of Delaware, and parts of Maryland and Virginia.

In conjunction with the National Alliance of Businessmen, the 30 Rotary Clubs in the peninsula have agreed to hire 400 veterans between now and March 1, 1973. It is the first service organization project of its kind in the country.

The program was kicked off on March 1 of this year, and though only about half of the clubs have been contacted so far, 10 per cent of the projected hiring goal has been accomplished already.

The total number of Rotarians in District 763 is 1,800, of which 1,600 are key businessmen in the local area. Employer outreach for the project is being handled by the NAB's Veterans/JOBS Representative, Air Force Sergeant Bill Buhelt. Sergeant Buhelt, a veteran of 20 years service who will continue on with the NAB when he soon retires, is enlisting Rotary support by speaking before each of the Clubs in this large district. He reports uniformly enthusiastic response to his request that Rotarians help veterans to find promising training and employment opportunities.

"Hire A Veteran" has been endorsed as the Delaware Rotary's primary vocational program for '72-'73. In addition to the impact which this campaign is having in the local area, Rotary International is interested in expanding the idea, and probably will pattern a national program on that of District 763.

In a recent speech, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird commended Rotarians across the nation for their efforts in helping veterans to find jobs.

"These veterans had a wartime task that was in some ways the most difficult ever given to our armed forces," he said. "Yet despite all the difficulties, with rare exception, they did well. They are entitled to the nation's gratitude and I believe they are entitled to a special measure of assistance as they re-enter the civilian community. I know of the special interest that Rotary Clubs throughout the country . . . have taken in supporting this program. I commend Rotarians for what they are doing and urge continued intensified effort."

Directly benefiting from the jobs produced by the Rotary's outreach effort will be those servicemen stationed at Dover Air Force Base who choose to remain in the Delmarva Peninsula after their release from active duty. Sergeant Buhelt served at Dover himself, and maintains close contact with the three-man staff of the Transition Program office on the base.

Whenever he hears of a job opening in the area, in the course of his outreach work, he lets the Transition office know. An airman who has completed Transition training and wants to live in the Delmarva area can often be lined up with a job before separation from the service.

DEVELOPMENT OF TURKISH MUNICIPALS ASSOCIATION (TMA)— TITLE IX FOREIGN AID IN ACTION

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Joseph S. Toner, Director of U.S. AID in Turkey had forwarded to me a paper on the development of the Turkish Municipals Association and AID's contribution to the growth of that organization. The TMA is concerned with the problems facing municipalities in Turkey.

This U.S. AID/Turkey paper gives a brief TMA history, describes U.S. AID's role in the development of the TMA and summarizes the TMA's present place in Turkish governance.

I find this encouragement of TMA a first-rate application of title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act. The objective of AID's involvement with the TMA is described in the paper as creation of "a forum which would help to promote popular participation in municipal government and a system of municipal government more capable of responding to the demands of its citizenry." This is a textbook description of what sponsors of title IX wanted when that section was written into the Foreign Assistance Act. The progress described in the paper encourages all of us who are committed to the title IX concept.

The paper follows:

TURKISH MUNICIPALS ASSOCIATION

Assistance to the Turkish Municipals Association could well be one of AID's most beneficial projects in Turkey. The Turkish Municipals Association (TMA) is a prime example of a once dormant organization which has been transformed, with AID support, into a powerful lobbying force aimed at promoting a strong pluralistic system affecting the relationship between central and local government. Today, it is one of the few organizations in Turkey, national in scope, that has gained a substantial degree of independence from the Central Government.

At the time the Turkish Municipals Association was created, municipal problems were increasing in number and magnitude. Municipal employees were poorly trained for their jobs and municipal officials were given many responsibilities but very little authority. The Turkish Municipals Association started humbly and has developed into one of Turkey's most prominent forces. Today, it appears to have one of the finest training programs available anywhere for mayors. It speaks with authority, the authority of being wellgrounded in Turkish tradition and also on behalf of a majority of Turkey's 35 million people.

It is the purpose of this paper to point up the situation which led to the creation of the Turkish Municipals Association, to explain how it grew to its present position, and to shed some light on AID's role in its development.

Traditionally, municipal government in Turkey has been under the administrative control and supervision of the ministry of Interior. Since World War II the rapid urbanization process evident throughout the country has created problems of vast dimensions for the fast growing urban areas. In the 1940's the urban population was 25% of the total population; today it is 45%. To further complicate matters, Turkish cities are old, having been built long before the advent of the automobile. The effect of urbanization (the coming of the automobile included) on these cities has created problems such that new infrastructures had to be built in order to absorb the increased population.

Changes in the nature and character of municipal problems have far out-paced adoption of new and effective measures to cope with the new problems. As more people began to migrate to urban centers, Ministry of Interior officials continued to influence municipalities regarding municipal laws, police and traffic control, budget approval, inspection of financial records and in some cases even the temporary removal or appointment of Mayors. Municipalities had little or no administrative or financial autonomy. Even today, a municipal law adopted in 1930 continues to govern the scope of municipal

authorities and responsibilities. Likewise, municipal revenues are governed by a law adopted in 1948, although cost requirements have changed drastically. Such laws were prepared in Ankara with little knowledge of problems encountered by municipal governments and with no input from those officials charged with administering the laws.

Both because of scarce revenues and the organization of the tax base, Turkish municipal governments have been unable to meet many of the basic needs of their communities.

An example will demonstrate the plight of Turkish cities. According to information gathered at a recent international meeting of local authorities, a German city of about 100,000 population had an annual budget of about 275 million DM (U.S. \$86,478,000). On March 1, 1972, the budget for Ankara (population 1.5 million) was announced—430 million TL (U.S. \$30,715,000). The budget for a population of 100,000 in Germany is almost 3 times that of a population of 1.5 million in Turkey!

In 1945, a small group of professors from Ankara University, along with a few city planners, economists and Government officials decided to try a different approach to improve local administration. They concluded that proper organization and administration were two of the needs Turkish municipalities had to meet in order to obtain optimum use of available manpower and financial resources. To find solutions to the problems which plagued the municipalities, the group founded the Turkish Municipals Association (TMA). TMA set out to make scientific studies and to encourage training courses for municipal officials in municipal development, city planning and local administration. These findings were made available through periodic publications. For nearly twenty years it did little more than sponsor an occasional conference for mayors and publish its periodicals.

In the early 1960's, a major event occurred which provided the framework for profound changes in central-local government relationships. In 1963, laws governing election of mayors were revised to permit popular election of mayors instead of by City Councils as had been the practice in the past. Following this change, and under new leadership, TMA began to grow.

By 1967, mayors, with mandates from the cities, began to make their presence felt in the Board of Administration, TMA's executive body. TMA began to expand its activities and to bring them more into line with city officials' concerns, particularly by placing greater emphasis in training programs in technical and administrative aspects of municipal government. It was during this period that the Turkish Municipals Association gave the first hint that it might develop into an important institution. AID recognized this potential and, as a result of meetings between TMA and AID officials, an expanded role in municipal organization and administration was drawn up for TMA.

AID has played a critical role in the development of TMA on at least two important levels. AID's budgetary support over the past five years has declined from virtually underwriting the total cost of TMA activities (almost 80% of total in 1967) to a much lesser level (12½% of total is projected for Turkish Fiscal 1972). The effect of gradually decreasing the level of AID lira support has encouraged TMA to increase its own sources of revenue and to approximate financial independence early in its development.

With AID budgetary support, a program was developed to strengthen TMA by expanding its service to municipalities through extension of conferences, seminars, training courses, research and publications, and by sending participants to the U.S. and Europe. The objective of the program was to create, through the Municipals Association, a forum

which would help to promote popular participation in municipal government and a system of municipal government more capable of responding to the demands of its citizens. Since AID made lira funds available in 1967 to February 1972, TMA has compiled the following record of accomplishments:

Sponsored—17 regional seminars for 941 municipal technical employees; seminars (for over 200 Provincial Center city mayors) on top level management urbanization, municipal income, and metropolitan administration.

Conducted—9 regional mayors' seminars for 917 mayors; 11 training courses for 378 newly elected mayors; 6 training courses for city clerks.

Published—20 books.

The regional conferences for mayors, the regional technical courses for technical employees and the training courses for new mayors were the first of their kind ever held in Turkey. The training courses for new mayors offers instruction on personnel policy, laws of local organization, accounting, information with respect to lending channels available to cities, local laws concerning revenues, and penalties. In addition to scheduled programs, many municipalities sent letters to TMA discussing various problems. These letters were then published by TMA as a first line of training, i.e., awareness of common problems.

A second level at which AID's role has been critical is in strengthening TMA's reputation in the eyes of its members. AID has financed (and continues to support) teams of mayors, under TMA sponsorship, who have gone to the United States for the long-term purpose of broadening their knowledge of urban affairs and adapting those techniques suitable for use in Turkey. TMA sponsorship of these overseas training programs has served to demonstrate the respect and support TMA has achieved from the international community.

TMA operates as a pressure group to advance municipal interests. TMA-sponsored meetings, training courses, seminars, etc., bring cities' and mayors' problems to the surface. Mayors from different regions come together to listen to experts on various subjects important to municipalities. Through meetings of this kind, mayors have become better acquainted with each other's problems and are developing a show of unity and strength in their dealings with the Central Government.

TMA also brings Central Government personnel to meet with mayors. Many Central Government officials, by participating in TMA programs, have become better acquainted with the problems and needs of the cities. Open discussions of municipal problems between mayors and Central Government officials have taken place. A case in point is the Mayors' Seminar on the Municipal Revenue Bill which was held in Ankara in January 1972. During the seminar, one-fourth of the Cabinet of the Central Government attended various portions of the seminar. It is significant, and indicative of TMA's growing importance, that such a large number of Central Government officials felt it necessary to attend and to present the official views to the mayors' group.

The strength of the Turkish Municipals Association is predicated upon the fact that mayors represent the tremendous voting power of the cities. A source of strength in its earlier organization was the close contact between Parliament and members of TMA, but TMA has since broadened the base for its lobbying activities. Today, TMA officials assert that Central Government policies cannot be effectively executed at the local level without the aid of the Turkish Municipals Association. They say that not only does 45% of the total population live in the cities, but all newspapers and other media, almost 98% of all industries, all hospitals, banks, and most schools are located in Turkey's

cities. Municipal government needs to fulfill its role as guardian of the rights of its citizenry. Using the Turkish Municipals Association as the voice of Turkey's cities, they say, is "the way to democratic rule."

AID's policy of encouraging TMA to strive for financial viability now instead of waiting until it is confronted with a crisis has led to an early recognition that raising the revenues of TMA would make it a much stronger and more effective organization. TMA, since it is decentralized and not a governmental body, does not have authority to levy taxes or to receive compensation for its services. The Law of Organizations, which governs all organizations in Turkey, limits membership fees to 120 TL (U.S. \$8.57 per annum). However, donations are permissible. Today, in large cities such as Ankara, Istanbul and Izmir, individual "donations" per member are between TL 5,000 and TL 7,000 per annum. Despite the fact that members are making "donations" each year, TMA wants to make higher fees a legal requirement for its members. A bill to this effect is now being considered in Parliament.

Presently, a Municipal Revenue Bill, designed to significantly increase revenues to cities, is being considered by Parliament. The bill is so important to municipal development that TMA has given the bill top priority backing. At the end of the Mayors' Seminar on the bill, all mayors present sent cables to the President and to Members of Parliament stating that they were strongly in favor of having the Revenue Bill become law. Also, through a small working committee on the Bill, TMA has been able to have major inputs in discussions on the form the bill will finally take. It has even had representation (non-voting of course) in Parliament's sub-committee hearings. This represents a significant change in the traditional process of decision-making; traditionally, municipalities have had little input regarding legislation.

TMA activities are not only concerned with training and getting the Municipal Revenue Bill passed. They are pressing for the passage of a new Property Law (the main source of income for U.S. cities). TMA anticipates that a Revenue Bill and the Property Law would generate an average of about 50% more revenue for the cities. While this will mean a substantial increase in income only for the larger cities, the laws would bring little additional income to smaller communities. TMA has been instrumental in increasing the Central Government's share of income returned to small cities by moving from the traditional distribution of revenue on a population basis so that the smaller cities at the bottom of the distribution pattern will have their portions increased from the lump sum allocated to municipalities for a given fiscal year.

TMA is also lobbying for a Law of Consolidation of Municipal Debts and for a new system of electing mayors; and it has plans to set up an institute for mayor training and research. TMA is still working to increase its publications and to provide consultants to municipalities to aid with special projects, sometimes using its good offices to make important technical contacts.

Another function of the Turkish Municipals Association is to represent Turkey in the European Council of Local Authorities (ECLA) and the International Union of Local Authorities (IULA). Both organizations promote discussion of municipal problems openly in an international forum. Until a few years ago TMA was not active in conferences sponsored by either ECLA or IULA. Now, with its broader outlook, TMA attends regular conferences and meetings. In 1973 ECLA's annual conference is scheduled to be held in Turkey.

As for TMA activities over the next five or ten years, the general belief—both of TMA and Central Government officials—is

that TMA will have a greater impact. The goal of TMA is to gain greater autonomy from the Central Government. Much has been done, but much remains.

As an institution to continue to improve municipal government, the Municipals Association is well suited; it has not other interests. Using its combined influence, the Municipals Association has been able to lobby impressively for passage of measures aimed at helping the cities. At the national conference in 1968, the mayors indicated their willingness and their ability to support expanded TMA activities. Again, at the Mayors' Seminar on the Municipal Revenue Bill in January 1972, TMA demonstrated that their members will rally around issues common to many municipalities.

The Turkish Municipals Association is an indigenous organization whose founders recognized the need for some group through which municipal government could be improved. It was not, however, until the proper mixture of dynamic TMA leadership and AID assistance were combined that TMA began to realize the goals set by its founders. TMA has been successful because it has been able to attract strong leaders who firmly believe that municipal government can best be improved through a system which affect municipalities. AID has guided TMA's development through a rational policy of budgetary support which has encouraged rapid expansion, but only after the Association's leaders had established a solid foundation.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION IN PRE-DOMINANTLY RURAL AREAS

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, recently I had an opportunity to read an important and eloquent statement by one of our colleagues. Because I know something of the genesis of legislation that has given the States Federal aid to education, and because Montana and Arizona each has a large Indian population, and Air Force bases, Senator FANNIN's testimony has particular significance for me.

The distinguished senior Senator from Arizona has called for a renewal of our commitment under the authority of Public Law 815 to construct schools.

Mindful of the possibility that it will be criticized as inflationary, Senator FANNIN, a responsible member of the Committee on Finance, has demonstrated that the effect would be minimal or zero. Moreover, because the proposal contemplates expenditures for school construction in predominantly rural areas, it is a logical complement to legislation already approved by the Senate for rural development. Last, but not least, his formula would bring jobs into areas of substantial or persistent unemployment.

In testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, Senator FANNIN urged increasing the budget amount from the requested \$15 to \$45 million. He suggested appropriation of one-third the amount for the construction of schools for Indian children, both on and off reservation, and two-thirds for schools for the children of uniformed services

personnel who live on base. I would prefer that we build all of the schools that have been found eligible for Public Law 815 assistance—there is nearly \$300 million in the total of applications awaiting funding by the Office of Education—and I cannot endorse the suggested wholesale elimination of assistance for all children whose parents work, but do not live, on Federal property, such as those at Fort Peck and Hungry Horse. However, at a time of vigorous competition for the budget dollar, \$45 million is greatly to be preferred to \$15 million. I hope the Senate Appropriations Committee will give serious consideration to Senator FANNIN's arguments in behalf of increased money for school construction.

Mr. President, to his service on the Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, Senator FANNIN brought his personal knowledge of the desperate needs for school facilities of his Navajo and Hopi constituents. As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Arizona's senior Senator joined the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) and others of us in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 144, calling for the construction of schools in or near Indian reservations. The measure was approved by the Senate in the last Congress but was never concurred in by the House.

Further, Senator FANNIN is aware, as we all are, that recruitment of volunteers for our Armed Forces has grown more difficult, as the proposed bonus testifies. Surely, if men are to remain in the military, we must assure them that their dependent children have a decent education on or near the bases to which they are assigned.

The Federal impact in both cases is unequivocal. There is no tax base to raise money for schools. Indian reservations are tax-exempt lands. So are Air Force and Army and Navy bases. The Federal responsibility for each is well established in our laws. What has been missing is money.

Senator FANNIN recognizes our commitment and our neglect and offers a responsible solution to difficulties that will continue to compound unless we act.

I hope that all Senators will read his statement carefully. I ask unanimous consent that its entire text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and proposed amendment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR PAUL J. FANNIN
ON PUBLIC LAW 815

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much your providing me with this opportunity to testify before your committee.

In appearing here, I am not unmindful of the difficulties you face in funding a multitude of Federal programs. The fiscal challenges we face as a nation are of major importance to me, a view which I know you share. In this respect, then, my testimony today, which is primarily directed toward Federal school construction programs, takes into account the continuing budget restraints and the need for fiscal responsibility. But I must add that budget pressures can be somewhat ameliorated by a strong economy; and the proposals which I am offering today constitute a plan to stimulate the economy within a context of sound fiscal policy.

CXVIII—1252—Part 15

My purpose is to make a case for the increased funding of the P.L. 815 school construction program.

P.L. 815 and its companion measure, P.L. 874, known more popularly as the "impacted aids" measures, constitute a Federal policy for assisting school districts financially burdened as a result of new or expanded Federal activities. Specifically, P.L. 815 authorizes Federal financial assistance for construction by local education agencies of urgently needed minimum school facilities in school districts which have had substantial increases in school membership as a result of new or increased Federal activities. Assistance is also authorized for construction of minimum school facilities by local educational agencies for pupils residing on Indian lands and by the Federal government on Federal property (such as Army, Navy, and Air Force installations) when no state or local education agency can legally do so.

Since its enactment in 1951, Congress has appropriated well over a billion dollars for support of the P.L. 815 Program. The result has been the construction of 76 thousand classrooms serving some 2,201,140 students throughout the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Wake Island. P.L. 815 has contributed much, and Congress can be justifiably proud of its significant accomplishments.

Yet, while P.L. 815 has realized some important educational needs in the past, funding levels for the last four years have been insufficient to meet the requirements of the program. As a result, there are pending at this time 555 applications totalling \$261,633,676 against a budget request of \$15 million. Obviously, it would be unrealistic and fiscally irresponsible to fund all present applications in one fiscal year; but the present budget request is inadequate and deserves reconsideration by this Committee.

In my opinion, a reasonable increase in appropriations for this vital program can be justified.

P.L. 815: PROBLEMS OF FUNDING

The reduced funding levels which the P.L. 815 Program has experienced during recent years is due to a number of decisions which have effectively limited not only P.L. 815, but other Federal construction programs as well.

Beginning in 1967 the Congress passed, and the President approved, P.L. 90-218, which directed that Federal obligations and expenditures in controllable programs for fiscal year 1968 be substantially reduced. This was followed in 1968 by enactment of the Revenue and Expenditure Act, which had a similar effect on available funds and expenditures in fiscal year 1969.

Then in 1969 the President, through the President's Construction Reduction Plan, ordered a 75 percent reduction in direct construction obligations. This Presidential order had the effect of permitting only two construction contracts to be let in fiscal year 1970. The result of these actions was to significantly reduce actual appropriations for P.L. 815 for 1968, 1969, and 1970.

Public Law 815: Appropriations as Percent of Authorization: 1968, 69, 70

(In thousands of dollars)

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------|--|
| 1968: | | |
| Authorizations | 80,000 | |
| Appropriations | 22,937 | |
| Percent of Authorization | 28.7 | |
| 1969: | | |
| Authorization | 79,162 | |
| Appropriation | 15,153 | |
| Percent of Authorization | 19.1 | |
| 1970: | | |
| Authorization | 79,347 | |
| Appropriation | 15,167 | |
| Percent of Authorization | 19.1 | |

Moreover, the effect of these actions con-

tinued into the 1971-72 fiscal year with appropriations remaining at the same level.

The rationale for limiting construction activities was based on the desire to reduce Federal expenditures and the fear that construction activities would significantly contribute to inflationary pressures. This rationale is understandable and given the historical context, justifiable. However, the circumstances which originally supported this view are changing; and it would seem appropriate, at this time, to review this policy. In addition, there are factors which not only support a review but provide attractive reasons for increased funding of school construction projects.

PUBLIC LAW 815: THE CASE FOR INCREASED FUNDING

There are a number of reasons which can be cited to support the view that P.L. 815 should be funded at substantially higher levels.

First, P.L. 815 is national in scope. As of March, 1972, the Office of Education had on file 555 approved applications from 45 states, Puerto Rico, and Guam.

Second, the 555 applications, now pending, represent estimated entitlements totalling \$261 million. This constitutes a program of important dimensions.

Third, by providing Federal assistance through P.L. 815 for the construction of needed school facilities, the Federal government can contribute to the easing of the ever increasing financial pressures which schools affected by Federal impact activities are currently experiencing.

Without sufficient assistance from P.L. 815, these schools will have to resort to other financial approaches which may not be sound or operate needed educational programs at near or below minimal levels. These represent the basic issues in school financing, but P.L. 815, if adequately funded, could help to overcome the difficulties which many schools are facing in providing quality educational services.

Fourth, Congress, through P.L. 815, has declared it to be the policy of the United States to provide for the construction of needed school facilities in school districts which have had substantial increases in school membership as a result of new or increased Federal activities. This is a commitment relied upon heavily by those affected school districts; and, in addition, it is a priority program for many schools and the communities which they serve. In this spirit, then, Congress should renew its commitment to P.L. 815 by funding it in a manner which substantially serves its objectives.

Fifth, the need of many schools for additional facilities, due to Federal activities, is increasing, while funding for P.L. 815 has declined.

With limited funds, only a few projects can be supported; and the result is that a large number of projects must be deferred. In some cases, projects must wait two or three years or longer to be funded while the needs which triggered the application continue, and even increase. In fact, no funds have been appropriated for Section 5 for nearly five years. In my estimation, by insufficiently funding P.L. 815, existing problems remain unsolved and additional ones are created.

In my own State of Arizona, for example, the lack of funds to adequately support P.L. 815 is causing considerable difficulties, especially in those public schools educating Indian children who live on the reservations. These schools have experienced substantial increases in Indian student enrollment during the last few years, a trend which I expect will continue. Yet, the facilities which were designed originally to handle fewer students are now hopelessly inadequate. These schools sought assistance for constructing the critically needed facilities under Sections 14a and 14b but learned that the funds

allocated to these sections were insufficient to meet their needs at that time.

This resulted in many of these schools having to acquire temporary facilities (some of which are considered sub-standard), adjust their programs, initiate double sessions, and make other arrangements. Together, these decisions are defeating the superb efforts of these schools to provide a quality educational program for our Indian children.

This situation is made doubly critical by the fact that these schools, because of insufficient P.L. 815 funding, are having to make other financial arrangements to acquire the money for providing or constructing additional facilities. This has proved difficult because these schools have a limited tax base and their bonding capacity is statutorily restricted. Moreover, some schools, after exhausting these two approaches, have had to divert portions of their operating budgets to acquire or rent temporary facilities. The result, in some cases, has been the shrinking of funds budgeted for operating expenses.

More importantly, however, the diversion of operating expenses affects the quality of the educational program, and I am sure you will agree that this situation makes it all the more critical that funds for P.L. 815 be increased.

The outlook, however, is not promising. At the present time, there are 46 approved applications under sections 14a and 14b with estimated entitlements of \$43 million. Yet, the 1972-73 budget proposes that only \$5 million be appropriated. This troubles me because Arizona alone, having the largest concentration of reservation Indians, needs \$23 million, nearly 50 percent of the total, to realize the physical plant objectives of its reservation public schools.

The continued minimal funding of this vital program will undoubtedly postpone the realization of a quality educational program for our reservation Indians.

This is not only my concern—the Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education, of which I was a member, recommended in November 1969 that “P.L. 815 be more fully funded.” The final report of the Subcommittee, *Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge*, argued that “it is imperative that more attention be given to funding this legislation particularly for those sections under which disadvantaged students, such as Indians, are suffering with inadequate facilities. It is difficult enough to teach children with special needs, without having to face the added difficulty of inadequate facilities.” To achieve a quality Indian education program, P.L. 815 needs to be sufficiently funded.

Yet, the needs of 14a and 14b are only one part of the total picture. By highlighting these needs, however, we are making the case for the needs of all schools which have made application under P.L. 815.

Sixth, the P.L. 815 program offers a unique opportunity to serve the objectives of recently enacted Congressional policies for rural economic development.

Interestingly enough, 410, or 74 percent of the pending 815 applications with estimated entitlements totalling \$129 million are located in rural areas. Senator Ellender has expressed the need for “a national program to stay and reverse the heavy flow of people who are migrating into our cities if we are ever to obliterate poverty, revitalize our countryside and provide opportunities for those tens of millions who will soon join us on this earth. I believe that the sprawling, haphazard and unmanageable urbanization of our country can only be halted by encouraging a reversal of migration trends through inducements to remain in rural areas. The Federal government can and should do more to provide jobs, better economic opportunities and a more attractive,

decent and healthful living environment in the less populated areas of our Nation.”

P.L. 815 can play a major role in realizing the worthwhile objectives that Senator Ellender has enunciated. Funding the P.L. 815 program can create jobs, develop economic opportunities and, through the provision of a quality educational program, provide an attractive living environment.

More importantly, however, by fostering rural economic development through P.L. 815, a significant residual benefit could accrue to the educational system of rural school districts.

In a recent study prepared by the Library of Congress, which sampled selected rural school districts applying for P.L. 815 support, it was determined that the adjusted gross income per pupil within those school districts was below the state average. For applications under Sections 5, 9, and 14c of the Act, 28 out of the 40 districts sampled were below the average. And for applications under Sections 14a and 14b, all the sampled districts were below the state average.

Obviously, then, by promoting construction activity in rural areas it may be possible, with the assistance of other Federal policies, to raise income levels and thus provide greater revenues for educational activities. In addition, increased funds for educational endeavors could help to ease the financial pressures which so many schools are currently facing.

Seventh, P.L. 815 could serve to reduce unemployment. A recent study prepared by my staff indicates that a definite correlation exists between the location of P.L. 815 applicant schools and the presence of areas of unemployment as designated by the Department of Labor.

It is my argument that in areas of high unemployment, especially in skills related to the building trades, Federal expenditures, in this case the P.L. 815 program, would not tend to be inflationary, but in fact would actually promote the economic improvement of the areas.

While I have not as yet exhausted the data to permit a completely valid national generalization, I have sampled enough states to support the correlation.

For example, in five Western states—New Mexico, Arizona, California, Washington, and Montana—there are 174 applications with estimated entitlements totalling \$84 million, of which 121 applications totalling \$59 million are in areas described by the Department of Labor as being economically depressed. In addition, of those 121 applications, 75 are in rural areas. Thus, by funding P.L. 815 school construction projects in these areas, unemployment could be eased and rural economic development fostered.

In summary, P.L. 815 would not only serve to realize educational objectives, it could solve some important economic problems as well.

PUBLIC LAW 815: INFLATIONARY IMPACT

Mr. Chairman, whether one chooses economic or educational reasons for funding P.L. 815, the question of inflationary impact must be faced.

It has been argued that by funding Federal construction projects, including P.L. 815, serious economic consequences would surely follow in the form of strong inflationary pressures. It is my contention, however, that funding P.L. 815 would not result in unmanageable economic problems.

To support this contention, I would cite as reasons the rural orientation of present P.L. 815 applications and the relationship of some of these applications to areas of unemployment.

First, 410, or 74 percent, of the total applications now pending are located in rural school districts. Since Arizona's applications are predominantly rural, I asked Arizona State University and its College of Business Administration to determine the extent

of inflationary impact if its applications were funded. They reported that, “Since \$24.2 million of the unfunded P.L. 815 applications in the state are in the non-SMSA counties (only \$5.2 million in SMSA counties), it is certainly feasible that some local labor, possibly now unemployed, could be utilized with little inflationary impact. Of further interest in this regard is the fact that roughly 87 percent of all contract construction work within the state does occur in Maricopa and Pima Counties. This may indicate that additional construction expenditures directed towards the more rural areas (e.g., Indian reservations) could result in little or no increase in construction costs because of the absence of high demand for such activities in those areas.”

The Arizona State study concludes by arguing that “problems of inflation, albeit construction prices, services costs, etc. have been more noticeable in metropolitan areas. If inflation is expected to be a continuing problem (clearly a separate question) then it will likely continue to be more noticeable in metropolitan areas.”

I realize, of course, that these generalizations may not be entirely valid for all areas since local conditions will vary, but I am convinced that funded P.L. 815 applications in rural areas will not result in serious inflationary consequences.

Second, I am also convinced that school construction projects located in areas of unemployment will not create significant inflationary pressures.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, it would appear that inflationary consequences would be minimal if the P.L. 815 program were funded. More importantly, however, funding P.L. 815 at this time could result in some significant economic benefits which would more than outweigh any inflationary consequences. In this respect, P.L. 815 presents an opportunity for stimulating economic growth without serious inflationary impact.

P.L. 815: RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Chairman, in reviewing the evidence, there is no doubt that a case for funding P.L. 815 at substantially higher levels exists.

I, therefore, recommend the following for your consideration:

First, that the Committee approve the language in the Administration's budget for restricting funding to Sections 14a and 14b and Section 5.

Second, I urge the Committee to increase the budget amount from \$15 million to \$45 million to be divided as follows: one-third to Sections 14a and 14b and two-thirds to Section 5.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Chairman, I believe we have demonstrated a need and a rationale for funding P.L. 815, and I earnestly hope that Congress will now find it possible to increase its commitments to this vital program.

PROPOSED FANNIN AMENDMENT

APPROPRIATION ESTIMATE—SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

For carrying out title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 13), and the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 19), [\$430,910,000] \$460,910,000, of which \$415,000,000 shall be for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by said title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, and [\$15,910,000] \$45,910,000, which shall remain available until expended, shall be for providing school facilities as authorized by said Act of September 23, 1950: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained herein shall be available to pay local educational agencies pursuant to the provisions of any other section of said title I until payment has been made of 100 per centum of the amounts payable under sections 6 and 3(a) of said title which section 3(a) shall include all pupils

residing on Indian lands: *Provided further*, That none of the funds remaining after the foregoing payments shall be available to pay local educational agencies pursuant to the provisions of any other section of said title I until payment has been made of 100 per centum of the amounts to which such agencies are entitled pursuant to section 3(b) for pupils who are dependents of Uniformed Services personnel: *Provided further*, That the amount to be paid to an agency pursuant to said title I (except section 7) for the current fiscal year shall not be less, by more than five per centum of the expenditures for free public education made by such agency for the fiscal year 1972, than the amount of its payment under said title I (except section 7) for the fiscal year 1972: *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained herein for providing school facilities shall be available to pay for any other section of the Act of September 23, 1950, until payment has been made of 100 per centum of the amount payable under section 5 and subsections 14(a) and 14(b).

