Baird, Dale L.
Barineau, Richard L.
Barron, Bonie P.
Baseley, Jacque A.
Belville, Arthur J., Jr.
Bergeron, Joseph W., Sr.
Birren, James M.
Bolles, Elmer S.
Brakowiecki, Laurence R.
Brewington, Robert E.
Broughton, Frankie D.
Bryant, Edward L.
Carr, Jay S., II
Carr, William W.
Carter, Wallace M.
Cheely, Benjamin L.
Collins, Melvin
Condrey, Jimmy W.
Corbett, Edward F.
Critzer, Roger A.
Cuddy, Raymond S., Jr.
Curry, Carl R.
Day, Lawrence M.
Dolphin, John J.
Donelow, Robert L.
Dowell, Frederick L.
Dunbar, George H.
Eckman, George M.
Egbert, Carroll F., Jr.
Eldredge, Frederick R., Jr.
Estey, Howard E.
Faircloth, Jeris L.
Farr, Roland C.
Fitzgerald, Joseph T., Jr.
Flowers, Percy
Ford, Billy J.
Geer, Robert W.
Giger, John R.
Griffin, Charles L.
Gwinn, Robert P.
Halburnt, James C.
Haley, Dale A.
Hallbick, Larry J.
Harkless, James J.
Harpe, Charles W.
Hashagen, Donald J.
Hastings, Sidney T.
Heatley, George
Hicks, Robert
Hinchliffe, Herbert C.
Hinman, Rex L.
Howard, Sylvester
Hunnicutt, Thomas
Hurst, Charles E.
Jackson, Albert P.
Jenkins, Robert
Jiminez, Francis
Johnson, John W.
Johnson, Robert B.
Jordan, Robert T.
Justis, Forest W.
Kidd, Arthur J.
Kiker, Meek C.
Kingry, Thomas E.
Kistler, Ernest J.
Kolek, David L.
Ledford, William H.
Liebl, Luitpold J.
Lile, Brian K.
Loy, Lloyd L.
Luchansky, George J.
Lundberg, Frank C.
Lynch, John F.
Machado, Louis E.
Mannix, James W.
Mattox, Chester C.
McDuffie, Don C.
Meagher, Gregory F., Jr.
Mouton, Joseph
Newman, Billy R.
Palmquist, Charles J.
Parrish, John W.
Payne, Walter A., Sr.
Scroggy, Gene A.
Seagroves, Ronald G.
Sellers, Walter S.
Sherry, Guy R.
Smiley, Perry
Snodgrass, Nathaniel L.
Spangler, Tommy L.
Surles, Charles T.
Thompson, Leon R.
Vaughn, James
Vessey, Arnold F.
Webster, Lawrence E.
Whipple, William L.
White, Llewellyn S.
Whitehead, Otis J.
Widenhouse, Robert W.
Williams, Robert G.
Wilson, Eugene S.
Witham, Merton T.
Wolf, Donald E.
Young, Paul M., Jr.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND; INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION & DEVELOPMENT; INTERAMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK; AND ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

George P. Shultz, of Illinois, for appointment to the offices indicated:

U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years and U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years.

A Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years; and

U.S. Governor of the Asian Development Bank.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Carroll G. Brunthaver, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, vice Clarence D. Palmby, resigned.

Carroll G. Brunthaver, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, vice Clarence D. Palmby, resigned.

BOARD OF PAROLE

Maurice H. Sigler, of Nebraska, to be Member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1978. Mr. Sigler is now serving in this position under an appointment which expires September 30, 1972.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## A STUDY OF THE RUSSIAN NAVY

### HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD a study on the Russian Navy by Michael MccGwire, a former commander in the British Navy and naval attaché in Moscow. The title of this study is "Soviet Naval Capabilities and Intentions."

I would like to summarize some of the main points of this report. First, Mr. MccGwire says the West has given the Russians propaganda advantages by overstating the threat in the Mediterranean. The author speculates that this may have been done to create myths similar to the bomber and missile gaps for the purpose of expediting funds through Congress. Mr. MccGwire states that—

By ignoring the "most likely course of enemy action," and by concentrating our attention solely on some hypothetical "worst case," based on a rather flattering estimate of Soviet naval capabilities and an implied absence of Western reaction, we undermine our own maritime credibility while encouraging the Soviet Union to develop a taste for sea power, and to fulfill our most gloomy prophesies.

The basic strategy of the Soviet Naval forces is the "Young School" concept adopted in the early thirties of only defending their maritime frontiers and not ruling the waves. The first two tasks of the Soviet Navy are:

1. Countering the Polaris submarine.
2. To neutralize the strike attack aircraft carriers prior to aircraft launch.

The main defense areas are the Baltic and Black Seas. It was from these areas that the Western Powers intervened by sea in an attempt to crush the revolution. Then in 1957 the United States introduced the A3D aircraft on our aircraft carriers in the Eastern Mediterranean. Since these planes could reach Russia's industrial areas the Russians felt they had to counter our carriers in the Mediterranean for defensive purposes. When we later put Polaris submarines in the Mediterranean this gave them another reason to be there. Mr. MccGwire illustrates this by saying:

The greatly increased range of sea-borne strategic weapons has meant that the eastern basin of the Mediterranean is now in many ways of greater defensive concern to the Soviet Union than her northern seas. Moscow is equidistant between the two, but whereas population and industry thin out to the north of the capital, to its south and east lies the greater part of Russia's industrial strength. It seems probable that the 1963 announcement that Polaris submarines were taking up station in the Mediterranean, caused the Soviet Navy to advance its plans to project a naval presence in the area.

This is a classical case of the spiraling arms race.

Concerning the value of our huge carriers, Mr. MccGwire says:

As sufficient nuclear submarines armed with horizon-range missiles become available for the task, it seems likely that Western strike carriers will be marked wherever they may be.

It is the belief of many naval experts that the aircraft carrier is now obsolete due to the cruise missile. The new Russian C class cruise missile system would be very dangerous against carriers, because of its submerged launch, supersonic speed, and surface-skimming trajectory.

But once out of the Russian frontier area, Mr. MccGwire feels Soviet capabilities fall off:

The Soviet Navy does not have the capacity to sustain general naval operations in a hostile maritime environment at a distance from Russia's shores. The Soviet Union currently lacks a worldwide maritime capability.

I ask unanimous consent that the study be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOVIET NAVAL CAPABILITIES AND INTENTIONS

(By Michael MccGwire)

Most qualified opinion is in fact agreed on the essentially defensive requirements which caused the Soviet Union to develop its present naval capability, although there is a wider range of opinion as to where this may lead them in the future. All are also agreed that, irrespective of its genesis, growing Soviet naval strength presents a potential threat to Western interests, which must be countered. But starting from these points of agreement, opinion then divides into two broad groups. There are those who see the greatest danger to the West, in a democracy's reluctance to provide adequate resources to long-term defence in peacetime, and who therefore tend to formulate the threat in extreme terms, both of military capability and aggressive intentions, in order to frighten the politicians into releasing adequate funds to naval defence. And there are others who consider that more certain damage to Western interests has been, and will be caused by alarmist assessments (however worthy their motives) which exaggerate Russian maritime capabilities and ignore the considerable constraints which limit the flexible employment of Soviet naval forces.

I hold unreservedly to this latter opinion, and it is not because I under-rate the very real threat to Western interests which is implicit in Soviet naval strength nor because I am persuaded of their friendly intentions. My reasons are twofold. Firstly, experience as a long-range planner has shown me the dangers of 'fiddling the factors' in order to produce some predetermined conclusion, and how in the long run it always rebounds to one's disadvantage; in formulating a threat which will persuade the politicians, we run the risk of obscuring our own perception of the real danger to Western maritime interests, and at the same time we are likely to distort our wider foreign policy assessments. And secondly, I have watched the way in which alarmist, and frequently ill-informed Western comment has brought Russia political benefits, which the Soviet Navy could never have achieved on its own.

Over the last three years, there has been a marked and substantial shift in the Soviet Union's political exploitation of her navy's enforced forward deployment; this stems from the aftermath of the Arab-Israeli conflict in 1967, and the sudden and vociferous public awareness in the West, that Russia had a navy which went to sea. Western commentators delivered a substantial (and undeserved) propaganda success to the Russians by insisting that the Soviet naval presence must paralyse Western naval initiatives, by failing to distinguish between the widely varying combat capabilities of the Russian units in the Mediterranean, and by speaking of illusory 'massive naval reinforcements' during the June war (which on one occasion even included a water-tanker and an ice-breaker towing a patrol-craft). They then confirmed Russia's naval standing in Arab eyes, by ridiculing official Western statements which pointed to the exposed nature of these Soviet deployments, and to the vulnerability of individual units to Western attack. This alarmism may have been thought necessary to arouse a sense of concern in NATO, or to extract funds from a reluctant US Congress, but it none the less provided the Russians with a detailed course on how to discomfort the West with the smallest diversion of resources; it has also given Soviet surface deployments a military credibility which is still largely spurious. It was most noticeable that, prior to June 1967, Russian deployments were primarily a navy-to-navy affair, with a relative disregard for the potential political benefits. The strategic reasons underlying these deployments have not changed, but since that date, naval visits have been increasingly used to reinforce the reputation which the West has gratuitously bestowed on the Soviet Navy.

In the late 1950s the Soviet Union derived substantial political benefits from the publicising by Western commentators of the mythical Bomber and Missiles Gaps, and the ease with which the West can still be induced to credit their opponents with an exaggerated military capability must be a source of continuing gratification to Soviet leaders. It conceals their technological inadequacies from critical world opinion, and allows them to make retrospective claims to have influenced the outcome of events in situations where they have sat by helpless, as selfishly worried spectators. It is significant that well into 1968, the Russians remained understandably silent about their negative contribution to the outcome of the June war, concentrating their propaganda on linking the presence of the US Sixth Fleet with the Israeli attack; but by 1969, the Soviets were emboldened to play back the West's more alarmist assessments, and now claimed that it was the Russian naval presence which saved the Arabs from imperialist intervention in 1967.

As with Soviet naval capabilities, so with their intentions, and they are only too happy that the West should concentrate on the former and assume the worst of the latter. By causing the West to over-estimate both her belligerency and her naval strength, the Soviet Union hopes to encourage inaction and acquiescence when otherwise the West might thwart her plans. She has not lacked support and from the start Western Jeremiahs have insisted that the mere presence of Soviet naval units, irrespective of their real or relative capability, must inevitably inhibit the West's reaction. The effect of these exaggerations is to obscure the limited nature of the Soviet Union's physical commitment outside the boundaries of the Warsaw Pact, and to induce a quite unjustified belief in both her capability and her readiness to use force. There is a perverse community of interest between Russia's desire to obscure her naval inadequacies and the West's concern to guard against overcomplacency. Naturally enough, the Soviet Union welcomes the Western amplifier which is now plugged into her naval propaganda machine, whose authoritative voice helps to compensate for the sometimes glaring shortfall between her words and deeds.

It is of course a distorted form of realism which insists that we must ignore our opponent's intentions. While it is proper to concentrate on capabilities in contingency planning or at the theatre-tactical level, such an approach is wholly inappropriate as the basis of policy formulation at the politico-strategic level. A country's national interests, intentions and essential defence requirements are equally important factors in the threat equation and to exclude these constraints on Soviet action, must inevitably distort Western maritime policy and inhibit the effective use of our naval superiority. By ignoring the 'most likely course of enemy action', and by concentrating our attention solely on some hypothetical 'worst case', based on a rather flattering estimate of Soviet naval capabilities and an implied absence of Western reaction, we undermine our own maritime credibility while encouraging the Soviet Union to develop a taste for sea power, and to fulfill our most gloomy prophesies.

I make no apologies for this digression before getting down to the details of the paper, because Russian intentions are a function of Western political will and the extent to which Soviet maritime policy is shaped by the West's naval preponderance and by the nature of our response at sea, is inadequately understood. I will come back to this fundamental point, which should become clearer as we turn to consider the development of Soviet naval policy since the war, and gain a better idea of the changing requirements they have had to meet. This background knowledge is fundamental to analysing the present capabilities of their forces.

THE STRATEGIC THREAT FROM CARRIERS

By 1957–58, the Soviet Navy realized that it had been geographically and technologically outflanked. The US Navy's A3D carrier-borne aircraft could reach Russia's industrial areas from the South Norwegian Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean; the US Navy's nuclear submarines were of much higher performance than the Soviet classes due to begin delivery; the US Navy was also establishing an anti-submarine area-defense system off its seaboard which would largely neutralise the Soviet strategic delivery units; the US. Navy's *Polaris* would pose an additional strategic threat.

The maritime threat to Russia was once more a national rather than a single service problem and the repercussions on naval building were considerable. Neither the missile-cruiser nor the SSG were of much use when the encounter-zone was beyond the range of shore-based air-cover, and all these programmes were cancelled. The relatively inferior performance of Soviet strategic delivery submarnes and the threat of nuclear strike by carrier aircaft combined to cause the reallocation of nuclear propulsion to what was now the top-priority task of countering the carrier. The second generation SSBN was cancelled and the hull/propulsion unit was configured as an SSGN, making use of the J-Class weapon systems. Meanwhile the Soviet Union misinterpreted the future scale and nature of the *Polaris* threat, and saw it as a complementary weapon system to close the Northern arc, where principles of area-defense could apply. The main requirement was to extend the range of helicopter operations, to achieve which two *Stalingrad* class (the *Sverdlov*-successor) cruiser hulls were adapted to build the *Moskva* Class anti-submarine cruiser. These were mainly interim measures, and the final answer had to await the third generation of nuclear submarines, which were projected at this time and due for delivery in 1968. These would include a nuclear missile system with a self-contained horizon-range missile system for use against the carrier and a much improved *Polaris* style SSBN. Meanwhile the Soviet Union adopted various other expedients such as basing W-Class submarines in Albania (1958) trying to set up a joint Sino-Soviet naval and air defense command (1957) and the stationing of intelligence units off the USA (1959).

THE INCREASED THREAT FROM POLARIS

By 1961, the Soviet Union had come to realise that the threat from *Polaris* was not limited to the Arctic, but that Western Russia was now threatened from 270° of arc, extending from the Indian Ocean through the Mediterranean to the Norwegian Sea, and that by the middle sixties, one third of the USA's nuclear strike capability would be seaborne. This generated a fundamental re-assessment of naval policy which is discussed further below, leading to the decision that some form of permanent counter must be deployed against both *Polaris* and the US carriers.

In 1962, the Soviet Navy was ill-prepared for this radical reorientation of policy, both operationally and in terms of the necessary ships to implement the concept. Although primary reliance was to be placed on submarines and naval air, surface ships would be required in support, but their only surface-to-air missile (SAM) armed destroyer-type (the *Kashin*) was programmed to build at a mere two units a year. To ameliorate the situation, they undertook the major conversion of eight of the older *Kotlin* Class destroyers, and six of the *Krupnyj* Class missile units, into SAM-armed anti-submarine ships. This gave these ships a weapons performance comparable to the *Kashin*, for delivery during the latter half of the sixties.

In the longer term, they were somewhat better placed. They were already committed to a three-fold increase in their nuclear submarine building capacity, with the third generation of submarines due to enter service in 1968–69. Meanwhile, in the normal course of events, a new family of surface ships was scheduled to begin delivery in 1970, and the design of the larger type could be ajusted to reflect these changed requirements.

THE SHIFT TO FORWARD DEPLOYMENT

The last eight years has seen the Soviet Navy's progressive shift to forward deployment, as it attempts to counter the strategic nuclear threat which can now be posed from sea-areas 2,000 miles or more from Russia's frontiers. Admiral Gorshkov has admitted that the change has not been easy, involving as it did the organic restructuring of the Navy and the reorientation of traditional naval policy and operational habits, in order to meet this qualitatively new requirement. The process still has some way to go, but the pattern of operations is now clear enough to identify the underlying concept of operations.

*Posing a permanent counter*. For the Soviet Union, the implications of the USA's shift to seaborne strategic strike systems went far beyond the intensification and diversification of an existing threat. Most serious was that naval units would largely escape the intercontinental nuclear exchange; the USA would therefore have the option of holding back their seaborne systems, in order to dictate the subsequent course of a general war. To foreclose this option, the Soviet Union had to provide for the destruction of these US naval units at the outbreak of war, irrespective of whether the effective reaction time would also be able to prevent the launch of strategic weapons. Since the destruction of all US units could not be guaranteed, the

Soviet Union would need to develop its own SSB force in order to ensure that the post-exchange nuclear balance was preserved.

In formulating an operational concept to meet these specialised requirements, Soviet naval leaders chose to exploit the particular characteristics of nuclear-missile war at sea; (it is likely that the alternative of trying to match the West's maritime capability was dismissed as impractical for both military and economic reasons). The Soviet Navy requires to destroy Western strike units at the outbreak of war. To do this, the Soviet Navy does not need maritime superiority, because their naval units deployed to this task have only to survive long enough to discharge their weapons; if they are already within weapon range of their opponent, the requirement is limited to surviving a preemptive attack. Meanwhile, the free use of the sea which has enabled the peacetime deployment of US strategic strike units within weapon range of the Soviet Union, means that the Russians are likewise free to maintain their own naval forces within weapon range of Western units.

This operational concept, which can be described as "posing a permanent counter under the protection of peace", underlies the extending pattern of Russian naval deployments since 1962, and points the way ahead. The decision to by-pass the basic naval requirement to be able to survive in a hostile environment, is particularly significant, and has allowed the Soviet Navy to base its future plans on the sustained mid-ocean support of units on forward deployment. It does not however reduce the vulnerability of such operations to interference from the West, and militarily, is only tenable in the context of mutual deterrence.

As a corollary of this concept, existing Soviet "zones of maritime defence" (which only reached 200-300 miles from Russian shores), were extended to cover the more vital sea areas of threat, such as the Norwegian Sea and the eastern Mediterranean. This served to contest the right of Western strike units to use these seas unhindered, while allowing the Soviet Navy to apply some of their established tactical concepts of anti-submarine area defence, in their efforts to counter *Polaris*.

*Countering the carrier.* Initially this involved the close shadowing of Western carriers whenever they approached to within strike range of the Soviet Union, in order to provide target location data to Soviet missile units, which remained permanently within weapon range. In the Norwegian Sea and Pacific the requirement could be met by sailing units as the need arose, but to counter the carriers of the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean, a continuous Soviet naval presence was necessary. In the longer term, as sufficient nuclear submarines armed with horizon-range missiles become available for the task, it seems likely that Western strike carriers will be marked wherever they may be. Irrespective of their current employment, as long as U.S. carriers carry nuclear weapons in their magazines, their potential threat remains.

*Countering the* Polaris *submarine.* The problem of posing a permanent counter to *Polaris* is of quite a different order, reflecting the difficulties of initial acquisition and remaining in contact with a nuclear submarine, as well as the vast areas of sea from which missiles can be launched against Russia, including the Mediterranean, the eastern Atlantic and the Arabian Sea, as well as parts of the Pacific. The range of methods adopted by the Soviet Union has yet to be fully perceived, but it appears that they are trying to develop some combination of continuous tracking and area defence. The problems are immense, and in most respects they are at a disadvantage to the U.S. Navy in this field. The Soviets lag both in nuclear submarine design and submarine detection systems, and are badly placed in terms of maritime geography. But limited prospects of success have never discouraged the Soviet Union from embarking on measures which she sees as essential to her national security, and there is little doubt that the Soviet Navy will continue to give priority to their efforts to counter *Polaris;* certainly, these provide the explanation for a large proportion of their distant deployments.

THE EXTENDING PATTERN OF SOVIET NAVAL OPERATIONS

The past decade of Soviet naval operations illustrates the progressive implementation of the long term operational concept. The appointment of Kasatanow to the C.-in-C. of the Northern Fleet in February 1962, was one of several indicators of the reorientation policy which appears to have been decided during 1961. Preliminary moves were made in 1962, but it was not until 1963-64 that the shift to forward deployment became more widely noticed. The initial areas of attention were those from whence both *Polaris* submarines and aircraft carriers could launch strikes against Russia; the eastern Mediterranean, the Norwegian Sea and equivalent areas in the Pacific. This was partly because the Soviet Navy already had some form of counter to deploy against the carriers, but also reflected their policy of trying to achieve a *de facto* extension of the Soviet Union's maritime frontiers, by maintaining a naval presence in those sea areas of most immediate defensive concern to Russia. After five years of steady if slow progress in these areas, the Soviet Navy turned its attention to the sea-route between the USA and the Mediterranean, and then to the Arabian Sea.

*The Mediterranean deployment.* The greatly increased range of seaborne strategic weapons has meant that the eastern basin of the Mediterranean is now in many ways of greater defensive concern to the Soviet Union than her northern seas. Moscow is equidistant between the two, but whereas population and industry thin out to the north of the capital, to its south and east lies the greater part of Russia's industrial strength.

It seems probable that the 1963 announcement that *Polaris* submarines were taking up station in the Mediterranean, caused the Soviet Navy to advance its plans to project a naval presence in the area, before it was properly equipped to do so. Although there was a progressive naval build-up from the initial sorties in 1963, their afloat support was not designed to work from open anchorages, and they were neither able to sustain year-round deployments, nor substantial numbers of ships on station. It was not until after the June 1967 war that the availability of sheltered berths for their support ships in Egyptian harbours, enabled a substantial jump in the average number of ships deployed. Throughout most of 1968-69, the Soviet naval squadron was maintained at about seven to ten submarines and eight to twelve surface combatants, the number rising when overlaps were arranged to allow for major exercises; since 1967, the Soviet Navy has also been able to maintain a year-round presence in the Mediterranean, although it is still considerably reduced during winter months. The Arab-Israeli war led to the use of Egyptian airfields in support of Soviet naval operations, by UAR reconnaissance aircraft and by Soviet ASW *Badger* units. Apart from marking the carriers of the Sixth Fleet, Soviet naval activity concentrates mainly on anti-submarine (i.e. counter *Polaris*) operations in the eastern Mediterranean.

Besides these attempts to counter the US strategic threat directly (which includes posing a threat by proxy, through the supply of naval arms to Arab states), Russia is also pursuing a policy of "maritime exclusion" designed to cause the US Navy to cease (or limit) its operations in the Mediterranean. The Soviet Union has always sought to achieve *de jure* recognition that the Baltic and Black Seas were "closed" or "neutral" seas, and has never accepted the right of non-riparian powers to innocent passage in these areas, and she is now trying to extend this concept to the Mediterranean. She made proposals in 1958 and 1963 about non-nuclear zones, but in April 1967 Kosygin demanded the withdrawal of the Sixth Fleet, and this signalled a policy of deliberate harassment by Soviet naval units. By November 1968, Russia was claiming that since she was a Black Sea power she was by definition a Mediterranean power, and she declared that the area should be designated a nuclear-free zone from which the Sixth Fleet would be excluded. This diplomatic offensive is having some effect in the area, and Jugoslavia and Algeria have separately suggested that both Russia and the USA should take their quarrel and their fleets elsewhere. It is probable that on balance, such a solution would be acceptable to the Soviet Union, if she could be certain that *Polaris* submarines would also be excluded.

*Mission.* Traditionally, the primary mission of the Russian Navy has been "to defend the homeland," and although the nature of maritime warfare has undergone fundamental changes, there is ample evidence (including the statements of Soviet leaders) that this still pertains today, although it is now set in the context of mutual deterrence and general nuclear war. It is this basic mission which, over the years, had dictated the size and composition of their fleets, and the characteristics of their naval units. Before 1958, the nature of the maritime threat to Russia meant that (apart from strategic delivery) primary naval requirements were limited to operations in the four fleet areas, and these would take place following the outbreak of war. But the introduction of nuclear weapons and long-range delivery systems has radically altered the operational scope of the Navy's traditional mission. To defend the Soviet Union against attack from the sea now requires the Soviet Navy to operate in remote areas at a great distance from Russian shores.

*Tasks.* In support of its mission, the Soviet Navy now has to discharge five primary tasks:

(a) To counter the *Polaris* submarine.

(b) To neutralize the strike carriers prior to aircraft launch.

(c) To contribute to the Soviet Union's strategic delivery capability.

(d) To gain command of the four fleet area, particularly the Baltic, Black and Barents Seas.

(e) To provide maritime flank support for land operations along the coastal axes.

There are of course many other ways in which Soviet naval forces can or would be used, particularly after the outbreak of fighting. But these five primary tasks have precedence, both chronologically and in determining the design specification of new classes of ships. And although all submarines have an anti-surface capability, attack on sea-communications is not among these five tasks, all of which must be discharged during the initial nuclear exchange, or earlier.

The last two are traditional tasks, whose underlying nature has changed little, although the geographical scope has been somewhat extended, and it is assumed that operations will take place in a nuclear environment. The first three derive from the availability of nuclear weapons and the increased range of seaborne delivery systems, and it is these tasks which embody the special characteristics of mutual deterrence and nuclear-missile war, of which the most significant is the force-consuming requirement that these tasks must be discharged continuously in peacetime, at wartime level of readiness.

*The Soviet naval balance.* The composition of her fleets, the pattern of their deployments and the statements of her leaders, all confirm that the Soviet Union has built a Navy for strategic deterrence and general war. Her navy is deficient in its capability to discharge three of its five primary tasks, and this deficit will probably persist, at least in the task of countering *Polaris*. Her surface ships can sail around the world in time of peace, but because of the unbalanced structure of her fleet which has been built to meet a particular threat, and the West's naval predominance, the Soviet Navy does not have the capacity to sustain general naval operations in a hostile maritime environment at a distance from Russia's shores. The Soviet Union currently lacks a worldwide maritime capability.

## H.R. 12674—A BILL TO CREATE A NATIONAL CEMETERY SYSTEM WITHIN THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

### HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to coauthor H.R. 12674, a bill to create a national cemetery system within the Veterans' Administration. The vote by which this bill passed the House of Representatives last Monday, 310 to 4, is a reflection of the strong support for the provisions of the measure by this body.

The bill represents the initial step in ultimately solving the national cemetery problem that has confronted the veterans of this Nation for the past several years.

Despite the fact that every honorably discharged veteran is entitled to burial in a national cemetery, there have been no new cemeteries constructed since 1950 and existing burial spaces are rapidly being filled and national cemeteries closed to further burial.

The bill, H.R. 12674, will transfer to the Veterans' Administration the administrative jurisdiction over the national cemetery system presently administered by the Department of the Army; military posts cemeteries administered by the respective services departments and cemeteries on foreign soil administered by the American Battle Monuments Commission. These Federal cemetery systems, together with the several cemeteries presently operated by the Veterans' Administration will form the nucleus of a new national cemetery system.

Under the terms of the measure, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is required to undertake a comprehensive study of the criteria that should govern the future of the national cemetery system. The Administrator will then report to us within 30 days after the convening of the next session of Congress, his recommendations for a national policy on veteran burial, including the need for and location of additional national cemeteries.

The bill additionally authorizes a plot allowance of $150 payable on behalf of those veterans who are not buried in a national cemetery. Authorization for the interment in Arlington National Cemetery of an unknown serviceman from the Vietnam era is also provided in the bill.

It is my understanding, however, that at the present time there are no unidentified war dead from the Vietnam conflict.

Mr. Speaker, this is necessary legislation. As a cosponsor of this bill, I have supported it vigorously in committee and on the floor of the House of Representatives. I hope the other body will act promptly and rapidly to send the measure to the President for his approval.

## FEDERAL AID TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS

### HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, the subject of school financing is one which has caused great concern to me and to my fellow Senators. Schools throughout the country, both public and private, are facing increasing financial difficulties as the costs of providing an education rise at a rapid rate. Many concerned parents and educators feel that private, alternative sources of education are a vital part of the American educational tradition which may now be faced with extinction, because they cannot meet the increasing financial demands placed upon them. Parents who choose to send their children to private schools, for whatever reason, face the very real problem of having to pay two tuitions: One to the private schools which they have chosen, and one to the public school system in the form of educational taxes. The private schools themselves face a double problem: Not only are the costs of education going up, but, in addition, the revenues from tuition are going down as more and more parents withdraw their children from private schools—either because they no longer wish their children to attend private schools, or because, quite simply, they no longer feel that they can afford the double burden of taxation and tuition.