EFFECT OF AMENDMENT FOR SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

The Amendment would provide \$460,910,000 in the 1973 appropriation bill, an increase of \$30,000,000 over the budget request, for financial assistance to local school districts for the construction of school facilities in areas where enrollments are increased by Federal activities as authorized by Public Law 815. The new total for this program would be \$45,910,000, while the amount requested for maintenance and operation, \$415,000,000, will remain the same as the original budget request.

The effect of this proposed amendment would be to triple the funds going to Sections 14(a) and 14(b) and Section 5. Preliminary estimates indicate that about 12 projects under section 14(a) and (b) (substantial number of children residing on Federal property—mostly tax exempt Indian land—and lack of Federal resources) and 53 projects under Section 5 (local education agencies with heavy Federal impact) will be funded with this increased appropriation. Most of the 23,400 pupils eligible for payment in these projects either reside in school districts serving Indian children, or reside on military installations located in applicant school districts. A number of the pupils eligible for payment who reside off Federal property will reside on such property upon completion of programmed military housing units.

School assistance in federally affected areas
1973 budget estimate..... \$430,910,000
1973 revised estimate..... 460,910,000

Net change..... +30,000,000

The proposed amendment would retain the Administration sponsored appropriation language concentrating payments on Sections 14(a) and (b) and Section 5 but would add an additional \$30,000,000 to provide a total of \$45,910,000 for construction and a total of \$460,910,000 for the entire appropriation.

This additional \$30,000,000 would increase the projects funded to 65, 12 projects under Sections 14(a) and (b) and 53 projects under Section 5. More than 50 percent of the approximately 23,400 pupils eligible for payment either reside in school districts serving Indian children, or reside on military installations located in applicant school districts. A number of the pupils eligible for payment who reside off Federal property will reside on such property upon completion of programmed military housing units. The combined number of unboxed pupils under subsection 14(a) and (b) and Section 5 applications as of the end of the application four-year increase period is reported to be 26,800 and projected two years beyond the end of that period is estimated to be 38,200 for applicant school districts examined.

**DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS,
PUBLIC LAW 815, CONSTRUCTION**

| State and outlying areas | 1972 appropriation | 1973 estimate | 1973 proposed amendment |
|---------------------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------|
| Total..... | \$19,300,000 | \$15,910,000 | \$45,910,000 |
| Alabama..... | | 298,000 | 298,000 |
| Alaska..... | | | |
| Arizona..... | 2,024,615 | 3,949,000 | 13,185,000 |
| Arkansas..... | | 713,000 | 950,000 |
| California..... | 10,609,500 | 6,689,000 | 10,632,000 |
| Colorado..... | | | 1,614,000 |
| Connecticut..... | | | |
| Delaware..... | | | 332,000 |
| Georgia..... | | | |
| Hawaii..... | | | 337,000 |
| Idaho..... | | 2,141,000 | 2,378,000 |
| Illinois..... | | | |
| Indiana..... | | | |
| Iowa..... | | | 311,000 |
| Kansas..... | | | 585,000 |
| Kentucky..... | | 304,000 | 304,000 |
| Louisiana..... | 487,959 | | |
| Maine..... | | | |
| Maryland..... | | | |
| Massachusetts..... | 1,500,000 | | |
| Michigan..... | | | |
| Minnesota..... | | 912,880 | 863,000 |
| Mississippi..... | | 889,900 | |
| Missouri..... | | 146,004 | 845,000 |
| Montana..... | | 447,828 | 2,970,000 |
| Nebraska..... | 1,069,924 | | |
| Nevada..... | | | |
| New Hampshire..... | | | |
| New Jersey..... | | 976,000 | 976,000 |
| New Mexico..... | | | |
| New York..... | | | |
| North Carolina..... | | | 2,036,000 |
| North Dakota..... | 210,190 | | 1,875,000 |
| Oklahoma..... | | | |
| Oregon..... | | | |
| Pennsylvania..... | | | 3,091,000 |
| Rhode Island..... | | | |
| South Carolina..... | | | |
| South Dakota..... | 305,800 | | |
| Tennessee..... | | | |
| Texas..... | 498,000 | 587,000 | 980,000 |
| Utah..... | | | |
| Vermont..... | | | |
| Virginia..... | | | |
| Washington..... | 172,400 | 111,000 | 937,000 |
| West Virginia..... | | 60,000 | 60,000 |
| Wisconsin..... | | | |
| Wyoming..... | | 82,000 | 82,000 |
| District of Columbia..... | | | |
| Outlying areas..... | 25,000 | | |
| Unallotted..... | | | 269,000 |

GENERAL MOTORS IS FIRST IN SAFETY

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, for the 23d time in 30 years, the General Motors Corp. will be awarded, on June 9, 1972, the National Safety Council's highest award for on-the-job safety. In announcing the recipient of the 1971 Award of Honor, the National Safety Council stated that General Motors had been selected in recognition of its continuing safety record. In order to win this award, General Motors safety record had to be better than the average safety record of both General Motors and the entire automotive industry for the preceding 3 years. The automotive industry leads all other industries in on-the-job safety, and the National Safety Council's statistics indicate that General Motors employees has an accident frequency rate almost twice as good as the entire automotive industry. The accident frequency rate for General Motors employees last

year was .82, which is less than one accident per million man-hours worked. A million man-hours is the equivalent of 500 persons each working a normal work year of 2,000 hours.

In addition, eight General Motors facilities hold National Safety Council world records for safety based on continuous man-hours worked without a disabling injury in that particular facility. They are: General Motors Assembly Division, Wilmington Plant, Wilmington, Del.; Terex Division, St. Clair Plant, Cleveland, Ohio; Central Foundry Division, Saginaw Plant, Saginaw, Mich.; Electro-Motive Division, Cleveland Plant, Cleveland, Ohio; General Motors Parts Division, Otterburn Plant, Flint, Mich.; Chevrolet Motor Division, Tonawanda Foundry Plant, Buffalo, N.Y.; Chevrolet Motor Division, Detroit Forge Plant, Detroit, Mich., and Chevrolet Motor Division, Metal Fabricating Plant, Flint, Mich.

It is obviously apparent that this outstanding record could not have been achieved and maintained without the sincere and dedicated efforts of General Motors and its employees to insure that safety really is first on every job. I congratulate them on this fine accomplishment.

RESULTS OF THE HONORABLE DELBERT L. LATTI'S LATEST QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. DELBERT L. LATTI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Speaker, each year I send a questionnaire to my constituents to give them an opportunity to express themselves on some of the more important current issues and events. I have just completed the tabulation of this year's returns and wish to share them with my colleagues.

By a vote of 4 to 1, the people in my district have indicated their support of the President's efforts to bring peace to the world by meeting with the leaders of Russia and China on their own soil. It is interesting to note that only 28.1 percent of those responding would trust the North Vietnamese—as some are now advocating—to return our prisoners of war after we withdrew all of our troops from South Vietnam. The results indicate that 69.1 percent are satisfied with the President's schedule of troop withdrawals from South Vietnam. In order to give you the complete results of this poll, I now submit them below in their entirety:

(Answers in percent)

1.a. Did you approve of the President's trip to mainland China? Yes, 82.1; no 17.9.

b. Do you agree with the President that the opening of a dialogue with mainland China is essential if we are to have world peace in the future? Yes, 83.1; no, 16.9.

c. Should we expand trade with mainland China if this means the extension of credit? Yes, 61.3; no, 38.7.

d. Do you agree that we must continue to support Nationalist China? Yes, 60.4; no, 39.6.

2. Do you favor the President's planned trip to Moscow? Yes, 77.5; no, 22.5.

3.a. In your opinion is the Administration's program to hold down prices and wages (Phase II) working? Yes, 22.4; no, 77.6.

b. Would you have preferred a one-year extension of the 90-day freeze on prices and wages? Yes, 63.8; no, 36.2.

4. Are you for the busing of children to achieve a racial balance in our public schools? Yes, 9.5; no, 90.5.

5. Do you favor a program of national health insurance to cover major illnesses for all citizens? Yes, 46.8; no, 53.2.

6. Last year, President Nixon vetoed a proposed 2 billion dollar a year comprehensive child care program. Should the federal government undertake such a program? Yes, 20.6; no, 79.4.

7. Do you favor tax incentives as a means of encouraging industries to locate in rural areas and small communities? Yes, 47; no, 53.

8.a. Are you satisfied with our withdrawal rate from Vietnam? (There were 543,000 troops in Vietnam when this Administration took office. There will be 69,000 on May 1st). Yes, 69.1; no, 30.9.

b. Some are urging the fixing of a pullout date, followed by the removal of all our troops, and then trust the North Vietnamese to promptly return our POW's. Should your government adopt such a policy? Yes, 28.1; no, 71.9.

9. Are you in favor of granting amnesty to draftees who left the country to avoid induction into the service? Yes, 18.3; no, 81.7.

10. Do you favor legalizing the sale and use of marijuana? Yes, 12.4; no, 87.6.

11. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to permit the voluntary saying of prayers and reading from the Bible in the public schools? Yes, 87.2; no, 12.8.

12. For farmers. Some erroneously blame the farmer every time retail food prices advance without realizing that the farmer's share of the food dollar has actually declined from 49% in 1951 to 38% 1971. Should farm organizations and the Department of Agriculture do more to make the general public aware of this fact? Yes, 94.3; no, 5.7.

BAN ON FIREWORKS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while driving through northern Virginia the other day, I noticed the roadside stands commencing the sale of fireworks. I have long felt that the sale of fireworks should be banned. Therefore, I was especially pleased that one of the outstanding publications in my district, the *Homewood-Flossmoor Star*, saw fit to make the following statement in their May 21 edition:

BAN ON FIREWORKS

With another Fourth of July holiday approaching, it is timely to take note of attempts to obtain a nation-wide ban on all fireworks except those used for licensed public displays.

The National Society for the Prevention of Blindness is in the vanguard among those seeking to eliminate the annual threat to life and limb. But the society complains that its formal request for a public hearing on the problem was denied by the Food and Drug Administration, the federal agency responsible for fireworks control.

Only half of the states have laws in line with the society's position. And, the NSPB argues, "the laws of these states are more

stringent than (and tacitly undermined by) the FDA order which permits Class C fireworks, the so-called 'common' or 'safe and sane' variety." Yet 42 per cent of injuries listed in the document, "Fireworks Incidents in the United States During 1969," were attributed to Class C fireworks.

The case for stringent regulations on a national basis is a strong one. Although Illinois law bans the sale of fireworks for other than supervised displays, example, "bootlegging" them from other states is demonstrably commonplace.

The NSPB conceded that the FDA has proposed some changes in fireworks controls, but argues that they don't go far enough. "Far enough," it is indicated, is a total ban on fireworks not used for licensed displays. We agree.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE HENRY LESTER HOOKER

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, May 27, Hon. Henry Lester Hooker, who recently retired from Virginia's State Corporation Commission, was honored by his lifelong friends and professional associates on the occasion of the presentation of his portrait to the Patrick County Circuit Court in Stuart, Va.

Judge Hooker was born in Patrick County 87 years ago, and throughout a long, productive career in public service, never lost his love for his place of birth, nor allowed the ties which joined him to that place and its people to be severed. That his affection was returned is attested by the ceremonies last month.

My valued friend and predecessor in the Congress, the Honorable William M. Tuck, delivered the principle address on this occasion in his inimitable style. I include his remarks in the RECORD for two reasons: First, in order that the Members may review the record of Judge Henry Lester Hooker, an outstanding Virginian and, second, so that the Governor's many friends in the House may know he retains today his uncommon and brilliant talent for a well-turned phrase:

REMARKS BY WILLIAM M. TUCK, SOUTH BOSTON, VA., AT THE PRESENTATION OF PORTRAIT OF HON. HENRY LESTER HOOKER IN THE CIRCUIT COURT ROOM OF PATRICK COUNTY, AT STUART, VA., ON SATURDAY, MAY 27, 1972

Your Honor, please, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is always a joy for me to visit Patrick County. I could not if I would forget the many kindnesses bestowed upon me by your officials and citizens throughout the many long years that I have been in public life. I cannot hope to live long enough to find time enough to do enough to demonstrate even in a small way my appreciation of the friendship of the people of Patrick County.

You have honored me again by inviting me to take a part in the program on this auspicious occasion.

Since time immemorial it has been the custom to pay tribute to eminent citizens by those who revere and respect them and this is evidenced by the portraits, plaques, monuments, statues and memorials throughout this nation as well as the civilized world. Thus, it is not only appropriate but also fitting and proper and in compliance with

this ancient practice that notice should be taken of the character and the public services rendered by the Honorable Henry Lester Hooker, a prominent native of Patrick County and a distinguished Virginian whose portrait is being presented today.

This gentleman was born at Buffalo Ridge, in Patrick County on the 25th day of April, 1885, the son of John Wesley and Margaret Akers Hooker. He was the youngest of thirteen children in a family consisting of nine boys and four girls.

The Hooker parents were sturdy, God-fearing people who instilled into their children the fundamental truths of life. All of the boys and girls of this family were endowed with sterling qualities of character and all of them were highly respected, some of whom became widely known for the success which they achieved in their respective lifelong pursuits.

In fact, for more than three-quarters of a century, the Hooker name has been synonymous with the name of Patrick, and this was no doubt due to the innate character of the family as well as the principles with which they were indoctrinated by their honorable and resolute parents.

Judge Hooker's formal education was acquired in the public schools of Patrick County, at the College of William and Mary, and Washington and Lee University Law School. Upon completion of his law studies, he returned to Stuart to practice his profession of law. He became associated with his elder brother, the late Honorable J. Murray Hooker, who had already become successful in the legal profession. The law firm of Hooker and Hooker became widely known, not only in Patrick County, but throughout this entire area of Virginia. The association with his brother was indeed a pleasant one and it continued until Judge Hooker was on November 4, 1924, elected by the people of Virginia to become a member of the Corporation Commission of this Commonwealth.

Although the professional relationship with his brother ceased with this election, the interest and natural aptitude they both had for public affairs as well as the warmth of personal affections remained between these two brothers for the remaining sixteen years of the life of J. Murray Hooker.

In these brief remarks it is impracticable to enumerate all of the achievements and honors which have come to this distinguished gentleman, but probably the most notable and certainly the happiest and most fortunate of these was when he won the hand and the heart of the charming and attractive Miss Nell Sanford, the daughter of the late beloved Reverend and Mrs. Millard Fillmore Sanford. Throughout the happy years of their married life, she has stood ever by his side to sustain and support him. No doubt, she has contributed much to the enhancement of his usefulness as a public official. I may add also that H. Lester Hooker, Jr., and Eleanor Hooker Boisseau, as well as the seven Hooker grandchildren and the four great-grandchildren, have likewise brought happiness and contentment as well as honor to the Hooker family fireside.

The Corporation Commission of Virginia was created by the Constitutional Convention of 1902 and was given almost plenary powers over the regulation of rates and activities of railroads and other public utilities.

Since then many other duties have been conferred upon this body by legislative enactment and by constitutional changes so that it has become the most powerful agency of our state government in Richmond, regulating and to some extent controlling nearly every activity affecting the lives, the economy, the happiness and the welfare of our citizens. Lester Hooker has served as a member of this body or as Chairman thereof for a period of 48 years, more than twice as many years as the Commission's age at the

time he became a member of it. He has served during the span of service of at least ten other members of the Commission. Thus, he has been a part of the growth and powerful influence of this most important body and occupies a position of distinction not surpassed by that of any other renowned Virginian who served thereon, including one who became a Justice of the Supreme Court of Virginia and two others who became Governors of the Commonwealth.

In addition to serving as Chairman of the Commission for many of the years he was a member of it, he has served as President of Southeastern Traffic Association, President of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners and Chairman for 25 years of its legislative committee, Virginia member of the Washington-Metropolitan Area Transit Commission.

Although not related to his official duties he has found time to serve as a member of the Board of Visitors of his alma mater, the College of William and Mary, where he has also served as President of its Society of the Alumni. He is and has been for many years a faithful and active member of the First Baptist Church of Richmond where he belongs to the Board of Deacons of that large religious organization.

He has wrought well in myriad and other useful activities outside of the high public station which he held.

The ancient and honorable College of William and Mary, proud of him as alumnus of that institution, bestowed upon him membership in the Phi Beta Kappa Honor Society and conferred upon him the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws.

The Virginia State Bar in 1971 paid tribute to him for his long tenure as a member of the profession of law, and the Virginia State Legislature at its recent Session, by the vote of every member of the House of Delegates and Senate of Virginia, passed a resolution commending him for the faithful services he has rendered to the people of Virginia.

I first met Judge Hooker in 1912 when he and Mrs. Hooker came to Chatham to visit her brother, the late Dr. T. Ryland Sanford, who was then President of the Chatham Training School (now Hargrave Military Academy). As I reflect upon this, I realize how rapidly the sands have passed through the hourglass of time.

Eight years later when I was a student at the Washington and Lee Law School, I roomed with his brother-in-law, the late R. Paul Sanford, and thus I became better acquainted with Lester Hooker. The acquaintance formed eight years earlier ripened into a deep friendship which has endured since that time and which will continue, I am sure, as long as life lasts.

Knowing him as I do, I am cognizant of the fact that his record speaks in loud and divers tones and nothing that may be said on this occasion can add to or improve upon that record. We cannot gild or embellish the lily.

Virginia has been greatly blessed in this century by having men of character and ability to serve her in high public positions. Judge Hooker's name will always rank in the forefront of those who have served during this period.

In all the relations of life, and particularly in the administration of public affairs, there is no substitute for honor, character, intelligence, industry and devotion to duty. Judge Hooker possesses in a preeminent degree these priceless virtues which are so highly cherished in our Commonwealth and which Virginia has scrupulously required of her public men.

Judge Hooker's success is built more securely on the strong foundation of moral character, integrity and thorough reliability. He has shunned the limelight and has never sought to be a shining star. His approach

has been of the modest variety, but he has given unstintingly of his almost boundless talent, ability and common sense.

The possession of these sterling virtues in a very high degree are largely responsible for the esteem in which Judge Hooker is held by the people of this Commonwealth who are familiar with his work as a member of the State Corporation Commission.

The worth and merit and qualities of character with which Judge Hooker is endowed would have enabled him to achieve success and distinction in any line of human endeavor to which he may have chosen to devote his talents.

He has honored Patrick County and the citizens of Virginia, and in this brief ceremony we undertake to pay appropriate tribute to him.

Knowing Judge Hooker as I do, I am sure that he is pleased to have the privilege of returning to his native hearth. He loves Patrick County and her citizens with a zeal unsurpassed by that of any other native. The majestic mountains and marvelous scenery, as well as the alluvial fields along the banks of the streams which provide water for this country, are prized and appreciated and loved by him. It is natural and human for one to love the place of his nativity and it is particularly so when one is blessed to be a native of such a picturesque County as Patrick with the firm mountains and hills so indicative of the solidarity of its citizenship.

These thoughts and the love of home are alluded to by Sir Walter Scott in his Lay of the Last Minstrel when he said, "Brathes there a man with soul so dead who never to himself has said, this is my own, my native land, whose heart hath n'er within him burned, as home his footsteps he has turned from wandering in a foreign strand."

The merit and worth of character of Judge Hooker entitles him to a place on the honored walls of this Court room—a temple erected for the administration of the pure and unpolluted stream of public justice. Here all may come, irrespective of their rank or station in life—the high, the low, the rich and the poor—and lay down their troubles before this Honorable Court and juries assembled here from time to time in the confident knowledge that if the facts and circumstances in regard to their problems are properly related they will have justice meted out to them by clean hands and from minds unclouded by prejudice or by passion, and eyes undimmed by emotion.

He deserves a place on these walls with that gallant, dashing, colorful Confederate Cavalryman, General J. E. B. Stuart, whose name and fame is unbounded and who will be known and respected as long as bravery is appreciated in the military annals of our history. He deserves a place along side also the late Senator A. M. Lybrook, one of the Big Four who nearly a hundred years ago joined with three other Senators and the then Lieutenant Governor of Virginia in rejecting a leadership in Virginia directed by a political tyrant and charlatan who in the dark days of Reconstruction gained complete control of Virginia through the formation of a cabal composed of the worst elements of both races. Senator Lybrook and his associates succeeded in overthrowing this disdainful element and restored Virginia and her government to the people and honorable and worthy officials.

The memory of Senator Lybrook will live long. His portrait, like that of Judge Hooker, hangs in one of the public buildings of the Capitol of this State.

And lastly, Judge Hooker's portrait should be on the walls of this court room with his late lamented brother, the Honorable J. Murray Hooker, than whom there was none greater and who occupied a place of the warmest sort of personal affections in the hearts and minds of the people of Patrick

County and respected and appreciated throughout the entire State of Virginia.

He was a member of the Virginia State Constitutional Convention of 1902 and also occupied with distinction the office of Attorney for the Commonwealth for Patrick County and later became a member of the United States Congress from the Fifth Congressional District of Virginia. After his retirement from Congress in 1925, he served as Chairman of the Democratic Committee for the Commonwealth of Virginia until his untimely passing in 1940. I may add also that he was the father of the present distinguished gentleman who presides over this Court and who has discharged the duties of his office and otherwise conducted himself in a manner so as to enhance the already high standing of our Virginia Judiciary.

We need now more than ever men of the character of Judge Hooker and the others to whom we have alluded. In this connection and without understating to be dramatic, I close with these lines, "God, give us a man a time like this demands, strong minds, great hearts, true faith and ready hands, men whom the lust for office does not kill, men whom the spoils of office cannot buy, men who have opinions and a will, men who have honor, men who will not lie, men who can stand before demagogues and damn their treacherous flattery without flinching, tall men, uncrowned, who live above the fog in public duty and in private thinking, for while the rabble with their thumb-worn creeds, their large professions and little deeds mingle in selfish strife, lo, freedom weeps, wrong rules the land, and waiting justice sleeps."

THURMAN J. WILLIAMS OF WEST ORANGE, N.J., GETS TITLE OF CERTIFIED MUNICIPAL CLERK

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, among the unsung heroes and heroines of our Nation are our municipal clerks whose faithful performance of ever more complex duties contributes so greatly to their fellow citizens' well-being. These valued administrators in local government receive too little notice or credit for their meritorious service.

I am happy that Mr. Thurman J. Williams, the town clerk of my hometown of West Orange, N.J., has been awarded the title of certified municipal clerk by the International Institute of Municipal Clerks. Certification signifies the clerk who sets high standards for knowledge, skills, experience, and ethics.

Mr. Williams, who has served as town clerk since August 1, 1950, richly merits this select title. He has the respect and affection of all the people of West Orange and of his professional colleagues. He is past president of the Essex County Municipal Clerks Association and served as member of the advisory committee of the International Institute of Municipal Clerks from 1953 to 1959 and as trustees of the international from 1957 to 1962.

I join all my fellow citizens of West Orange in extending warm felicitations to "Tiny" Williams for his distinguished career.

NIXON'S KIEV TOAST—AN INSULT
TO HISTORY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's visit to Kiev, Russia, and his toast "We should drink tonight to the heroes who fought in war and the heroes who have rebuilt this city in peace" is indicative of how much our leaders have conveniently forgotten of the past. The report written by U.S. Ambassador William C. Bullitt "A Talk With Voroshilov" tells another story about Kiev, one of barbaric cruelty on the part of the Bolshevik conquerors the President hailed as heroes.

I include the testimony of Mr. Bullitt, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union—1933-36—taken from House Report No. 2189, 84th Congress, 2d session, "The Great Pretense: A Symposium on Anti-Stalinism and the Twentieth Congress of the Soviet Communist Party"—May 1956—pages 18-19:

THE GREAT PRETENSE

The present attempt of the Moscow commissars to masquerade as innocent victims of Stalin's sadistic brutality should deceive no one. A hyena that laughs remains a hyena. A wolf in sheep's clothing changes his coat but not his heart. Americans have been bamboozled so often by this Communist tactic that few are likely to be impressed by the present smiles and beatings of the Kremlin gang. Any who are inclined to believe that there has been a change of heart in Moscow should remember that the men who are now attempting to prove themselves amiable souls are the same men who carried out murders, tortures, and mass starvations for Stalin. To me they seem more repellent now when they are professing that they were always horrified by Stalin's lying and bloodthirsty brutality than they seemed when they were frankly gangsters.

Many of them were murderous criminals on their own hook long before Stalin achieved supreme power. For example, Marshal Voroshilov, who is today the Soviet Chief of State—the Soviet Union's Queen Elizabeth—has always been able to smile disarmingly and to pat children affectionately on the head, and is no doubt the nicest of the Communist lot. Just how nice he is seems to me worth relating at this time.

One night in the winter of 1934 he was seated on my right at dinner and Marshal Budenny was on my left. They had drunk a bit of vodka and both were relaxed and gay. "You know, Bullitt," said Voroshilov, "Budenny is the man who won the civil war without ever knowing what he was fighting about."

"That's true," laughed Budenny. "My motto has never been proletarians of the world unite; it has always been cavalymen of the world unite. I don't care why I fight so long as I have a good war."

We laughed, and Voroshilov then said, "I think the most extraordinary thing we ever did together was to capture Kiev without fighting."

"What happened?" I asked.

"Well," said Voroshilov, "there were 11,000 Czarist officers with their wives and children in Kiev and they had more troops than we had, and we never could have captured the city by fighting, so we used propaganda and we told them that they would be released and allowed to go to their homes with their families and treated as well as possible by our

army and they believed us and surrendered."

"What did you do then?" I asked.

"Oh," said Voroshilov, "we shot all the men and boys and we put all the women and girls into brothels for our army."

"Do you think that was a very decent thing to do?" I asked.

"My army needed women," said Voroshilov, "and I was concerned with my army's health and not with the health of those women; and it didn't make any difference anyhow, because they were all dead within 3 months."

Voroshilov no doubt deserves his position as Chief of State of the Soviet Union, and is no doubt the most honorable and charming of Communists; but that is exactly how honorable and charming he is.

I hope that Americans who may become inclined to believe any promises now made by the Communist leaders will remember the fate of the Czarist officers and their wives and sons and daughters in Kiev.

The present Soviet objective is clear. It is to lull us into a sleep of death while the Soviet Union achieves control of new areas without war, and prepares sufficient hydrogen bombs and intercontinental jet bombers to destroy our retaliatory power by a sneak attack, so that some day it will be in a position to blot us out with impunity. (End of Quote)

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate, May 29, 1972]

KIEV VISITED BY PRESIDENT

KIEV, U.S.S.R.—President Nixon saluted at a lavish dinner Monday night "the heroes of the Ukraine in war and in peace," and said he hoped his Kremlin summit talks would help prevent in the future the type of devastation that leveled this city in World War II.

The President flew to this capital of the Ukraine after concluding a week of talks with Soviet officials. He flies to Iran on Tuesday, then arrives in the United States on Thursday after an overnight stop in Poland.

In a toast at a dinner given by the Ukrainian government, Nixon said the third-largest city in the Soviet Union suffered "destruction of human life on an unprecedented scale" at the hands of the Nazis in World War II.

CITY REBUILT

But, he said, the city was rebuilt in seven years and the "Republic of the Ukraine continues to grow and prosper."

"We should drink tonight to the heroes who fought in war and the heroes who have rebuilt this city in peace," he said.

He referred also "to the new leadership to which our two countries . . . may contribute by which the world may have a period in which the tragedy of war will never again be visited upon this city or any other city like it in the world."

After the dinner and toasts, Nixon and his wife listened to nearly an hour of concert music in Mariinsky palace, then returned to a state guest house.

Nixon's departure from Moscow was delayed about 45 minutes by the change of planes.

President Nikolai V. Podgorny and Premier Alexei N. Koygin went aboard the Ilyushin 62 in Moscow after one of its four engines failed to start. They apologized to the President.

Joining them was Boris Bugaev, the Soviet minister of civil aviation.

The delay in take off was about 45 minutes.

The backup aircraft arrived in this capital of the Ukraine without trouble and taxied to the terminal where a group of Soviet officials and about 300 city employees with paper flags waited to greet the President.

Nixon emerged from the jet with Mrs. Nixon at his side, paused for a look at the overcast skies and descended a red-carpeted

ramp to shake hands with Alexander Lyashko, the president of the Ukrainian Republic.

After a brief arrival ceremony near three tall flagstaffs with the colors of the United States, the Soviet Union and the Ukraine, the presidential party boarded two black limousines for a motorcycle-escorted drive into the city.

The President leaves from Kiev on Tuesday for Tehran, Iran. After that he goes to Warsaw, Poland.

SENATOR HOWARD BAKER OF TENNESSEE
SERVES IN LEADERSHIP
ROLE IN U.N. CONFERENCE ON THE
HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, the U.N. Conference on the Human Environment opened in Stockholm yesterday. The whole world is watching these proceedings because they will have a profound effect on the survival of planet Earth.

In order for my colleagues to know exactly what is involved in the Conference, I am placing in the Record at this point a summary prepared by Senator HOWARD BAKER for Phoenix Quarterly, the publication of the Institute of Scrap Iron and Steel.

Senator Baker has served as Chairman of the Secretary of State's Advisory Committee for the U.N. Conference and over the past year he and the 27-member advisory committee have solicited and analyzed the broadest range of views and has published them in a report, "Stockholm and Beyond," in preparation for the conference.

Tennessee is proud of the leadership role its senior Senator has taken to make sure this vital conference deals effectively with the worldwide problems of environmental quality. The summary of his work is carried in the Phoenix Quarterly article. I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

U.N. CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN
ENVIRONMENT

(By Senator HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.)

On June 5, 1972 more than 130 nations will meet in Stockholm to convene the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. This is the largest conference ever conducted by the United Nations and by far the largest event ever hosted by the Swedish Government.

However, its significance does not pertain solely to its size. The recognition by all nations, no matter what their stage of development or form of government, that we must ultimately depend upon a common system for our survival is indeed the most significant aspect of this first international conference on the human environment. Never before has this been as clear to man as it is now and recognition of this basic fact makes preservation and protection of the human environment much more than just a domestic matter to be dealt with in a piecemeal fashion.

This was profoundly impressed upon the Swedes years ago when industrial gases from British smokestacks fell on Stockholm in the now famous "acid rains." It was for that reason and others that the Swedish delegation to the United Nations introduced and ob-

tained passage of a resolution calling for a United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.

Since that time, an immense amount of work has been done to make the Stockholm Conference "action" oriented. A very small staff of experts headed by the very able Maurice Strong comprise the U.N. Conference Secretariat whose persistent efforts over the past two years have virtually ensured success for the Stockholm Conference.

Taking the proposals of a special 27-nation Preparatory Committee, the Conference Secretariat has compiled and distributed specific "action proposals" in six general areas for the consideration of each government expected to attend.

Those six areas are:

1. The Planning & Management of Human Resource Management;
2. Environmental Aspects of Natural Resource Management;
3. The Identification and Control of Pollutants and Nuisances of Broad International Significance;
4. The Educational, Social and Cultural Aspects of Environmental Issues;
5. Development and the Environment; and
6. Institutional Arrangements.