Legislators at both the State and the Federal level have given thought to this problem. Many feel that the private schools are indeed vital to the American tradition, and must be aided by public funds in order that they may continue to fulfill their role in American society. At the college level, of course there are already a large number of State and Federal programs which provide aid both directly to colleges and universities, and to the students who attend these institutions.

The problem is more complex at the level of elementary and secondary education because, as things are at present, the vast majority of the private schools are operated by religious organizations. The most extensive network of private schools, enrolling roughly 83 percent of all private elementary and secondary students, is that of the Catholic Church. The question of aid to private elementary and secondary schools cannot be separated, therefore, from the question of the interrelationship of church and state. The first amendment to the U.S. Constitution forbids the Government to take any action to establish any church or religious activity.

The constitutional prohibition against establishment of religion has led the U.S. Supreme Court to set very strict rules over the kinds of aid which governments may provide to schools affiliated with religious organizations. State laws providing for aid to parochial schools have recently been declared unconstitutional, because they were deemed to constitute establishment of religion or to engender excessive intermingling and potential entanglement of the church and the state. Only those limited programs of aid to parochial schools for the express purpose of providing nonsectarian services to the pupils in the schools, and some aids directly to private school pupils, have been allowed to stand.

In view of these strict constitutional requirements and the close scrutiny which the Supreme Court may be expected to devote to any program of aid to parochial schools, Congress is obliged to proceed very cautiously in this area.

Two types of aid which could possibly be developed to bring financial relief to the parochial schools—as well as to other private elementary and secondary schools—are the voucher system and the tax credit or tax deduction system.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is currently conducting an experiment with a voucher system. Under this system a local school board gives each student in the school district a voucher valued at some sum of money, perhaps the average annual expenditure per pupil in the local public schools. The student is then free to use this voucher to pay the full cost of his education at any school he chooses, so long as that school meets requirements for participation laid down by the school board and also agrees to accept the voucher as full payment for educational services over the school year.

Another possibility lies in providing tax deductions or tax credits to parents who pay tuition to send their children to private elementary or secondary schools. Under this system, the parent, when he filed his Federal income tax form each year, would be allowed either to deduct some proportion of his tuition payments from his taxable income, or to subtract some fixed amount from the actual tax which he must pay. The amount of tuition which he could deduct or which he could credit against his final tax liability would be determined, probably, in relation to the number of children for whom he is paying tuition, and his total family income.

This is a difficult problem, one which vitally affects the education of our children. America has always paid careful attention to its educational system and has developed one of the best systems in the world. We must now find a resolution to this pressing problem, but we must find a solution that will be consistent with our legal as well as our educational traditions—and which will assure the long-range health and vitality of all our Nation's schools.

## A COMMENDABLE SELF-INITIATED ANTIPOLLUTION EFFORT

## HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that far too often there is an emphasis or a great deal of publicity on negative situations concerning our country's commitment to better protect and improve our environment. At this time, I would like to bring to the attention of all Members the efforts of the Saginaw Steering Gear Division of General Motors which, on its own initiative and expense, has installed a "closed loop" system for recycling and reusing more than 1,000,000 gallons of industrial oils annually.

This new system eliminates the need for disposing of used industrial oils by burning, burial or other methods that might pollute the environment. Instead, as it is pointed out, the oil now is recovered, cleaned, refined and fed back into the division's manufacturing plants for reuse.

Let me quote from the statement issued by Mr. Ellis M. Ivey, Jr., general manager of the steering gear division, who said:

A recent report by the United States Environmental Protection Agency shows that 1.5 billion gallons of industrial lube oils are purchased in the United States annually and that 30% of this amount is not consumed and must be disposed of in some manner. The EPA is increasingly concerned that this 30% is being burned or dumped, thus becoming an environmental pollution threat.

Mr. Ivey then concluded:

Our "closed loop" system ends this problem for our plants, except for water soluble oils. We now are planning additional, still more advanced, waste oil removal systems for the near future that will further reduce the possibility of air, water, or solid waste pollution.

Because I felt that this was an excellent example of good citizenship and concern for our environment, I informed the Environmental Protection Agency of the development of this new system.

I am happy to include the letter of commendation received from the EPA on this matter, as well as a news statement from the Saginaw Steering Gear Division. Both follow below:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY,
*Washington, D.C., April 13, 1972.*

Hon. JAMES HARVEY,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. HARVEY: This is in response to your letter of March 24, 1972, to Mr. William D. Ruckelshaus, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) forwarding information on the closed-loop oil recycling system developed by the Saginaw Steering Gear Division of the General Motors Corporation.

We appreciate receiving this information and would like to commend the company for their effort in attacking the problem of pollution caused by the discharge of waste oils into the environment.

The Environmental Protection Agency initiated studies addressed to waste oil management in 1967. A grant was awarded to Villanova University to upgrade current rerefining technology. In 1969, a grant was awarded to the National Oil Recovery Corporation to develop new technology for the conversion of waste oils into saleable products by distillation. The results of this work are now being put to use in an economically feasible manner. A grant issued to the City of Buffalo, New York, has developed information on insewer detection techniques and trapping equipment plus effects of waste oil in benthic deposits in the Buffalo River. We have just recently awarded a grant to the State of Maryland to develop methods for dealing with the problem of the disposal of all types of oily waste materials on a statewide basis. This grant includes the requirements for a state-of-the-art report which will be used as the basis for the reports to the Congress required by the pending legislation. We have also been in contact with the City of Seattle to investigate the possibility of having a similar study conducted there. Another contract is to be awarded to study the efficacy of using waste oils in conjunction with incineration of garbage and refuse. EPA is currently preparing a Request for Proposals for the development of improved technology for the rerefining of waste oils. This RFP will be issued in the latter part of this fiscal year for funding in Fiscal Year 1973.

The abatement of pollution caused by waste oils will have to be attacked by the combined efforts of government and industry. Efforts in this direction such as those taken by Saginaw Gear will greatly assist in finding a solution to this problem.

I appreciate your interest in this matter and would like to thank you for sending this information to us.

Sincerely yours,

A. C. TRAKOWSKI,
*Acting Assistant Administrator for Research and Monitoring.*

---

The Saginaw Steering Gear Division of General Motors has completed and put into use a "closed loop" system for recycling and re-using more than 1,000,000 gallons of industrial oils annually.

The new system, according to Ellis M. Ivey, Jr., general manager, eliminated the need for disposing of used industrial oils by burning, burial, or other methods that might pollute the environment. Instead the oil now is recovered, cleaned, re-refined and fed back into the division's manufacturing plants for reuse.

Last year Steering Gear treated approximately 300 million gallons of waste water from its plants in the "closed loop" system and recovered 1,193,840 gallons of oil. After preliminary treatment this oil was trucked to a Detroit firm where it was re-refined and returned to storage for re-use in SSG manufacturing processes.

The "closed loop" system, located at the division's Holland Road location in Buena Vista Township, collects industrial waste water from Plants 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 and from the Chevrolet Manufacturing Plant at 2328 E. Genessee Avenue. Aa similar system treats waste water from SSG Plants 1 and 2. Waste from the Chevrolet plant is pumped to the facility through a 1½-mile-long underground conduit. This waste water contains large quantities of various industrial oils, grease, and other substances used in manufacturing operations.

The waste water treatment facility skims floating oils from the surface of the water and dredges the heavier waste materials from the bottom of the settling tanks. The recovered oils are pumped into holding tanks where further settling and skimming is performed.

Eventually, the oil is drained from the holding tanks into tanker trucks for shipment to the re-refining plant in Detroit. After being re-refined, the oil, which is found to be equal to new oil for cutting, broaching, and grinding operations, is repurchased by Saginaw Steering Gear.

Before the "closed loop" waste water treatment facility was completed, most of the recovered oil had to be disposed of by a professional waste disposal firm, which meant that it was buried, incinerated, or used for road surfacing. Each of these methods poses a threat of undesirable environmental pollution. The completed "closed loop" system permanently eliminates any such possibility.

In commenting on the new system, Ivey said,

"A recent report by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency shows that 1.5 billion gallons of industrial lube oils are purchased in the U.S. annually and that 30% of this amount is not consumed and must be disposed of in some manner. The E.P.A. is increasingly concerned that this 30% is being burned or dumped, thus becoming an environmental pollution threat.

"Our 'closed loop' system ends this problem for our plants, except for water soluble oils. We now are planning additional, still more advanced, waste oil removal systems for the near future that will further reduce the possibility of air, water, or solid waste pollution."

---

## YES, THE DEMOCRATS CAN BEAT RICHARD NIXON

## HON. MIKE GRAVEL

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Yes, the Democrats Can Beat Richard Nixon," written by Joseph Napolitan, and published in the Saturday Review of April 1, 1972.

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

YES, THE DEMOCRATS CAN BEAT RICHARD NIXON

(By Joseph Napolitan)

I start by assuming that Richard Nixon can be defeated in 1972. There are some elections that cannot be won—even on a Presidential level. I'd put the 1964 Johnson victory over Goldwater in this category; I don't see any way that Goldwater could have beaten Johnson that year. But I do think Nixon can be taken in 1972—that's not to say he *will* be, only that he *can* be.

Right now, of course, the Democrats are preoccupied with the internal problem of selecting a candidate, but I hope, and indeed I urge, that at least the leaders of the party concern themselves with the more distant but also more crucial matter of winning the general election once the candidate has been nominated. I say this now because what happens between the present time and the Democratic nominating convention in July will have incalculable impact on the outcome of the election. The status of the war in Vietnam and the economy of the country are the two major variables, and my crystal ball is murkier than most people's so I wouldn't even hazard a guess about how those important factors will have developed by November 1972. But if I were to lay out a program to defeat Nixon, I would start now, and this is what I would do.

First, I would plan a negative campaign. That is, the thrust of the effort would be aimed at influencing people to vote *against* Nixon rather than *for* my candidate, whoever he might be. Any incumbent President in turbulent times must run on his record, or be forced to run on his record if he tries to seek another avenue. The powers of the Presidency are awesome, the resources of the President are unmatchable by the party out of office, and the staff and services provided by the federal government are far too rich for the out party to match, particularly if the out party still is trying to pay off its 1968 debts.

But there is one big disadvantage to running as the incumbent: You must accept responsibility for what has happened to the country in the four years of your stewardship.

I'd begin my campaign planning with polls. Starting immediately, I would try to make arrangements with the leading political polling firms, Democratic state committees, and Democratic candidates for statewide and Congressional offices to include a brief series of questions in all their polls about the Presidential election. The polling firms might have to get the permission of their political clients to include the questions, but this really shouldn't be a problem. If I were running a statewide campaign for a Democratic candidate in 1972, I'd certainly want a pretty clear look at the Presidential contest anyway. Even if it became necessary to pay the polling firms a few hundred dollars for adding the questions, and I don't think we would have to, it still would be worth it.

There are certain *kinds* of questions I'd like to see included in all polls, starting immediately, with exactly the same wording in each poll, and presented to demographic cross sections as similar as possible in each state. First I would list the candidates and ask the respondent if he had heard of each and whether he regarded them favorably or unfavorably or had no opinion. Next I would ask him what he felt were the major accomplishments and failures of the Nixon administration. Then I would have him select who he thought would make the best Democratic candidate. Finally I would have him choose between Nixon and several of the more prominent Democratic contenders.

Obviously, this wouldn't be a survey in depth, but it would give the Democratic National Committee, which bears the ultimate responsibility for organizing the Presidential campaign, a constant and standardized flow of information from the various states. The DNC can feed this information to a computer and get figures and comparisons, broken down regionally and demographically (by age, for example, or by race, sex, income, education, religion, and so forth). And all for free, or practically nothing.

I can readily understand Presidential candidates' reluctance to share their private poll information, but if they would all agree to provide the national committee with this kind of information, with the understanding that all the candidates for the nomination would have access to it, they'll all benefit, and so would the committee.

Another thing I'd do now is line up half a dozen good polling firms, concentrate on the states that need to be polled, and assign them some specific states and dates. For example, I'd want a full-scale poll in the field about a week after the Democratic nominee is selected, probably another one the first week in September, and a third about the second week of October. I wouldn't assign more than three or four polls to any one polling firm, because none of the firms I know of can handle a lot of states simultaneously and turn out high-quality work on time. The questionnaire should be prepared at the DNC and the demographics be selected by someone appointed to supervise polling operations for the DNC so that the polls would be compatible and easily matched. Polling firms use various age breakdowns. My firm happens to use these: twenty-one through thirty, thirty-one through forty, forty-one through sixty, over sixty. We make a ten-year breakdown between twenty-one and forty, because those under thirty really grew up on television, those over thirty weren't as influenced in their childhood by television. In 1972, obviously, the eighteen- through twenty-year-olds should be included, and I'd put them in a separate category, to measure what impact, if any they will have in the Presidential election. The breakdowns for income, education, and other factors also should be standardized.

I wouldn't advocate any national polls, because we don't have a national election; we have a series of state elections, and there are many states that the Democratic Party need not poll in 1972.

We tried to do some selective polling in 1968, but by the time we got going—after Labor Day—it was too late to achieve maximum effectiveness. We were in the awkward position of being forced to produce our media materials before the poll results were in hand. But if the Democratic National Committee follows the outline I've presented, or something similar, it will have the best set of polls ever produced for a Presidential candidate.

Another project I'de get started on early would be the selection of target states. We wasted a lot of money in 1968 because of poor advance planning; there's no excuse for allowing this to happen again in 1972.

Picking the target states is easy. In 1968 Nixon won thirty-two states with 301 electoral votes, Humphrey won thirteen and the District of Columbia with 191, and Wallace won five with 46. The clear and obvious Democratic targets for 1972 are the thirteen states Humphrey won in 1968—Connecticut, Hawaii, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, Washington, and West Virginia—plus the states Nixon won that the Democrats have a reasonable chance to carry in 1972. This is the critical list, and on it I would place, in order of importance, California, Illinois, Ohio, New Jersey, Missouri, Wisconsin, Delaware, and Alaska. Those eight states delivered 137 electoral votes to Nixon in 1968; today, because of census reapportionment, they're worth 140. The states Nixon carried in 1968 now total 305 electoral votes instead of 301; Humphrey's states drop from 191 to 188; Wallace's from 46 to 45.