Preparation in this country for the Conference has also been underway for approximately two years. The Department of State as well as all concerned governmental agencies have been working together for more than a year now in an effort to involve top environmental experts of the Federal Government.

In a similar effort to involve environmentalists from outside the government, the Secretary of State asked me to chair an Advisory Committee composed of 30 citizens representing a broad range of occupational interests from all across the country. Although the Advisory Committee was formed almost a year ago, it really didn't get off the ground until the United Nations Secretariat distributed the specific "action proposals" for the consideration of governments.

Having received those documents in early March, the Advisory Committee conducted a series of six public hearings in New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Denver, Houston, and Washington, D.C. Although each hearing focused on one of the six subject areas, testimony was heard on all Stockholm related matters.

More than 150 witnesses testified including Mr. George Kennan, former Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Dr. Margaret Mead, Dr. Kenneth Boulding, Senators Cooper and Magnuson, and the renowned environmental saboteur "the Fox," just to name a few.

As a result of the more than 150 witnesses who testified and the approximately 300 written views submitted to the Committee, a report of recommended U.S. positions for the Conference was drafted and adopted by the Committee with some amendments.

Some of the major Committee recommendations include creation of a strong, high-level environmental office with a United Nations Intergovernmental body which will be a subsidiary of the General Assembly. This office would be funded by a U.N. Voluntary Fund for the Environment consisting of a minimum annual budget of \$50,000,000 to be derived from contributions of member states based on a natural resources consumption formula. Those countries which are under-consumers of energy would pay a nominal amount, perhaps a minimum of \$1,000.

In addition, the Committee recommended consideration of the establishment of a governmental system to regulate consumption of natural resources under international jurisdiction. This illustrates the Committee's concern for our finite resources and the need for increased use of recycling.

These are two of the many recommendations included in the report that will be published and available to the public by May 1.

The Department of State and involved governmental agencies have copies of the report and are considering its recommendations as they prepare official United States positions for the Conference. The degree to which the Advisory Committee's recommendations are incorporated into official U.S. positions is yet to be seen, but the significance of citizen input is clear and the entire Committee commends the Department of State for their efforts to involve the public in the preparations for this historic event.

PULITZER PRIZE

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1972

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently the famed Pulitzer awards of excellence in journalism—the highest prize in American journalism—focused attention anew upon disclosure of the Pentagon papers relating to the Vietnam war and the United States' role in the Pakistani war. These were journalistic endeavors of readily apparent national and international import; as a result, published accounts of the Pulitzer awards focus chiefly on those prizes.

Another Pulitzer Prize this year recognized distinguished leadership and reasoned judgment in a journalistic approach to yet another war—that of social ills and racial tensions—whose battles have been fought upon the streets of urban neighborhoods throughout this Nation.

I am proud to extend my warm congratulations to John Strohmeier, editor of the Bethlehem, Pa., Globe-Times newspaper, who received this year's prize for excellence in his editorial approach to the actions, reactions, and emotions spawned during "a year of crisis" in the city of Bethlehem, as well as other significant local, State, and national issues.

The symptoms of this domestic crisis were typical—violence, bloodshed, polarization, civic hostility, and alleged over-reaction by law enforcement officers.

Bethlehem's crisis was sparked by the fatal shooting of a young black girl and the wounding of a Puerto Rican youth outside a neighborhood youth center, and was fired by mass arrests of alleged "conspirators" in a 1970 Ale House incident and a series of other confrontations which pitted community officials and police against the city's youth and minority groups.

Strohmeier responded editorially in a manner which Globe-Times Publisher Donald Taylor described as forcing the community "to face the present and arrange for a future so very different from its past." The good which has resulted from Mr. Strohmeier's editorial guidance is readily apparent today in the substantial shift of community reaction, the calmed tensions, court dismissal of conspiracy charges against a number of individuals, including a young teacher Strohmeier had characterized throughout as a "peacemaker" and "the one person with his finger in the dike," and the selection in 1972 of that peacemaker,

Robert Thompson as Bethlehem's Outstanding Young Man of the Year.

In our deliberations of today's critical problems in America's urban neighborhoods, Mr. Speaker, I believe all of us in Congress will benefit from having read a few of the series of editorials which have earned for John Strohmeier and the Bethlehem Globe-Times the coveted distinction of a Pulitzer Prize:

DESTROYING THE PEACEMAKERS

The Thanksgiving morning barroom fracas and the mass arrest of 21 persons in the near-riot constitute a matter of only the gravest concern.

We now see the rising militance of disaffected youth on one hand and the resort to blunter measures by police on the other. It is bad enough that two already hostile camps harden some more but the tragic aspect is that police are losing the distinctions between the troublemakers and the peacemakers.

The humiliating arrest of Robert Thompson, a respected youth adviser, for the reasons stated is a sad turn. An honors English teacher at Freedom High who spends nearly all of his spare hours working with youngsters at Nick's Mill, Thompson is one of few in the city who lives and feels the problems of youth. He has been the one person with a finger in the dike while appealing within the established system for help in a deteriorating situation.

It is a tribute to his dedication that Thompson left his bed in the middle of the night in an attempt to cool off the confrontation developing in the area of the Ale House in the early hours of Thanksgiving morning. But as far as police are concerned, he was part of the problem. They herded him among 21 others into a paddy wagon for a night in jail and an arrest for unlawful assembly, conspiracy and disorderly conduct. A ranking officer conceded that Thompson tried to mediate in the ruckus. When asked why he was arrested, he replied, "Well, he was there."

The actions of Patrolman John Stein, who handed in his badge at the spot rather than participate in the arrests, is a far more vivid repudiation of such police shotgun tactics than any words of outrage.

It is not our intent to minimize the incendiary matters in the air that night. Coming so soon after a robbery and stabbing in another section of the South Side earlier in the night, the Ale House incident had all the signs of organized trouble. Yet, it is fully as important for police not to over-react as it is for them to capture the law-breakers. Instead of resorting to hard police work to apprehend the real troublemakers and press the case against them to the hilt, police simply made a sweep.

The Thanksgiving morning incident is bound to set off new polarizations and cause more side-choosing in the community at large. Meanwhile, very little beyond words is happening to get at the root of the problem.

In a letter published elsewhere on this page, Prof. Victor Valenzuela of Lehigh University asks the crucial question: while frictions grow between the increasingly sadistic young and the increasingly irritated society, what is this city and its leaders doing to analyze the problem and bring forth the remedy? Strangely, this is the same question Robert Thompson asked two years ago, one year ago, and as recently as last month.

REMOVE STIGMA

A councilmanic investigation of events centering around the "brutality" incident of Sept. 25 at the Bethlehem School District Stadium and later in police headquarters is long overdue. Yet, the necessity for such scrutiny should never have arisen.

Last week's revelations by ex-patrolman John A. Stein must finally strip away a layering of contradictions and begrudging admissions by police and city officials which have eaten into the very fabric of community social relations in past months.

As an early reaction, certain officials have objected to this "new light" without an adequate advance warning and time to prepare further explanations.

The fact is that nothing has been revealed which has not been common knowledge within the police and administration circles for months. But the police reports of what transpired inside the station on the night of Sept. 25, when five young defendants were roughed up, have not been made part of the public record to this day. Meanwhile, neither the mayor nor council saw fit to explain the stunning contradiction in which the top police tried to cover up the incidents by stating they knew nothing of the beatings one day and then meekly accepting the findings of the Human Relations Commission the next day by admitting certain incidents had occurred and that verbal reprimand had been issued.

Now with former officer Stein's eye-witness account of what happened that night, more scurrying for cover is again evident.

John A. Stein came to Bethlehem a "new model" policeman—intelligent, educated, idealistic and yet practical enough to participate in the department's own reorganization. His gradual disillusionment and eventual solitary stand for what can only be considered minimal standards of investigation and discipline point a sorry finger at police moral leadership.

Any organization under constant public criticism cannot be expected to operate effectively and, sadly, the nation's police have borne much of the brunt in recent battles for social change.

Bethlehem, too, has changed much in recent years and police here have been shocked and dismayed to suddenly find themselves the objects of scorn. But just as much of this universal disrespect is unconscionable, the violent enforcement of seemingly more proper attitudes is dangerously retroactive.

Besides creating Bethlehem's credibility gap, a head in the sand attitude by the Bethlehem police has permitted abrasions to grow into a full-scale alienation of many young people. It would have taken little time and training to recognize that certain police responses heighten the problem instead of lessening it. Provocations to retributive violence by juveniles yelling obscenities is immature and hardly meets professional police standards.

Acknowledgment that these standards were not met that night of Sept. 25 might early have cooled tensions and mistrust which finally culminated in the senseless events of Thanksgiving morning.

The new decade has commenced on a hopeful note. Council's budget, with the mayor's provision for professional youth workers and staffing of youth centers, points a community commitment to a cooperative direction.

Yet, the taint of the old will remain until the clouds lift from the contradictions that characterize the police actions following the night of Sept. 25. Only when all the facts are laid out and we get down to the real stock taking can we remove this stigma which hobbles honest police work and stifles the climate of goodwill.

WHITEWASH

The vote of confidence passed by City Council to reaffirm its faith in the Bethlehem Police force is about as meaningless as a vote for motherhood. It was an obvious attempt to apply a coat of whitewash on important issues raised by the concerns of former policeman John Stein.

Ex-officer Stein, who served on the force two and a half years, might have found it easier to step out silently and concentrate on his studies at Lehigh, where he is completing his fourth year. However, the coverup of the role of high police officials in the station house beatings and the growing needless alienations between police and youth compelled him to state his views and risk the scorn of many of his former colleagues.

Only Councilmen William J. P. Collins and Walter Dealtrey seemed to understand the issues raised by Stein's account: 1. How could a departmental hearing which recommended a verbal reprimand really deal with the matter when, as it now develops, Public Safety Director Irvin Good was seen swinging at one of the youths corralled in the police station on the night of Sept. 25. Was Good identified as a participant, and, if so, was he supposed to reprimand himself? 2. There have been many police arrests but few cases ever get to the prosecution stage: Why? As Councilman Collins asked, "I would like to know whether any of these alleged criminals have been given a license to commit crime."

Council's blindness to these concerns was best expressed in the long harangue delivered by Councilman Ray Dietz who attempted to impugn the motives of John Stein, the Globe-Times, and apparently anyone else who would dare to question the operations of the Bethlehem police force. It never occurred to him that the motivations might have been public interest. Instead of recognizing his own public duty to clear the stigma, he chose to pour on platitudes about his pride in the police force. In the words of Mark Twain, Councilman Dietz showed only he would rather be popular than right.

A more proper way to "stand behind our police" is to ensure a responsible administration, to correct those abuses of police procedure which are letting so many arrest cases slip away, and to set standards for the vast majority of city policemen who want to do their duty above reproach.

By voting not to clear the air, City Council indicated that it either doubts its own ability to muster "a calm and serious approach" to the truth, or it is so certain of the outcome of an investigation that it fears the revelations.

ON ECOLOGY: SELLING OUT THE MONOCACY

The Monocacy Creek is one of those dwindling natural resources that provides fun and fishing and breeds wildlife and vegetation in a rapidly growing urban area. This week, city council has been told that the state health department is about ready to clear the way for industrial firms to dump into the stream wastes that are potentially dangerous. In short, the state is on the verge of lowering the quality of water standards for the Monocacy.

This straightforward indictment of Pennsylvania's concept of protecting the environment was made not by any of the many conservation groups which occasionally cry out about beer cans and litter. It was a documented charge launched by an individual, an Allentonian at that, who has enjoyed the many recreational treasures of days spent on the banks of the Monocacy. Harry Forker is heartsick that the Monocacy is about to be degraded and that the state is the villain in the rape of this stream.

So far, the state health department has not denied that it has approved, though not yet issued, a permit to let the National Portland Cement Co., north of Bethlehem discharge wastes into a prime fishing stretch of the Monocacy with an oxygen content lowered to six parts per million. Forker contends that this level is too low for marine and plant life to survive as natural trout food.

While both the cement plant and the state might put forth a biologist to debate Forker's contention on the level of oxygen necessary for marine life survival, no one can

fault him on real thrust of charge. It is that in this age of vanishing natural resources the state should be raising the level of water quality, not lowering it.

No amount of industrial or economical development is worth degrading this fine public stream. Every effort should be made now to draw the line against further intrusion by man. In fact, hearings held earlier this year indicated that the Monocacy has the potential to be upgraded into a fine cold water fishing stream capable of holding over and breeding fish.

How then, does the State Health Department reconcile its tacit approval for lower standards simply to help an industry accommodate scrubbers that have failed to meet clean stream criteria? How, in fact does it explain the long history of enforcement negligence which has permitted lagoons of a paint and pigment plant further down stream to ooze into another choice fishing stretch of the Monocacy? Does the State Health Department exist as a partner of industry or a protector of the public?

Governor Shapp made much in his campaign about getting tough on pollution enforcement. The sad abuse of the Monocacy deserves to be called to his attention. Everyone who has ever fed a duck on any of its calm pools, caught a trout in its swift waters, or thrilled at the sight of a migrating warbler on its shaded banks should recognize a personal mission to save the Monocacy.

Don't let them degrade it. Write the governor. Write Dr. Maurice Goddard (Department of Environmental Resources, Harrisburg), and write City Council. It is the only way left to head off this sellout by the State Health Department.

A PULITZER PRIZE

A Pulitzer prize is American journalism's highest honor. It is humbling to discover that the Bethlehem Globe-Times and its editor join the long list of illustrious names who have been honored since the prizes were started by Columbia University in the famed publisher's name 56 years ago.

The Globe-Times won the award on the basis of 10 editorials, five of which dealt with racial tensions that began to polarize the city in an all too familiar pattern. The unhappy events at the Protection Firehouse youth center, the Ale House malee, the police beatings, and the arrest of Youth Worker Robert Thompson are history. The fact that they occurred and the fact that we wrote editorials deploring the change in the mood of the city are not nearly as important as Bethlehem's response to them. Injustices were recognized. Changes in outlooks occurred in many places, not the least of which were in the police department. Instead of condoning actions which might invite confrontation, police now hold classes on minority problems and staff a program in which policemen work full time in community relations to head off problems. Meanwhile, the city administration, school district, the churches, and the United Fund have developed their own ways to help alienated youth and assist in the transition of different cultures. Finally, in picking Robert Thompson the "Outstanding Young Man of the Year" for 1971, Bethlehem itself made amends to a young peacemaker who suffered the indignity of arrest as a troublemaker only a few months before. As one of the editorials in the Pulitzer exhibit commented: "It was a hard lesson. Bethlehem is a wiser and more sensitive city. And it has managed to preserve the loyalties of the Bob Thompson despite ample cause for distress..."

It is not often that a Pulitzer Prize comes to a smaller newspaper. We are grateful to the Pulitzer Advisory Board and Columbia trustees for recognizing that bigness is not essential in working in the Pulitzer tradition. And we are particularly grateful to

this city because its enlightened response in those troubled months was such an important element in the prize that will enshrine the Bethlehem Globe-Times in journalism history.

LESSENING THE INEQUITY

At the close of Wesley United Methodist Church's six-part panel discussion, "The Street Scene: Youth in Bethlehem," Dr. Charles Chaffee, retired Bethlehem Area School District superintendent, expressed reservations concerning the recommendations drawn up by the 19 panelists who participated in the programs. The response he received showed that others shared his beliefs.

Among other suggestions, Dr. Chaffee urged "caution" when referring to proposals calling for the establishment of an area legal defense fund, and the support of the newly-founded Lehigh Valley Ball Fund, Inc.

He asked if anyone believed that a magistrate will hold a person over for court, and if the courts would take action against that person, unless sufficient evidence suggests that the party in question committed a crime.

One point Dr. Chaffee apparently overlooked is that the basic assumption underlying our legal system states a man is innocent until proven guilty. Neither arrest nor arraignment establishes guilt or innocence, only the trial itself. Thus, until a verdict is pronounced, we are dealing with an innocent man.

That innocent man is guaranteed the right to proper legal defense, and does not have to spend the time pending his trial in jail if he can meet the financial requirements of bail.

For many citizens in this immediate area and the country as a whole, however, both bail and proper legal defense are luxuries. Whether the barriers be economic or educational these people are denied the rights of due process of law. Because of inability to finance bail, they are forced to sit in jail or prison, having been convicted of no crime, while others accused of the same or even worse crimes are able to pay bail and go free. The difference is in the pocketbook.

The same is true for legal defense. For many, retaining a private attorney, no matter what the caliber, is totally unfeasible. They are forced to turn to the over-worked, understaffed—and often inefficient—public defenders office. Again, another person accused of a similar or worse crime but with more economic resources available is able to retain a more effective attorney and perhaps win a more favorable verdict.

To balance the inequities, concerned citizens in both Bethlehem and the nation are forming bail funds and legal defense funds. These nonprofit organizations are established behind the promise of equal justice for all. They provide bail and assist in obtaining creditable defense for those unable to afford these items themselves. Without such groups, the noble ideal "equal justice for all" remains the biting reality of "justice for the wealthy and pot-luck for the poor."

LONDONTOWN IN HANCOCK CELEBRATES 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday it was my pleasure to join Jon Myers, president of Londontown Manufacturing Co., Sid Salitsky, plant manager, and the employees of Londontown in Han-

cock, Md., for the celebration of Londontown's 10th anniversary in Hancock.

Construction on the plant began in January 1962, and the plant opened in April 1962. Originally the plant planned to employ a maximum of 200; however, by late 1964 employment had reached approximately 300 and today 450 individuals work within the Hancock Londontown plant. The Hancock plant was the first Londontown plant built outside Baltimore. The third plant was also located in Washington County in Boonsboro.

The anniversary celebration included a luncheon at Weaver's restaurant followed by a presentation of awards to employees at the plant. It was an impressive celebration. In the past 10 years Londontown has contributed much to the local community and has helped reduce unemployment in the area. I commend those who helped bring Londontown to Hancock and those who have made the past 10 years so successful.

A DECEPTIVE BILL

HON. DAVID E. SATTERFIELD III

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on higher education scheduled for House action this week contains provisions which should be of deep concern to every Member. For all intent and purpose, the anti-busing provisions approved by the House have been rendered ineffectual by alterations in their language. Furthermore title VII will for the first time provide legislative approval to merger and consolidation of separate and distinct school districts and provide grants to the school boards involved to finance cross busing integration plans.

The Richmond Times Dispatch has published two editorials dealing with this report which I include herein and which I recommend to my colleagues for their consideration:

A DECEPTIVE BILL

Members of the U.S. Congress who vote for the \$21.3 billion higher education bill because they think the riders attached to the legislation will help halt forced busing may be in for a rude awakening.

The Senate approved the bill 63 to 15 last Wednesday, with many conservatives and moderates who oppose busing voting with the majority and some liberals who favor busing voting with the minority. The legislation is reputedly designed to place Congress in opposition to compulsory busing, and the big bold headings of the bill do give you that impression: "Prohibition Against Assignment or Transportation of Students to Overcome Racial Imbalance," "Prohibition Against Use of Appropriated Funds For Busing," Etc.

But before purchasing an insurance policy, a wise consumer reads the fine print, and before buying this legislative piece of goods, the house of Representatives should do its homework, too. Third District Rep. David E. Satterfield, III, has given the bill, as it emerged from a House-Senate conference committee rewriting, a thorough reading, and he is alarmed by the implications of several sections. So are we.

Consider, for example, Title VII, Section 709. This would authorize the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to make grants to local school boards to finance cross-busing integration plans throughout a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). Grouped in this region's SMSA are Richmond and the counties of Chesterfield, Hanover, and Henrico. This measure would require that, under a federal grant, each school throughout the SMSA would have to have a percent of minority-group children at least half that of the SMSA-wide percentage of minority children. In plain language: children would have to be swapped and shuttled throughout the region to fill out racial quota sheets. The racial goal would have to be met by "a date certain" but "in no event later than July 1, 1983" (just in time to celebrate the drawing of George Orwell's 1984).

On first reading, this provision might seem to leave everything to local option. No grant for metropolitan busing can be made unless "two-thirds or more of the local educational agencies" have approved the application, and the pupil enrollment of the approving localities must constitute at least two-thirds of the SMSA-wide enrollment. But, read it again, and think. What about the will of the local electorate? This bill leaves the momentous decision of busing across political boundaries entirely to local school boards, which, in Virginia, are not elected by the public. The blessings of city councils and boards of supervisors, which are accountable to popular will, are not sought or required. The Richmond School Board's insistence on suing for school consolidation here, despite the opposition (at the time) of a City Council majority, should be reminder enough that school boards can sometimes place themselves above the people.

And it is even possible that some zealous HEW chieftain could order local school boards to draw up a metro busing scheme. For Sec. 708(a)(2) authorizes HEW to make grants to local schools "for the purpose of conducting special programs and projects carrying out activities otherwise authorized by this title, which the Assistant Secretary (of HEW) determines will make substantial progress toward achieving the purposes of this title." One of the stated purposes of Title VII is to overcome minority-group "isolation." And how does the title define a desired "integrated school"? See Sec. 720(6), to wit: "... (one) in which the proportion of minority group children is at least 50 per centum of the proportion of minority group children enrolled in all schools of the ... Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area ...". So if the purpose of the title is to promote busing on a SMSA-wide basis to achieve a magic percentage, couldn't an ideologically-committed HEW bureaucrat, convinced of his self-importance, deduce that it was his patriotic duty to give local school boards a little shove by, say, threatening to terminate their federal funds or hauling them into court? Does God grow little green apples, and does it snow in Indianapolis in the wintertime?

This bill is, simply, a problem-creator masquerading as a problem-solver. It calls for a stay of federal district court busing orders until all appeals have been exhausted, but it is doubtful that judges will choose to let that Congressional expression infringe upon their independence of action. It prohibits federal agencies from ordering local officials to spend local money for forced busing but it adds the qualifier "unless constitutionally required" (a loophole big enough to drive the entire HEW bureaucracy, Justice Department, and federal judiciary through).

Furthermore, as we noted in a May 22 editorial ("Students on Welfare"), it is tragic that Congress has let the most revolutionary extension of federal control over higher education slip through thus far practically uncontested amid the busing battle. This mammoth bill would make it a "right" of every student in the United States to receive a

federal handout of \$1,400 a year to attend college, reduced only by the amount the U.S. Commissioner of Education, in his infinite wisdom, might decide an individual family could afford to pay. It would give direct grants from the federal treasury to colleges, both private and public, on the highly dubious criterion of the number of federally-assisted students the colleges enroll. It would create new dollar-gobbling educationist bureaucracies dedicated to promoting the idea that everyone should get a college degree, no matter how little the country needs the extra degree-holders or the degree-seekers need (or merit) the degrees.

This bill purports to be for higher education and against busing, but it could very well destroy the present system of decentralized higher education and spread the cancer of forced busing to awful new extremes. We urge members of the Virginia Congressional Delegation to vote against it.

STUDENTS ON WELFARE

Congress is going about some good work in a bad way. It is trying to address the forced busing problem in elementary and secondary schools by attaching a mish-mash of contradictory riders to the \$18.5 billion aid-to-higher education bill.

By submitting the proposed Equal Educational Opportunities and Student Transportation Moratorium Acts to Congress, President Nixon has offered a reasonable approach to the busing problem. But while the administration's bills languish in committee, Congress continues to play the game of making law by rider. This is not to suggest the President's program is perfect; indeed, Congress may be able to improve upon it. But dealing with busing as an issue separate from collegiate education is definitely a wiser approach than the present mess.

Largely because of the busing snafu, not nearly enough public debate has been given to the merits of the higher education bill itself. Undoubtedly this measure is, as Capitol Hill liberals have boasted, the most "sweeping" entry of the federal government into higher education ever. But is it something for which the American people really want to pay? Does the public know what's involved? Does the nation want to move toward universal higher education, paid for from the public till?

This gigantic measure would establish "as a primary tenet of federal policy that every qualified and needy student had a right to federal aid in meeting the expenses of a post-secondary education," according to Congressional Quarterly.

College students, in effect, would become the newest federal welfare clients, complete with guaranteed annual income from Washington. For the bill provides that any student accepted by or enrolled in an accredited college would be entitled to receive a grant of \$1,400 minus the amount his family could "reasonably be expected" to contribute to education expenses. And who would decide what a family could reasonably be expected to contribute? Why, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, who else?

This is, remember, an outright grant, a handout, not a loan the student would have to repay or a work-study stipend he would have to earn. The cost of these grants has been estimated at \$940 million in fiscal 1973, \$995 million in fiscal 1974, and \$1.05 billion in fiscal 1975. This largesse would be in addition to the on-going billion to the on-going federal student aid programs—work-study payment, direct loans, and the like—which cost \$1.07 billion in fiscal year 1972.

The colleges themselves would be encouraged to lap the federal gravy. For every student it enrolled who received a federal handout, the college would be entitled to a "cost-of-instruction allowance" from the federal government. Ostensibly designed to help the colleges bear the burden of educating the

student-welfare recipients, this provision obviously would have the real effect of inducing even greater reliance by colleges on the central government than now exists. The estimated cost of the "allowances" would be \$674 million in fiscal 1973, \$694 million in fiscal 1974, and \$716 million in fiscal 1975.

The overall higher education tab for the next three years is a staggering \$18.5 billion. It should be noted that this figure represents "authorizations," and actual "appropriations" are often far less. Even so, the principle would be established by which billions of tax dollars could be dumped down a hole nearly as deep as the public welfare program.

Student financial aid, whether from private loan and scholarship sources, or from carefully designed public programs, is important. But Congress would be wrong to promote the idea that everyone ought to go to college at enormous expense to the taxpayer. It has apparently listened too much to the groups of educationist lobbyists, which now number in the hundreds, and not enough to the complaints of the average taxpayer. The fact is, the nation's colleges already have too many students who have no business being there. As the Scranton Commission on Student Unrest noted, many students are enrolled simply for the sake of being enrolled and not for the sake of education. "The presence of such unwilling students at the university seriously undermines its morale, for understandably they demand kinds of experience and instruction that universities are ill equipped to provide," the commission said.

Furthermore, as any liberal arts graduate who is now pumping gas or scrubbing floors can attest, the value of a college degree has been vastly oversold. The employment market simply cannot absorb the hordes of "generalists" being produced by colleges, and, in many cases, technically-trained high school graduates are getting the best jobs.

President Nixon submitted a far more realistic proposal which would have relied more on private money markets than the federal dole for student aid, but as is their wont, liberal Democrats made the sky the limit. The President, however, has demonstrated the courage to veto inflated education bills before, and he ought to give this one the same treatment, even if it means killing the anti-busing riders, which seem at this point to be virtually meaningless anyway. Busing then ought to be considered separately and Congress ought to try to draw a higher education bill that won't bankrupt the nation.

MOSCOW SUMMIT MEETING

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was immensely pleased with the encouraging results of the recent Moscow summit meeting. The cause of peace has been moved measurably forward by this historic meeting. However, many of us here were bitterly disappointed that a resolution of the war in Southeast Asia was not produced by the summit. None can deny the breakthroughs that were made at the meeting, but our concern over the continuing destruction of Indochina has not been alleviated. An article which appeared in the New York Times explores this situation thoughtfully and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, June 5, 1972]

THE IMPERFECT CIRCLE

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, June 4.—The success of the Moscow summit is a particular triumph for Henry Kissinger's world view. He has argued that great powers can balance their mutual interests on a planetary scale, transcending local or ideological differences. In Moscow, as in Peking, President Nixon boldly followed that approach.

The question that remains is how the global vision can solve the little local difficulty of Vietnam. Mr. Kissinger would doubtless accept that it is not begrudging the triumph of Moscow for those concerned about Vietnam to ask.

In the Kissinger view, American policy—Presidential policy—should be a circle in which all elements fit together. Bangladesh, the Middle East: Everything must be related to the effort to create a structure of great power accommodation. In those terms Vietnam is an annoyance. It is "one small country," as Mr. Kissinger recently called North Vietnam in evident frustration, that will not fit the pattern. It is a bump on an otherwise perfect circle.

American policy is to squeeze that bump, to make it conform. The evident fear is that to compromise our political objectives in South Vietnam in any meaningful way would weaken our power and credibility everywhere: would threaten the entire circle.

That is the theory underlying the tremendous increase in American firepower applied to Vietnam in the last two months: The intensified bombing of the North, the new shelling from ships offshore, the approval of new strategic targets, the mining of harbors. And the prospect is for more escalation: more B-52's, more ships, a new air base in Thailand.

One who has just been in North Vietnam would never underestimate the destructive force of those bombs and shells. American bombing has clearly wounded the transportation system and made life more difficult. It has also destroyed many civilian facilities—schools and homes and hospitals—and taken many lives.

The utilitarian question is whether the destruction will work politically: Will it make the North Vietnamese negotiate on American terms in Paris, as Mr. Kissinger has long hoped?

When I tried to explore that question in Hanoi, several persons referred to the testament of Ho Chi Minh, written a few months before his death in 1969. It includes a two-line verse:

Our mountains will always be, our rivers will always be, our people will always be; The American invaders defeated, we will rebuild our land ten times more beautiful.

The implication is that the North Vietnamese will accept total destruction of the works of man in their country if that is the price of the war. It is a difficult thought to believe in its fanaticism, but there it is.

If in fact the present level of American air and naval activity does not make them come to terms, what follows? In Hanoi, many foreigners thought the logic of American policy was to go on up the path of escalation, hoping that each step would at last bring political results. Some thought the next logical step would be the destruction of Hanoi.

There is no real sign now of any internal check to such a policy. Protest in America is at a low level. People are weary, without hope. Congress is ineffectual. Few seem to care how many Vietnamese are killed in order to make the circle perfect.

But history will care. If American bombers turn Hanoi into rubble, as they can, Americans will be the victims as well; their children will have to live with it. And that sug-

gests that the whole Kissinger vision may be wrong: Vietnam is not a bump on an otherwise perfect circle. It is the issue on which the United States will be judged, by the world and by itself.

To apply some force to preserve an indigenous independence in South Vietnam would be one thing. To use staggering destructive power for the sake of preserving Nguyen Van Thieu in office is another. As André Fontaine said recently in *Le Monde*, it is an obsession, the self-destructing pursuit of a white whale.

In all this Henry Kissinger has a particular responsibility. Not only because of his position—the power remains the President's—but because of his life and ideas.

He saw for himself the terrible results of an ideology of force. He taught hundreds of students the necessity for analysis, for detachment, in weighing values and making political choices. To forget all that now, to provide the intellectual rationale for the obsessive pursuit of an abstraction, would indeed be *la trahison des professeurs*. Henry Kissinger must know better.

VD PROBLEM IN NATION, QUESTION OF OUR PRIORITIES

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the social stigma surrounding the subject of venereal disease has been such that at all levels of government and society we have refused to think about it hoping that the problem would go away. As is so often the case with neglected problems, we are presently faced with a national situation in which, next to the common cold, venereal disease is the most common affliction of our population. Of all the reportable communicable diseases, venereal disease exceeds the combined total of all other reportable diseases.