If the Democratic candidate can carry the thirteen states Humphrey carried in 1968, plus as few as three of the states Nixon carried (California, Illinois, Ohio, or California, Illinois, New Jersey; or California, Ohio, New Jersey), he can accumulate the 270 electoral votes needed to win, regardless of what Nixon and any third- or fourth-party candidate may do. I don't see this as an impossible task.

The keystone state is California. That's the battleground for 1972. Gainer of 5 electoral votes—booming it to 45 while New York drops back to 41—California is the prize that could decide the election. A Democrat could win without California by carrying Humphrey's 1968 states plus, say, Illinois, Ohio, New Jersey, Missouri, and Alaska, but it would be more difficult.

Of the states that Humphrey lost in 1968, I would say New Jersey, Missouri, and Alaska will be the easiest to swing into the Democratic column in 1972, closely followed by Delaware. California, Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin will be tougher—much tougher, but worth fighting for.

With the objectives clearly defined so early in the game this is the time to begin tooling up in the target states—for whoever the Democratic candidate may be. Special television programs can be developed for these states. Registration drives should begin at once in Democratic strongholds in these states, among blacks and young people and the poor. The votes aren't hard to identify, but unless they are registered they won't do the Democratic Party any good in November.

I may give the impression here that I am writing off certain states, and I am. There are at least a dozen states I'm willing to concede immediately and avoid spending any money in at all, unless that money is raised in the state to be spent there. This may be a cold-blooded position not calculated to win friends among state chairmen and committeemen and women, but, to tell the truth, I'd rather win the election than make friends. (It's amazing how friendly everyone gets to be after you've won.)

There are some states that Nixon carried in 1968 that a Democrat conceivably could win in 1972—other than the eight I already have listed—but none in which I see the Democrats with a strong chance. Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee possibly—but if I had my druthers I'd much rather place emphasis (i.e., money) in states where I had a better chance of winning than I do in these places. And I wouldn't bother with the Wallace states at all. It's conceivable a hawkish Democrat such as Senator Jackson might pull off one or two if he wins the nomination, but I wouldn't bet on it. And who knows at this point whether there will be a third-party candidate (Wallace) or maybe even a fourth-party nominee (Gene McCarthy or John Lindsay). But, for planning purposes at this stage, it really doesn't make much difference, because there is a minimum number of electoral votes required to win—270—and efforts should be directed at carrying enough states to accumulate that number of votes.

If this is going to be a negative campaign—and I don't see how it can be any other kind unless Nixon is not the candidate—then the DNC computer should be put to use right away. I'd begin feeding it every public statement Richard Nixon has made since he became a Congressman, properly coded and categorized. I'd also add the statements of Spiro Agnew and any other Republicans who might be targets of one sort or another in 1972—for example, Republican National Chairman Robert Dole. Then when I (i.e., the DNC, any of the Presidential candidates, eventually *the* Presidential candidate and his running mate, or any other prominent Democratic speechmakers) wanted to demonstrate the inconsistencies of Nixon's actions with his words, I could just punch the right buttons on my computer, and it would print out the material I needed.

This information-retrieval system can be a tremendous boon to speech writers, copywriters, film and radio producers, and local Democratic candidates. It's just a question of assembling, coding, storing, and retrieving. I assume something like this has and is being done, because the information it can provide, literally on a moment's notice, will be invaluable to the campaign.

My major interest in campaigns is political communication. This involves the use of mass media, particularly television and radio, but other media as well. When I became advertising director of the Humphrey organization late in the 1968 campaign, I tried to implement some of my theories on the use of media in a Presidential election, with a fair amount of success. But the shortage of time and funds caused us to fall sort of our goal. We have the time now, and I expect there will be enough money amound to finance an adequate campaign—not as much as the Republicans will have, but enough to cover the necessities if it is spent properly.

I would try some new approaches to the use of media in the 1972 election, some of which can be initiated before we even know who the Democratic candidate will be. In fact, there is no reason why the candidates could not be informed what is being done (notice I said "informed," not "consulted"; you don't produce good media by committee in consultation) on their behalf. Presumably, the eventual candidate might want to scrub everything, but I doubt it if the material I envision is produced the way it should be;

and even if he doesn't want to use it, it will be prepared in such a way that Democratic candidates for Senate, the House, and statehouses will be able to make use of it.

Suppose I had carte blanche to organize and implement media planning and structure for the 1972 Presidential election: What would I do?

First I would take the seven big states I feel are essential to win in 1972—California, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Michigan, and Texas—and get some tough research done on how the Nixon administration has failed to solve the problems in those states. I would deal in hard specifics, with problems directly related to the individual states. In New York, for example, this could include the massive problems of welfare and drug addiction; in California, the rampant unemployment in aerospace and the erosion of natural resources.

I would find out not only what the problems are and how the Republican administration has failed to solve them but also what solutions have been presented by the Democrats. We should also note that California, New York, Illinois, and Michigan have Republican governors, and that Pennsylvania and Ohio had Republican governors until the start of 1971.

As soon as I had assembled my research, and probably concomitantly, I would engage three or four of the best television documentary producers to make a thirty-minute film on each state. These films should be suitable for both Presidential and regional candidates. Wherever and whenever possible, attractive local candidates should be included in the film.

By the late spring or early summer of 1972 I would have a package of half-hour documentaries for use in the major battleground states, specifically relating to their problems, revealing Republican failures and outlining Democratic programs. Remember one thing: We should never underestimate the intelligence of the American voter or overestimate the amount of information at his disposal. We should be giving him solid chunks of anti-Nixon information preparatory to presenting our own constructive proposals.

While I was producing these state documentaries, I also would be working on some *problem* (or, if you prefer, *issues*) documentaries on the major problems facing the country: lack of job opportunities, drug addiction, education, pollution and conservation, education, welfare, and poverty. Again, these would be definitive studies that would document Republican failures and present Democratic programs, and they'd work for whoever the nominee might be. I can't see that there would be sharp differences among Humphrey, Muskie, McGovern, Kennedy, or Jackson programs on drugs or poverty or protection of natural resources or education.

The basic footage could be filmed in the spring and early summer; after the candidate is nominated, he can be worked into each of the films, and there could be time and space provided for tie-ins with local candidates.

These problem-oriented films could, if desired, be shown on national network television, although I would be more inclined to make local purchases within states so that we would be paying for only the states we wanted to reach and not for states where we have no chance of winning anyway. I'd have all these films ready to go on the air by Labor Day, and perhaps run one a week for the next five or six weeks, making them available to state committees and candidates within each state for additional showings at their convenience and expense.

As soon as the candidate is nominated, I'd begin work on a biographical documentary of him and, perhaps, his running mate. This would be for use later in the campaign, say from the middle of October on.

From all these films—the state documentaries and those on problems—five-minute programs and one-minute spots also could be culled. The candidate would go into the campaign armed with the greatest assortment of television weapons any candidate for President anywhere has ever had. What would this whole package cost? About $1-million—or something less than 8 per cent of the total Republican television time budget in 1968, around 15 per cent of what the Democrats spent on television in the past election. And there would be some offsetting gains: Candidates for senator and governor might be induced to pick up part of the tab by acquiring the films they considered most useful to them in their own races and adapting them to their personal needs.

The key to the success of this project is the quality of the materials produced, as it so often is. That's why I would try to get a lock on the best film producers as early as possible and put them to work on these films before they get so committed in other races that they don't have time to work on the Presidential election. This happened in 1968, to Humphrey's detriment.

Nixon made much better use of radio in 1968 than Humphrey did. For 1972, a series of low-key, factual five-minute radio programs on important issues can be prepared early, utilizing the best speech writers in the Democratic stable, and go on the air during the summer. The cost is low, and the impact can be high.

I'd also make use of the *losing* Democratic contenders in films, perhaps a series of five-minute programs not unlike the one made with Humphrey and Ted Kennedy in 1968. These would not be used nationally but shown in the states where the losing candidate is particularly popular. For example, if Senator Jackson doesn't make it, a five-minute film of him and the Democratic nominee discussing the problems of the state of Washington should have favorable impact in that state. The same would be true with Harold Hughes in Iowa, Birch Bayh in Indian, Kennedy in Massachuseets, George McGovern in the Dakotas, Humphrey in Minnesota, Edmund Muskie in New England. Not too costly, and potentially useful.

I'd get the best political time buyer available and have him chart the states where we wish to make our biggest push and outline budgets and potential time buys in those states. Buying network time isn't as difficult in a Presidential election, because the networks are, by law, forced to make equal time available to each of the Presidential candidates. The time buyer's skill can best be used within key states.

There also are some more esoteric areas of electronic communication that I would want the Democrats to take advantage of. One is instant reaction, and the other would be the establishment of videotape and radio files. I would establish an "instant-reaction" electronics team, a group of television and radio specialists who could capitalize on an event virtually instantaneously, be it a statement, a speech, or a piece of news, and through electric feeds make it available to the networks and key stations throughout the country. Often this could be news material offered to the stations for use on news programs; in other cases, paid spots produced in twenty-four hours or less and worked into previously purchased time.

No one knows when news that could affect the outcome of the election will break, or even when an opponent will commit a gaffe that could be capitalized on. Under conventional systems of producing television and radio spots, it takes days, sometimes weeks, to turn out reaction spots. Under the system I envision, these could be done in hours. What it takes is an alert electronics team, standing by twenty-four hours a day, ready to act on literally a moment's notice. The problem here really is not so much one of implementation, but of proper planning and having the right people ready to move when they must. I am convinced that the cost of such an operation would be far less than the value we would realize from it.

For years candidates have maintained newspaper clip files; sophisticated ones are beginning to use computer retrieval systems similar to the one I mentioned earlier. But now it is time for candidates, at least for Presidents, to establish data banks of video- and audiotapes—not necessarily or exclusively of their opponents, but also of news events. These can be used for recall, to capitalize on the information already inside everyone's brain. Consciously, we tend to forget fairly rapidly; subconsciously, we retain information for much longer periods, possibly forever. The audio/videotape banks would permit our television and radio producers to create instant recall of major events and to capitalize on both the emotionalism and the rational reactions that surrounded these events during the time they were taking place. For example, no one who lived in New York in July 1970 is likely to forget the suffocating smog that smothered the city for a few days during the middle of that month. Utilization of newsfilm clips and commentaries would instantly recall those horrendous conditions and could trigger the rage and frustration New Yorkers felt during those days.

These electronic data banks could be extraordinarily valuable in preparing television and radio materials for the Presidential election—but the time to start assembling them is *now*, not after the candidate has been nominated in the middle of July 1972. A candidate who goes into the campaign armed with this kind of backup material, and the availability of instant reaction facilities, possesses a big advantage over the candidate who doesn't, and this is the kind of thing the party apparatus can be doing prior to the election. By Labor Day 1972 the operation should be organized and ready to go, the material assembled, the technologists in place, the research completed, the techniques perfected.

This whole operation obviously requires planning, direction, and financing. The last may be the toughest, but I think it's not a question of whether the Democratic Party can afford to do it but whether the party can afford *not* to do it. And, in the long run I don't think the program I have outlined would cost any more than the haphazard media programs both parties have had in the past; intelligent reallocation of resources would provide maximum value for every dollar—something we did not receive in past elections.

In any event, one aspect of the campaign has worked out well. Former Attorney General John Mitchell will run Nixon's campaign again. Anyone who can manage Nixon from a fifteen-point lead to a seven-tenths-of-a-point victory in seven weeks is too good a friend to lose.

---

## GENERAL ASSEMBLY CALLS FOR NEW GRAIN AND OIL SEED BASE

---

## HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the second session of the 64th general assembly of the State of Iowa expressed a deep concern for the inability of Iowa grain producers to obtain premium prices in accordance with the consistently higher quality of the grain and oil seed products which they submit under the present grade-price structure.

In Iowa House Concurrent Resolution 111, all resources of the Federal Government are called upon to institute a study of the present price-grading system with the intent of establishing a new basis for determining the market price of feed grains and oil seeds. The text of the resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 111

Whereas, we, the members of the Agriculture Committee of the Iowa House of Representatives, have a deep concern for the problems of the grain producers of our state in marketing grain and oil seeds, the market price of which is determined by established grade; and

Whereas, hundreds of Iowa grain producers are submitting grain and oil seeds to local markets, which grain and oil seeds average consistently higher in quality and grade than is provided for in the present grade-pricing system; and

Whereas, these producers of premium quality grain and oil seeds are unable to procure premium prices for their products under the present grade-price structure, now therefore be it

*Resolved*, by the House, the Senate concurring, That the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Congress of the United States, and the Committees on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives and Senate be directed to immediately institute a study of the present price-grading system for grains and oil seeds in the United States with the intent of establishing a new base for determining the market price of feed grains and oil seeds; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, the Speaker of the United States Senate, the Committees on Agriculture of the United States House of Representatives and Senate and to all members of the Iowa delegation to the Congress of the United States.

---

## INCREASING CONFIDENCE IN THE ECONOMY

## HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, new information on the economy indicates it is continuing to expand. The Department of Commerce has reported that new factory orders for durable goods during the month of April continued their upward trend of the last several months. In addition, the F. W. Dodge division of McGraw-Hill Information Systems Co. has reported that new construction contracts during the month of April were at a record level.

Total new factory orders during April were $35.5 billion, up 1.2 percent from March. The April increase followed a 1.7-percent increase in March. The total March–April rise of 2.9 percent in new factory orders for durable goods would be equal to an annual rise of more than 17 percent. The strength of the recent performance in new durable goods orders is highlighted by comparing the last 4 months of 1971 with the first 4 months of 1972; the increase is higher this year.