The statistics themselves are appalling. In a joint statement prepared by the American Social Health Association and cosponsored by the American Public Health Association and the American Venereal Diseases Association, it was noted that the number of reported cases of gonorrhea increased 16 percent in 1970. Over 2 million cases were treated, and this, of course, does not include the tremendous number of unreported cases and the large unknown reservoir of silent infection, which is common in females. It is estimated that as many as 1 in 20 of the sexually active females is suffering from gonorrhea.

It is estimated that this year there will be 2½ million cases of gonorrhea and over 100,000 cases of syphilis.

Over 10 years ago the very successful treatment of venereal disease with penicillin had led to a significant reduction in the number of active cases of venereal disease and to a feeling of security on the part of public health personnel and the public which was entirely unjustified. Now we are faced with a pandemic of extraordinarily large proportions, and the immediate question is why should this have happened.

Some of the contributing aspects have been inadequate education, stemming in part from ignorance and in part from

the social stigma which surrounds the whole subject. It has resulted from a grossly inadequate amount of research. No doubt this failure to support research in part stemmed from the assumption that the problem was solved and, again, from the fact that most of our talented research people would rather work on projects which are much more socially acceptable than is research on venereal disease problems. Among the urgent needs for research, might be included the need for a better method of early detection and identification of the so-called silent cases.

Some of the problems have been compounded by the failure of physicians to report new cases which come to their attention. Since four out of five cases of venereal disease are seen by private physicians, this failure of the physician to make a report, and it does require paperwork, results in no steps being taken to identify contacts and, therefore, treatment of exposed individuals who may be infected. Another of the contributing aspects has been the failure to implement known control measures. Even with these facts before us it is discouraging to note that authorized funds have not been appropriated, and appropriated funds have not been utilized. The trained investigators interested in working on venereal disease problems are too few to effectively use what funds are available. Obviously, training programs are needed.

Actually, in the progress report, which was mentioned before, it was noted that there have been increasing numbers of outbreaks of gonococcal ophthalmia neonatorum when institutions have relaxed the routine application of prophylactic drugs to the eyes of newborn infants. When one looks at the problem of venereal disease as a health problem in the United States, one must realize that our order of priority in the expenditure of control and research funds is completely out of balance. Actually, more money is spent on leprosy with about 119 cases in the United States than on all venereal disease with 2½ million cases. Because of the long neglect of research, the problems are tremendous and the trained investigators are very few.

Dr. Milton Puziss, who is Director of Extramural Research at NIAID, has noted that our information on how syphilis spreads within the body is a flat zero. We do not even know how to grow the syphilis organism in artificial media.

We do know that the epidemiological and clinical pictures of syphilis and gonorrhea are changing. These diseases which have been around for a very long time are adapting to changed treatment programs. It is now taking a great more penicillin to cure these diseases than was required when first this treatment procedure was introduced. In other words, the strains of the organism are becoming penicillin resistant. There is no satisfactory vaccine against these organisms. We are in need of trained investigators and, therefore, training programs to develop skills in the area. There needs to be developed a clinical specialty of venereology in this country such as is practiced in other countries. And

there needs to be increased training of the dermatologist, the internist, the obstetrician, the pediatrician, the neurologist, the family physician, and public health officer since all of these have important roles to play, both in the case management and in the control of the different manifestations of venereal disease.

When we look at the facts of the case, we can only admit that as a nation we have been grossly negligent in facing up to this most serious of public health problems. In our Federal health programs, we have put insufficient funds and insufficient effort into education, research and control procedures. Unless we work more rapidly to correct the situation, we will inevitably be faced with problems of taking care of the results of these diseases which include insanity, paralysis, congenital malformation, arthritis, blindness and a general disability which can only increase the welfare and social security costs to the Nation. While the economic costs are bound to be great, the humane costs are, of course, inestimable.

It is inevitable that we ask the question of why this rapid increase in venereal disease, and it is easy to point the finger at the new permissiveness in our society, the changing attitudes and the use of contraceptive procedures such as "the pill." However, it seems also reasonable to point to the almost complete failure to provide education in our public schools and for the public at large.

We need to develop new techniques of health education in order to reach teenagers and young adults who are now the sources of about one-half of the reported venereal disease cases. There has been a tendency for the older generation to talk down to their children on the subject, forgetting it was their own generation, during and following World War II, that was responsible for a higher syphilis rate than is existent today.

The present increase in venereal disease is worldwide and highest in those areas of civil unrest, social change, and population mobility. The causes are complex and numerous.

One may well ask where we stand today in the United States. If there was an outbreak of diphtheria or smallpox of the order or magnitude of venereal disease, we would expect immediate response and rapid action by the public, by Government and by the medical profession. However, because of the social stigma which surrounds the venereal diseases the lag period between concern and action is very much longer. The public simply has not realized the full significance of the present epidemic proportions of venereal disease. Consequently, there has been little effort to force Government and professional action by large numbers of citizens.

The rates of infection will only be brought under control by regular, well planned, coordinated action. Because of the very wide extent and extreme seriousness of the problem, Federal leadership, including appropriations for research and grants, will be very necessary but State, local, and private efforts will have to be made on a much larger scale.

Above all, the medical profession will have to recognize its responsibility and become much more involved.

The most immediate need, as this country faces this major epidemic of venereal diseases, is that there should be a recognition of the extent of the problem and an understanding of the steps which must be taken to control the epidemic.

Obviously, there must be research. The research must extend into surveillance which must be included in epidemiological studies. There must be bacteriologic and immunologic investigations which will be required for the evaluation of potential control measures.

So little is known about the physiology and cellular structure of the gonococcus that these must be examined in detail. The study of the modes of action of antibiotics and the movement of the venereal disease organisms through the body will have to be known before effective therapeutic measures can be used with confidence.

The need for research is paralleled by a need for education and research into the methods of education so that we can reach those segments of our population which appear to be most vulnerable.

Finally, public health measures must be instituted which can effectively aid in the control of venereal diseases.

Unless we move swiftly and with efficient resources, the problem can only become much worse and the toll in human misery and loss of human resources will be astronomical.

FROM ND TO OMB

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the Notre Dame Alumni magazine carried an article on a distinguished alumnus, Don Rice, who, unfortunately, is leaving the Office of Management and Budget to become president of Rand Corp. I have worked with Don on several projects. His acumen and fairness have been most helpful.

I would like to share this article by Terence F. Shea of the National Observer with my colleagues:

FROM N.D. TO O.M.B.

(By Terence F. Shea)

As we went to press, the appointment of Don Rice '61 as president of Rand Corporation was announced. The best-known "think tank" in the nation, Rand is a nonprofit organization which conducts research and analysis on problems of U.S. national security and domestic affairs. The company is headquartered in Santa Monica, Calif.

Don Rice walks quickly down the deserted marble corridors of the old Executive Office Building, steps out into the warm night, and crosses the few yards of open space to enter the White House by a side door. The security guards recognize him, nod approvingly, and he moves on, making his way through the quiet, carpeted hallways of the Executive Mansion's West Wing.

In Henry Kissinger's office, as in others throughout the White House, staff members work after most government personnel have gone home. The President's Office—unoccupied but brightly lit and guarded—is a room where Rice enjoys pointing out seldom-noticed architectural touches.

A few steps away is another room that he unhurriedly describes with a tone of appreciation in his low voice. It is a place of polished dark woods and of sweeping canvases that portray great military events of American history. It's a conference room, yet it possesses a feeling of elegance that he likes because it's tasteful to the last detail; it's not overdone.

It is in this room at 7:30 almost every morning that Donald B. Rice '61 and several other top federal officials gather with key presidential aides to share information about the business of the government.

The 32-year-old Rice, who received a bachelor-of-science degree in chemical engineering from Notre Dame 11 years ago, is an assistant director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). He works with OMB Director George Shultz and Deputy Director Caspar Weinberger to provide the President with a review and evaluation of federal agencies' budget requests and to analyze and evaluate the agencies' programs.

The OMB's three assistant directors cover the entire federal budget. One reviews defense and international programs, another deals with "human resources" spending through departments such as Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare. "I have the third piece," Rice says.

That piece includes economic, science and technology programs, such as the Commerce and the Transportation Departments, the Atomic Energy Commission, NASA, the Small Business Administration and the National Science Foundation. Also included are natural-resources programs, such as the Agriculture and the Interior Departments, the Corps of Engineers' civil-works functions and the Environmental Protection Agency.

"We're in the unique place of being able to see the whole—or for each of us at least a very large part of the whole—compared to what an individual agency can see," Rice says. "In a sense, our constituency is the general taxpayer. That interest must be represented here. It's not likely to get continuous, front-burner recognition in other parts of the Executive branch, which also have special interests to serve."

He adds that "the Agriculture Department doesn't spend much time talking to aerospace companies, and NASA doesn't spend much time talking to farmers," but the OMB talks to all agencies, studies their programs and points of view, and advises the President on how much money each should have, what should be done with it and how.

He adds, "Our job really is to be sensitive to the agency that's making the request," Rice says, "but to be even more sensitive to the President's problem, and to lay out alternatives and evaluations that are helpful to him."

To do that, Rice has a staff of more than 80 persons who are to "know enough about the programs to understand them, figure out what can be done to improve them, make them more efficient and identify things that are candidates for elimination or reduction. They also have responsibility for monitoring the management effectiveness of the agencies in their areas. They identify problem areas where management capabilities and management systems aren't sufficient to the need . . . figuring out what needs to be done, and following up when something has been decided."

In his spacious, high-ceiling office in the Executive Office Building, Rice settles into one of the chairs around the circular conference table and says that economic anal-

ysis at the OMB isn't all that far from chemical engineering at Notre Dame.

After receiving his degree, Rice worked a summer as a chemical engineer for the Humble Oil Co. refinery in Baton Rouge, then entered a master's-degree program in industrial administration at Purdue. It had "a heavy emphasis in economics and quantitative-methods, operations-research kinds of problems, which were pretty easy to build onto an engineering background."

At Purdue he received a Ford Foundation doctoral fellowship in economics and management, became interested in management science and applied economics and decided to stay on for a Ph.D. His three degree areas—engineering, industrial administration and analytical economics—are alike in that "they help you develop a way of thinking about problems, decision problems," Rice says, "developing a bias toward searching out the facts and thinking in terms of alternatives and differences."

"It also makes a good mix," he adds, "because in this job it's helpful to have some engineering or technical background to help understand more about what the programs really do—and that's important for trying to figure out how much of them we ought to have."

Rice and his wife, the former Susan Fitzgerald, a 1961 Saint Mary's College graduate, left Purdue after four years and went to Monterey, Calif., where he did two years of ROTC obligation by teaching at the Naval Postgraduate School. Over the fireplace in his Washington office he has hung framed photographs that convey a kind of Impressionist feeling for the unspoiled coastline of central California.

It was at Monterey that Rice "helped put together and teach a four-week course designed to teach middle-management personnel—both civilian and military—in the Defense Department something about the planning, programming and budgeting system of the McNamara period." In effect, Rice helped Defense Department officials understand the changes taking place there in the middle 1960s. He was concerned particularly with the new management approaches and analytical procedures that Robert McNamara introduced.

In June 1967 Rice came to the Pentagon as director of cost analysis in the office of the Secretary of Defense. A year and a half later, after President Nixon named Melvin Laird Defense Secretary, Rice was appointed Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Resource Analysis—"another one of those long Washington titles that go on forever," he observes with a grin.

The new post put him in charge of the Pentagon's cost-analysis division, which he had been directing, plus other divisions that analyzed the department's manpower requirements for wartime operations. Some of his work concerned the Vietnam war—mainly in analyzing postwar problems and South Vietnam's economy after U.S. troop withdrawal. Most of it was highly classified and almost none made news.

However, the results of one of his studies did get some public attention. The study was "Instrumental in showing that the so-called \$30 billion 'peace dividend' that was to come after the war was an exaggeration," Rice says. "It was true that the defense budget at its peak got to be a number that was \$30 billion higher than it was in the latest year before the war," he explains, but in the intervening years inflation had pushed up the prices of everything from toothpaste to fighter-bombers.

In fact, he adds, if the Defense Department's manpower strengths and total forces were kept at their prewar levels, the defense budget "would have to be in the neighborhood of, well, it's classified, but it would have to be much larger than it is today. Tens of billions larger."

When President Nixon created the OMB about two years ago and named then-Labor Secretary George Shultz as its director, Rice came over from the Pentagon to the position he has now. "The OMB attracts people who are here to serve the presidency—and the President," Rice says. He regards his post as one of the "half dozen or so best jobs in town." It's not without drawbacks—especially a frustration in not being able to actively make a worth-while program achieve all that he knows it wants to do and can do. The results of pouring more money into existing programs, he indicates, may satisfy political constituencies without solving the problems.

"Our basic job is identifying alternatives," Rice says. "An agency may not even know that something they're proposing is inconsistent with a policy in another area that it touches on or overlaps with." There also may be "alternatives in terms of different ways of getting after the same objective." And sometimes it's a question of "whether the thing is worth undertaking."

The voice that Rice and his colleagues have in government decision-making sometimes is in the form of a recommendation attached to an analysis, but it's "awfully important to keep that for the end," he emphasizes, "separate from the basic staff job."

The recommendations are expected to be based on "our substantive knowledge of the program area," he says, "but there are also times when we have to consider the political climate in terms of the receptivity of a congressional committee to a particular idea. We certainly don't serve our boss well by ignoring the fact. We also make it clear when an idea is an opinion rather than an analytical conclusion."

Rice admits, "there are times when my work leads me to a different conclusion than that of my bosses, including the President. On the other hand, I've been through enough different levels of jobs already in my career to know darn well that the guy at one level doesn't see all of the ramifications of the problem."

"There's a certain intellectual arrogance that one can fall into in this business," Rice says. "As soon as you begin to feel you always know the right answer, you're no longer any good to the people who put you here to provide them independent, objective display of meaningful alternatives and their implications."

The penalty of arrogance is swift: "The decision-makers stop listening to you," Rice explains, "so you've got a powerful incentive to not let yourself get sucked into simply putting forward your own personal opinion." He adds that "we lose our effectiveness as staff assistants to the President if we try to do the President's job for him, and he wouldn't put up with that."

Though Rice isn't required to keep the White House informed of his whereabouts, he adds that he is "not allowed to get too far out of the line of a telephone call from George Shultz." Usually he is close by the West Wing anyway—either there at a meeting or across the street in his office, where he puts in a workday of 12 hours or more, plus several hours on Saturday. "And then, of course, there's always a briefcase for nights and weekends," he adds.

Don and his wife, Susan, live in a Williamsburg Colonial in the Aurora Hills section of South Arlington, in Virginia—12 minutes from the White House. They have three sons—Donald III, who is soon to be 9; Joseph John, just 7 and Matthew Fitzgerald, 3. On weekends they may do a little bicycling through the neighborhood, take the boys to the Smithsonian, ride up along the Potomac or hike out to Virginia's Great Falls. In a way it's all familiar countryside to Rice. He grew up in central Maryland around Frederick, where his family has a tire distributorship.

Last year the Rices returned for their class reunions at Notre Dame and Saint Mary's—the campuses without students seemed "a little like Washington when Congress is out of session," he comments. It is more through his occasional meetings with Father Hesburgh in Washington that he concludes that "the students in general are not only brighter but also more purposeful, more interested and more concerned than perhaps we were."

"The university is, of course, a freer community than it was when we were there; I think the changes had to come. Notre Dame has to be a quality place from an intellectual and academic point of view—and one of N.D.'s special features is that that point of view extends to its Catholicity as well as its academic areas. It also has to be a first-class research institution in its own right."

"Whether it's history or literature or mathematics or engineering or economics," he says, the purpose for students is to "learn how to think about a decision problem or a public-policy problem in its component parts, really think it through and understand it in an unemotional and objective way—developing one's ability to think in a useful way about the problems of society."

Don Rice is immediately concerned with the environment and pollution. The environment issue is a public-policy concern that is "personally appealing" to him. But his way of thinking about it, he adds, must be "not just those things that interest me personally." He is more concerned with those things that are really important; those things that this country has to grapple with.

"Sure there sometimes are conflicts between his personal attitudes about a program, and his recommendations to the President from a strictly professional, analytical point of view, he says, "although I certainly haven't had that kind of problem in the space area."

The space program is one "that intrigues me personally," Rice says, particularly in "trying to understand how much of that it makes sense to do. That's always an important question. The question of how much is enough is really what this game is all about."

A GI BILL FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of Congress an idea put forth by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Elliot L. Richardson in a commencement speech at the President's alma mater, Whittier College, on June 3. In this speech, Secretary Richardson suggested a GI bill of rights for community services which would encourage assistance to communities by providing educational benefits to those who participated in selected community projects. This idea was further described by the Secretary in commencement remarks prepared for the University of Connecticut on June 5.

The proposal addresses itself to a number of problems besetting today's youth, including: boredom, lack of direct experience in the life of society, uncertain career choices. The rationale of the proposal would seek to—

Build upon the lessons of the GI bill, that returning to school after a period of

services results in high motivation and effectiveness, and that service to country is a desirable criterion in the award of student aid.

Encourage students and their families to view a period of community service as a rewarding and legitimate alternative to enrolling automatically in college or graduate school;

Expand the range and number of opportunities for young Americans to contribute to their communities and society; and

Contribute to the solution of social problems and through the additional services which young Americans can contribute.

Such a program could be administered much like the GI bill for veterans, with a regional or local boards certifying projects meeting urgent social needs for those applying for positions. During their period of service, participants could accrue educational benefits on a monthly basis, just as GI's do for their period of military service. School benefits could later be applied against the mounting cost of postsecondary education.

Quite frankly, I find the proposal most intriguing and intend to develop legislation which would incorporate the concept of a community services program. All communities could benefit from the services of motivated, concerned citizens performing needed tasks.

The concept will be particularly attractive to young people but might be beneficially broadened to include those in middle age and beyond—for example, housewives with children in school or grown; military retirees seeking a second career; and our senior citizens who have experience, time and most importantly compassion. Many citizens could also benefit from obtaining the education credit for purposes of self development and vocational retooling. Further, there might be value in volunteers of varying ages, working together on common social and community problems. What better way to reduce the "generation gap?"

Excerpts from Secretary Richardson's speeches follow. The Secretary speaks first of using youth's talents to better society. He then presents a "G.I. Bill for Community Services," and discusses hoped for results of such a bill:

SPEECH BY SECRETARY RICHARDSON YOUTH TALENTS AND SOCIETY

Our way of life, predicated on the rights of every one of us to make choices—to move around, to express individual conscience—has also brought us urban sprawl, the despoliation of rivers, forests and parks, and for too many of us, the emptiness of facing a tightly competitive system that sometimes embraces the wrong values. Worse, it is a system that all too often has left the poor, the old, the minority member and the undereducated by the wayside, in a denial of the American birthright of equality...

But no student of history, or of current events, or of societal crisis, could honestly deny the evidence that—by virtually any measure one might name—we are constantly and consistently moving closer to fulfilling the original promises upon which the United States was founded.

In truth, I believe the doubts being expressed today are generated not so much by our failures as by our successes; and by our looking wistfully backward rather than san-

guinely to the future. America's collective retina holds fixed the image of the pioneer: The mythical man of the West, a man responding directly to a wilderness he had to live with, the culmination of centuries of the exploring man, the innovating man, living almost entirely on the resources of the self. Today, we are left with the impulse to explore our world but find we are walled in by the compromises we have to make to a world without physical frontiers.

To develop our full capabilities, we need more than abstract challenges. We need also to confront real problems, make decisions, take risks, and learn by experiencing the consequences of our actions. Learning through action is how most of us learn skills such as how to cope with bureaucracies, how to serve people, how to squeeze the maximum amount of time out of the day. It is how most of us develop the self-confidence and resourcefulness to move on to successively greater challenges.

The learning that goes on in school, however, is passive learning. It is learning how to take notes, to sit in class, to read thoughtfully and listen carefully. To sharpen one's intellectual skills and ability to handle abstract subjects is immensely important. But learning through vicarious experience, through books and teachers, is not enough.

For these reasons, we need to reopen the question this country debated briefly a decade ago—the question of how to provide new challenges for the thousands of young people whose idealism has not yet soured. We would all agree, I believe, with that marvelous statement of William James that what we need to solve our problems is something like "the moral equivalent of war." But to develop this spirit, we need something like the moral equivalent to basic training. Is there a way to structure opportunities for the young to test themselves on adversaries such as pollution, crime, drugs, and poverty? Are there meaningful moral equivalents for basic training which could be accessible to individuals with a wide range of talents, to women as well as men?

GI BILL FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES

Why not create a new kind of "GI Bill"—a "GI Bill" for community service? Surely service in the community is as valuable to our country as military service, and more rewarding to the individuals concerned. The Peace Corps, VISTA, and the Teacher Corps have demonstrated what young volunteers can achieve. Yet new programs need not be Federally run. Young people can have a wide variety of choice in fitting their interests and abilities to areas of social concern. Every community in America has tasks which can be done by young people who choose to stop out of school for a period of service... a period of broader education in problem-solving and citizenship. Benefits for such service would, in addition, communicate to students and parents that young people engaged in such activities were not "drop-outs" but "stop-outs," who are planning to return to formal education somewhat later—with a stock of experience enabling them to make a much more personal and intense commitment to their formal education.

Such an idea could be implemented in a program much like the existing GI Bill. Regional or local boards could certify projects which meet urgent social needs with meaningful tasks which young people can do. Students could then apply for these positions. During their period of service, lasting perhaps from six months to two years, students could accrue benefits on a monthly basis, just as GI's do for their period of military service. When students return to school, these benefits could then be applied against the mounting costs of going to college.

For years, the GI Bill has stood as a landmark of social vision. It has helped millions of servicemen return to school after a period of military service. The returning servicemen

proved to be among the most motivated students in college, giving new vitality to the process of higher education.

The same emphasis can and should be given to young people willing to demonstrate their commitment to public service. We have already proved the value of Federal incentives to young people with such programs as the Peace Corps, VISTA, and the Teachers Corps. These programs have shown the enormous value of such service to the volunteers themselves, and to the schools to which they return. A GI Bill for community service would extend the Federal commitment to get people involved in the life of their communities by providing educational benefits to those who voluntarily participate in selected national, regional and local community projects and services.

ANTICIPATED LEGISLATIVE RESULTS

To the degree this nation can enlist volunteers for important, necessary tasks; to the degree we can tap the compassion, the concern and the commitment of our people—to that degree will we be able to affect change, to bring all of our people into the mainstream, to bring the afflicted and the underprivileged within striking distance of the American dream.

In recent years, we have evolved a politics of impatience: Each major gain triggers new expectations and demands for action. Civil rights, women's liberation, the demand for open space, the demand for equalizing opportunities for education through new tax systems, aid to needy students, and institutional reforms, the need for incomes for our poor and better health care for all—these issues and others have piled one on the other, producing a snow-balling phenomenon of social change. Successes breed new expectations so that, while most things are getting better all the time, they seem to be getting worse.

These trends can be contained only if a substantial number of people from your generation make a new commitment to community and public service. I am talking about individuals who will focus their energies and skills in a particular area, be it education, health, the reform of prisons—not all of these. Individuals who will talk less about the "urban crisis" and more about how to organize an effort to remove lead-based paint from the walls of their neighborhood. Individuals whose time-frame for change is calculated not in terms of a weekend or a summer of activity, but months and even years of persistence and commitment.

With such a commitment, much can be accomplished.

The same challenges put forth by Secretary Richardson to the Nation's youth could apply equally to the constructive use of talents of our middle and senior citizens. Educational awards are also needed in the mid-career and early retirement years.

I believe a "GI bill for community services" is worthy of further consideration.

THE COURTS ARE CONTRADICTING THEIR OWN DECISIONS

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, rarely—very rarely—a statement comes to the attention of each of us which is so clear, so incisive, as to need

no embellishment, no elaboration. Such a statement is the following article written by Whiteford S. Blakeney, a Charlotte, N.C., attorney who has argued before the Supreme Court on a number of constitutional questions.

Mr. Blakeney has examined the matter of pupil assignment in the public schools in a manner readily comprehended by lawyer and layman alike.

I include the statement published in the Charlotte Observer of April 3, 1972, in the RECORD at this time:

THE COURTS ARE CONTRADICTING THEIR OWN DECISIONS

Amid all the controversy over the busing of public school children, there can be no disagreement on one point, namely, that the subject is thoroughly confused.

The more it is discussed by writers, commentators, political candidates and public officials—the more it is expounded in court decisions, in congressional debate and even in presidential message—the more tangled it seems to become. This may be mainly due to the fact that, in all that is being said and written on the matter, there has actually been very little defining or analyzing of the basic principles involved. Yet this can be rather briefly done.

It is first to be noted that the terms "busing" and "forced busing" are short-hand colloquialisms. School children are not being ordered or required to ride buses anywhere.

But children are definitely being assigned and reassigned and moved around among the public schools by federal court orders, according to their race and color, and they are compelled to attend at the schools thus designated, regardless of how they get there—school buses being simply the means of conveyance they most frequently use.

More specifically, say the courts, wherever there have been laws which prevented the racial mixing of children in public schools during past generations, then no matter that such laws are now all voided and non-existent, nevertheless present day children shall be compulsorily moved around among the schools in order that a sufficient racial mixing may be achieved and maintained.

What is "sufficient" racial mixing? To this question there is no answer, other than the cryptic pronouncement by the courts that the schools must be "unitary." In truth there is no definition, no standard and no measure from any source. Thus, a "sufficient" racial admixture in all the complex and varying situations is whatever federal judges may deem to be "sufficient."

What do the courts point to as their authority for the exercise of such power and the issuance of such orders? For all of their rulings and all their actions in this field, they rely and stand solely upon a single general provision in the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which states that all persons shall receive "the equal protection of the laws."

Has not the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that this very provision of the Constitution invalidates all laws and governmental actions which require the assignment of children to public schools on the basis of race or color? The U.S. Supreme Court has indeed so ruled. And that brings us to the heart of the matter.

In 1954, in the landmark case of "Brown vs. Board of Education", the U.S. Supreme Court declared that henceforth there could be no laws or governmental actions compelling racial separation in public schools; that public schools, on the contrary, must be operated "on a non-racial basis"—and that therefore no child could be excluded from any public school because of his race, and that assignments and admissions to the public schools must be made without regard to race.

Yet within the last several years, amazingly, and without acknowledging that they are doing so, the federal courts, including the Supreme Court—but with various of the federal judges in strong disagreement—have completely reversed that fundamental decision and are ruling that children shall be excluded from public schools and assigned to other public schools specifically and solely according to their race.

Thus, the courts are now holding that the language of the Fourteenth Amendment commands and requires that which they held, only seventeen years ago, to be prohibited and forbidden by the very same language.

It is doubtful that there has ever been, in the entire history of the law, a more monumental inconsistency and contradiction than this. It is an inconsistency and contradiction which the courts have thus far been unwilling to confront or explain—and it is the fountainhead of the confusion and perplexity and indecisiveness that surrounds this whole controversy.

Obviously it is perplexing to be told by a court that the same constitutional provision which forbids compulsion on the basis of race requires compulsion on the basis of race—and that the imposition of racial compulsion is the correction of racial compulsion.

This basic and ever-present inconsistency inevitably produces resentment and resistance, no less than bewilderment, in the minds of those who are subjected to the present orders. Nor can it fail to create misgiving and uncertainty among the officials who must administer such orders, and even among the judges who promulgate them.

There can be no doubt as to the intense and widespread opposition to the decrees which the federal courts are issuing on this subject. Every poll and survey and vote on the matter shows this to be true in every part of the country.

The only statutory enactments on the subject, by Congress or by any elected representatives, have been in clear opposition to this compulsion which the federal courts are imposing by decree on their own initiative.

Currently there are being presented in Congress a multitude of proposals for legislation dealing with the subject—most of which are, however, hopelessly ambiguous—and some of which are deliberately designed to resolve nothing but to "take the heat off" the issue.

Meanwhile, the federal courts struggle with the insoluble legal and logical inconsistency which they have themselves created. Alternately, they declare that they will not require or permit attendance assignments for the purpose of achieving "racial balance" in the public schools—and at the same time, they proceed to issue orders, or sustain orders, which have no other purpose than that.

Urgently, they emphasize that the right not to be excluded from a public school or assigned to a public school on the basis of race or color is a constitutional right, absolute and inviolable. In the next breath, they qualify or suspend this right to such extent as they deem "reasonable" and for such period as they consider "appropriate" in the exercise of their "equitable remedial power"—thus obviously transforming constitutional right into shifting sand.

Formerly, of course, the compulsion here in question was applied to force the segregation of races, whereas now it is applied to force the integration of races. Nevertheless, it is still force—force at the hands of government—and force imposed on each individual according to his race, and for no other reason than his race.

Consequently, both white and black children are now in the position of saying:

"Because of my race, I am not allowed to attend a public school I wish to attend. Because of my race, I am compelled to attend

a public school I do not wish to attend. The school authorities, under court order, take note of the color of my skin and shape this compulsion upon me solely according to whether they find me to be black or white."

The hope was that legal compulsion based on race had been lifted. The reality is that race is again imposed—as rigidly and zealously as it ever was before the 1954 decision. What purported to be a grant of freedom has been transformed into a denial of freedom!

The rationale of the new racial compulsion is that it is a sort of retribution or remedy for the former racial compulsion which operated in the opposite direction. But is a former denial of freedom to be atoned or remedied by imposing a new denial of freedom? And is it not a strange irony indeed that this new denial of freedom is imposed upon children who were neither the authors nor the victims of the earlier wrong?

Nevertheless it is argued this new compulsion will be good for the children, white and black alike. Perhaps so, and perhaps not. But above all towers the paramount fact—it is not freedom!

The Constitution of the United States does not vest the federal courts with any authority to prescribe what they may deem to be "good" for the American people. Quite to the contrary, that great covenant protects the individual from impositions, restrictions and compulsions infringing his liberties, by whomsoever devised or planned, and whether well intended or not. What judges may consider to be beneficial is by no means the test of constitutional right. As Daniel Webster declared:

"It is hardly too strong to say that the Constitution was made to guard the people against the dangers of good intentions."

Justice Brandeis said:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the government's purposes are beneficent . . . The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachments by men of zeal, well-meaning, but without understanding."

And as Thomas Jefferson vividly expressed it:

"Let us hear no more then of the good intentions of man, but bind him down with the chains of the Constitution."

It is further contended that the destruction of the freedom here at stake is justified because the end to be gained is "quality" education. As to this, the fundamental answer is that the surrender of freedom in return for "quality" education or anything else is indeed a poor exchange. Nor, under our Constitution, does any arm of government, including a federal court, have any authority to force such exchange upon any citizen of this nation.