The Dodge index of new construction contracts, as seasonally adjusted, rose to 167 in April, up from March's 159 and February's 155. The growth was strong in both residential and nonresidential contracts. Residential building contracts showed the biggest gain, with a 27-percent increase to $3.97 billion, as compared to April 1971's $3.12 billion. Nonresidential contracting showed a 6-percent gain to $2.18 billion, as compared to $2.06 billion a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, this strong performance by these two important indicators is very encouraging because of the increasing confidence in the economy indicated by such a high level of durable goods orders and the inevitably favorable effects which such strong construction activity has on the rest of our economy.

## FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, APRIL 1972

## HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the April 1972 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

Federal Civilian Employment, April 1972

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of April was 2,870,842 as compared with 2,866,346 in the preceding month of March. This was a net increase of 4,496.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of April totaled 2,830,332. This was a net increase of 4,123 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of March. Employment by months in fiscal 1972 follows:

| Month | Full-time employees in permanent positions | Change from previous month | Temporary, part-time, etc. | Change from previous month | Total employment | Change from previous month |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1971: | | | | | | |
| July | 2,521,703 | +1,391 | 381,448 | +18,755 | 2,903,151 | +20,146 |
| August | 2,524,098 | +2,395 | 366,062 | −15,386 | 2,890,160 | −12,991 |
| September | 2,527,518 | +3,420 | 317,021 | −49,041 | 2,844,539 | −45,621 |
| October | 2,529,832 | +2,314 | 303,236 | −13,785 | 2,833,068 | −11,471 |
| November | 2,528,233 | −1,599 | 300,256 | −2,980 | 2,828,489 | −4,579 |
| December | 2,525,858 | −2,375 | 300,662 | +406 | 2,826,520 | −1,969 |
| 1972: | | | | | | |
| January | 2,552,081 | +26,223 | 272,945 | −27,717 | 2,825,026 | −1,494 |
| February | 2,550,984 | −1,097 | 277,284 | +4,339 | 2,828,268 | +3,242 |
| March | 2,539,790 | −11,194 | 286,419 | +9,157 | 2,826,209 | −2,037 |
| April | 2,533,275 | −6,515 | 297,057 | +10,638 | 2,830,332 | +4,123 |

Agencies of the executive branch have reported a net reduction of 17,037 in total full-time permanent employment since June 1971 (excluding for comparison purposes a shift of about 30,000 Postal Service employees from temporary to permanent status) to the April total of 2,533,275.

Administration orders announced last August were directed at reductions in the category of full-time permanent employment in agencies exclusive of Postal Service. Since June 1971 this employment has been reduced 15,650, indicating further reduction of about 21,780 to reach the level of 1,918,100 projected by the budget for June 30, 1972 under the reduction orders.

This net decrease in full-time permanent employment of 15,650 reflects reductions of 20,826 reported by the Defense Department in the 10 months since June 1971, partially offset by increases totaling 5,176 reported by other civilian agencies. The further reduction of 21,780 necessary to reach the projected June 30, 1972 level is anticipated by the Administration as a result of expected Defense reductions resulting from the transfer of Okinawa and seasonal decline in overseas teachers, together with lower than anticipated expansion in certain civilian agencies.

Changes in total employment in April in Civilian Agencies of the Executive Branch as compared with civilian employment in Military Agencies were as follows:

| | April | March | Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| Civilian agencies | 1,714,680 | 1,705,937 | +8,743 |
| Military agencies | 1,115,652 | 1,120,272 | −4,620 |
| Total, civilian employment | 2,830,332 | 2,826,209 | +4,123 |

The civilian agencies of the Executive Branch reporting the largest increases in April were Agriculture with 5,028, Treasury with 1,783 and Interior with 1,410. In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were reported by Army with 2,134 and Air Force with 1,360.

Total Executive Branch employment Inside the United States in April was 2,651,950, an increase of 8,769 as compared with March. Total employment Outside the United States in April was 178,382, a decrease of 4,646 as compared with March.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in April totaled 32,236, an increase of 383 as compared with the preceding month of March. Employment in the Judicial Branch in April totaled 8,274, a decrease of 10 as compared with March.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from the Joint Committee report, on personnel employed full-time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during April 1972, showing comparisons with June 1970, June 1971, and the budget estimates for June 1972:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

| Major agencies | June 1970 | June 1971 | April 1972 | Estimated June 30, 1972[1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agriculture | 89,912 | 84,252 | 82,789 | 83,000 |
| Commerce | 25,427 | 28,435 | 27,860 | 28,500 |
| Defense: | | | | |
| Civil functions | 30,297 | 30,063 | 30,129 | 30,600 |
| Military functions | 1,129,642 | 1,062,741 | 1,041,849 | 1,011,000 |
| Health, Education, and Welfare | 102,297 | 104,283 | 106,556 | 102,000 |
| Housing and Urban Development | 14,661 | 16,030 | 15,729 | 15,200 |
| Interior | 59,349 | 57,570 | 56,585 | 56,900 |
| Justice | 38,013 | 42,662 | 44,131 | 45,100 |
| Labor | 10,217 | 11,352 | 12,111 | 11,800 |
| State | 23,618 | 23,398 | 22,768 | 22,700 |
| Agency for International Development | 14,486 | 13,477 | 12,400 | 12,400 |
| Transportation | 63,879 | 68,482 | 66,995 | 66,400 |
| Treasury | 86,020 | 90,135 | 95,661 | 98,500 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 7,033 | 6,920 | 6,808 | 6,700 |
| Civil Service Commission | 5,214 | 5,324 | 5,167 | 5,600 |
| Environmental Protection Agency[2] | | 5,959 | 8,030 | 8,000 |
| General Services Administration | 36,400 | 38,076 | 35,596 | 39,400 |
| National Aeronautics and Space Administration | 31,223 | 29,478 | 28,026 | 27,500 |
| Panama Canal | 14,635 | 13,967 | 13,863 | 14,200 |
| Selective Service System | 6,665 | 5,569 | 5,790 | 6,200 |
| Small Business Administration | 4,015 | 4,004 | 4,007 | 4,000 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 12,657 | 13,612 | 13,801 | 14,000 |
| U.S. Information Agency | 9,989 | 9,773 | 9,462 | 9,400 |
| Veterans Administration | 148,497 | 158,635 | 160,976 | 162,700 |
| All other agencies | 29,807 | 31,333 | 32,791 | 34,300 |
| Contingencies | | | | 2,000 |
| Subtotal | 1,986,953 | 1,955,530 | 1,939,880 | 1,918,100 |
| U.S. Postal Service | 565,618 | 564,782 | 593,395 | [3] 613,400 |
| Total[4] | 2,552,571 | 2,520,312 | 2,533,275 | 2,531,500 |

[1] Source: As projected in 1973 budget document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.
[2] Established as of Dec. 2, 1970, by transfer of functions and personnel from Interior, HEW, Agriculture, Federal Radiation Council and Atomic Energy Commission.
[3] Includes approximately 39,000 postal employees subject to reclassification by June 30, 1972, under a labor-management agreement. Reclassification of 30,000 such employees was reported to the Committee in January 1972.
[4] April figure excludes 3,054 disadvantaged persons in public service careers programs as compared with 2.947 in March (see table 3, p. 11).

## ITALIAN REPUBLIC DAY

## HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, on June 2 the Republic of Italy celebrated the 26th anniversary of that date when, in 1946, its people voted by popular plebiscite to replace the monarchy with a republic. This occasion affords me the special pleasure of honoring the people of Italy and the nation which has its own unique place in the world community.

Following the devastation of World War II, Italy began the long journey which has carried it to new heights of economic growth and national pride. The impressive progress of the past generation demonstrates the indomitable spirit of the Italian people. Tremendous obstacles faced Italy. The country lacks widespread natural resources. Yet, industrialization has created in Italy industries known throughout the world for the production of automobiles, tires, textiles, and leather goods. Through trade and commerce, Italy has strengthened ties with the free world and has become an integral part of the Western European community.

The economic advances have contributed to a strengthening of the Republic itself. Recently, more emphasis has been placed on providing the fruits of economic prosperity to the entire nation. Economic policies are being aimed at increased diversification and development—especially in the underindustrialized south. Despite the diverse nature of the populace, Italy proved in recent elections that the Italian people remain committed to democracy—to social and economic change without authoritarian discipline.

The Western World owes much to the long and rich history of Italy. Roman law, which is the basis for our own legal system, was only the first of the contributions made by the Italian nation to the culture of Europe and the Americas. In the arts, science, and in philosophy, Italians from many ages have been leaders in their fields. The works of DaVinci, Raphael, and Michelangelo testify to the genius of the nation's artists. The world of opera and classical music would be far different from what we know without the talents of Verdi, Vivaldi, and Toscanini. The writers Dante and Pirandello are among the greatest authors in the history of literature. In the field of science, men like Galileo, and DaVinci made invaluable contributions to our understanding of the world around us. The fields of philosophy and government have been enriched by the writings and actions of Cicero, Machiavelli, Mazzini, and Garibaldi.

The creativity and energy which the people of Italy have demonstrated in their native land have been transmitted to our country by the hundreds of thousands of Italians who have come to these shores. Italian-Americans have contributed to all fields of American life. Constantino Brumidi—the Michelangelo of the Capitol—and the famed physicist Enrico Fermi are two examples. The industry and devotion of Italian-Americans has made this Nation a better place for all our citizens. The many Italian-Americans who have been instrumental in our own country's progress insure that the bonds between Italy and America will continue to be strong and friendly.

I extend my warmest congratulations to the Italian people for the 26th anniversary of the Republic, and wish them the continued success which is rightfully theirs.



## HELPING THE VOICELESS CHILDREN

## HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an article by Thomas R. Miller, entitled, "Helping the Voiceless Children," appeared in the New York Times on June 3, 1972. It is a poignant statement.

We can count the lives lost and the billions of dollars wasted in Vietnam, but it is not as easy to measure the suffering among the survivors. And the deepest cruelty in Vietnam has been inflicted upon the children. They are the true innocents. The article follows:

HELPING THE VOICELESS CHILDREN

(By Thomas R. Miller)

I recently went to Hue to see the damage caused by the new fighting. Before it began doctors at the hospital there estimated it would take thirty years after the fighting stopped to take care of the war's innocent victims. Now it most certainly was worse—sudden rocketing followed by heavy bombing in populated areas.

At the airport American G.I.'s, brought for combat duty in the defense of radar sites in the rugged hills around Hue, walked slowly and silently through the mud, obviously bitter that they might be the last Americans to die. They were greeted by an equally silent group of South Vietnamese troops waiting, bandaged and bloodied, for air evacuation.

Tens of thousands of refugees had packed themselves into every available space, silently enduring the latest man-created test of their willingness to live. Many others were not so lucky and were caught to the north when the heavy bombing began. "I saw hundreds being killed and injured by the bombs," said a stunned 66-year-old man who had just escaped from Cam Lo with 500 other refugees after days of heavy bombing. Rockets from the North had taken their toll, too.

What about the civilian medical conditions? At first we got no clear answer. The hospitals in Hue and Quantri were hesitant to give out any information. It was only when one of the hospital officials came privately to a reporter friend of ours—a Vietnamese-speaking doctor who had a keen interest in civilian medical problems—that we learned the real story.

"I needn't tell you that there have been many wounded brought to the hospitals," the hospital official said, "but in Quantri there was only one part-time doctor and no emergency service before the fighting began. Then, when the fighting began, the hospital staff, including the doctor, fled," he added. Immoral for a doctor to flee his patients? I thought. It is hard for Americans to put themselves in the position of the Vietnamese. Among the people, no one is loved and honored more in Vietnam than the rare soul who, when the test comes, does care beyond himself and his family. We learned more, confirming our worst fears of the human destruction.

Except for one napalm-burned child, we did not have space to bring injured children back—they would come later through the organized clinics. And for those lucky few children who did make it to the hospital, the painful task of putting their little bodies back together would begin. Tiny arms glued by burn contractures to the side; skull and faces shot away or eaten away in a few days by a disease called "noma" (it was last seen in Europe in Nazi concentration camps); hands and legs injured and burned; eyes that could not shut. It is too much for even the most hardened observers to bear.

Through clouds of smoke from napalm fires we returned to Saigon. My next duty was to prepare an announcement to the overworked Vietnamese staff that their already small salaries would be cut because we were running out of funds for our hospital.

## RIGEL SCHOOL FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION: A MODEL SCHOOL IS DEDICATED

### HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, during the tenure of Mr. Henry Bryant, superintendent of the Elmendorf Air Force Base schools and during my tenure as superintendent of the Fort Richardson schools, an idea was born, an idea that developed over 6 long years into a reality that was officially dedicated on May 16 of this year. That idea was the Rigel School for Special Education, at Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska; the first special education building in Alaska designed specifically for this purpose.

There are no orthopedic barriers at Rigel; the front doors are electric, all halls have handrails, each room has an exterior door. There are no classroom doors, but there are screen barriers with one-way glass for observation. The building is completely carpeted. The gang lavatories have no doors and each has a special wheelchair sink. The multipurpose room is completely open with no hall walls. It has a hot lunch kitchen for about 100. In fact, in a preview of the building the many teachers, visitors, professors, architects, and professionals who toured the building could not think of one thing that had been left out of this innovative building.

Rigel School is named for the star that makes up the heel of the constellation Orion—Rigel, the smallest and brightest star. On May 16, 1972, Rigel School was dedicated "to all the special people who need an abundance of love and understanding to meet their needs." The following description, written by Mrs. Thelma Fenner, a teacher at Rigel, shows just how well-equipped toward meeting those needs is the Rigel School:

Today, Monday, February 29, 1972, we had our first day in our new school—this also happened to be the day President and Mrs. Nixon were at Elmendorf on their way back from China.

Our facilities consist of 10 classrooms, conference rooms, testing rooms and multi-purpose rooms. We are very happy with our set up.

At present we have 2 classrooms for the TMR (trainable children), each well equipped for the Children's individual needs.

One class for the Multi-handicapped. We have railed supports for these children along the hallways even to the stage in the multipurpose room.

One classroom for the hard of hearing. We do not take the deaf (children with no residual hearing), these children are taken care of by the Alaska Crippled Children Association School. We have special equipment that will greatly aid these children. The teacher will also be teaching communication skills and speech.

There will be two classrooms—one for the children interested in vocational home-ec. and the other for vocational arts and craft.