Moreover, is it not common sense to question whether forcing children, on purely racial grounds, into schools—particularly distant schools—which they do not wish to attend, and which their parents do not wish them to attend, is likely to increase their motivation to apply themselves in such schools—or likely to have good effect upon their relations with their fellow students there—or likely to improve the morale, discipline or standards of excellence in those schools?

Indeed, no knowledgeable and candid observer will deny that since the imposition of the requirement that assignments to public schools be made on the basis of race, strife and dissension and disciplinary problems are up and the "quality" of education is down.

As a consequence, there is an ever increasing flight from the public schools all over the country. And in this exodus, incidentally, there is to be found an especially high proportion of "liberal" leaders, both in and out of government, who nevertheless continue to prescribe the compulsion in question for those who remain in the public schools.

The true solution of the whole matter is to establish it as law, beyond question, that no child shall be denied access to any public school because of his race or color and that no child shall be assigned to any public school because of his race or color.

All of the zeal, interest and concern that surrounds this controversy should be brought to bear to see to it that such freedom is truly and genuinely and in absolute good faith accorded to every child—and that there is no governmental action or practice or subterfuge to the contrary.

There should be impartial and vigorous enforcement of this freedom from every side and in every quarter. Governmental pressure and compulsion should be rooted out of the field—whether its thrust is in the direction of forcing racial separatism or in the direction of forcing racial mixing. Governmental force shaped by racial considerations is the evil and the wrong in either case, and it is this that should be unequivocally outlawed.

Statutory enactment by Congress could be ineffectual, for the federal courts could ignore or nullify it as being contrary to their current "interpretation" of the Constitution. The writing into the Constitution of a new and definitive provision on the subject is the only sure course.

This is certainly not a task to be lightly undertaken. It is, however, the only resolution of the matter that courts could not undo. And the subject is of such vital and basic importance as to justify its being specifically dealt with in the Constitution.

Such a constitutional provision should be very carefully and clearly phrased, so as to be effective for its purpose beyond question. The following, for example, would seem to be a wording that would meet such requirements:

No governmental authority shall henceforth, in any way or any purpose, prescribe or require any attendance assignments in public schools on the basis of race or color.

Very recently a member of the U.S. Senate stood before that body and stated that he would oppose a similar proposal, because he considered it "a step on the road backward . . . toward freedom of choice!"

This is indeed a startling illumination of how far we have traveled toward the loss of fundamental liberty in this land. For, here it is pronounced in the Senate of the United States that "freedom" and "freedom of choice" is a step "backward". From which it would follow that the road "forward" is toward a regime in which our lives will be in all respects planned and prescribed for us—that the future belong to totalitarian government—and that individual liberties under Constitutional guarantees are but sentimental memories of a day already gone.

The American people will surely accept no such pronouncement. Sooner or later, their answer to the present controversy will be: No compulsion from government based on race—but, instead, freedom without regard to race!

CAMBRIDGE TEACH-IN ON GREECE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on April 22 a committee of professors sponsored a teach-in on Greece in Cambridge, Mass. The teach-in marked the fifth anniversary of the coup that established the military dictatorship in Greece.

Our colleague from New York (Mr.

ROSENTHAL) addressed a statement to this gathering at Harvard University. As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, Mr. ROSENTHAL has been conducting hearings on the administration's desire to home port U.S. naval vessels in Greece. His knowledge of Greek affairs qualifies him as a congressional spokesman on United States-Greek relations.

His brief statement to the teach-in follows my remarks. It is a good statement and I subscribe to it.

In addition to the Rosenthal statement, Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter to the sponsors of the teach-in from Helen Kazantzakis, widow of the widely respected Greek writer Nicholas Kazantzakis.

The material follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

I am happy to support the goals of the Cambridge Teach-In On Greece, which is designed to remind Americans, on the fifth anniversary of the dictatorship in Athens, that the Greek concern for their democracy is our concern also. I hope that your message is heard not only in Athens, but in Washington, too.

There is more than strong sentiment for the birthplace of democracy in our common interest in the restoration of a democratic government in Greece. That country, especially since the Second World War, has been the object of important American policy decisions and considerable American military and economic aid. The purpose of those actions was to insure the continuation of a free and democratic Greece. The admission in 1952 of Greece to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, which is explicitly an alliance of democracies, had the same goal. These actions, collectively commit our country morally and politically and, in the NATO treaty, militarily, to the defense of a democratic Greece.

Today we find American policy accepting, with weak protest, an intimate and continuing association with an illegal and dictatorial government which seized power in 1967 and thereby confounded every legitimate American interest in Greece. All of this is done today in the American interest in the strategic location of Greece, in its role as a military ally of the United States and as part of the price of having to deal with governments as we find them. That these considerations are short-sighted and demeaning to the aspirations of the Greek people for freedom is deplorable enough. But that they do a great disservice to our country and its traditions and principles, and to our long-term interests, is an even greater concern to me.

I hope that your efforts, and those of others like you, will inspire a change in the policy of our government which, for Americans, and perhaps for Greece also, is at the heart of the problem of the Junta's continuation in power.

BERKELEY, April 18, 1972.

To: Cambridge Teach-In on Greece.

I am deeply moved by your interest in the cause of Greek freedom. It is encouraging that such eminent American scientists and men of letters are joining us in the common struggle for human dignity and freedom.

I regret very much that I am unable to be with you on April 22d, but I join you in spirit and send you my greetings and warmest thanks for your important contribution to the struggle for the restoration of democracy and human rights in Greece.

ELENI KAZANTZAKIS.

DAY CARE LEST WE ALL FORGET

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, 5 months ago President Nixon vetoed the bill extending the life of the poverty program because, among other things, it bill extending the life of the poverty program. I am proud to have voted for that program. I believe it was one of the most useful concepts ever supported by the Congress, and President Nixon's veto of the bill—and the demagogic language he used in his veto message—will stand out, in my judgment, as one of the gravest errors of his Presidency.

The following column from the Boston Globe of May 23 illustrates poignantly just what harm the President did to family life in America by his veto of that legislation. We will continue to press for enactment of this program, and one day we will have a President who will join in the fight for adequate day-care facilities, rather than one who has turned his face against working parents who need assistance not to separate their families, but to keep them together:

DAY CARE LEST WE ALL FORGET

(By Ellen Goodman)

It was five months ago that President Nixon vetoed the bill that would have put \$2 billion into day care for children, and usually, after five months, you forget.

But I still keep hearing the echoes of his veto of the bill because of what he called its "family-weakening characteristics."

And I remember Sen. James B. Allen (D-Ala.) seconding the veto because he said day care would "undermine the family as a basic unit of society." And Rep. John G. Schmitz (R-Calif.) who said that if the bill were passed it would produce "a nation of orphanages."

And I wonder if these men who are so sure that Federally supported day care, free for the poor and minimal for the low income, would mean the destruction of the family—I wonder if these men have ever met the Bottellis or the Carters or the McManns.

The Bottellis (none of these are their real names) had five children over their ten years of marriage and were living carefully on Mr. Bottelli's earnings (one-third overtime) of \$10,600 a year as factory worker. The oldest was nine and the youngest only two when Mrs. Bottelli died suddenly.

The father was left with no way to care for them. He couldn't afford a full-time housekeeper, especially one who would stay with them for the overtime shifts.

In his desperation to keep his family together, he tried to get on welfare and quit his job but his male social worker rejected his request because, he said, "it was tasteless for a male in our society not to work."

He could neither find nor afford the day-care programs that would allow him to continue working and keep his children together in their own home.

What happened instead is that the Bottelli children who had just lost their mother now lost each other and their father and their home. They were sent as foster children to five different homes.

Is this the family that the President was afraid would be destroyed by day care?

Or maybe it was the Carters. The Carters are a Springfield couple who have three chil-

dren, two of them preschoolers. Together, he's a laborer and she's a waitress, they earn \$6300 a year, barely above the poverty level.

The Carters are technically together. But in reality, Mr. Carter goes to work at 8:30 a.m. and returns at 5:30 p.m. Mrs. Carter then goes to work at 6 p.m. and gets home by 3 a.m.

They share work, they share child care, but they don't share each other. Mrs. Carter told a social worker that she could list the number of times in the last months when they had spent a night together or had an hour or two alone when the children were asleep.

They could neither find nor afford day care so they could both work days and maintain some semblance of togetherness.

Is this the family that Mr. Nixon was afraid would be destroyed by day care?

Or is it the McManns? The McManns are a couple in their 30s who together made \$7000. They have six children, four of them pre-schoolers who were cared for by Mrs. McMann's mother. When the grandmother became ill, Mrs. McMann had to quit work to take care of them. They could neither find nor afford day care. It was clear that they couldn't live on the husband's \$3900. So Mr. McMann left home in order that his family could receive welfare.

Is this the family that the President was afraid would be destroyed by day care?

Day care is not the compulsory wresting of children from their mother's breasts and homes; the herding of reluctant innocents into cell blocks for anti-family propaganda.

It is on the contrary, one of the most solid, realistic supports for the family where it is available both geographically and financially.

And it is voluntary.

But the President vetoed the bill. That was in December and now it's May, and usually you forget. But in the last five months, Mrs. Bottelli died and her children were scattered; the Carters have grown further and further apart till they are strangers; and the McManns have lost their father and gone on welfare.

TV PLAYS AN AWESOME ROLE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, young Americans grow up with television constituting an important aspect of their lives. Unfortunately, television has presented a world which reflects reality only dimly and which, on many occasions, presents unreality as if it were the real world in which individuals actually live their lives.

Television news, for example, tells us of violence and echoes the flamboyant rhetoric of those who urge that the society be burned down. It does not provide equal time and, more often, provides no time at all for the reports of citizens working to create a better society and a more humane world.

Part of the reason for this is that the camera, far from capturing the real world, tends, instead, to falsify it. Bruce Herschensohn, until recently film director for the U.S. Information Agency, noted that—

The camera is a liar. All those lenses, viewfinders, turrets, cranks and buttons have been made to preserve the visible on film or tape or for live transmission. But that as-

sumes the visible is the truth. It's not. The invisible is the greatest truth.

Mr. Herschensohn asks what is so important about what is invisible, and responds to his question:

Everything that's truly important. Peace is invisible, freedom is invisible, love is invisible, faith is invisible. Even the motivation behind political decisions is largely invisible.

The camera, however, is unable to record the invisible. It not only focuses on the visible, Mr. Herschensohn points out:

But it lives with an inborn prejudice. It ignores the visually dull and records the visually interesting. And most often the visually dull is the more vital hint of the invisible truth.

While television makes the most of sporadic acts of violence and of protests, it tends to ignore what life in America is really about Mr. Herschensohn states:

Young people, old people, hard-working people, good people are spread through every state. Most will die unrecorded on a permanent public medium because they are neither astronaut nor aberrationist, neither hero nor hijacker, neither movie star nor murderer. They are just too average—and there are too many of them. And so the normal goes unseen.

Also unseen, with regard to the war in Vietnam, are pictures of calculated atrocities of the Vietcong. Many Americans believe that all of the violence in that war is committed not by the Communist aggressors, but by American and American-supported troops. Why is this so? Mr. Herschensohn notes that—

Films provided by free societies show what visually appears to be our side as attackers. Films provided by free societies exhibit our impatience. Because our photographers cannot be there, we do not see on our television sets the terror the other side inflicts, the executions they administer, the death and destruction they cause, or their invading masses killing the innocent.

Would we have won World War II with television as it exists in America today? Bruce Herschensohn doubts it.

I wish to share with my colleagues excerpts of Mr. Herschensohn's remarks before a luncheon group in Washington, D.C., as reprinted in *Human Events* of May 27, 1972. These excerpts follow:

TV PLAYS AN AWESOME ROLE (By Bruce Herschensohn)

Two weeks ago, within hours of the announcement that J. Edgar Hoover had passed away, we were all able to watch pictures of him moving and talking, on our television sets. Within our homes, on that day, we were able to watch him from birth to death.

But I remember when I was a boy Carole Lombard was killed in an airplane accident. A few months later, perhaps a half year, her last motion picture was released. It was Ernst Lubitsch's *To Be Or Not to Be*, and I didn't want to see it because I thought it was horrible taste to release a film with someone who had died so recently. My feeling was in no way unusual—in those days.

But today, because of television, it is common and it is an every night procedure to watch and hear those who have passed away within months, within days, within hours or even within minutes. It is also common to watch the living pass through the barrier of time. We see James Stewart 60 years old at eight o'clock and 30 years old at 11 o'clock.

This generation has been witness to life and age and death in new time zones and it has created the young-generation-in-a-hurry. Television has brought this generation a feeling of urgency towards life.

Added to this has been the past decade's events of the assassinations of President Kennedy, Dr. King and Sen. Kennedy—the cruelest public decade of all in which young loved and important men's lives were taken within the nation's living rooms. This generation was having experiences from which past generations were largely spared, until much later in life.

PART OF THE FAMILY

Television has had a tremendous effect upon all of us and upon the way we live our lives. It is the first time in history that a piece of furniture, without a soul of its own, has become a member of the family.

Let us take a fictional family which is not at all different from a real-life family. We will call them the Smiths. The family consists of a husband, a wife, a son, a daughter and a television set. The husband's name is William. His wife is Ruth. Their oldest child is 10-year-old Debbie. Their second child is 21-inch RCA. Their youngest child is six-year-old Tommy. It's an average American family.

They have learned to live with ill health since someone within the family is always getting sick. If 10-year-old Debbie or six-year-old Tommy has a temperature one night, they don't call a doctor immediately. They wait until the following day. But that isn't the case with 21-inch RCA. If horizontal bars keep passing over Channel 9 of RCA, they have someone come on a house-call within hours.

While RCA is being treated, they sit watching the care he is receiving. Their prayer is that he won't have to go away for a cure but that he can be taken care of at home. No matter the cost, it's worth it. He must be well—tonight.

William and Ruth hardly remember life without RCA, or at least its predecessor which was smaller and only black-and-white. They don't know what effect it has had on them and their family because they don't often think back to how life was without it. They suspect its only real effect has been something for the family to do—a means of entertainment and information. But it has been much more than something for them to do. And it has been much more than entertainment and information.

As a member of the family, RCA is deeply trusted. The trust is not deserved. RCA is really no more than a transmitter of material recorded by a far-off camera—and the camera, in addition to all its more recognized capabilities, has one vice which goes unmentioned in the instruction books. The camera is a liar.

All those lenses, viewfinders turrets, cranks and buttons have been made to preserve the visible on film or tape or for live transmission. But that assumes the visible is the truth. It's not. The invisible is the greatest truth.

What is so important that's invisible? Everything that's truly important. Peace is invisible, freedom is invisible, love is invisible, faith is invisible. Even the motivation behind political decisions is largely invisible.

The camera, unable to record the invisible, not only focuses on the visible, but it lives with an inborn prejudice. It ignores the visually dull and records the visually interesting. And most often the visually dull is the more vital hint of the invisible truth.

It is not visually interesting to watch a free border—to watch cars going across an unmarked line. But a police barrier with fire hoses and barbed wire? That's interesting.

The fact that in America cars go from New Hampshire to Vermont, from Nebraska to Iowa or even from Michigan to Canada is dull and boring.

Peace is simply a visual bore. War isn't. Put television cameras in choice positions around An Loc during a battle. It will be watched. Put the same cameras around Ann Arbor to watch the peace. It will be dull and boring.

President Nixon used the term, "A silent majority." More regrettable than their silence is that they, too, are invisible. The invisible American rarely sees the lens of a camera aimed at him.

Young people, old people, hard-working people, good people are spread through every state. Most will die unrecorded on a permanent public medium because they are neither astronaut nor aberrationist, neither hero nor hijacker, neither movie star nor murderer. They are just too average—and there are too many of them. And so the normal goes unseen.

Because of the immediacy of television, Americans and citizens of other sophisticated countries of the world have become news-oriented. There is a great deal of difference between fact orientation and news orientation. Many say this generation knows more information than any generation before it. The truth is it knows more news than any generation before it. But news by itself can be misleading if not put in context with facts which are not news.

HALF-TRUTHS, NON-TRUTHS

Because the camera is a liar, and a prejudiced one, television has been guilty of educating the younger generation in half truths and non-truths. The 6 o'clock or 7 o'clock or 8 o'clock news is accepted as truth. It is truth—but news programs by their very nature must present the truth of abnormality.

A riot? News. No riot? That's not news. A murder? News. A life continuing from Monday to Tuesday? No news. A baby found in Appalachia with a distended stomach? News. Millions of well-fed babies? No news. No story. Not interesting. Not visual. Dull. Boring.

And so night after night all those little segments of news build up a composite and grand visual picture entitled: "The United States of America."

But it isn't.

The fact that riots and murders and poverty are news is a virtue and not a vice. It attests to their abnormality. If they were normal they would not be news.

Occasionally, but only occasionally, the truth of abnormality works in visual favor of a free society. Apollo is one of those few rarities. It is a godsend because it obeys the law of the eyes. But as moon launches have become more and more normal, television coverage has become less and less extensive.

Without the camera, Apollo 11 would have been reduced to astronauts and NASA spokesmen lecturing on radio and in text. The proof that it happened at all would have been a touring rock exhibit.

On the other hand, Viet Nam without television might well have cast a different psychological climate around the world—as World War II and the Korean conflict might have seemed different with television.

Thirty years ago we were involved in World War II and we were not winning. But the nation mobilized, it backed its President, it fought and ended the totalitarian expansionism which it set out to end.

In retrospect, with some but little dissent, we agree it was a war we should have fought in both the Pacific and European theaters. Japan attacked us and Hitler was after the domination of the entire European area, deliberately committing the most inhumane atrocities as a matter of policy.

For the purpose of discussion, let us imagine the isolationists won their point and we didn't enter the European theater. There could be little question today that Hitler would have won and Europe would be a continent of masters and slaves with few, if any,

ethnic groups surviving. So with or without Pearl Harbor, most today would agree, our involvement in the European theater of World War II was more than justified.

But let's add one more dimension to the early '40s. Let us imagine that television was in homes then as it is today. Let us imagine that we watched World War II daily in the same way we watch Viet Nam today. My guess is that the war would not have been over in 1945, and perhaps we would not have won at all.

To learn our progress in the war we would not have heard the voice of President Roosevelt on radio and we would not have imagined him sitting by a fireside in our warm and secure living rooms. We would, instead, have seen him sitting within the Oval Office between two flags, until visually he would have become quite dull.

In addition, with Americans at home being witness to so much killing and bombing by Americans overseas every night on television, the President would have felt compelled to explain, to defend and to justify what the American military had to do. In short, instead of being on the attack with his words, he would have had to have been on the defense.

He would have had to have told the American people of the aggression of the other side since, though they would have seen Americans kill and bomb nightly, they would not have seen each night on television the killing of Jews and interiors of concentration camps and the swarming masses of Nazi invaders. Our photographers were not with the other side. In time, we might not have believed the President, since our eyes would have been telling us different things.

When his speeches were over, his words would have been analyzed by people we knew much better than we knew the President, because we would have seen them in our homes every night on television telling us about all sorts of things we didn't know without them telling us.

Why do some trust them more than the President? First, because they show us pictures every night and tell us things we don't know. They have become our secret teachers. The following day, when we discuss world events, we know who really made us so smart.

We trust them because we have seen them everywhere—and we know they go everywhere for the sole purpose of keeping us informed without any other motive. We have seen them in hard hats in disaster areas, we have seen them at rocket launches, we have seen them all over the world, and we like them because they go to all the places we can't go—and they go for us. Going as many places as they do, we feel they must be experts.

But many have become suspect of the President. Are his motives as pure as the news-men's motives, who we know so well? Surely, he wants to be re-elected President. Even if he doesn't care about that, he surely wants his party to win again. And, of course, he wants history to be kind to him.

But we have the feeling that television news commentators are permanent. Not having to face an election or a place in history, we cannot suspect them of ulterior motives. What they tell us *has* to be the truth. We forget, however, that their careers are fragile and their Nelson rating is their electoral vote. More important, we ignore that their careers are based on obeying the rules of the visible, while the President is obeying the rules of the invisible.

The President must work with possible intents of the other side, with options on his side. Neither the intents nor the options are visible. When he works with restraint, it is always invisible. You can't see the consequences of those things he has not done.

Even in terms of dissent versus support, the dissent is visible in masses protesting and demonstrating, whereas support gener-

ally comes in the words of letters and telegrams.

It is entirely possible that we can no longer fight wars in a visual age. This would surely be a great advance if it were true for the entire world. Unfortunately, the rule only applies to a free society. In closed societies they see what the government wants them to see. In short, the visible becomes the invisible.

The people of Hanoi and Vinh and Tran Hoa do not sit in their living rooms watching a North Vietnamese version of a Fulbright indict their version of a secretary of state or secretary of defense. They watch the real Fulbright indict ours. They would not photograph dissenters in North Viet Nam. They would kill them. They, instead, run films of the dissenters we photograph.

Ton Duc Thang's speeches are not followed by an analysis of his words by a commentator. Their scenes of war are only the scenes which can be used to prove their points—visually. And there are no equal time provisions in closed societies.

But films provided by free societies show what visually appears to be our side as the attackers. Films provided by free societies show our demonstrations against our policies. Films provided by free societies exhibit our impatience. Because our photographers cannot be there, we do not see on our television sets the terror the other side inflicts, the executions they administer, the death and destruction they cause, or their invading masses killing the innocent.

In the United States, television works against us because of those limitations of not being able to show the aggression of the other side, because of the free access to the defenders of South Viet Nam, and because of the rules of the visible and the visually interesting.

Each night for all those years, American families watched the lush green jungle and saw Americans with guns, and were given a death score. In the next instant they saw Jane Withers in a plumber's outfit happily extolling the virtues of a can of new super stain removing Comet. In the next instant they saw American abnormality at a university.

And it went on and on and on with inhumane rapidity. Technology had outdistanced human reaction time. Could the engineers and technicians who sat in the control rooms, punching up images, one after the other, realize the impact of their keyboards when their images registered on the human mind? Probably not. The next night Viet Nam death would be bracketed between Feminine Deodorant Spray and the march of militants.

Television images can mean life and death to someone. In a larger sense, those images can mean life and death to nations. Those images can be more powerful than a thousand armies—because armies can only scorch the skin but television can scorch the mind.

William and Ruth and Debbie and Tommy have been scorched by the fifth member of their family and they will continue to be scorched unless they understand the capabilities and lack of capabilities of that fifth member.

Their brains will continue to be asked to accept that inhumane cadence of the unconnected every night. There will still be one minute of war, two minutes of demonstrations, 30 seconds of murder, 40 seconds of poverty. Technicians faced with buttons to press will take families everywhere, any time—as long as it is abnormal and visually interesting.

And so William and Ruth and Debbie and Tommy sit together at the end of the day. William doesn't say much about what happened at the office. Ruth doesn't say much about what she did at home. Neither Debbie nor Tommy say much about what they

learned in school. They would all much rather sit and watch RCA.

RCA loves to talk, and besides, he shows pictures.

They have no idea that within that family room, they are living, as we are living, in the Pearl Harbor of communications.

December 7, for this generation, is not a Sunday morning. It's the collective influence of the numbers on a channel selector and the deeply trusted pictures on that bright and colorful tube. As generations before us, we believe what we can see—and we look where they tell us to look.

THE C-5A GALAXY

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there are few, if any, persons today who do not know of the famed C-5A Galaxy, the world's largest aircraft. In recent months, there has been some rather strong criticism of the production of the C-5A, but there has been very little mention of the plane's good qualities. Two articles in this month's Retired Officer magazine are indicative of the facts which much of the press has failed to grasp concerning the C-5A. I think that all should be interested in these articles and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues as follows:

THE USAF C-5 GALAXY—"FAT ALBERT" CAN DO

(By Gladys E. Wise)

Next month the world's largest aircraft completes two full years of operational service. Two-thirds of the planned C-5 force already are in use and the last aircraft—the 81st—just showed its distinctive "Fat Albert" profile on the Lockheed-Georgia assembly line. About this time next year that aircraft will be delivered to the Military Airlift Command.

Ceremonies marking the delivery of the last airplane likely will be more subdued than the March 2, 1968, gala when President Johnson hailed the rollout of the first C-5. Hopefully, it will be a less spectacular event than the June 6, 1970, delivery of the first operational C-5 when, as the aircraft touched down at Charleston AFB, S.C., before the waiting crowd and national TV, a wheel disengaged itself from the gear and bounced down the runway independent of its 27 well-secured counterparts.

Whatever the ceremonial tenor, however, delivery of the 81st C-5 will mark a significant gain in the United States' airlift capability—in the mobility of DoD combat forces—and, through these, in the U.S.'s flexibility to meet its worldwide commitments. The C-5 adds the second half to an airlift team planned more than a decade ago for rapid movement of large contingents of U.S. forces and all their equipment. It made sense then. It still does.

The C-141 Starlifter was the team's first half—the initial step. It is all jet—fast, but limited by size to moving only about 65 percent of the Army's combat gear. Combat units had to be tailored to fit the available airlift and their initial firepower was trimmed accordingly. The C-5 grew from the remaining need to move all equipment too big for the C-141 at roughly equivalent speeds.

That compelling need prevailed through tight budgets, technical problems and controversy when abdication might have been much

more politically comfortable. The need is being met today competently, safely, often dramatically but not without trauma.

Throughout its short history, the C-5 has stimulated comment and controversy comparable to its record-breaking size. But while it is simplistic and inaccurate to equate the C-5's origin and design, achievements and unique capabilities, impressions and problems solely to its dimensions, size is a significant factor in each area.

The C-5 is big. Its cargo compartment provides about 33,500 cubic feet of usable space—roughly equivalent to that of three normal-size homes. The 121-foot long cargo deck is longer than the Wright brothers first flight. Its 19-foot width compares favorably with that of the length of a normal-size living room and, at 13.5 feet, the cargo compartment ceiling is nearly twice as high as that found in a standard home.

The cargo compartment floor is designed to support up to 300 pounds per square foot throughout the level area, and up to 400 pounds per square foot in the center for vehicles weighing as much as 80 tons. By comparison, the floor in the average home is designed to support about 40 pounds per square foot, and the flooring in a warehouse for heavy items will support about 250 pounds per square foot.

The C-5 achieved its first "first" just by rolling out (the largest ever) and adds "firsts" every time it hauls an intact cargo not previously considered air-transportable—22 light observation helicopters in a single C-5 plus some palletized gear; three Army Chinooks with very little disassembly in another; four CH-53 Sea Stallion helicopters, support equipment and 90 Navy people aboard two C-5s; a complete mobile radar approach control unit; a Titan III missile core; a 74-ton low pressure turbine generator; the new A-7D simulator that weighs 76 tons.

The C-5's size inspired a public relations man to call it the "Holland tunnel with wings" and influenced its crews to use a less-flattering, but friendlier nickname, "Fat Albert." It prompted retired Navy Commander Bennett to record his first impression of the C-5 in the article which appears on page 24 of this issue.

Ironically, size also contributed indirectly to the C-5's well chronicled cost growth and its most stubborn remaining problems, the static strength and fatigue life of the aircraft.

At the outset, the C-5 seemed a state-of-the-art aircraft, well suited to the Total Package Procurement approach. Subsequent events belied that optimism.

Lieutenant General James T. Stewart, Commander of the Air Force's Aeronautical Systems Division at Wright Patterson AFB, Ohio, recently told a west coast audience that prerequisites for TPP include, "being able to define in advance what the total system will do and look like; having the technology completely in hand . . . needing only a minimal amount of development effort; and having a solid basis for estimating the total package costs."

TPP assumes no surprises. It is valid, useful, used effectively when there are none.

The C-5 contract, however, coupled stringent, unyielding performance specifications, schedules and dollar commitments from development through production with a general hands off policy for the government from the day-to-day details of how the contractor might get there from here. Concurrency—embarking on production before development tests are completed—was, in this case, another unfortunate provision. C-5 development did not require a major breakthrough in aircraft technology, per se, but it did require—as it turned out—an extremely refined design to meet the performance specifications.

Air Force Assistant Secretary Philip N. Whittaker, cited this example in an address

before the Western Metal and Tool Conference in Los Angeles: "Early in the program it was clear that it would be difficult to meet the requirement that this large aircraft land on 4,000 foot unpaved fields. To provide this performance, Lockheed had to increase the size of the wing, and then the structure had to be redesigned to keep the weight within limits. . . ."

Unanticipated changes such as this increased development costs well beyond expectations and, more, led to increased costs in production and schedule slips. Under TPP's aegis, there was little contractual leeway for Lockheed or the government to trade off between performance, dollars and schedules.

As costs continued to grow from technical problems and inflation, so did contractual disputes between Lockheed and the government. By 1970, Lockheed neared bankruptcy. The C-5 program, limited to 81 aircraft by budget constraints, was threatened. And the TPP contract, conceived as a means to assure the government lower overall systems costs and the contractor at least a modest profit, had become, at best, an impractical management instrument.

In July 1971, then Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard told the House Banking and Currency Committee, "There were issues on both sides that had merit and substance. The total package procurement type of contract is unworkable for this type of a program. The specifications called for some unnecessary requirements. At the same time the company clearly had bid in, probably hoping the repricing formula would save them from substantial loss. There was ample evidence of poor management on the part of Lockheed. Faced with the need to obtain the C-5A aircraft, something had to be done."

"I was convinced that a program beset with charges and counter-charges, bogged down in litigation quagmire, could not be brought to a successful conclusion technically and under better cost control without an understandable and a workable contractual arrangement."

"After thorough and careful consideration of all the factors, I recommended that we complete the program under a cost reimbursement contract with tight management control by the Air Force, and that Lockheed accept a \$200 million loss on the total C-5A program."

"On June 7, 1971, the Air Force and Lockheed signed the restructured C-5A contract converting it to a cost reimbursement instrument."

Restructuring the contract solved no technical problems, of course, but as Secretary of the Air Force Robert C. Seamans told Congress earlier this year, it "eliminated litigation then outstanding between Lockheed and the Government and provided a workable basis for management of the C-5 contract by the Air Force."

Another boon to the program was the assignment in mid-1970 of USAF Brigadier General Warner E. Newby as Systems Program Director. General Newby's credentials include technical and management expertise acquired in the B-52 production and modification program and a dedication as outsize as the C-5 itself to assuring the U.S. the best possible return for its investments. Correcting problems rarely attracts public notice anywhere near that given the problems' existence, but under General Newby's direction, with the controls and authority the new contract provides, solutions are being found, cost estimates have remained stable, and there is managerial balance and rapport between the Air Force and Lockheed that makes both possible.

An example is the C-5 landing gear. It is designed to spread the aircraft's weight over four main-gear bogies with six wheels each and a nose gear with four wheels; to kneel for easy loading; to cant for crosswind land-

ings; to retract each main gear independently for maintenance without jacking the aircraft; and to partially deflate the tires in flight for landing on substandard runways. The gear is obviously big, extremely complex and perhaps excessively automated. The kneeling mechanism, in particular, malfunctioned often enough to be a time consuming—and therefore costly—nuisance. Safety was not involved, but reliability was. After a number of modifications, including a simplified relay logic system and substitution of a hydraulic for a pneumatic drive kneeling mechanism, gear reliability continues to improve.