The other four classrooms will be for children with learning disabilities with specialties in Reading, Math, Lang. Arts, and Science.

Distar, complete series in reading, math, lang. arts, Lippincott Reading Series, Reader's Digest Series, Action Series, teacher's own series, and many others are introduced to our students.

For P.E., the children will be introduced to special perceptual exercises that will aid them in our classes. We have plans for the best program of P.E. that the state has to offer.

The individual needs of each student with learning disabilities dictates that the teacher has available a wide range of instructional aids and methods. Teaching Resources provides in our school this variety with many different programs, and within each program itself. Each concept or progression in every program is so structured so that the teacher can use as many, or as few, of the multiple procedures and exercises suggested at each step without interfering with the continuity of the program.

We are introducing special programs such as Dubnoff, Program I, these are basic perceptual skills that develop the child's readiness for reading and writing.

Dubnoff Program I, Level 2, develops cognitive skills for reading and writing readiness.

Dubnoff Program I, Level 3, brings to the children a complete curriculum of writing readiness skills.

Dubnoff Program 2, is for visual-motor perception with pattern boards.

For eye-hand coordination, we are using in each room the Pathway School Program. These are games and exercises to develop or improve visual-motor integration, and body-arm-hand-eye movements in unison. Many children are developed in these games and exercises. Body awareness and relationships in working in a confined space at a restricted or defined activity is stressed.

Our A.D.D. Program of auditory discrimination in depth is designed to teach beginning students, or below average students of any age, the basic auditory perceptual skills they must have in order to read and spell correctly—the ability to decode and encode.

In Math, we have the Foundation for Math, which is a completely new approach in four sequential units, to provide a foundation of basic skills and concepts from which mathematical competency is developed. This Math program was developed by Dr. William Crueckshank, Professor of Psychology and Education, University of Michigan.

These above programs will be added to our regular programs: We are striving at all times to bring to our children the newest and the best approaches that have been presented to us.

Your child will be safe and loved in our classrooms. We welcome your inspection.

Rigel School is a joint venture of the Air Force and Army through ALCOM to serve the special education students of the base and post. It presently accommodates 85 trainable, mentally retarded and physically handicapped youngsters. Next year there will be about 110 students. There are 10 teachers, a coordinator, and a principal to provide the program for the youngsters from Elmendorf and Fort Richardson, Alaska.

Rigel is a model school of special education, wtih architectural curricular and administrative innovations. I urge my colleagues and all those interested in special education to study this unique school and all the possibilities it presents. Rigel School is a milestone in special education, a school plant which will certainly enhance the school experiences of our special disadvantaged, dependent schoolchildren, and I am proud to have had a small role in its planning and development.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that I speak for all the Members of this House when I offer congratulations and best wishes to the Rigel School for Special Education as they celebrate their building dedication and begin their first year of operation. A special salute should go to Henry Bryant, superintendent of schools, who had the perseverance to see this project to completion. He deserves great thanks from all of us.

## OPERATION FACT

### HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, a unique approach to promoting rural-urban understanding, Operation FACT—Food and Agriculture Communications Tour—was recently sponsored by the National Agricultural Institute.

I was most impressed with this effort, and I commend the National Association of Wheat Growers, and its supporting organizations such as the Kansas Wheat Growers Association, for recognizing the value of meeting face to face with consumers and working to help them to better understand and appreciate our agricultural system. The timing of this activity was particularly good. It was launched during a period of heightened concern over food costs and at a time when the public was receptive to the farmer's side of the story.

Mr. Eugene Moos, president of the National Association of Wheat Growers, was one of four active farmers who served as farm ambassadors to the cities of America to set the record straight regarding mass urban confusion over food prices. During the tour, the team met with shoppers, sought the views of consumer spokesmen, talked with students, and answered questions from radio, television, and newspaper reporters in Washington, D.C., Chicago, Seattle, Houston, Atlanta, Boston, and New York to disseminate the facts regarding farmers, farm prices, and our Nation's No. 1 industry—agriculture.

Mr. Moos, a wheatgrower from Edwall, Wash., has prepared the following report on his participation in Operation FACT which I would like to share with my colleagues at this time:

A REPORT ON "OPERATION FACT"

(By Eugene Moos)

The objective of the National Agricultural Institute's "Operation FACT" (Food and Agriculture Communications Tour) was to provide two-way communication between farmers and consumers with a special focus on the food price issue. We pointed to the positive aspects of agriculture's story, and sought also a more complete understanding of consumer concerns.

Each of the tour participants was a producer of a basic agricultural commodity. They were J. S. Francis, Jr., Peoria, Arizona, cotton and alfalfa; Thurman Gaskill, Corwith, Iowa, corn-hog; John Barringer of Memphis, Tennessee, cattle; and myself, a wheat producer from Edwall, Washington. The group was selected to provide broad geographic balance, and to reflect a representative cross-section of various commodities.

"Operation FACT" started in Washington, D.C., on April 18th with a press conference held in the hearing room of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Team members were joined by Secretary of Agriculture Butz, Senator Carl Curtis of Nebraska and Congressman George Mahon of Texas. The team also appeared on "Panorama," a local TV talk show.

Prior to the tour start, a briefing session by USDA personnel was held on April 17th. The briefing session covered agricultural program policies, export markets, domestic marketing and public information efforts of the Department.

Before leaving Washington, D.C., team members had the opportunity to tour the meat processing and distribution center of Safeway stores for the District of Columbia area. Two hundred and forty-six supermarkets are served from this meat center, covering an approximate 200 mile radius of Washington, D.C.

The first team stop was in Chicago. There we met with Jane Byrne, consumer advisor to the Mayor of Chicago, and assistants. After these meetings, we attended a press conference in North Chicago at a Jewel Store which was covered by three TV networks plus radio and news reporters. Team members were filmed interviewing both men and women shoppers. The shoppers all felt that food prices were high, but then "so was everything else." No one blamed farmers, and shoppers always referred to the "big guys" as being responsible for high food prices. We also appeared on a major radio talk program in Chicago.

The following day we were in Seattle and met and lectured a class at Seattle Pacific University. Each team member gave a 10-minute presentation covering all of agriculture. I covered farm programs and their relation to food prices. Questions from the class were direct but not hostile.

Next, I met with a group of University of Washington graduate students at a marketing seminar. I gave a 20-minute presentation and the class asked questions for over an hour. Class participation was very good with major interest on understanding farm programs and farm subsidies. The students seemed to have a very good understanding of marketing involved in the food chain.

In Houston we met with consumer representatives and had a 40-minute dialogue on a radio show. We also met with the editorial board of the *Houston Chronicle* to discuss food prices and the farm situation; the newspaper men gave an impression of understanding and interest. Two of our team members were interviewed on a local TV talk show while in Houston. We met consumers at supermarkets, talked with home economists, housewives and consumer advocates and served on a panel responding to consumer questioning.

In Atlanta the team appeared on live TV talk shows, live and taped radio programs, and met with the editors and editorial staff of both the *Atlanta Constitution* and *Atlanta Journal*. We also conducted two hours of interviews with consumers at an Atlanta shopping center.

We participated on radio and TV talk shows in Boston. We met with the Massachusetts Commissioner of Agriculture and the Governor, and were introduced to a Joint Session of the Massachusetts Legislature where the team spoke briefly on the purpose of its tour. The team met with the "Mini-Consumer Board of Directors of the Stop and Shop Supermarkets" and had a two-hour exchange on food prices, farm returns, farm programs and subsidies, agricultural politics, etc. Operation FACT visited one of the few supermarkets located in the Black community anywhere in the U.S., and we talked at length with black consumers—most of whom are on fixed incomes or of low income.

An unusual experience in the Boston area was a visit to the U.S. Army Research and Development Center in Natick. Here, the Department of Defense is conducting experiments to improve food storability (shelf life) through irradiation processes. They are also developing a freeze-drying process to minimize handling and distribution problems connected with large-scale food shipments.

In New York we met with a Consumer Journalism class at the Columbia University Graduate School. We presented our story and then asked for their critique in terms of credibility and style of presentation. The class indicated that the team was very effective. They asked the same question we heard in Boston—"Why aren't farmers doing more of this to counteract their poor image?"

Before leaving New York we met with the editorial staff of the *Wall Street Journal* and were questioned on the direction and purpose of Federal farm programs.

Our tour ended in Washington, D.C., on April 28th with a luncheon on Capitol Hill set up by Senator Curtis and Congressman Mahon and attended by members of the House and Senate Agriculture Committees and top-level USDA personnel. The team reported on its communications tour and presented its findings to members of Congress attending the lunch. The report stimulated an impressive amount of interest and a lengthy question and answer period.

---

## TOP SOVIET OBJECTIVE: U.S. WITHDRAWAL FROM EUROPE

---

### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there are many voices both at home and abroad who urge an American withdrawal from Europe. One of the bases upon which such a policy is advocated is that the Soviet Union has abandoned its own territorial ambitions in Western Europe and has now embarked upon a policy of conciliation and detente.

Often, our own country has been victimized by its optimistic assessment of the policies of those whose aggressive desires have been made known, but have been somewhat camouflaged. Insisting upon seeing the best in others, we have mistaken the camouflage for reality and have often overlooked the real facts. Hitler's aggression in Europe, the Japanese assault in Asia, the Communist desire for control over Eastern Europe after World War II, all were misunderstood by American observers.

Speaking before the German Atlantic Society, West German Publisher Axel Springer expressed the view that Soviet goals have not changed in the least. He noted that—

For me the purpose of the East is unshakeably clear, and it is equally clear that the Soviet Union's Western policy has not altered one iota in its aims since the war. That aim has always been: Consolidation of military conquest in Eastern Europe, Sovietization of all Germany, and hegemony over Europe.

Mr. Springer points out that—

An American withdrawal is . . . the top priority long-term objective of Soviet policy for Europe. American withdrawal is the actual main objective of the repeatedly propagated European security conference, which West Germany in the Moscow treaty has promised to support. Once the U.S. troops were to go, however, NATO would become a mere chimera; the decisive prerequisites for Soviet hegemony over Europe will then have been created.

If the United States leaves Europe, Mr. Springer believes:

The Kremlin then expects . . . that not even ten years would be needed to bring Western Europe under Soviet control.

I wish to share Mr. Springer's remarks, as they were published in The New York Times of May 16, 1972, with my colleagues, and insert them in the RECORD at this time:

THE UNITED STATES MUST NOT LEAVE EUROPE

(By Axel Springer)

STUTTGART, GERMANY.—In the reflected glow of good feeling cast by West Berliners being temporarily reunited with families and friends in the eastern part of the city behind the Wall, it is worth looking at the reasons why reunion has been permitted to happen after six years of isolation and to determine the place Berlin occupies in today's world. By doing so, we may see why a city so far away is important to Americans.

To define the city's place, one need go no further than the statement of Willy Brandt in 1958, when he was both Mayor of Berlin and President of the Association of German Municipalities. He said, "From all German cities, factories and communities the call must come, not to be ignored, 'We will not be torn asunder. Berlin is the capital of Germany.'"

That place in both history and geography had been confirmed in the Convention on Relations between the Three Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany dated Oct. 23, 1954. What then, one may well ask, has happened that the Soviet-dominated Eastern part of our country woos West Berliners with the promise of easy access and the present leaders of the Federal Republic eagerly respond to such overtures?

From my viewpoint there are only a few possible explanations: Either those responsible in Bonn believe, in spite of all their own experience and in the face of all the information from secret and nonsecret services which they continuously and copiously receive, that one can now trust the Soviets because they have changed. Or, those responsible in Bonn have given up and believe there is no more chance for a free society to prevail against the Communists, and so one must try to come to an arrangement with the inevitable. Or, finally, those responsible desire victory for Socialism and the elimination of a free society because they believe in a just and workable Socialism or even a humane Communism.

For me the purpose of the East is unshakably clear, and it is equally clear that the Soviet Union's Western policy has not altered one iota in its aims since the war. That aim has always been: Consolidation of military conquest in Eastern Europe, Sovietization of all Germany, and hegemony over Europe.

This is the old great Russian aim, once

documented by a competent man, a witness who cannot be suspected of being a modern cold warmonger. "Russian policy is unchangeable," wrote this expert. "Russia's methods, tactics, maneuvers, can change; but the Pole Star of Russian politics—to rule the world—is a fixed star. There is only one way to deal with a power like Russia, and that is the way of fearlessness. . . ." Who wrote that? The London correspondent of the old New York Daily Tribune in his reports on Eastern policy. His name: Karl Marx.

The Eastern ambition to rule is served up to the Germans today in cheap demagogics as a peace policy. But for the Soviets, I believe, it is a policy for preparing the conquest of the rest of Europe. To me, therefore, the *ostpolitik* of the present German Government implies a deadly danger for our country and our people; and I consider it at the same time a menace to Europe as well as to the entire free world of which America is, of course, the foundation.

The immediate objective of the East clearly remains one way or another to overcome the "enemy," which means the West Germans. Why do they want this? Because Communism can only exist unchallenged in East Germany once democracy is eliminated from the Federal Republic in West Germany. Otherwise its magnetic attraction for the 17 million Germans under the Red yoke will persist. That is why it is so important for the Soviet imperial league to banish from the edge of its fortifications the permanent temptation of freedom. That is why Berlin is such a disturbing factor to them and so important to the West.

This objective is being pursued by the East in various ways. One is directed to political capitulation by the West. Important landmarks in this are the treaties of Moscow and Warsaw. A great deal has been said about these in the last Bundestag debate.

But to those in the United States, I believe one point in this East-West confrontation has particular importance: As long as the Americans remain engaged in Europe, the Soviets will not attain their objective. An American withdrawal is, therefore, the top-priority long-term objective of Soviet policy for Europe. American withdrawal is the actual main objective of the repeatedly propagated European security conference, which West Germany in the Moscow treaty has promised to support. Once the U.S. troops were to go, however, NATO would become a mere chimera; the decisive prerequisites for Soviet hegemony over Europe will then have been created. If the Americans leave Europe, the Kremlin then expects, according to credible information, that not even ten years would be needed to bring Western Europe under Soviet control.

## MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

## HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

## INDUSTRIAL NATIONS ON THE BRINK OF AN ECONOMICALLY DESTRUCTIVE TRADE WAR

## HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of Missouri are privileged to have one of their distinguished citizens, William S. Lowe, serving now as president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

This is recognized as a fine thing for the citizens of Missouri and particularly the city of Mexico, Mo., where Mr. Lowe makes his home. As one who has known Mr. Lowe for many years and had the privilege of serving with him on the Board of Trustees of William Woods College at Fulton, Mo., I suggest that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is fortunate in getting his services. He is a man of leadership and vision.

As foreign trade has become increasingly important to our economy, it has grown correspondingly as a subject of controversy. We have before us numerous measures designed to further restrict the flow of goods and capital across our borders. In other industrial nations, the situation is much the same.

In a perceptive and timely speech to an audience of European businessmen, Mr. Lowe has warned that the major industrial nations are today poised on the brink of an economically destructive trade war. The way to prevent it, he says, is for businessmen and their organizations to make every effort to educate the peoples of the world to the benefits of freer trade.

Mr. Lowe is himself an experienced international businessman. He is chairman and chief executive officer of A. P. Green Refractories Co., which manufactures firebrick and other ceramic materials used to insulate against ultrahigh temperatures in many industrial processes. The company has 22 plants in the United States and Canada, and 16 in other countries, with headquarters in Mexico, Mo. He is also a past president of the Missouri Chamber of Commerce, which he still serves as a director and member of its executive committee.

Mr. Lowe's speech, "Organizing for Economic Progress," was delivered to the biannual meeting of the Council of American Chambers of Commerce Abroad in Europe and the Mediterranean, held in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, May 26:

### ORGANIZING FOR ECONOMIC PROGRESS

Chairman Kelly, President Piliero, ladies and gentlemen: Mrs. Lowe and I are delighted to be here in this historic city of Amsterdam, and to have the privilege of meeting with all of you on the auspicious occasion of the semiannual meeting of the Euro-Med Council of American Chambers of Commerce.

I have heard that Netherlanders say, "God made the world, but the Dutch made the Netherlands." The sturdy, innovative character of the Dutch people is certainly evidence of that.

It is a privilege for me to represent the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and I bring you greetings and best wishes from our board of directors and from Arch N. Booth, our executive vice president.

In our Chamber federation of 40,000 business and 4,000 organization members, the American Chambers Abroad are far more important than their numbers alone would suggest. You are our window on the world. We are proud of you, and we invite an ever closer working relationship as we address ourselves to the problems and opportunities of the international business community.

The economies of the nations of the world are becoming more closely interrelated every day. What affects one tends to spread rapidly to all. Problems cross international borders. So must our search for solutions.

In our common effort, however, we must take care that the solutions we offer are soundly conceived. Then, we must make certain they are wisely implemented.

I want to discuss with you tonight some of the current developments and emerging problems which are seen by the National Chamber both as cause for concern and as challenges which offer opportunities for progress.

Underlying these developments has been the emergence of a new Europe—the near fulfillment of a remarkable concept—the European Community. Concurrently there has been another important post-war phenomenon in the world—the development of the multinational enterprise.

On the first point, developments of economic and trade relations between the United States and an enlarging European Community call for new forms of cooperation. Such cooperation is bound to benefit all parties involved. Let us acknowledge that the United States benefits from the success of the market of Six. Let us earnestly hope that similarly good relations can be maintained with the Europe of Ten.

There are, nonetheless, problems which should have attention before they become acute. This means a keen sense of responsibility on the part of all countries involved—the United States included.

### THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Just as the economies of countries are interrelated, so are the elements of international economic policy: Trade problems cannot be separated from monetary and investment matters. There are certain broad principles concerning the framework of international trade which I believe we all agree should be recognized:

1. The importance of increasing world trade;

2. The gradual elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade;

3. The principle of comparative economic advantage guiding the structure of trade;

4. The necessity of stable monetary arrangements for the development of trade relations.

At the same time, in supporting the principle of free trade, recognition should be given to the fairness of trade. Fair trade must be achieved by competitive performance and neither impeded nor distorted by artificial measures.

We recognize the essential role that the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has played and must continue to play in the evolution of an open trading system for the world. In consideration of the evolution of world trade in recent decades and of the emergence of new economic and monetary organizations, we would urge that it is time for the GATT rules to be applied and honored.

With respect to the importance of non-tariff barriers to trade, more attention must be given to the problems of world-wide technical and environmental standards and legal and administrative controls.

On the monetary side, while the Bretton Woods system has been of considerable benefit to the world economy, it does require some modification. Even so, its basic principles remain valid and should be maintained. For example, every country has the responsibility of managing its own economy appropriately, so that its actions do not have an adverse impact on other economies. Also, while the system of relatively fixed parity levels is a good one, some changes are desirable in order to give it greater flexibility. When a currency's parity is out of line, it should be adjusted before a crisis erupts.

Establishment of a European currency may face practical difficulties in the short range, but may well be a desirable objective.

There should be early restoration of the convertibility of the dollar, and full confidence in the dollar must be reestablished. To this end, continued efforts must be made to improve the U.S. balance of payments, including the strengthening of its trade accounts to enable the U.S. to meet its other important international obligations.

One desirable step in this direction would be a partial funding of U.S. dollar balances—converting into longer-term debt some portion of excess short-term dollar liabilities to overseas holders.

Progress toward convertibility would serve to reduce the danger of a general imposition of controls over trade and capital movements. Certainly, any world monetary changes should aim at the greatest possible freedom of trade and capital flows.

It seems likely that Special Drawing Rights will ultimately become the major foreign reserve asset as their allocation expands, with a relatively lesser role for dollars, sterling and gold.

One way to utilize surplus dollars more effectively is through more European direct investment in the United States. If you know of obstacles to such investment, please tell us. They should be identified and removed.

INTERNATIONAL INVESTMENT AND NATIONALISM

The third part of the international economic equation is international investment. Freedom of trade and investment are generally linked. Investment provides one of the most effective vehicles for improving the wealth of both rich and poor countries.

The major impediments to investment all over the world, including fiscal, legal and social disparities, need removing. Double taxation should be eliminated, and national treatment generally accorded all investors. Of course, international investment must always respect national sensitivities.

There is an insidious, narrow economic nationalism rising in certain countries—and to a degree even in the U.S. It is not to be confused with patriotism. Its rationale is expressed in terms of a need for more employment within a country, for the conservation of foreign exchange otherwise required for imports and, possibly, for the provision of an opportunity to earn foreign exchange through exports.

None of these objectives is in itself unworthy. The approach used, however, is contrary to the trade expansionist concept and frequently has to find its support through specious appeal to prejudice. The outcome is usually a highly protected preference for domestic goods accompanied by a virtual shut-out of foreign goods. Quality, performance, price, operating costs and all the other considerations which go into the determination of value are subordinated to the nationality of source. So also are the advantages derived from effective competition.

The displaced U.S. exporter is, accordingly, obliged either to abandon the market to protected domestic sources or to try to hold a place by undertaking production within the market.

If, indeed, this production takes the form of direct investment, it may be found that the plague of economic nationalism passes from the goods to the investment. In what sometimes seems to be little more than false pride, laws are passed to curb foreign ownership or to confine it to a minority position. The rationale rests on a claim that sometimes a business should be operated not in accordance with the best interest of the concern itself but in accordance with what local nationals or their government may deem best for some other purpose.

To forestall these irresponsible actions, international investors must always seek to emulate the high standards of responsible corporate action that many multinational enterprises have applied with success. Even then, there will remain an urgent need to increase *public understanding* of the proper function played by multinational investment in the world economy. The multinational corporation on a world-wide scale has been a most effective and successful agent for the production and distribution of goods and services through all parts of the population.

You and your membership play an important role in explaining to the public the positive contribution of multinational corporations. Emphasis on sound public affairs programs is exceedingly well placed.

Attitudes vary greatly throughout the world and are influenced by many things, not the least of which are local political considerations. In certain Latin American countries at this time, the multinational enterprise is in a tenuous situation, to put it mildly. Even in Canada domestic pressures have brought about proposals for a review of take-overs by foreigners. Canadian firms valued at more than $250,000 or with annual revenues exceeding $3 million would be effected.

Meanwhile, on the brighter side, in Japan there is a distinct trend toward greater freedom of movement of capital.

In Europe, I am reliably informed, most countries enjoy stable government and once hostile governments are now re-inviting U.S. investments, albeit under close scrutiny. In spite of this, it has been pointed out that protectionist trends in European-U.S. trade relations are heavily reported and have a concentric impact larger than reality. The press throughout Europe has been saturated with articles on the vices of multinational corporations. U.S. investment is seemingly not needed now as it was in the past.

U.S. ECONOMIC AND TRADE POLICY

Understandably, the United States has grown anxious at the signs of a European Community turning inward and becoming more protectionist, while expanding its size. On the other hand, the Europeans chastise the U.S. for complaining about the economic dislocations caused in the States by Community trade policy. But Europeans should remember that in the past the U.S. has accepted tremendous economic, political and military burdens to create a politically strong, economically stable Atlantic Alliance.

In the trade field, the U.S. has initiated several major trade agreements and has taken the lead in removing tariff barriers to trade expansion. The National Chamber does not believe it is the intention of the U.S. Government to renounce these precedents. However, it is clear that a tougher trade policy is emerging from the U.S. in response to tougher trade policies by its trading partners. The National Chamber supports this rational position.

The fact, is the post-war era of American scientific and technological supremacy in the world economy has come to an end. We now face a new era of more intensive international competition.

We cannot indulge the misconceptions that have encouraged fiscal irresponsibility at home and weakened the dollar abroad. Deep-rooted and persistent inflation has become a serious problem. Events have forced us to recognize that we can no longer safely ignore rules of reason, prudence and self-discipline in the management of our economy. That was the significance of President Nixon's dramatic move on August 15.

The President's decisive action offered our nation, and the world, historic risks as well as historic opportunities. The risks are that the greatest bastion of free, competitive enterprise, in a reflex action of self-defense, may now turn inward, in both economic and political philosophy. The opportunities are, through renewed constructive and cooperative action, to achieve another step forward in the slow, and sometimes painful, evolutionary process toward a more open world and greater human welfare.

President Nixon had no choice but to arrest the forces that were slowly but surely sapping our economic vitality. The symptoms of our creeping incapacity, both at home and abroad, have been long apparent. They included the 20-year chronic U.S. balance of payment deficits, the resulting decline in our gold reserves from a post-war high of $25 billion to less than $10 billion, the drop in our share of world exports from 25% in 1948 to 14% in 1970, and, for the year 1971, the first trade deficit since 1893. Add to these unnerving statistics the fact that the purchasing power of the dollar has declined by 27% since 1965. Under such circumstances, even those who know the dangers of wage-price controls could only applaud the President for his recognition of the emergency facing our nation. Phase I had to come.

Insofar as Phase II is concerned, the jury is still out. If you want to be a pessimist, you can point to the fact that both wage rates and prices have been creeping up at a faster rate than the guidelines are supposed to allow. And you can worry about the "time bomb" inflationary potential of the government's record deficits, when economic recovery is completed and the economy returns to capacity.

On the other hand, the optimists can point to the fact that inflation has slowed somewhat, if not as much as we would like.

In the end, the greater threat to our economy would seem to come not from *economic* policy, but rather, from the effect of domestic political considerations *on* economic policy.

LABOR TURNS PROTECTIONIST

While U.S. business supports in principle the President's program, labor has been more critical, culminating in the well-publicized walk-out from the Pay Board.

George Meany's attacks on the wage-price aspects of the package are being parroted on the trade and investment policy side.

Mr. Meany believes that the President's program for increasing exports and curbing imports is inadequate. He feels it will not restrain U.S. based multinational companies and the international banks from practices which, accounting to the AFL-CIO, have meant the "export" of American jobs.

Therefore, organized labor in the U.S. is urging Congress to enact an ominous program which includes:

New tax measures to halt the alleged "export of jobs"; to remove presumed incentives to establish new plants and to curb expansion of existing facilities abroad.

New legislation to restrict outflows of U.S. capital, including close controls on the nature of investments and on the effects of Eximbank loans of U.S. trade and the national economy.

Presidential authority to supervise and limit the export of technology, through standards to regulate licensing and patent agreements.

International fair labor standards inserted in trade agreements.

And quantitative restraints on imports that allegedly threaten the displacement of U.S. production and workers.

The bill itself is less of a threat than the philosophy it represents. It has been generally recognized for the reactionary outrage that it is, and therefore stands little chance of passage as a unit. However, the political influence of organized labor is both potent and enduring. Therefore, the greater danger is that regressive trade legislation will make its way through Congress piece-by-piece, either separately or tacked on to other, unrelated bills.

Guarding against this eventuality will require continuing vigilance and effort.

With labor throwing its weight into the scale against international trade, American farmers become the swing vote. An alliance of farm interests, enlightened consumers and internationally-oriented businesses has just enough political strength to hold the protectionists at bay. We must therefore keep in mind the political importance and social implications of the agricultural situation on both sides of the Atlantic. In current and forthcoming negotiations, account should be taken of the necessity for maintaining equitable income to farmers while enhancing their market opportunities.

As you can see, this is an issue ideally suited both to the demagogue and to an age in which people receive their news in small capsules and their conclusions in quick jumps.

Indeed, there are already pending in Congress several bills to repeal the earned income exemption for U.S. citizens working abroad, to limit or eliminate credits allowed on U.S. taxes for taxes paid abroad, to repeal the Asset Depreciation Range allowance, to repeal the Domestic International Sales Corporation, and to repeal the Western Hemisphere Trade Corporation tax provision.

Both the labor push for protection and the populist appeals for tax reform are aimed directly to the very corporations which you represent, or with which you deal. Beyond that, they are aimed, through ignorance or selfishness, at the entire underpinning of the economic prosperity of the Western world.

Americans especially are just not aware of the importance of international trade to the high standard of living we all enjoy.