Reliability of the C-5's 38 highly interdependent avionics subsystems also is improving and a redesign now being tested should solve the pylon fatigue problem that grounded the C-5s for a time last autumn.

"Remaining problems are chiefly related to the static strength and fatigue life of the aircraft," Air Force Secretary Seamans told the House Armed Services Committee last February. "The possibility of installing a new wing to increase static strength was rejected because of the cost involved. Alternatives such as special flight management, including reduced load factors and payloads; design changes; and incorporating a Lift Distribution Control System are being examined as means of extending the operational life of the C-5."

Last November, the Air Force approved General Newby's proposal to form a team of specialists to conduct an independent in-depth review of the entire airplane structure. This year-long study should produce a clearer indication of the C-5's structural lifespan and identify the most cost effective approach to any future modifications which may be needed.

Meantime, crews make rolling takeoffs, limit loading weight for touch and go's, and reduce the use of reverse thrust on landing when possible. These techniques do not impair operational efficacy but they cut down on structural wear and tear. They boil down simply to flying the aircraft like the valuable instrument that it is.

C-5 fatigue tests have several more years to run. Retrofits and data revalidations continue. The Review Team's conclusions are at least nine months away and there is still a fourth C-5 squadron to equip.

The C-5 story will not end for many years after that. When it does, a thorough biographer may treat its problems and solutions in the dispassionate historical perspective now afforded early B-52 structural modifications; or the outer wing beefup which improved the F-4; or the installation of B-58 drag chutes to alleviate tire and brake overheating; or even the fatigue and reliability problems that accompany development of nearly every civil transport.

This is neither to excuse nor term "normal" the problems encountered in the C-5 program. General Stewart recently categorized some past actions as "R&D . . . Real Dumb," and history's final tally may include some of that kind of "R&D" in the C-5's background.

But one thing seems obvious from the 40,000 operational flight hours accumulated to date—the C-5 can do; it is doing the strategic airlift mission for which it was designed. It is not yet a pluperfect superbird. But it clearly is not the airborne disaster its critics describe.

THAT WAS THE DAY: WHEN THE WORLD'S BIGGEST PLANE FLEW OVER!

(By Commander Andrew B. Bennett, USNR, retired)

Our little gray home in the West is located within the landing approach area of Moffett Field, about a dozen miles to the southeast thereof as the plane flies. Besides enjoying such amenities as fair climate, a garden-like

atmosphere and quiet neighbors, we are treated to a daily air show. One need not have been a former pilot to find interest in the coming and going of various types of aircraft; with time they become old friends. Most are Moffett-based planes, like the Orion P-3's, the long range patrol craft and noted for their quiet engines. Then Phantom jets and Delta Darts come by, showing their tremendous power; also an occasional transport like the Hercules or a Starlifter. The colors and markings of helicopters show them to belong to Army, Navy or Coast Guard. Way high up, coming or going to Travis AFB soars the mighty B-52 of the U.S. Air Force, its contrail tracing a white line. With the sun slanting from the right angle the small image of the plane is seen as a tiny white arc against a blue sky. During maneuvers there have been times when these mighty planes were on the wing night and day.

It was in this setting one bright May morning that I had gone into backyard, mulling over a news item about politicians whose dovish ideas could pose a threat to our national military preparedness.

Through the rumble of an approaching multi-jet there was a piercing sound which compelled me to look. Something new was up! (literally): While the sky was not exactly darkened, by the size and appearance of what flew over I knew at once that here was a stranger in our midst; soon verified when seen through binoculars. Could it be? Yes, it must be the new Lockheed C-5A; the world's biggest aircraft, now beginning service with the Military Airlift Command of the U.S. Air Force. It was a sight long to be remembered.

Whatever might have been scheduled on my Plan of the Day I cancelled at once and drove to Moffett Field where I called on the Duty Operations Officer. He confirmed that the monster-sized plane I had seen was indeed the famous C-5A, just arrived on its first visit to this big Navy airbase.

She was to make some demonstration take-offs and landings and would be open for public inspection in the afternoon. That meant a three-hour wait but who could forego this opportunity. Her arrival had not been publicized, so only a small knot of people were on hand to watch the takeoffs and landings; the crowd later increased to several hundreds after word got around.

Nothing to do but wait. Some 300 yards away the huge "Galaxy" was poised on the taxiway; her engines idling. The upper half of the huge fuselage is painted a gleaming white and the lower half a soft gray. With an underslung profile the amidships is barely two feet above the ground and can be made to "kneel" to further adjust the height of the ramps to the ground- or truck-bed level. Maximum take-off weight is 765,000 lbs., twice the lift of previous military airlifters. All this weight is supported by four six-wheel "bogeys" on the main landing gear clustered amidships and with a four-wheel bogey on the nose gear strut.

More people arrived, including TV camera crews; their comments reflected surprise at the size of the plane.

Bigness is a characteristic which has always benefitted Moffett Field. Both by association or through interest I was acquainted with most of the major changes which have taken place during its 38 years of operation. Looking at its giant No. 1 hangar it was easy to visualize again the huge silvery bulk of the Navy's dirigible, the U.S.S. MACON which was based there in the early 30's. During WWII many non-rigid "K" balloons operated from there on patrol duty.

Watching the ground crew I saw a sailor kick one of the big tires of the nose wheel assembly. He was so dwarfed by the bulk looming over him so that he appeared as an ant kicking a table leg! Exactly at 1300 hours the number one jet was fired up,

followed by the other three in slow sequence. Slowly she moved forward down the taxiway, made a nimble turn and took a stance at the end of the runway.

She revved up to full power; the brakes released and she began to gain speed rapidly. We had heard that the big craft was empty but we were not prepared to see her suddenly lift off, airborne, having covered only a fraction of the long runway. This feeling was echoed by the exclamation of the crowd. After a 15-minute flight she floated down in a gentle glide which seemed unrealistic for a plane of her size. From touchdown to stop the run was only half the takeoff run.

By mid-afternoon Galaxy #0007 was moored near the Operations Building and lines began to form. The huge bow had been raised to well above the flight deck and ramps were lowered forward and aft. Being now so close, the plane's huge size seemed incredible. I was eager to go aboard but the line ahead seemed not to move.

At long last my turn came. Seven steps up to the main (cargo) deck, then 15 big steps up a nearly vertical ladder; a left turn and I was in flightdeck country. A small crowd up forward was packed like sardines; others turned aft to inspect the crews' quarters and those reserved for special passengers. I wedged my way forward as others were leaving. I was in luck: in my small group were a couple of Moffett's own flying officers, an Australian commander and a Canadian lieutenant commander plus a gentleman in civvies who no doubt was on the staff of the Ames Laboratory complex and therefore a part of Moffett.

The plane commander, Major Stephen Jackson, USAF, sitting half turned and relaxed in the pilot seat on the portside, was answering a stream of questions asked by my flying companions. This was high caliber shop talk: dealing with instrumentation, handling, performance, worldwide communication, navigation, on-board computers, hydraulic systems, crossover functions for dual purpose or back-up systems, safeguards and emergency provisions. With each such fact my respect increased for the men who designed, built or operated this plane and I marvelled when I heard that it could go anywhere, and carry any equipment the Army has. In size it is about twice that of our heretofore biggest transport, the C-141 Starlifter, itself a marvelous plane.

Others were awaiting their turn and reluctantly we stood down and went to visit other parts of the big ship.

Aft but separated from the forward compartment is the "Troop Scoop", a 60-foot tunnel-like blister running the length of the plane above the cargo hold. It accommodates 75 men, seated six abreast but with a center aisle. Also a galley and conveniences. The seats are regular upholstered, reclining airliner type seats. They are for the crews of military equipment carried in the hold.

The cargo hold is one big tunnel 121 feet long, excluding ramps, 13.5 feet high and 19 feet wide. Normal payload is 220,000 pounds, maximum 265,000 pounds. With drive-through loading, all equipment can be driven off in 15 minutes or less; palletized cargo is loaded directly onto trucks. The plane is also designed for airdrop delivery. Loading and refueling can be done in less than an hour's time. When word is passed to "fill 'er up" they are talking about 49,000 gallons of jet fuel, enough to fill about 6.5 regular size railroad tank cars!

But enough statistics; there is not enough room here to do justice to or quote all the superlatives about this fascinating plane. Those further interested can ask the Lockheed-Georgia Co., a Div. of L.A.C., Marietta, Ga. 30060. Ask for publication G-1170-N; a 22-page brochure packed with data. It is not intended for bedtime reading as it will make the wheels go non-stop!

Better yet, make an effort to visit the C-5A

Galaxy soon. It will boost one's pride and renew faith in America and its people whose creative genius and technical knowhow is admired and envied throughout the world.

PAINFUL ANNIVERSARY

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago today on the occasion of one of his greatest triumphs Robert F. Kennedy was killed. The memory of his death is still terribly painful to those of us who loved the late Senator from New York.

Today in California many will celebrate the anticipated victory of GEORGE MCGOVERN in that State's critical presidential primary contest. There will be others, however, who while wishing Senator McGOVERN nothing but the best, will remember Robert Kennedy and be saddened by what might have been.

To say this is not to demean GEORGE MCGOVERN, who has earned—against the greatest odds—his day in the sun, but rather to state again one's profound regard for Senator Kennedy, a man unlike any other that I have known.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I cherish the memory of Robert F. Kennedy's life—even though today is not a happy day remembering what happened that terrible night 4 years ago in Los Angeles.

In Monday's Newsday, the Long Island newspaper, Jeff Greenfield, who served as one of Senator Kennedy's speechwriters, wrote a beautiful tribute to the memory of the late New York Senator and I think it important to be shared:

[From Newsday, June 4, 1972]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT F. KENNEDY

(By Jeff Greenfield)

On the television they are talking about the crucial California primary, and flashing pictures of a gun spurting smoke, and a man stretched on the ground with blood staining his shirt and his wife kneeling over him, and again I am in Los Angeles in a fifth floor suite of the Ambassador Hotel a few moments after midnight on a June Tuesday in 1968, watching the newsmen blurring out half-heard details, watching the faces of the men and women who had been through it with Dallas, stunned but utterly unsurprised, muttering "oh no, oh God no," hearing the innocents who did not know it could happen again. "It can't be, it just can't be."

That June 6 night and the four following days are a blurred nightmare to me, coated with exhaustion, shock and disbelief. The hospital vigil, a flight across America in an Air Force transport, a dawn telephone call to tell me what I already knew, a walk to a Capitol Hill haberdashery ("I'd like four neckties, please . . . black"), the funeral at St. Patrick's, cameras clicking like crickets gone mad when President Johnson walked in, and an incredible eight-hour train ride to Washington, with bad jokes and good laughter and the horror of death along the way, and the silence within as silent rows of young black men lined the roadbed through Baltimore, with raised fists and signs from their younger brothers: "Goodbye, Bobby," "We'll Miss You."

There has been almost no day these last four years when I have not thought of Rob-

ert Kennedy. But I have thought far less of when and how he died than what he was alive. Partly, I know, this is due to the combination of accidents that turned me into a 24-year-old speechwriter on a presidential campaign. Robert Kennedy was at the center of so many things at once—a cult of personality, an heir to a mythic mantle, a wave of protest against the Vietnam war, a spokesman for the disaffected and deprived, a campaign for the presidency—that it was to me a constant state of life at a fever pitch. There were times, in his office in the Senate and during the 85 days of Robert Kennedy's presidential campaign, that it seemed as if we were at the crest of a tidal wave; currents of love, hate, frenzy, energy, hope and fear battering around us.

Partly that, yes. But not wholly. Because I remember most fondly, most wistfully, moments outside the roar of crowds and the play of sound and light and passion that is an American presidential campaign. I remember Robert Kennedy in the way his detractors will never believe: as a vulnerable, funny man with a remarkable insight into this country's wounds.

Robert Kennedy's personality was like his Senate office the first time I saw it: overcrowded, overworked, chaotic, disorganized, yet efficient, like some college newspaper office. He was late for everything, in motion constantly, impatient, sensing that there was never enough time. You could, after a week or two, walk into Kennedy's offices and know immediately whether he was there or not: People walked more quickly; spoke more like he did, in a kind of enigmatic shorthand; a hum like a high-tension wire was almost audible among his staff.

Perhaps that suggests fear; if so, it is misleading. Kennedy did not inspire fear, not in the sense of a cringing set of subordinates waiting for the lash of Big Daddy. What Kennedy did was to make you aware of standards; to remind you that he expected what he himself reflected, a constant pursuit of excellence. To be part of that world was an experience I have not since felt. As Jack Newfield, Kennedy's most incisive biographer, has put it, "Bobby made everybody play over their heads."

This was true in matters of substance. I had come to Kennedy's staff believing that John Kennedy was the intellectual, the brilliant reader-writer, while Bobby was the ruthless tactician. Yet working for Robert Kennedy was like studying with a legendary tutor. Every time I worked on a speech, or a statement for the Senate floor, or a committee hearing, the first question he would ask was the question I had forgotten, or raised in my own mind and dismissed as just too detailed or complicated.

"Well . . . what about this point?" Kennedy would say about a speech on Vietnam. "Have you checked this out with Goodwin? Didn't the Times have a piece on the desertion rate in the South Vietnamese army? There's a fellow at M.I.T. . . . Why don't you call him and see what he says." He had a commitment to getting at the core of things, an unwillingness to ignore the unanswered question, that was astonishing. More important, it explains why his legislative staff—particularly Adam Walinsky and Peter Edelman—turned out the extraordinary work they did in three short years. When Robert Kennedy told Walinsky, "Why don't you take a look at Bedford-Stuyvesant?", it led to a comprehensive program of economic development, including job training, urban renewal, community television, and a new kind of neighborhood government. When Kennedy Peter Edelman started looking at conditions among migrant workers, it led not just to legislation, but to a personal odyssey of discovery and solidarity almost unheard of in contemporary American politics.

The ideas, programs and suggestions that poured out of Kennedy's crowded Senate of-

fice included fights that are only now being recognized as important battles. Tax reform, and an end to special loopholes for the rich; tighter regulation of utilities and consumer frauds; community participation in big cities; the plight of the white working class, coupled with specific programs to better the lot of working Americans; these were the sources of excitement in that office, far more than any "Camelot" mystique.

There was also the sheer pleasure of discovering a very funny man. Robert Kennedy had a gift for mordant, self-deprecating humor, spontaneous and contextual rather than finely grafted gags. In 1967, with a fight over a separation-of-church-and-state provision looming in New York, Kennedy was talking to Walinsky, Edelman, Frank Man-kiewicz, and myself.

"Look," he began, "the only way the new constitution could pass is if I spent a million dollars and changed my religion. First of all, I haven't got a million dollars . . . wait a minute, that's not true. Of course I have a million dollars . . . but I'm not changing my religion. Now," he continued straight-face, "there are certain compensations." Looking stony-faced at four Jewish aides. "After all, I'm going to heaven and you're not."

During the 1968 campaign, reporters were constantly looking for crowd size and enthusiasm. As a chartered flight was coming into an airport for a rally, R. W. Apple of the New York Times asked Kennedy, "How big is the crowd, senator?"

The plane pulled to a stop and the door swung open.

"Fifty thousand," he said and stuck his head out and waved briefly. A cheer went up. Kennedy pulled his head back in, turned to Apple with a schoolboy grin, and said, mocking the press clichés, "They screamed with pleasure."

His self-mockery really was easy to take. At some point during the Indiana primary, an ancient two-engine plane started down the runway and abruptly sputtered to a halt. Kennedy rose from his seat.

"I just want to say in all modesty," he said, "that if we don't make it, your names will be in very small print."

Others have written about Kennedy's sense of empathy: a capacity to feel the hurt, or rage, or discontent of people utterly unlike him. Still others insist on his ruthlessness, or vindictiveness; and I am sure he was capable of both compassion and mean spiritness. He was a human being, not a saint; he could be curt and short with his staff and friends, and could and did go against his best instincts—whether it was a hesitant opposition to the war in Vietnam, or a belated decision to challenge Lyndon Johnson.

Yet perhaps the most insistent memory I have of Robert Kennedy is of a night in Indianapolis, just after Martin Luther King was shot. Kennedy had come back from an impassioned talk to a crowd of blacks, many of whom first heard the news of King's death from Kennedy. He had quoted Aeschylus to them, and spoken of the death of his own brother. But that night, back at the hotel, he was in a quiet, detached mood. Sometime about 2 A.M., he came into a room where Adam Walinsky and I, along with Ted Sorensen via telephone, were trying to work on a speech about the King death for the next day.

"You know," he said, "that fellow Lee Harvey . . . Harvey Lee . . . Oswald . . . he set something loose in this country . . . something very strong . . ." Kennedy had, I realized somehow, heard the name of his brother's murder from those first reports which got the names transposed, and he had never been able—or willing—to get them straight.

And then he said "Martin Luther King's death isn't the worst thing that ever happened."

I thought it cold and unfeeling at the time—until I realized he had been dragged back to November 22, 1963, and something that felt even worse than the death of Martin Luther King.

And two months later, in a hotel in Los Angeles, I understood fully and terribly what he had meant.

BURKE'S GUIDE TO REVOLUTION

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, following is a timely and thoughtful piece concerning the great 18th century philosopher Edmund Burke. It was written by Dr. Robert Nisbet and appeared in the Wall Street Journal of June 5:

BURKE'S GUIDE TO REVOLUTION

(By Robert Nisbet)

How does one live sanely through an age of revolution? What can keep the sheer number and complexity of revolutionary changes in our age from inducing in us that special apathy zoologists say is common to all organisms when environmental stimuli become too diverse and insistent? How do we distinguish between true revolutions and false ones; between major changes serving justice or freedom and those serving little more than the interests of power and privilege?

One way of trying to cope with the intellectual demands of our age is to return to an earlier revolutionary age, and, to study the life and works of the great 18th Century philosopher, Edmund Burke. Burke was preoccupied during his lifetime by some five revolutions or, at very least, situations with high revolutionary potential: the English revolution of 1688 which had occurred four decades before his birth; the American revolution; the French revolution; the strong protests of Bengalese against British administration of India; and the turmoil in Ireland as the consequence of British policy there toward Roman Catholics.

It may come as a surprise to many, accustomed to thinking of Burke as the unvarying defender of his beloved England or of traditional civil order to learn that of these five revolutions or potential revolutions, Burke gave impassioned support to four of them: the English, the American, the Indian, and the Irish. To one only, the French, did Burke offer stringent, relentless opposition.

DR. JOHNSON'S UNEASE

Had there been, in Burke's day, an organization like the present Americans for Democratic Action to give statistical ratings of "liberal" and "conservative" to legislators, Burke would surely have drawn, in these five issues, all of them of great public importance in England, an 80% for liberalism, which is not bad in our day or Burke's. Actually, there is little doubt but that Burke would be rather astonished, were he to come back on earth today, to find that he is universally regarded as a conservative, as the founding father indeed of modern political conservatism. He was, after all, himself a Whig, and his political views were regarded with some unease by that quintessential Tory, and Burke's admiring friend, Dr. Johnson.

Even so, we cannot overlook the well attested fact that Burke's view of the social organism, and of the relation between order and freedom, is the clear source of the stream of political and social conservatism running through Coleridge, Matthew Arnold, and de Tocqueville in the 19th Century down to Ortega y Gasset, T. S. Eliot and Yeats, among others, in our own century. It

is best to leave Burke as history has made him: the classic conservative of modern times.

To understand Burke and his attitude toward the revolutions of his day, it is necessary to begin with, not tradition, convention, and order as such, but rather with rights, liberty and equity, the protection of which Burke saw as government's chief function. To be sure, we do well to note Burke's veneration of tradition, his sense of society as a partnership of the dead, the living, and the unborn, and his respect for "the wisdom of our ancestors."

But it is wrong, and without foundation in Burke's writings, to see him as the ritual antiquarian, the doctrinaire conservative. Tradition, convention and habit serve vital functions in Burke's theory of society. Not only are they the sources of the civil order, the sense of community, that freedom requires for creative expression; these forces are also, in Burke's view, the sources of those prejudgments that can alone make ideas of freedom, right and equity binding to the members of any community. "People will not look forward to posterity," he wrote, "who never look backward to their ancestors."

Burke was far from being the enemy of change and reform. "A state without the means of some change is without the means of its conservation. Without such means it might even risk the loss of that part of the constitution which it wished the most religiously to conserve. . . . He that supports every administration subverts all government," he wrote.

Far from being an advocate of simple *laissez-faire*, Burke could declare: "Government is a contrivance of human wisdom to provide for human wants. Men have a right that these wants should be provided for by this wisdom. It was Burke, not a *philosophe* across the English Channel, who said: "The arrogance of age must submit to be taught by youth."

Now, remarks such as those were never made by a mind given to doctrinaire conservatism. Traditionalist we may choose to label Burke, but the fact is, few minds of stature have ever given more brilliant witness to rights, liberties and equities in the affairs of government.

This explains Burke's love of the English revolution that had just preceded his career and that had, well into the 18th Century, its due share of die-hard opponents. Burke saw that revolution as the means not of creating new rights and liberties for the English people but instead of a shoring-up of rights and liberties that were, he argued, very old in English history. And thus too, as I have noted, Burke's constantly watchful eye on the efforts of the court of George III to diminish Parliament's autonomy and power.

Burke saw the cause of the American colonists almost exactly as he saw the cause of the English people themselves. The real fomenters of discord in the Colonies, Burke declared, were not the Americans but such "bold, improvident and visionary ministers" as Grenville at home, all of them more interested in repressive and arbitrary power, the fruit of "metaphysical speculations" into matters of finance and taxation, than in the prosperity of the Americans. Burke opposed England's policy toward America and this opposition did not cease when British troops were dispatched to America. His great speech on Conciliation marked his unyielding effort to bring those troops back home and to stop the war against the Americans.

It is not different, basically, with Burke's attitude toward the people of India and the Irish Roman Catholics. In his impassioned indictment of Warren Hastings, governor general of the British East India Company, Burke said, "That the people of Asia have no laws, rights or liberty, is a doctrine that wickedly is disseminated through this country. . . . I assert that their morality is equal to ours. . . . and I challenge the world to

show in any modern European book more true morality than is to be found in the writings of Asiatic men of high trust. . . . Make what we will of the personal element involved in Burke's charges against Warren Hastings; motivation is always complex. What is central is Burke's unambiguous defence of the Indians in their rebellion against what he called Hastings' "arbitrary power."

"No man . . . has a right to arbitrary power." That principle, enunciated by Burke in his defence of the Indian rebellion, is the cornerstone of Burke's philosophy. We see precisely the same attitude contained in his support of the Roman Catholics (Burke was himself Church of England though his mother had been Roman Catholic) in Ireland. "We found the people," Burke wrote of the Irish, "heretics and idolaters; we have, by way of improving their condition, made them slaves and beggars."

Now, let us turn to the French revolution. Why, given his support of Americans, Indians and Irish Catholics, did Burke oppose what was so widely regarded by English liberals, including Burke's fellow-Whigs in many instances, as the struggle for freedom and rights by the French people against a repressive government, the monarchy? The question is made the more pertinent by the fact that Burke seems at the very beginning of the uprising in France to have been sympathetic. Certainly, there is no doubt of Burke's belief that substantial reform was needed in France.

Burke's opposition to the French revolution came, as is a matter of record, when he realized that the controlling forces in the revolution were not those of reform but were instead Jacobin in inspiration, concerned not with the ascertainable needs of the French people but with abstract, millennially conceived, rights of all mankind. "For this purpose," Burke was later to write, "the Jacobins have resolved to destroy the whole frame and fabric of the old societies of the world and to regenerate them after their fashion."

It was Burke's achievement in what might be called the sociology of revolution to be the first to identify a new breed in European society, that of the rootless political intellectual, serving not church, class or country, but a set of rationalist ends, apocalyptic in their intensity, that were to be imposed upon the French people and then, successively, other peoples in the world.

INSIGHTS INTO TOTALITARIANISM

It comes as no surprise today to be told that the Jacobins were precursors to the Bolsheviks, forerunners of the modern totalitarians. One need but read the easily available, well known scholarship of a Robert Palmer, J. L. Talmon or Hannah Arendt. Insight into the nature of the totalitarian mind, complete with its passion for centralization and uniformity, for rationalist extirpation of tradition and prejudice, and for an absolute moralism that would extend when necessary to terror, was not so easily come by in the late 18th Century, and we owe Burke much for this first insight.

Burke thought there was a universe of difference between the French and the American revolutions. And Burke was right. I know of no serious interpreter of either revolution today who does not emphasize that universe of difference. The American revolution, as Burke never ceased to declare had been in opposition to arbitrary power and had been motivated by the rights belonging to Englishmen and Americans alike. The French Revolution, on the contrary, was, once it reached its real nature, a revolution of arbitrary power directed, in the name of abstract reason and morality, to historic rights and liberties.

Far from there being any significant inconsistency between Burke's view of the French revolution and his earlier support of not merely the American colonists but also the Irish Catholics and the Indians, we find

him, in a letter written in 1795, comparing Jacobinism to the "spirit of Protestant ascendancy" in England toward the Irish and their rights and also to the spirit of "Indianism" by which British wielders of power had sought to uproot Asiatic morality and consensus, replacing that with bureaucratically conceived and abstract principles born afar.

It is not difficult to discover in Burke's writing, from its earliest period on, a strong dislike of the *a priori*, the purely rationalistic and deductive, and, above all the kind of thinking that, in government, moves instantly to ordered, calculated and mathematically exact projects. "It is impossible not to observe," Burke wrote of the revolutionists in France, "that in the spirit of this geometrical distribution and arithmetical arrangement these pretended citizens treat France exactly like a country of conquest."

THE 20TH CENTURY

What, then about the revolutionary changes of the 20th Century? What would be Burke's probable reaction to these? There is little doubt but that he would see the Communist (and also the Nazi and Fascist) revolutions in essentially the same terms in which he saw the French. Now as then he would see the actions of elite groups of intellectuals and revolutionaries applying, in the name of an abstract and absolute virtue, the techniques of total power against populations.

But what about the more recent revolutionary changes in America, those of blacks, Chicanos and women, for example, seeking redress of wrongs and equity in the traditional structure of rights and liberties in the American political community? For the life of me I cannot see the unyielding defender of the American colonists, the Indians and the Catholic Irish taking a position other than in full support of the minority objectives of our day. He did then; he would today!

From this would not follow, though, indiscriminate support of the Bureaucratic and coercive tactics of some of our powerful agencies of government that also occasionally give the appearance of treating America, in Burke's phrasing, like a country of conquest. Recently the distinguished columnist of The Washington Post, William Raspberry, himself a black, wrote of educational desegregation: "The ideal is a situation in which race is irrelevant to assignment. Preoccupation with mathematical precision, unfortunately, is not the way to achieve that idea." Mr. Raspberry went on: "What's so ideal about mathematically precise distribution of human beings?"

What Burke wrote was: "Is every landmark of the country to be done away with in favor of a geometrical and arithmetical constitution?" I think Edmund Burke and William Raspberry would probably get along just fine.

(Dr. Nisbet is professor of sociology at the University of California, Riverside.)

SLAVE LABOR TO FEED AMERICAN PEOPLE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an American industrialist has announced a \$40 million deal to sell mushrooms produced by slave labor in Communist China to an unsuspecting American people. Reportedly, another \$40 million deal is in the making to import Red Chinese tomatoes.

One need not expect that the American

company—the Gloria Trade Co.—will label its product “produced by slave labor in Red China” to inform the American consumer as to why the product will be cheaper.

I insert a news release from a Hong Kong newspaper:

[From the Star, Hongkong, May 15, 1972]

U.S. FIRM'S \$40 MILLION MUSHROOM DEAL

An American businessman has negotiated a \$US40 million deal to sell Chinese mushrooms in the United States—and hopes to bring off a second deal for tomatoes also worth \$US40 million.

It is the biggest American trade breakthrough since American firms were allowed to trade with China last year.

In Hongkong today, the American businessman, Mr. Andy Jank, said: “We’re all very excited. I’ve been working for a long time to bring off the mushroom deal. It’s a terrific thing.”

Mr. Jank flew to Hongkong last month to begin negotiations with officials of the China Resources Co. in the Bank of China Building.

He said Americans now eat several million dollars worth of Taiwan mushrooms yearly, and would eat a lot more if Taiwan could supply them.

“We estimate we will be able to sell a 15-ounce can of Mainland mushrooms cheaper than the 13-ounce can of Taiwan mushrooms,” he said.

His company, the Gloria Trading Company, has been granted exclusive rights to sell Chinese mushrooms in the US over the next five years.

TOMATOES, TOO

Now Mr. Jank is negotiating with the Chinese for exclusive rights to distribute Chinese tomatoes in the US for the next five years—a deal he estimates would also be worth \$US40 million.

“Chinese mushrooms and tomatoes are probably the tastiest in the world,” he said.

Mr. Jank, who is also a director of Sino-American Engineering Associates, will return to America next week to report on the two deals.

POLLUTION STARTS WITH YOU

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, national interest in pollution control is certainly to be commended, and we recognize that the cooperation of individuals as well as that of Government, business, and interest organizations is essential if we are to overcome water and air pollution problems.

The Suburban Life of June 1 carried a very practical editorial commentary on the subject which should benefit its readers. I believe this merits wider review and I insert it into the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

POLLUTION STARTS WITH YOU

Some unlikely answers were received when a nationwide poll was taken recently to determine what federal government activities were most important and how they rated in priority among those questioned.

The replies were surprising as the poll was taken by the Opinion Research Corp., an international survey organization commissioned by the American Security Council whose concern was primarily on our military stance, and six of the seven questions dealt with our military policies.

Ranking highest in priority was air and water pollution control, with 28 per cent of those polled feeling that they personally considered this issue of most importance. National defense with 11 per cent ranked fifth, behind anti-poverty programs and aid to education, each with 18 per cent, and anti-crime programs with 17 per cent.

We recite these statistical figures to emphasize the importance which the average citizen places on pollution, and how the campaign for environmental controls has progressed in the last five years when more interest has been generated in the entire problem of ecology.

It costs hundreds of thousands of dollars each year in Cook and DuPage counties to pick up after the slob who tosses litter out of cars along highways. Millions of dollars are spent throughout the nation to the same end. The federal highway administration now is testing the feasibility of utilizing highway litter and industrial waste for highway construction material.

Since predominant forms of litter are metal cans, glass, rubber tires, paper and plastic, the research on these types for construction and maintenance operations is going forward to determine if these mixtures can be used for bituminous concrete, energy-absorbing barriers, soil stabilization, drains and ditches, and for mulching or soil erosion control.

We have established in our community central collection points for glass, tin cans and paper. The idea has caught the imagination of our people with the response to appeals very gratifying.

Even at the state level, the campaign for recycling has brought some tangible results under the direction of Governor Richard B. Ogilvie, who directed all state agencies under his jurisdiction to begin using 100 per cent recycled paper for letterheads and envelopes.

Paper costs will be cut by \$11,000 and eliminating the embossing operation will save another \$5,000 annually, not a great amount in the huge state budget, but enough to show results of the action. If widely followed, it would mean saving forests of trees.

Pollution is man-made. Anti-pollution measures have to start with each of us. If we do our share, we can save our lakes and streams, our air, and improve our own environment.

GALLON OF GASOLINE TODAY'S BARGAIN

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, most Americans have been gratified in the manner the oil industry has maintained a low price on gasoline. Over the years they have seen the postage stamp go from 2 cents to 8 cents which is a 400-percent increase.

Back in 1919, the average price received for a barrel of crude oil was \$2.50. At the average service station a gallon of gas sold for 27 cents. And at that time, there was no direct motor fuel tax added.

In 1971—52 years later—the price on a barrel of crude oil had only risen to \$3. A gallon of gasoline in 1971 yielded an average service station price of about 25.5 cents. To this, in 1971, was added approximately 12½ cents per gallon for direct U.S. and State tax. In plain language, this means that a service station

was getting 2 cents less per gallon than they got in 1919. The additional price to the consumer was through government taxes. Gasoline is cheap—only the tax is high.

Compare this record of the oil industry to the fact that food prices have more than doubled over this same period. Lumber prices have gone up 100 percent in the last 2 years. Prices of nonferrous metals have doubled in the past 10 years. The average American is making more as the 1919 U.S. wage averaged 47 cents per hour whereas workers are averaging above \$3 an hour today.

Oil supplies 44 percent of this Nation's energy needs and oil is in short supply. We are a country that needs and builds with power energy. We have only 6 percent of the world's population but America uses 33 percent of the world's energy.

We should take some positive steps. The first would be to reestablish an incentive depletion allowance for the oil industry. This would accentuate the development and exploration for more oil reserves in the United States.

Another constructive step would be passage of the Murphy bill. This bill provides guarantee of contract which gives a driller the opportunity to participate with stability in oil and gas development.

Oil and gas have helped build America. With oil exploration running at half its past activity, it is urgent that we emphasize exploration for the future.

OUR WORLD TODAY: OBSERVATIONS OF R. J. "JACK" PEEK

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, a grass-rooted Missourian concerned with his country's role in international affairs has often sent his opinions and analysis of current policies and actions of our Government to my office. For the enlightenment of this body, and to help better understand the feelings of the midwestern citizenry of this Nation, I insert the following observations and opinions of R. J. "Jack" Peek:

OUR WORLD TODAY

The evening of May 9th, 1972 will be long remembered by the people of this nation and the other nations of the world as the date when one man, the President of this United States placed his entire political and private life on the line when in his message to friend and enemies alike that the end of compromising in the Viet Nam had come to an abrupt end. That our so-called foreign friends and allies would no longer be looked upon with favor in supplying our adversaries with any supplies which would extend and prolong the present conflict.

In a final analysis these suppliers by their actions have become accessories and accomplices to the crime of murder and destruction being carried out by the Viet Cong! To rid the danger of a poisonous reptile you sever the head instead of severing the tail which should have been the procedure some seven years ago which would have saved thousands of lives and billions in funds. We

may as well prepare ourselves for the damnation and recriminations from the outside world opinion for the action which is to be taken in using our military to shut off the flow of outside military aid.

Certainly there will be a freeze up in diplomatic relations between the two major powers, Russia and China but then there has never been a complete "thaw" and neither will there be. Certainly too, there will be a diplomatic confrontation between Russia but a military showdown, never. First, both Russia and this nation realizes that both have the nuclear potential power to bring instant destruction to one another and others almost completely. China while having developed the bomb is not nearly advanced enough to effectively use it as on either the U.S. or her other enemy, Russia.

Furthermore China herself while having a tremendous backlog of expendable manpower she does not have the capability of producing the necessary military equipment for an expeditionary force of the size necessary for such a war. With the suspicion and distrust between the two nations both are busily concentrating on keeping the large border forces militarily equipped.

Neither Russia or the Chinese have any military troops in North Viet Nam neither will they make this commitment. Russia has never expended their military forces to any extent in any war being content to merely furnish the equipment for others to use.

In the Cuban missile crisis Russia proved their reluctance to face another world power militarily equipped by moving out the missiles when we faced up to them with our sea and air power.

If those who have criticized this administration regarding the return of our prisoners of war will recall, the enemy has never, made any firm commitment or guarantee that our prisoners would all be set free but only discussed this issue in general meaningless terms.

In viewing the whole seven years of this conflict the enemy has proven themselves incapable of showing any mercy or compassion for military personnel or the civilian population.

The only question now which bears consideration is do we have the necessary military power, the military equipment to carry out the action clearly and firmly stated by the President in his May 9th; address to the nation. Evidently he and his advisers feel sure that we do have.

Right or wrong no one can or will deny that no man in history has ever disregarded self, family and friends by honestly stating his convictions and decisions.

SELF-REGULATION IN THE SECURITIES INDUSTRY

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, in the Securities and Exchange Commission's Study of Unsafe and Unsound Practices of Brokers and Dealers, filed with the Congress on December 28, 1971, the SEC requested additional legislative authority in certain areas in order to perform more effectively the regulatory duties assigned to it by the Congress. At that time I expressed my support for the agency's request, and asked it to draft implementing legislation. The Commission recently prepared such a bill which was introduced as H.R. 15303 at the agency's request.

In reviewing the Commission's bill, I feel compelled to note some difficulties

I see in the methods the Commission uses in attempting to implement its desire for additional authority.

Portions of the bill provide for SEC review of disciplinary actions taken by stock exchanges and national securities associations—which I shall refer to collectively as "self-regulatory organizations"—against their members. The procedure devised by the Commission is analogous to a yoyo—the action of the self-regulatory organization is sent up to the Commission for review, which sends it back down to the self-regulatory organization if it does not agree with the sanctions imposed, which reconsiders and sends the matter back up to the Commission for a second review.

I see little reason for such a procedure, which appears to me to be discipline by negotiation. In SEC administrative proceedings brought initially before an independent hearing examiner, the agency has the power to review the examiner's decision and to affirm, increase, or decrease the sanctions imposed. It would seem appropriate to apply this procedure to review of disciplinary proceedings of self-regulatory organizations, and indeed such a procedure has been proposed in a different context in section 17A(g)(2) of H.R. 14826, which relates to the SEC's authority over clearing corporations depositories and transfer agents.

Various sections of the bill would change existing law by allowing the Commission to take certain actions with respect to proposed or existing rules of self-regulatory organizations by Commission rule, rather than by order. These changes would give the agency greater flexibility in its activities. On the other hand, it would remove such activities from the judicial review provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and place such review under the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, which, I am informed, differ from the Exchange Act with respect to forum and burden of proof. Very careful attention will have to be paid to these provisions in any deliberations of this bill.

The bill allows the Commission to take certain actions with respect to rules and violation of rules of self-regulatory organizations, with the exception of rules "concerned solely with internal management or procedures as between [the self-regulatory organization] and its members which does not substantially affect the public interest or the interest of investors."

This exception appears to cause more problems than it solves. What is a rule "concerned solely with internal management or procedures?" Who makes the determination? What if the Commission and the self-regulatory agency disagree—must this matter first be litigated before the Commission may act? If not, may Commission action subsequently be overturned if a court should decide that the rule does in fact fall within the proscribed area?

Similar questions could be raised with respect to the second part of the exemption concerning substantial effect on the public. I would be inclined to remove the exception from the bill.

The bill prohibits the Commission from instituting administrative proceedings against a member of a self-regula-

tory organization for violations of the rules of that organization until the Commission has: first, notified the self-regulatory organization of the alleged violation and the Commission's intention to institute a proceeding based on it and, second, has given the self-regulatory organization a reasonable time in which to compel compliance by its member with its rule.

The public interest often requires prompt action on the part of the Commission and the procedural barriers set forth in this bill would seem to prevent such prompt action on the part of the Commission. The better procedure, I believe, would be to delete these provisions from the bill and leave it to the Commission to determine on a case-by-case basis whether the public interest requires prompt action by the Commission or whether there is sufficient time to allow the self-regulatory organization to act upon the matter itself.

I note further that the bill allows the Commission to institute administrative proceedings for violations of rules of self-regulatory organizations but does not allow the Commission to bring civil injunctive actions in the Federal courts for violations of such rules nor to refer such violations to the Department of Justice for appropriate criminal prosecution. I understand that one of the quickest ways for the Commission to act is through an injunctive action with an attendant request for a temporary restraining order. I suggest that the public interest may require an amendment to the bill to give the Commission this authority.

At the time the SEC was asked to draft legislation implementing its unsafe and unsound report, it was requested that the Commission include in its bill a provision which would require that proposed rules of self-regulatory organizations would be released for public comment before any action was taken on them by the Commission. The SEC has chosen not to include such a provision in its bill. I feel strongly that any legislation involving rulemaking by self-regulatory organizations must provide that any changes in rules of such organizations must be accompanied with and only after public participation. Self-regulatory organizations should be required to submit proposed rule changes to the SEC well in advance. These proposals should then be made public. The public should be given an opportunity to comment. In short, proposed rules of self-regulatory organizations should, as a general rule, be treated no differently than proposed rules of the Commission itself.

Mr. Speaker, I have set forth in some detail the problems I have with the Commission's bill in the hope that interested members of the investing public, the organized bar, and the securities industry will give these matters close attention and transmit any comments they may have to the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance. When the Congress grants the Commission increased regulatory authority in this area, which I believe we must do, such legislation should be clear, concise, direct, and sufficient to allow the Commission to perform the duties Congress has set for it.

WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point the text of my monthly Washington News Notes bulletin:

CONGRESSMAN CRAIG HOSMER'S WASHINGTON NEWS NOTES

A LOOK AT THE SALT TREATY

From Congressman Hosmer's viewpoint, the strategic arms limitation arrangement negotiated by President Nixon and Premier Brezhnev adequately protects the national security of the U.S. As a Congressional arms control expert who fought ferociously for Non-Proliferation Treaty safeguards, Hosmer sees "no major problems" with the SALT ABM Treaty and parallel Interim Agreement on offensive missiles.

The U.S. and U.S.S.R. see it to be in their security and economic self-interest to remain mutually deterred by nuclear sufficiency. The concept of U.S. nuclear superiority went out the window with the massive Soviet arms build-up of the 1960's. This could not have been stopped short of a pre-emptive war or a staggeringly expensive build-up of our own.

In his decision, the President added up the cost of the treaty against the high cost of doing nothing toward arms control. In order to keep things from getting lopsided, Congress will have to support the President's request for R&D on the TRIDENT submarine program, the B-1 bomber and other improved strategic systems.

HOSMER AVAILABLE FOR SPEAKING DATES,
AUGUST 20 TO SEPTEMBER 3

Congressman Craig Hosmer will be home in the 32d District during the August Congressional recess. He will be available for talks, meetings and social events with local organizations during the period of August 20 through September 3. Requests should be sent in writing to Craig at 2217 Rayburn Bldg., Washington, D. C. 20515.

ON HEALTH INSURANCE

A lot of heat but not much light is being generated about public health care. Some election-year proposals would have Uncle Sam become the family doctor and pay all the bills. Says HEW Secretary Elliot Richardson: "When there is a flood in this country and its victims are left shoeless, the Red Cross does not send a pair of shoes to everyone in the country to insure that those in need get shod." There are gaps in our present health care system. But our national objective should be to take care of those in need without breaking the Treasury and imposing the heavy hand of Federalization on all our health programs.

HOSMER NAMED NUCLEAR MEETING CHAIRMAN

Because of his "long and distinguished career as one of the outstanding Congressional experts on atomic energy," the respected American Nuclear Society has selected Congressman Hosmer as Honorary Chairman of its 18th annual meeting this month in Las Vegas. More than 2000 of the top nuclear scientists from the U.S. and around the world will be participating in the five-day meeting.

SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT ON VIETNAM

More than 100,000 Americans have sent letters and telegrams to the White House giving their views on the President's decisive move to block the flow of war materiel to North Vietnam. The White House reports that the mail is still running 4-to-1 in favor of the U.S. action. All of the initial public opinion polls also showed between 60% and 76% support from the American people. Let's hope

the North Vietnamese also are reading the polls.

IT FIGURES, DOESN'T IT?

The National Commission on Consumer Finance has overspent its budget and has asked Congress for an additional \$500,000 on top of the original \$1.5 million appropriation. It's final report also will be six months late.

VIVA VOLUNTEERS

The National Volunteer Awards for 1972 will be selected from entries across the nation for \$5000 prizes for groups and individuals who have done outstanding jobs in volunteer programs. If you know of any individual or group deserving of consideration, send your nomination to: National Center for Voluntary Action, 1735 Eye St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20007. Deadline is July 15, 1972. Nomination forms also are available from that address.

ONE STEP CLOSER ON WILDLIFE REFUGE

By the time you read this the House will have passed Congressman Hosmer's bill to create a National Wildlife Refuge at Seal Beach. The vote was scheduled for Monday, June 5, and Hosmer was looking for overwhelming House support. The bill now goes to the Senate.

THOUGHTS FOR FLAG DAY 1972

June 14 is Flag Day, and in these days of patriotic cynicism, Congressman Hosmer says it is important that all Americans make a special effort to honor our national colors.

Henry Ward Beecher put it rather well when he said: "A thoughtful mind, when it sees a nation's flag, sees not the flag but the nation itself. And whatever may be its symbols, its insignia, he reads chiefly in the flag, the government, the principles, the truths, the history that belong to the nation that sets it forth."

BOYD URGES GENERALIST APPROACH

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Friday morning, May 26, 1972, Willard L. Boyd, president, the University of Iowa, delivered the charge to the spring graduates of the university. President Boyd emphasized the need for maintaining a generalist point of view in approaching new problems in our specialist-oriented society. The text of President Boyd's address is as follows:

CHARGE TO THE GRADUATES

(By President Willard L. Boyd)

Each of you has been certified by the faculty of the college in which you have been enrolled as being proficient in certain areas of knowledge. Each of you, however, has received your degree from the University of Iowa. This University-wide degree symbolizes our hope that your education at Iowa has transcended narrow disciplinary boundaries.

It is not enough for this University to certify your expertness, for expertness is inadequate for these times. Specialization is a narrowing process; it causes us to back off from the broader issues about which we know less than we do of our specialty. We need to be generalists as well as specialists. An educated person must be able to put her or his share of knowledge into a worthwhile whole.

It is painfully obvious that, despite all our new knowledge and all the experts we have prepared, we have not solved the complex problems of society. The sad truth of the knowledge explosion is that it has only

taught us more about the individual parts of society and greatly obscured the total view. We act too often as specialists, not generalists. Experts in detail, we shun a broad approach. We cannot make our way through the contemporary world if we abdicate our personal and collective lives to experts alone. We must all contribute to the solution of society's problems.

In approaching these problems, experts and lay people alike must bring to them intellectual, rigor. Yet intellect is not enough. It must be tempered with humaneness. Both reason and passion are needed to resolve these issues. Like Martin Luther King, each of us must have a dream. In a world of many people and many ideas, it must be a dream which admits of the aspirations of others as well as our own. We cannot realize our dreams if others cannot realize theirs.

Fundamental to our times is this quest for human rights which is our common bond. We must be active in this joint quest. Thus it is not sufficient for us inactively to refrain from improper discrimination, but rather we must act affirmatively to assure these rights among the sexes, the races, and the ethnic and religious groups of our world.

Your life will require more than expertness, more than intellect, and more than passiveness. I hope that somewhere in this University you have gained perspective as well as knowledge, you have gained understanding as well as competence, and you have gained commitment as well as conviction. If this is so, then we have done more than add to your knowledge, we have also added to your life.

PROJECT SER—MANDATE FOR LOCAL PARTICIPATION

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, with three bills in the House and two in the Senate dealing with the future manpower one question comes to mind. How will new manpower legislation affect categorical delivery systems?

I particularly make reference to America's second largest minority. With the Spanish-speaking population estimated at 11 million—I call my colleagues attention to "Jobs for Progress, Incorporation," the only national manpower delivery system for the Spanish speaking. Popularly known as SER, an acronym for, "service, employment, redevelopment," this organization has a 6-year history of service to its people. Sponsored by the two largest Mexican-American organizations, the American GI Forum and the League of United Latin American Citizens—LULAC. SER stands as a monument to the determination of an ethnic group striving to fully assimilate into the mainstream of American life.

In the spring of 1965, job placement centers for the Spanish speaking were operated in Houston and Corpus Christi, by the League of United Latin American Citizens—LULAC. Under the banner of "Jobs for Progress," the centers were funded and staffed exclusively by Spanish-speaking volunteers. They did more for the Mexican American in their short existence than permanent public agencies had been able to accomplish over the years.

Based on the lessons learned, the two

national organizations, LULAC and the American GI Forum, joined to form "Jobs for Progress, Inc." "to" eliminate poverty in the Southwest with special attention to culturally different. The large-scale program to tap the manpower resources of the Spanish-speaking community was given the name "to be" in Spanish—Operation SER.

THE TWO PARENT ORGANIZATIONS

The American GI Forum is a veterans family organization founded in 1948 in Corpus Christi, Tex., by Dr. Hector P. Garcia, for the purpose of abolishing discrimination practices against returning World War II Mexican-American veterans. The Forum since has broadened the scope of its objectives to include a program of improvement of the social, economic, and political conditions of the Mexican-American community. The organization has among its objectives: Leadership development, intergroup understanding, preservation of basic principles of democracy, veterans' rights, nondiscrimination, education, youth motivation.

The League of United Latin American Citizens was founded in 1929 in Corpus Christi, Tex. by the merger of three Mexican-American organizations.

LULAC was founded at a time when American citizens of Mexican ancestry were the victims of a very high degree of discrimination. The league was formed for the purpose of eliminating the segregation of Mexican-Americans and elevating their social, economic and educational status. LULAC led the legal battles which have eliminated overt segregation of Mexican-Americans in public schools, public facilities, and public employment; and it was LULAC who initiated and financed the court battles that led to the U.S. Supreme Court decision which declared unconstitutional the then prevalent practice in Texas, of omitting American citizens of Mexican descent from service in grand and petit juries. At present, LULAC members are very much involved in eliminating the more subtle, covert, segregation that now operates to hinder the socioeconomic progress of the Mexican-Americans in Southwestern United States, and in operating a vast system of scholarship assistance from school boards and public colleges indifferent to their problems.

Operation SER as of January 1970 was in operation in 23 projects. The national headquarters in Los Angeles was coordinating the activities of 5 State offices and 23 local offices. Skills banks have registered over 60,000 Mexican-Americans throughout 5 southwestern States. More than 14,000 persons have been placed in nontraditional employment using bilingual approach to motivation and training of participants.

Work orientation training conducted by operation SER has produced a marked increase in language competence and overall employability of the participants.

SER work orientation centers now offer a comprehensive range of innovative training and related manpower services.

On the eve of a new fiscal year SER is literally and figuratively on the map as the national manpower delivery vehicle

for the Spanish speaking. SER is now in the Northern and Midwestern States, providing services to the disadvantaged in cities such as: Chicago, Detroit, Topeka and is scheduled to expand to 20 more cities including the northeast by the middle of next year. Now with a larger national office, 31 locals, with a liaison office in Washington, whose staff frequently communicates with many of our offices, have worked as a national organization with a record of vast accomplishments and successes.

PERFORMANCE RESULTS

During the 6-month period being appraised, SER has served a total of 2,398 people. Of this number 1,390 have been trained and 1,144 have been placed in meaningful jobs. The remainder is currently in training. In addition, local SER projects are now operating at 96-percent capacity, and enrollments for the reporting period are 94-percent of the planned enrollment goal. These figures indicate the careful and effective planning that took place prior to implementation of the programs.

ENROLLEE PROFILE

The following enrollee profile illustrates that SER is serving those in need. SER enrollees come from broad cross-sections of the target population and provide evidence that SER is serving the community. The following statistics were gathered from 16 projects which were in operation at the beginning of the program year in September 1971:

Ninety-three percent of the enrollees are Spanish speaking.

Seventy-four percent are heads of households.

Fifty-four percent are male.

Forty-six percent are high school dropouts.

Twelve percent are junior high and elementary school dropouts.

Twelve percent are monolingual.

PLACEMENTS

Ninety-five percent of the planned number of placements anticipated at the beginning of the program year has been accomplished. This figure represents excellent planning on the part of the local project directors and their staff. Eighty-nine percent of the people served have been placed on meaningful jobs after leaving the program. More importantly, 91 percent of SER placements are still on the job 3 months after being placed. Many positive factors account for this encouraging fact:

The quality of the training services provided is exceptional.

Counselors and other staff members are instilling a high degree of motivation in the enrollee.

SER is soliciting and gaining meaningful support from local employers.

SER is working not only for immediate placement but also long-term gainful employment.

NATURE OF PLACEMENTS

An impressive 100-percent of SER placements have been in semiskilled, skilled, or high-skilled occupations. Ninety-two percent of those placements were in the enrollee's chosen field of interest. For obvious reasons, SER is striving to place people on jobs they desire.

But circumstances such as the status of the job market, availability of training programs, or the enrollees capabilities not meeting the job requirements make 100-percent success extremely difficult. The average starting wage for SER placements is \$2.49 per hour, well above the Federal minimum wage of \$1.60 per hour. This is a strong indication of the type of upgrading the SER enrollee is experiencing.

COST

One of the notable achievements of the SER program is the cost-per-enrollee figure of \$1,971. This compares very favorably with other major manpower programs which are experiencing costs-per-placement in excess of \$4,000 to \$6,000. This low figure indicates that SER is operating with great efficiency and economy, while providing quality services.

With all bills involving the concept of decentralization, placing policy, planning, and administration in the hands of State and local government, certain safeguards must be included in whatever legislation affecting manpower is ultimately passed. Safeguards that insure that on the local level SER continues to be given the opportunity to deliver manpower services to the disadvantaged.

A mandate, not a request, not a suggestion, but a mandate for local and State manpower organizations, such as the employment services to subcontract to SER, delivery of manpower services that are aimed at assisting the Spanish speaking, would be a safeguard.

To my many farsighted colleagues who have for a lifetime been proponents of equality and the rights to self-help, I urge that such a mandate be a part of the 1972 comprehensive manpower legislation. That whatever version of whatever bill, have a provision for the national talents, experience, and work of SER to continue on the local level as a named subcontractor of manpower services.

AN AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15259 BY MR. REUSS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of an amendment which I intend to offer to H.R. 15259, the 1973 District of Columbia Appropriations Act, to restore the administration's original request for \$35,000 to construct a bicycle route network:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15259, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. REUSS

Page 9, strike out lines 10 through 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following: available until expended, \$131,429,000, of which \$2,420,000 shall be payable from the water fund, \$1,760,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund, and \$12,262,700 from the highway fund: *Provided*, That of the funds payable from the highway fund \$35,000 shall be available for the construction of a bicycle route network in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, \$4,323,000 shall be

OF CABBAGES AND KINGS

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the other Members of the House a speech recently delivered by Dr. William J. Cook, Jr., of Montgomery, Ala., to the annual convention of the Alabama Education Association. Dr. Cook is professor of English and chairman of the English department at Auburn University at Montgomery, and is associate minister of the Carriage Hills Church of Christ in Montgomery.

Dr. Cook makes some interesting observations about our Nation and our heritage, and we would do well to heed his advice. I am pleased to include Dr. Cook's speech in the RECORD with my remarks:

OF CABBAGES AND KINGS

(By Dr. William J. Cook, Jr.)

Somehow, all among us, pervading and threatening to control our lives and perhaps even our destiny, there has developed a fanatical adoration for youth.

Catchwords such as "youth power," "youth rebellion," "youth leadership," make up not only a significant part of our conversation, but also a considerable part of our thinking.

It is more than merely the proverbial quest for the fountain of youth—although some older folk do make fools of themselves by identifying with youth, vicariously or actually. Witness: the fifty-year-old grandmother in a mini-skirt; the paunchy middle-age executive with bangs and shoulder-length locks; Bobby Darren; and government leaders who pamper and coddle youngsters.

But all the rest of us are influenced more than we ought to be by youth, maybe more than we know. Consider our contemporary styles of dress; our music; recreation. Most advertising now is aimed either at youth or people who think they are—or wish they were—young. In schools and universities, the most important thing has become not academics but getting along with the students. Some schools allow and even encourage the students to establish their own curriculum, make their own rules—stated bluntly, to call all shots. All universities, in our state at least, now have a youngster on the Board of Trustees. I am reluctant even to parody that. The time may come in which there will be an entire youth administration and faculty right alongside the legitimate administration and faculty. Even the church, always the last bastion of hope and order, has not escaped the onslaught of youth: "youth forums," "youth programs," "youth ministers," and, ridiculously enough, "youth elders" all have their place in our modern ecclesiastical disorder.

The reasons for the revival or resurgence of youth, according to proponents, are three: (1) at present fifty percent of the population is under twenty-five years old and ought, therefore, to have fifty percent of the say-so; (2) Age is obviously irresponsible or incompetent since the past two or three generations have gotten us hopelessly lost on our journey to happiness and well-being; (3) It is axiomatic (as well as a natural fact) that youth ever supplants old age—because youth is quicker, smarter, and better.

I want here to examine these reasons, to test the validity of each and logical the conclusions that follow them. I do not intend to demean youth—its vigor, intelligence, compassion, idealism, freshness. In fact, I admire

all of these traits, and would point out that all of us would do well to possess them for as long as we can. Certainly without youth and its power we would have no future and very little present. But it does seem that we should stop long enough to put things back in proper balance—the balance and order which evidently the Creator intended from the beginning and which held up for a surprisingly long time.

First, consider the claim that fifty percent of our population are under twenty-five. This proclamation, fact as it is, is supposed to foster at least equal voice in government, society, or whatever. Yet somehow it always comes out as a demand for the majority vote. Unfortunately, many of us failed math. (I must admit that here the youngsters have pulled the wool over the eyes of their elders—in this case they are assuredly quicker, smarter.) But the most that can be said in favor of this argument is that it is an excellent example of free-wheeling illogic.

It is true that fifty percent of Americans are under twenty-five. But approximately fifty percent of these are under fourteen, and one-half of those under fourteen are under nine. The last two categories are generally thought to be incompetent in national, even family affairs. Yet this is supposed to be the basis of fact supporting a demand for equal or superior authority.

But suppose the entire fifty percent of the population under twenty-five were between, say, eighteen and twenty-five. The argument would be more plausible, but not by much. It is still a fact that people in this age bracket are adolescents: adults in body and intellect, perhaps; but children in temperament and discretion; generally not capable of looking after their own best interests; quite obviously in need of leadership and direction.

This statistic waved so arrogantly before the advancing horde means only one thing: that there are more people now than ever before who need looking after—and sadly enough, more now than ever before who are not being looked after.

Second, there is the claim that the over-forty group—particularly those over sixty—have so fouled the world that it can never be right again. Some believe that the only solution is to tear down and build. Unfortunately, many have no immediate plans to build. But I must say that these extremists are in the minority.

Government studies indicate that the majority of adolescents prefer, and would defend, democracy—but only in the ideal. Here lies the problem. Perhaps the single most essential ingredient in social reform is patience. But that just happens to be the one virtue most markedly absent in adolescence.

The two or three generations preceding the present under twenty-five group did not do so bad:

They increased our life expectancy by about fifty percent;

Because of them we no longer have to fear epidemics—typhus, diphtheria, small pox, scarlet fever, and the like;

Because they were materialistic, we will work fewer hours, learn more, have more leisure now, travel to more distant places, and have more of a chance to follow our life's ambition;

They fought man's grisliest war. And when the tyranny of Hitler was defeated, they had the compassion to spend billions to help their former enemies rebuild their homeland;

They fought racial discrimination at every turn to usher in a new era in civil rights in 1954;

They made a start in healing the scars of the earth and in fighting pollution and the destruction of our natural resources (the word then was "conservation" not "ecology");

They built thousands of schools, trained

thousands of teachers and made higher education a real possibility for anyone who had the pluck to acquire it;

They survived history's greatest depression, learning first-hand what it means to be hungry and cold. Because of this, they determined it would not happen to us and it has not. The contrary is true: We have a better life, a warm home, wholesome food, and, in short, more than the necessities of life.

All this to say nothing of spectacular advances in technology and science. But the amazing thing is that in all this—in war, in economic miracles, in scientific prowess—they were able to remain humanitarian, to always find the golden mean between justice and mercy, accomplishment and humility.

In view of all this, I think I would say to the present younger generation: "You should do so well."

The third and final point for consideration is the axiom that "youth ever supplants old age." That this is true cannot successfully be denied. But it must be remembered that historically when youth supplants age, it is no longer youth—it itself has aged. This is the natural order, the logical order. And, I suspect, the Godly order.

No more terrible plight can befall a people than to be led by youth. Isalah, a man to this day respected by some, in describing the woes with which the nation of Israel was about to be cursed, said: (Isalah 3: 1-5):

"For, behold, the Lord, the Lord of hosts, doth take away from Jerusalem and from Judah the stay and the staff, the whole stay of bread, and the whole stay of water,

"The mighty man, and the man of war, the judge, and the prophet, and the prudent, and the ancient.

"The captain of fifty, and the honorable man, and the counsellor, and the cunning artificer, and the eloquent orator.

"And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them.

"And the people shall be oppressed, every one by another, and every one by his neighbour: the child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honourable."

That the elders rule and exercise authority is an eternal and universal truth built inextricably into the universe. Even in the Animal Kingdom, there are fathers and fledglings. And it's not so much a matter of chronology or longevity; it is a matter of experience and consequent wisdom and understanding. It is the logical, natural order.

But somehow this logical order has suffered a momentary collapse. And I suspect that many of us older folks are responsible for it:

(1) We are responsible for the lack of faith in people in influential and leadership positions; (2) We are guilty of relieved capitulation to the vagabond forces of the young; (3) we are victims as well as instigators of the general lack of morality and ethics, private and public. When I say "we" are responsible, I mean the home, the church, the government; professionals, businessmen, civic leaders, and especially educators—the announced moulders of society (or is it "molders"?).

As I see it, all of these agencies—particularly we educators—are involved in one way or another and are considerably to blame for hippies, yuppies, neo-nazis, or whatever—in short, all the groups we talk about with curiosity and fear.

I can tell you why. At least three reasons. First, simply because of personal and professional irresponsibility. We have wavered in our conviction of right and wrong. For instance, unsure of our own morality, we have tolerated and even condoned criminal activity—even on the part of high state officials—without raising an audible voice in protest or outrage. Pope said something like this:

Vice is a monster of such frightful mien,
That to be hated needs but to be seen;
But seen too often familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

We are dangerously near the hugging stage in our courtship with crime. If you think our bland tolerance of wrong-doing is not having its effect on youngsters, you're wrong. Tolerance is a good thing; but tolerance of the wrong things can get you in trouble.

Also, all of us, even those in leadership position, seem to lack enough moral conviction to take a positive stand on anything—to say "no" and mean it. But ultimately someone has to say "this is right and this is wrong" and mean it. It was indeed a sad day when we were conned into believing that nothing mattered in a world without any absolute values.

We have so concerned ourselves about treating people justly and fairly, that we have forgotten to treat "truth and right" with justice—even respect.

Second, we are responsible because we, of all people, have lost the ideal—the notion of perfection—the pursuit of excellence. We have become satisfied members of the cult of mediocrity. As a boy near Sand Mountain, I used to hear the expressions "a lick and a promise" or "a hit and miss"—indicating then rather jokingly that a job was not done very well. I have lived to see the day in which people do not laugh about that—it is a seriously guarded reality. A friend of mine, the young mayor of Luverne, told of taking his child to see the new addition to the original Methodist Church building which was built some fifty years ago. He asked the boy to compare the structures. The ten-year old noticed immediately that the new portion was aesthetically unattractive and already cracking and crumbling; he was impressed with the beauty and solidity of the older structure. His dad explained the difference: "The old one was built with pride and purpose."

How many people work because they like it? How many have combined avocation and vocation? I suspect that even some of you are teaching to pay for a color TV, or automobile, or something less noble than the teaching profession and the students deserve. Let me put it simply: If that is your purpose in teaching, do the world a favor and get out.

Third, we are responsible because we have dehumanized the system. Here again we educators—quite unfortunately—have confused values, worshipping at the altar of computers, forms, administrative red tape, and educational "experiments and studies" and have profaned the individual person. We are concerned with jobs and titles in our records and reports; fight rigorous battles to preserve our own bailiwicks; diligently attend conferences, seminars, meetings supposed to improve teaching skills; we build fancy marble buildings; furnish them with the damndest collection of mechanical spoofery ever known to man—and forget the person.

It is now possible for a student to attend four years of college and never see a teacher or anybody other than other student waifs—until his IBM card gets accidentally folded or crushed.

I saw a cartoon the other day which epitomizes the situation. On the teacher's podium was a tape recorder blurring out the lecture; on thirty student desks were thirty student tape recorders, taking it in. I don't know who gave the test.

If I were a teenager—if you were—and had any sense or sensitivity—you would be a drop-out, an addict, a "hippie," or worse.

You know, I was always told not to criticize unless I had some positive solutions to offer. Well, I do—nothing spectacular; merely fundamental truths as old as the hills.

The first is that we restore moral order and conviction to our personal and professional lives.

The second is that we accept responsibility cheerfully but that we do not seek it vainly.

The third is that we continuously reach for perfection in all things.

Fourth, we should follow only good leaders, those whose professional ability and moral code are of absolutely the highest calibre.

Fifth, we should be courageous—not afraid to try, of things new or old, of others, of success, of failure, of truth.

An old French proverb says: If youth but had the knowledge; if age but had the power. Our nation has unparalleled power in knowledge and energy. By adherence to these few suggestions, it seems to me that we could merge the knowledge of the aged with the energy of the young toward the mutual benefit of both.

HIGH TECHNOLOGY IN THE GOVERNMENT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Karl G. Harr, Jr., president of Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., recently published an article in the April 1972 issue of Professional Engineer. Mr. Harr in his thoughtful article points to the need of some form of cooperative endeavors between Government and industry to maintain sufficient research and development to assure that high technology products are developed and competitive in the world marketplace. Because of the importance of Mr. Harr's comments I am including them in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues and the general public:

HIGH TECHNOLOGY IN THE GOVERNMENT (By Karl G. Harr, Jr.)

For many years after World War II, the United States had the relatively easy task of competing with nations recovering from the effects of that war. As we exported goods, services, and technologies to help other nations get back on their feet, our domestic economy rolled along with constantly increasing momentum. Many of the goods sold abroad and most of the goods sold at home bore the label "Made in U.S.A." Our international economic policy was primarily devoted to the task of rebuilding the economies of war-devastated countries so that those governments could assume an increasing share of the burden of maintaining world peace.

Beginning in the 1950's, however, the pattern of world trade began to change. Slowly but steadily through the 1950's and 60's, our share of the free world market for goods and services decreased until now we are at a serious competitive disadvantage in many areas of international trade.

Not until the late 1960's did we begin to recognize the significance of what was taking place, and not until even more recently did we come to accept the fact that a coherent international economic strategy, with related domestic policies, is essential to the future growth of our own economy. We are in trouble in terms of balance of trade, and, over the short run at least, the situation is going to get worse. We also are falling behind the rest of the world significantly in capital rein-

vestment and, as a direct result our lack of capital growth, are suffering an extremely low increase in our rate of productivity. In fact, our increase is the lowest of any of the major industrial nations over the last five years.

Of the four basic trading commodities—agricultural products, raw materials, low technology items, and technology-intensive products—the only area in which we consistently have maintained a substantial trade surplus is the high-technology category. Now we are being confronted with increasingly aggressive and effective competition in the technology-intensive product area as well.

Although we have shown a surplus on the order of \$9 billion annually in this category, and the growth rate of exports of such products averaged ten percent a year during the 1960's (reaching a high of \$22.6 billion in 1970), imports of technology-intensive products have increased at a much higher rate (24 percent annually), jumping from \$3 billion in 1964 to \$13 billion in 1970.

Furthermore, within the technology-intensive field, the aerospace industry is undergoing critical changes that are producing effects felt throughout the U.S. economy. It has entered a period requiring major readjustment to changing conditions, priorities, and markets. In considering the relationship of the aerospace industry to the total economy, it is clear that the industry's problems constitute an economic and historic phenomenon of the first magnitude rather than an ephemeral annoyance, the effects of which will subside as soon as the current economic uncertainties are clarified.

The current situation and the outlook for the immediate future appear bleak, and if unchecked, this trend will result in a severe loss to the nation's output. In both tangible and intangible ways, the industry's problems have broad implications at both the Federal and local levels.

Therefore, acts and decisions which will affect the future role of this economic force in national affairs, determining whether the industry continues to contribute at its fullest capacity to the economic well-being of the nation or declines to the point where its potential cannot be realized, must be based on an accurate perspective.

The effect of changes in world trading patterns on the transport aircraft industry demonstrate the critical relationship of the industry to the U.S. balance of trade. The United States has dominated the world civil aircraft market, producing about 80 percent of the aircraft flown by free-world commercial airlines today. In the period 1965 to 1970, there was an aerospace trade surplus of nearly \$10 billion, of which jet transports were a major part. Today significant challenges are being mounted in Western Europe and, to a lesser extent, in Japan. Further, it is possible that Russia, with such aircraft as the supersonic TU-144, will succeed in its determined effort to penetrate markets we have dominated in the past.

Figures for technology-intensive aerospace exports alone, spanning ten years, are interesting:

In 1961 the United States exported \$28.557 billion worth of goods and services. Aerospace products accounted for \$1.653 billion, or six percent, of the total. And in 1961 the favorable balance of trade for the U.S. was \$6.096 billion.

Last year, 1971, the U.S. exported \$43.555 billion worth of goods, and aerospace products accounted for \$4.196 billion, or 9.6 percent, of the total.

But in 1971 the overall U.S. balance of trade was an unhealthy minus \$2.047 billion—the first negative trade balance for this industrial nation since 1888.

In other words, over a ten-year period the overall U.S. balance of trade declined by some

\$8.1 billion, while the aerospace segment of that trade increased from \$1.501 billion to \$3.863 billion—a net gain of \$2.362 billion.

As noted, U.S. commercial jet transports have been one of our most successful and profitable export products during recent years. We have dominated the free-world market. However, looking ahead, we can see the end of this dominance and, indeed, a reversal of the picture, unless we take some immediate actions to develop new transports to compete with those currently being developed abroad. We are not under immediate threat in the field served by wide-bodied, long-range commercial jets—the B747, DC10, L1011—and the other medium- and long-range jets that preceded them. But where are we in the development of transports larger and smaller than these aircraft?

We scrapped our supersonic transport aircraft project, relinquishing this inevitable market to the British/French combine and to the Russians. We are woefully behind in developing short takeoff and landing (STOL) aircraft and an air bus to serve the majority of air passengers who travel only 250 to 500 miles per trip.

The free-world jet transport market between 1974 and 1985 has been estimated at \$148 billion, half of which will be represented by purchases by U.S. carriers. This figure is in current dollars and assumes a five percent annual increase in costs due to inflation and product improvement. There are three general market areas—long range, including the SST; medium range, including twin engine airbuses; and short range including vertical and short takeoff and landing aircraft.

If the U.S. decided to be competitive in all three categories, it is estimated that it would capture 90 percent of the long-range market, 80 percent of the medium-range market, and 70 percent of the short-range market. If the U.S. does not compete, the potential loss of business has been estimated at \$77 billion. This translates into 1,479,000 man-years of lost employment, a \$29.6 billion loss in payrolls, and the loss of nearly \$10.6 billion in Federal income taxes.

The impact on the aircraft balance of trade is equally drastic. By 1976 the positive balance we now enjoy in aerospace exports will become negative, and in 1985 the negative balance will be an estimated \$4.5 billion. The cumulative negative balance of trade in aerospace products during the period will reach a total of \$18.3 billion.

Each of the potentially competitive foreign nations—Great Britain, France, West Germany, Italy, Canada, and Japan—has taken a number of positive steps toward obtaining a substantial share of the lucrative commercial aircraft market. In Canada, for example, companies receive grants equal to 25 percent of capital expenses on research and development. In addition, they can receive government payments of up to 50 percent of the cost of individual R&D projects. In Britain, companies can write off as much as 100 percent of their investment in new production facilities in the year they are made. German companies receive special tax write-offs of up to 50 percent of corporate research and development investment, plus a ten percent cash investment subsidy. These are examples of the planned aggressiveness being demonstrated by the governments of our principal competitors in the aerospace field.

In addition to these forms of indirect government assistance, direct subsidies are being provided by foreign governments for high cost, high export market potential programs—notably, commercial aircraft. For example, Western European governments are investing about \$4 billion in four major commercial aircraft programs aimed at a near-term market of \$30 billion. Favored by such subsidies are the British/French Concorde

SST (which is totally financed by the governments involved) and the A-300B Airbus, the Dassault Mercure 2, and the VFW-614 (which are receiving direct support of 85, 66, and 80 percent, respectively, from the committed governments). These programs are largely oriented toward export rather than toward the domestic markets of the countries involved, and all count on making major inroads in the market that the U.S. heretofore has dominated.

The compelling reason why these aircraft are being developed by our foreign competitors is that there are no competitive types being built in the United States; nor under present circumstances does it appear likely that we will be building competitive models in the near future.

There is one reason and one reason only why U.S. manufacturers are not competing and that is the lack of adequate financial resources. The U.S. aerospace industry still has superior technology, the management skills, adequate plant capacity, a highly skilled labor force, and the other essential ingredients for successful competition. However, it does not have the corporate financial resources that would be required, nor are these monies available in the private money market. The cost of long lead-time development and production before an advanced commercial aircraft can be sold in the marketplace and can begin to return money on the initial investment is not attractive to individuals or institutions engaged in investment of capital.

Clearly some form or forms of cooperative endeavor between Government and industry will be required to maintain the R&D level needed to develop and improve our high technology products and keep them competitive in the world marketplace.

The United States no longer is an unchallenged industrial giant whose great natural resources and leadership in the development and exploitation of materials, products, and processes renders it preeminent in high-technology areas. There is no panacea for the correction of current deficiencies in our international economic position or for the reversal of the deteriorating trend in our balance of trade. Instead, high-priority, multifaceted cooperative effort by the Government—both the legislative and executive branches—and by industry, labor, the financial community, and the public will be required.

One essential ingredient would be a clearly stated national objective of achieving a surplus balance of trade in a competitive international market by eliminating artificial controls, either foreign or domestic. Another essential move would be to develop and implement a coherent international economic strategy with related domestic economic policies to achieve the objective of a surplus balance of trade.

But the soundest of economic objectives and the most enlightened of supporting policies will not return the United States to a surplus position on the balance sheet of international trade if we do not have newer and better products to sell. This means that we must dedicate significant effort now to research and development, and it will take positive policy actions by the Government to restore the lost technological momentum in the United States and in the aerospace industry.

The sooner we recognize the fact that advanced technology is the foundation upon which all else rests, and the sooner we take the necessary steps to ensure that we remain competitive, at least in such high-technology areas as aerospace, the better chance we will have to support our economy, our essential social programs, and our standard of living in this fast-changing world.

MENTALLY ILL CHILDREN

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most forgotten segments of the American population is the mentally ill child.

We do not like to think about mental illness, and mental illness in children is even more unacceptable. But the fact remains that there are about 4 million children under the age of 18 with behavioral disorders of whom 1.4 million are in acute need of psychiatric care. Of these only 473,000 receive even minimal attention.

It is time to open our eyes to the needs of these children. It is time to take care of them.

Judith Randal wrote an article for the May 25 Washington Star entitled "Arthur Bremer and Mental Health." She points to the fact that:

The Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children concluded in its 1969 report that there is not a single community in this country which provides an acceptable standard of service for emotionally disturbed youth.

What has been the response of the Federal Government to this problem? An appropriation of only \$10 million for fiscal year 1972 and no money at all for the first 2 years President Nixon was in office. The same \$10 million appropriation is called for next year—no increase at all. And of that \$10 million all but \$2 million will be needed for continuing a few programs in existence now. It seems a strange priority to spend an extra \$5 billion on the escalation of the Vietnam war but only \$10 million to help some very sick children.

The article follows:

ARTHUR BREMER AND MENTAL HEALTH

(By Judith Randal)

Arthur H. Bremer, so his relatives and acquaintances in Milwaukee recall, was just another quiet kid, although some comment additionally that he was so quiet it was noticeable. The quietness, they say, sort of stuck out.

Looking back on it now, one might say he was not much different in type from Sirhan B. Sirhan and Lee Harvey Oswald.

Like them too, he had come to the attention of psychiatrists and guidance counselors in his younger days, but little or no treatment followed their diagnoses.

Today, Oswald is dead, felled by another assassin's bullet less than 24 hours after he fired the shots that killed John F. Kennedy. Sirhan is serving a life sentence in San Quentin, until recently under death sentence for the murder of Kennedy's brother Robert.

And Bremer is being held for trial on charges involving the shooting of Alabama Gov. George C. Wallace, who is paralyzed as a result of one of five bullets fired into him May 15 at Laurel, Md.

The frightening thing about quiet people like Bremer and Sirhan and Oswald is that there must be millions of them in the United States, holding their rage inside them until—lacking the safety valve most individuals have—they explode.

It happens more often than one might think, because it is only when the assassination of a prominent figure is attempted or a

mass killing is perpetrated by a Whitman or an Unruh that much attention is paid to the event, or for long.

Even more frightening is the fact that we have known about them for years. A 1930 White House Conference on Youth estimated that there were 2.5 million children with well-marked behavioral difficulties, and since then things have become worse.

There are now thought to be about 4 million such children under the age of 18, of whom 1.4 million are in acute need of psychiatric care, with only 473,000 receiving even minimal attention.

The Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children concluded in its 1969 report that there is not a single community in this country which provides an acceptable standard of service for emotionally disturbed youth.

Meanwhile, there have been the beginnings of a community mental health center movement in this country, but the Nixon administration has been openly hostile to the program, so that it has been only barely able to expand.

As a result, fewer than 400 of the some 2,000 centers that were projected have actually come into being and only about half of those in existence have the money or staff for the treatment of children and youth. Small wonder that the fastest-growing segment of the state and county mental hospital population consists of boys and girls aged 10 to 14. Their numbers are well over 55,000 now—more than double those of 1963.

Once in these warehouses, moreover, young patients frequently are housed with older inmates and get little beyond custodial care.

In many of the back wards of these institutions, there are people, 30, 40—even 50—who were admitted as children. There is nothing in the present situation to suggest that today's juvenile residents of such mental hospitals won't share the same fate.

In fact, one state estimates that 25 percent of the youngsters admitted to its mental hospitals "can anticipate being permanently hospitalized for the next 50 years of their lives."

To be sure, there are in a few places in this country private residential treatment centers which offer excellent care. But they, of necessity, charge \$50 to \$75 a day and collectively can accommodate only 10,000 children a year. Even in the face of high costs, for every child admitted to such a center, 10 are turned away.

So-called state training schools are a poor alternative. One expert has described them as "crime hatcheries, where children are tutored in crime if they are not assaulted by other inmates or the guards first."

Another told a Senate committee several years ago that these "correctional" institutions turn out "a finely honed weapon against society."

Mike Gorman, executive director of the National Committee Against Mental Illness, to whom this columnist is indebted for most of the factual material presented here, points out that in a period when the government has provided a \$250 million loan to Lockheed, hundreds of millions of dollars to keep the Penn Central Railroad afloat, and billions for highway construction, only \$62 million has been authorized for a three-year period to start children's units in community mental health centers.

In the first two years of the Nixon administration, not a penny of this actually was appropriated, and for the third fiscal year—the one that ends June 30—only \$10 million will have been spent.

The federal budget calls for the same niggardly amount for next year, of which all but about \$2 million will be needed for continuing the few programs already in existence.

All in all, it is a pretty sad commentary, not only on the nation's priorities, but also on a President who pledged during his early days in office "to provide all American chil-

dren an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development in the first five years of life."

COMMENCEMENT CONVOCATION, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the American people are becoming justifiably alarmed at the excess of sympathy and protection given the criminal and the minimum amount of sympathy and protection given the victim of the criminal.

Perhaps no one has placed the rights of the criminal and his victim in a better and fairer perspective than has the great philosopher, teacher, and writer, currently a professor of philosophy at New York University, Dr. Sidney Hook. The following remarks given by Dr. Hook at the commencement convocation at the University of Florida on December 11, 1971.

The remarks follow:

COMMENCEMENT CONVOCATION, UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

One of the great paradoxes of our time is that as the danger of major international wars recedes and the standard of living rises, the level of domestic violence and crime increases at a frightening rate. We need not rehearse the statistics that confirm the observations and experiences of concerned and intelligent citizens throughout the nation, especially of those who live in or visit our chief metropolitan centers.

Accompanying this increase in violence and crimes of violence has been an impressive, sympathetic concern—some have unfairly called it a preoccupation—with the human and civil rights of criminals and of those accused of crime. Judicial opinions as well as academic treatises on criminology reveal a growing and thoughtful sensitivity to the possibility that the procedures by which defendants in criminal cases are booked and tried, and the evidence against them evaluated, may lead to the miscarriage of justice. Legal practices that were once accepted without any qualms and doubts at a time when the Bill of Rights was adopted to safeguard the basic liberties of the people against possible tyranny of the state, practices that endured far into the 20th century, have been discarded in recent years in consequence of new, ostensibly more enlightened readings or interpretations of our constitutional rights.

There are those who maintain that the alarming increase in crimes of violence is a direct consequence of the liberal modifications of our arrest and indictment procedures, of Supreme Court decisions that allegedly have shackled the law enforcement authorities and resulted in an ever larger number of recidivists or repeaters among criminal defendants. However, such an inference may be a case of *post hoc propter hoc*. Causal questions in human affairs are notoriously difficult to resolve because of the number of variables involved. Striking correlations are not always evidence of the causal connections. For the purposes of our analysis, it is not necessary either to reject or accept the view—asserted by some with great confidence—concerning the influence of court decisions on criminal behavior. We suspend judgment about the causes of the increase in crimes of violence. We take our point of departure only from the indisputable fact that the marked and alarming increase in domestic violence has occurred.

What I propose to do is to raise some fundamental questions about the basic ethical and jurisprudential issues involved. Why should we as citizens be concerned with the human and legal rights of persons accused of breaking the law? Why should we seek to liberalize the processes of law enforcement by raising protective hedges around such persons by making their conviction more difficult?

The answers summarize a library of literature. First, over and above any considerations of humanitarianism, we wish to avoid the danger of convicting the accused on the basis of plausible evidence, who in ultimate fact may be innocent. Second, even if we do not make the presumption of innocence, there is a good reason why we should want to defend and extend the rights of those accused of crime. For hard as it may be for us to imagine, someday we ourselves may be in the dock facing criminal charges of one kind or another. The quirks of fate or hazard of fortune or the hidden purpose of providence—call it what you will!—have caught up even the most strait-laced and proper individuals in tragic and violent situations, as bizarre as they were unexpected. And not all of them have been crimes of passion. There is a perennial and humbling wisdom in the Puritan admonition to his son witnessing a wretch being dragged to the gallows: "There but for the Grace of God go I!" Both Goethe and Tolstoy have acknowledged that there is no crime in the calendar of human folly and bestiality which in some situations they could not conceive themselves committing. And if we pride ourselves on our own immunity from temptation, it may testify not so much to our incorruptibility, as to our lack of imaginative power.

This is the case for the rights of the criminal or the person accused of crime—and a powerful case it is. But before we bring in judgment we must perform an act of imaginative identification much simpler and more natural, and that is with ourselves as victims of crimes of violence. Granted that I am a potential criminal, I am also a potential victim of crime. The statistics of mounting violence show that cases of murder, non-negligent manslaughter and forcible rape have skyrocketed. It has been estimated that in large metropolitan centers, the risk of becoming the victim of a serious crime has more than doubled in the last decade. Since many crimes of violence are committed by repeaters, the likelihood of my becoming a victim of crime is much greater than the likelihood of my becoming a criminal. Therefore, the protection of my legitimate rights not to be mugged, assaulted or murdered looms much larger in my mind than my legitimate rights as a criminal defendant.

Let us be clear about some things that have become obscure in virtue of our legitimate concern with the rights of criminals and those accused of crime. The potential victim has at least just as much a human right not to be violently molested, interfered with and outraged as the person accused of such crimes has to a fair trial and a skillful defense. As a citizen, most of the rights guaranteed me under the Bill of Rights become nugatory if I am hopelessly crippled by violence, and all of them become extinguished if I am killed. The rights of victims are recognized in some legal jurisdictions which compensate them for disasters in which they become involved through no fault of their own. In England, it has been suggested that the assets of apprehended criminals who have committed capital crimes be distributed to the dependents of their victims. But my point here is that this emerging legal right of the victim is dependent upon the prior recognition of his moral right not to be victimized by the lawbreaker.

No matter how we seek to escape from

acknowledging it, there is a direct conflict between the rights of the criminal and of persons accused of crime and the rights of their past and potential victims. In some classes of cases it is clear that the greater the right of the person accused of crime, the less the right of his future victim. For example, the right of a person out on bail for a crime of violence, to receive bail when he is charged with committing the same type of violent offense, and to be granted bail even when he is charged with committing the offense a third time—a right which he legitimately claims since he has not yet been found guilty of the first offense—conflicts head on with the rights of his victims who can legitimately claim that they suffered this violence because the person at bar enjoyed his constitutional right to be free on bail. Those who fail to see this do not understand the nature of moral decision. A moral decision is not a choice between good and bad, right or wrong—this represents no moral choice but summarizes the complete moral judgment!—but between good and good, right and right, good and right. They also fail to see that this conflict of rights is expressed in our very Bill of Rights in which the free exercise of religion conflicts with the principle of separation of state and church, and in which the right to a free press conflicts with the right to a fair trial. They therefore fail to understand the law-making powers of the Supreme Court, some of whose Justices in the past deceived themselves with the absurd view that the rights of the Bill of Rights are absolute and cannot be abridged under any circumstances. If rights conflict they obviously cannot all be absolute!

Why has this conflict between the rights of the potential criminals and the rights of the potential victims not been previously recognized? Among the reasons undoubtedly has been the fact that in all periods when the rights of criminals and those accused of crime were being recognized the incidence of violent crime was, relative to preceding periods, declining. Where crime was rife, the human rights of those accused of crime were hardly recognized or ruthlessly sacrificed on the altar of law and order. The recognition and appreciation of the human rights of criminals and those accused of crimes go back a long way, as the right of sanctuary in Biblical times indicates. When crime became a mass phenomenon, however, these rights were honored more in the breach than in the observance.

How, then, should we resolve the conflict between the rights of the criminally accused and the rights of the potential victims? I submit that at the present juncture of events because our cities have become more dangerous to life and limb than the darkest jungle we must give priority to the rights of potential victims. I am prepared to weaken the guarantees and privileges to which I am entitled as a potential criminal or as a defendant in order to strengthen my rights and safeguards as a potential victim. Purely on the basis of probabilities, I am convinced that I run a greater danger of suffering disaster as a potential victim than as a potential criminal or defendant. It is these probabilities, that shift from one historical period to another, that must be the guide to wise, prudent and just administration of the law.

Actually, although the protection of the rights in the Bill of Rights has been extended by the court to state jurisdictions of criminal law, originally they were intended to curb primarily the violation of political rights by the Federal government. The judicial legislation that reinterpreted and extended these guarantees to hold for criminal defendants in state courts was in large measure certainly justified because of changes in social needs and the development of more humane attitudes. But today, a

humane concern for the increasing number of victims of violent crimes requires a reinterpretation, another emphasis. When we read that preventive detention at the discretion of the judge by denial of bail to repeated offenders charged with extremely violent crimes is denounced by ritualistic liberals as a betrayal of elementary justice, as smacking of the concentration camps of Hitler and Stalin; when we read that a person jailed for the death of 12 persons is freed from jail and the case against him dismissed because the prosecution's only evidence against him was a voluntary confession to the police who had failed to inform him of his rights; when we read that a man who murdered one of three hostages he had taken had a record of 25 arrests ranging from armed robbery to aggravated assault and battery and that at the time of his arrest was free on bail awaiting grand jury action on charges in five separate cases in a two-month period preceding the murder; when we read that a man whose speeding car had been stopped by a motorcycle policeman who without a search warrant forced him to open his trunk that contained the corpses of a woman and two children, walks out of court scot-free because the evidence is ruled inadmissible—we can only conclude that the law is an ass.

The true wisdom of the law consists in recognizing the conflict of rights and adjudicating the conflict by a decision that strengthens the whole structure of rights in the community. At a time when crime is rife, if the proof of a grave crime like murder is incontestable on the basis of evidence that may be tainted because the law enforcement officers disregarded the niceties of procedure, then legal action should be taken against these officers by the state or by the defendant rather than giving in effect a grant of immunity to a murderer.

We wish to reduce the role of violence in human affairs without sacrificing the principles of justice. The extension of the privileges against self-incrimination to absurd lengths by justices who abandoned common sense in a desire to establish a reputation for liberalism has no parallel in any other national legal jurisdiction. To elicit relevant testimony it has required legislation that has enabled some criminal defendants to purchase an undeserved immunity from punishment for very serious crimes. . . . Only a sociological mad-hatter would say that the fear of a nuclear holocaust is almost as serious a problem as the threat of one, or the fear of the population explosion as dangerous as the pressure of unrestricted growth.

Let us have done with extremists who would mindlessly substitute either toughness or permissiveness for intelligence in their simplistic response to the mounting crime wave. A fruitful way to begin the quest for intelligent solutions is to reorient our thinking in the current period to the rights of the potential victims of crime, and to the task of reducing their number and suffering. In this way we can best serve the interests both of justice and compassion.

McGEE FEELS LET DOWN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the Senate again voted in favor of a law which permits a small number of American mineral concerns to import Rhodesian chrome ore. This

breaks the United Nations sanctions against the illegal Smith regime and violates the U.N. Charter.

The vote was close—40 to 36—with only 10 members of the minority party voting to uphold our obligation under the U.N. Charter. In the June 5 edition of the Washington Post, the respected columnist, Mr. William Raspberry, questions whether the administration really wants our country to meet its obligation on this issue or whether it is only giving "lip service" to the cause.

Next week, on June 13 and 15, the Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements, which I chair, will conduct public hearings. The subject will be the effectiveness of sanctions as a tool of enforcement in the United Nations. In view of our now blemished record in upholding the embargo against Rhodesia, the subcommittee will reexamine our Government's role in this affair.

Mr. Raspberry's article follows:

McGEE FEELS LET DOWN

(By William Raspberry)

Sen. Gale W. McGee (D-Wyo.) lost his fight, and as a result the United States will continue its economic support of Rhodesia, which ranks next to South Africa as the most notorious white-supremacist regime in the world.

The specific support involved is the importation here of Rhodesian chrome ore, despite a United Nations embargo against it.

Following last Wednesday's Senate vote, in which McGee's anti-Rhodesia amendment to the State Department authorization bill lost in a 40 to 36 vote, McGee blasted the White House for "lying down on the job" and giving only "lip service" to the issue.

It was an uncharacteristically bitter outburst for the senator, who has been a supporter of President's Nixon's foreign policy.

The major source of the bitterness was McGee's feeling that he had been let down the White House garden path.

McGee already had lost a major fight on the issue when it first came up last fall. That fight was against an amendment offered by Sen. Harry F. Byrd Jr. (D-Va.) to the military procurement bill taking away the President's authority to ban imports of Rhodesian chrome so long as the United States was importing chrome from any communist country.

Last week's fight was an effort to repeal the Byrd amendment and put the U.S. in compliance with the United Nations embargo.

"Hell, he wouldn't have tried it the second time if he hadn't been given to understand that he would have strong White House support this time," a McGee aide said after the vote. "It doesn't help anything to lose twice in a row."

McGee had been led to expect strong administration support.

As a matter of fact, it was primarily at the urging of the State Department that McGee tried it again last week. There was State Department testimony in support of the McGee position a week before the final vote.

But the day before the vote, when McGee saw that there was the clear possibility that he would lose, he called on the White House for help, pointing out that he had six Republican senators, who had said they would vote with him if they got a call from the White House.

Although the White House had given verbal support to what McGee was attempting, the call never came. McGee lost by four votes.

In the days since the vote, there have been persistent rumors that the White House may even have given support to the other side.

McGee's staff won't go that far, but at least one Capitol Hill aide said that Sen. Robert Dole (Kan.), GOP national chairman, had made several phone calls urging support of the Byrd amendment.

"Bob Dole wouldn't do that without a go-ahead from the White House," the aide said. The administration's apparent change of heart isn't the only disappointment in this affair.

McGee hasn't had much to say about it, but he clearly is disappointed that there was so little support for his stand from black people.

A campaign by blacks to bring pressure on a handful of swing-vote senators could easily have made the difference between victory and defeat.

But the pressure never came.

The issue was raised, all right, during the

three-day African Liberation activities the weekend before the vote. Rep. Charles Diggs (D-Mich.), one of the participants in the African Liberation Day observance made specific reference to the issue.

But no one bothered to do anything to translate general support of what McGee was attempting into a specific, pragmatic campaign.

As a result, no one—either in the Senate or in the White House—felt any political heat. And the White House was free to do what it did.

Sadder still, there is no reason to suppose that any of those who permitted it to happen will be called to political account for it. Another foreign policy decision affecting black Africa has been made without any concern for the sensibilities of black Americans, and business goes on as usual.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 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 over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?