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE MNE

The National Chamber, through the efforts of its International Group and its Special Task Force on the Multinational Enterprise, is aggressively fighting these potentially disastrous anti-trade bills. Since good intelligence is the first step in a successful campaign, the Chamber undertook a survey of major U.S. international companies—now completed—which clearly documents three basic facts:

Contrary to labor's charge that foreign investment means the "export of American jobs," the findings show that U.S. international companies *increased domestic employment* far beyond the national average during the 1969 to 1970 period; that these companies *increased exports* far above the national average; and that the major reason for going overseas was that this was the only viable way of serving the market.

The full report is currently at the printer and will be available soon. It cuts through a proliferation of misinformation, and can go far in preventing misguided action in the U.S. against U.S. investment overseas.

The emergence of protectionist sentiment in the United States, as elsewhere, reflects a normal reaction to economic difficulty and unemployment. It is always easy to point to outside competition as the prime culprit when business slackens—whether or not it is justified. This makes it all the more important that all trading nations strive to abide by the rules of fair trading practices as restraints beget restraints on the part of others in retaliatory measure.

There must be a spirit of give and take so that the mutuality of objectives will not be obscured by narrow interests. This is not to say that dislocations should not be met on the domestic front, but the remedies to be used should be carefully chosen so that they will not be unduly disruptive or breed unbridled retaliation.

The 1970's will be a period of heightened competition and accelerated adjustment to change. Hopefully, 1973 will see extended negotiations among major trading nations to set the monetary, trade and developmental policies for an era marked by the maturity of the European market, the continuing rise of Japan, and the further growth of the multinational corporation.

Policy negotiations will be carried on in a context of increasing world concern over environmental issues, particularly as they relate to foreign trade and depletion of resources. The economic instability caused by varying rates of inflation will remain a major problem. To maintain an open society of dynamic growth and rising living standards through this decade, business and government leaders must not only have, but take, the opportunity to get down to basics in a frank exchange of views. The National Chamber is sponsoring a National Conference on International Trade Policy on December 6 in Washington, D.C. to provide such exposure of problems.

To lead calls for courage and enterprise. The call for enterprise falls most heavily on we who represent business. A prominent business statesman has wisely observed. "If we allow ourselves to be intimidated by sometimes exaggerated reports of hostility toward us, we will not be doing our part. If we insist on being 'liked' before we act, we will never enjoy the opportunity to earn the better right of being respected. If we act courageously, we shall become even greater contributors to a society which can only be as great as its industry is progressive. We need more effective private decision-making."

It has been well said that history demonstrates that a two-fold test of a great people is their ability, first, to foresee the impact of world movements on the nation, the economy and their personal well-being. And, second, their ability to act bravely, wisely, vigorously and promptly to master their own fate.

A statement of Nicholas Murray Butler seems even more apt today than when it was written over fifty years ago:

"What higher use can be made of a nation's sovereignty than to cooperate with other like-minded sovereign nations in the common tasks of advancing civilization and promoting the comforts, the satisfaction, and the happiness of man, in removing artificial barriers to trade and commerce, in spreading abroad the teachings of science, in making common property of the world's literature and the world's art, and in holding out the hand of helpfulness and courage to those less fortunate peoples who, backward in their social organization or in their philosophy of life, have not yet been able to take their place in the council board of nations?"

I am grateful for this opportunity to meet with you today. I feel very strongly that there is a great need for more consultation and cooperation among the business communities represented here. There must be more cooperation, for the world has grown too complex, the economic pressures are too strong for us to continue going our separate ways.

Please let us have your views at all times.

## THE ALASKA FESTIVAL OF MUSIC

### HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, each year, the Alaska Festival of Music is held to afford to Alaskans an opportunity to concentrate their attention on the performing arts. This 2-week program, including performing and visual arts ranges from native music and crafts to major orchestral compositions and jazz, and affords Alaskans from all over the State the opportunity to participate and perform. All Alaskans consider it a valuable part of the cultural life of the State. I enclose for the attention of my colleagues the recent proclamation of Alaska Gov. William A. Egan commemorating the Alaska Festival of Music:

PROCLAMATION—ALASKA FESTIVAL OF MUSIC TIME

The Alaska Festival of Music is dedicated to a threefold emphasis of studying, performing, and hearing great music.

The first Music Festival was held in 1956, and it has continued to draw its audience, participants, auditors, and native scholars from throughout Alaska.

The programs of the Alaska Music Festival, including performing and visual arts ranging from native music and crafts to major orchestral-choral compositions and jazz, afford Alaskans the opportunity to enjoy performances by talented residents of our own great State as well as performances by leading national and international artists.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, in recognition of this program which contributes to the prestige and culture of our great State, proclaim the month of June, 1972, as "Alaska Festival of Music Time" throughout Alaska, and I urge all who are able to do so to participate in, or attend, this worthy and enjoyable event which will be staged in Anchorage over a two-week period beginning June 15, 1972.

Dated this fourth day of May, 1972.

## NATIONAL STUDENT LOBBY ENDORSES EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972

### HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the Education Amendments of 1972 has received the endorsement of the National Student Lobby representing 134 member colleges and universities and 950,000 students in 36 States. It has been my pleasure to work with the NSL during our consideration of this legislation. I would like to express my personal tribute for their sophisticated and effective efforts and share with my colleagues the following statement:

STATEMENT BY LAYTON OLSON, DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL STUDENT LOBBY

The Conference Report on the Higher Education Act (S. 659) passed the Senate last week by a substantial majority (63–15). Now this legislation goes to the House for final passage. The Report represents two years of effort by members of Congress to legislate increased benefits for students enrolled in institutions of higher education and for the colleges they attend. As reported out of Conference, this Omnibus Higher Education Act (S. 659) includes new provisions and programs which would allow students, previously prevented from attending college for financial reasons, opportunities to acquire a college degree.

Last year over 400,000 students who were deemed eligible for participation in student assistance programs, both by their institutions and the Federal Government, had the door to college slammed in their face. For no other reason than insufficient funds, they were barred from attending college. S. 659 takes an important step in the direction of solving this problem. Most importantly, S. 659 begins the process of involving the Federal Government in guaranteeing at least some money to needy students through Basic Educational Opportunity Grants. This is an historic step.

With 134 member colleges and universities the National Student Lobby (NSL) speaks for 950,000 students in institutions of higher education in 36 states. With its central office in Washington, D.C., the NSL has been actively engaged in all phases of development of the Omnibus Higher Education Act. On March 22, 23, and 24 of this year, the NSL coordinated a major lobbying effort bringing 350 students from 39 states to Washington, D.C. to speak with their legislators and to lobby in support of the "Basic Grants" provision (which was subsequently included in the Conference Report)—and against anti-busing amendments. In addition, these students lobbied in support of the Harris Amendment which would encourage student representation on Boards of Trustees (a considerably watered down version of this Amendment now appears in the Conference Report).

As provided in the final Conference Report, the advantages of S. 659 to both universities and students are considerable. At a time when students and universities alike are under critical financial pressure, this Higher Education Act speaks substantively to the vital financial questions of higher education and to the changing approaches to institutional management. Benefits in S. 659 for students and universities include:

(1) The *Basic Educational Opportunities Grants Program* providing needy college students with up to $1400.00 yearly assistance for education, minus their "family contribution."

(2) Continued funding at guaranteed minimum levels of present student Educational Opportunity Grants (E.O.G.), Work-Study programs, and low-interest direct loans programs.

(3) extension of Work-Study programs to community service jobs (with preferences for veterans) and to part time students.

(4) a "Harris Amendment" encouraging student participation (i.e., representation) on college and university Boards of Trustees, with the student body having a voice in the selection of such student Trustee.

(5) funds to finance *reforms* in higher education.

(6) creation of a National Institute of Education to finance needed *research* at all levels of education.

(7) massive direct financial aid to colleges and universities.

Coupled with its other higher educational provisions, this conference bill undoubtedly represents the most comprehensive and advanced higher education achievement to have ever come for a vote before Congress. The National Student Lobby is seriously concerned with the future welfare of higher education in America, and urges the active support and passage of this act. The Senate has recognized the substantial merit of S. 659, and has voted accordingly. The time has now come for the House to act.

Passage of the Report on Higher Education (S. 659) in this session is placed in doubt by the anti-busing provisions. Jeopardizing the entire Higher Education program, however, on the basis of such an emotionally charged and confused issue as busing would constitute an unwarranted and irresponsible action by the House.

Ever since the Supreme Court struck down "separate but equal" and instituted busing as one method for achieving racial balance, the depth of our domestic racial problems have become clearer. The emotional question of the effectiveness of busing has divided the country. The anti-busing Amendments on the Higher Education Act S. 659 are seen by students as a serious threat to the progressive measures this legislation outlines and a weakening of the moral leadership of the Congress. However, the benefits of the Higher Education Act S. 659 provisions stand apart in issue and merit from the busing issue. The anti-busing provisions (providing for full federal court appeals before the issuance of a busing order) would be in effect only until January 1, 1974. The benefits and effects of Higher Education upon society are lasting; the weight of public emotions and opinion of the moment are not. Accordingly, it is the responsibility of the House to recognize this crucial difference, and to vote passage of the Conference Report on Higher Education (S. 659).

---

## NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS HIGHER EDUCATION CONFERENCE REPORT

### HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, as we near the final vote on the Higher Education Conference Report still another education association has endorsed the conference report. I am pleased to share with my colleagues the following letter I received today from the National School Boards Association in which this major association representing the public schools of our Nation urge adoption of the conference report. The letter follows:

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
*Washington, D.C., June 7, 1972.*

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
*Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN PERKINS: On behalf of the National School Boards Association I wish to again commend you and the members of your committee from both political parties for the outstanding way in which the conference on S. 659 was concluded.

This conference report, like nearly all similar reports, is the result of a compromise of varying points of view. Therefore it is inevitable that certain decisions of the conferees would not meet with our support—the final language of Title V, General Provisions Relating to the Assignment of Transportation of Students being the best example. Nevertheless, on balance we find this a *great* piece of legislation and *endorse* its final passage.

The scope of the bill is not limited to higher education, but contains substantive provisions for elementary and secondary schools. Local school districts need the research which will be provided through the National Institute of Education, they need support in occupational education, and they need financial assistance to deal with desegregation problems. The Education Amendments of 1972 contain provisions designed to meet these needs and much more.

Again I must say that we who represent the public schools of our nation urge the final passage of the report.

Sincerely,

AUGUST W. STEINHILBER.
*Director, Federal and Congressional Relations.*

---

## POOR WOMEN AND THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—ERA

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, 1972, Mrs. Elizabeth Duncan Koontz delivered a speech—"ERA and Upward Mobility for Women"—at the Equal Rights Amendment Ratification Assembly here in Washington. Mrs. Koontz, in her address, quickly laid to rest one of the perennial arguments used against the ERA, the equal rights amendment. The ERA is not a constitutional provision aimed at giving the greatest benefits to business and professional women. Its object is to benefit all women and, in the larger sense, the entire Nation.

As Mrs. Koontz points out, young women and girls, particularly disadvantaged young women and girls, will benefit greatly from the ERA. Mrs. Koontz' description of these benefits is a good one. I place it in the RECORD at this point:

ERA AND UPWARD MOBILITY FOR WOMEN

(By Mrs. Elizabeth Duncan Koontz)

Many people have the mistaken idea that the Equal Rights Amendment will be of greatest benefit to business and professional women—that it might even work to the disadvantage of other workers.

Actually, young women and girls, particularly the disadvantaged, stand to gain the most in tangible benefits, once the Amendment becomes law. This is true on a number of counts.

1. EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Our society has, for too long, designated certain jobs for men and others for women, and for the most part, women's jobs have required less skill and paid less money. For this reason girls and women have usually been excluded from vocational education courses in auto and aircraft mechanics, electronics, repair of appliances and office machines, jewelry and watch repairing, and similar training.

Most vocational training for girls is confined to fields traditionally thought of as women's. More than half the women and girls in public vocational programs are being trained in home economics and about one-third are studying office practice.

As a matter of policy, many school systems have maintained separate vocational courses or even separate vocational schools for boys and girls. The Amendment would require that all educational opportunities in the public schools be open to both girls and boys.

Young women from poor families will benefit at the college level, too. Many depend on Scholarships for tuition and other expenses but often women are restricted by a quota system or men are given preference in the awarding of scholarships. Under the Amendment, government supported colleges and universities would be required to make scholarships and other student aid programs equally available to students of both sexes.

2. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR JOB TRAINING

Publicly funded training programs for the disadvantaged would be required to provide the same opportunities for men and women under the Equal Rights Amendment. At present, some inequities do exist.

For instance, the law provides that the Secretary of Labor endeavor to achieve 50 percent participation of women in the Job Corps. However, the present enrollment of women is only 28.9 percent, in spite of the fact that the Nation's highest unemployment rate is among non-white girls, aged 16–21.

Possibly, young women are not attracted to the Job Corps because the kinds of training provided follow the same old limiting pattern. For instance, enclosed in the December assistance checks sent by a southwestern State to recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children was Job Corps recruiting material. Young women were offered training in the occupations of secretary, hospital and food service workers, beauty operator and nurse's aide. Young men were offered training as auto mechanics, heavy equipment operators, carpenters and electronics workers—all better paying jobs with a future.

To cite another example—the recently passed Public Law 92-223 amending Title II of the Social Security Act, gives male heads of households priority over female heads of household for training and work under the Work Incentive Program (WIN).

3. BENEFITS FROM MILITARY SERVICE

Women would be subject to the draft under the Equal Rights Amendment but military service would make them eligible for training while in service and for all the veterans' benefits which have provided an exit from poverty for disadvantaged young men for many years.

At present, the armed forces treat men and women differently in a number of ways that tend to discriminate against women:

Young women cannot volunteer for military service unless they are high school graduates. This is not true of men.

Women must make higher scores on the educational tests than the regular scores for men who are drafted.

Women are excluded from many occupational slots that might lead to lucrative careers in civilian life. They are not, for example, permitted to train as pilots.

4. ANY STATE OR LOCAL LAWS LIMITING THE HOURS WOMEN MAY WORK OR THE TYPES OF WORK THEY MAY DO AND LAWS SETTING CERTAIN LABOR STANDARDS FOR WOMEN ONLY WOULD BE INVALIDATED

Actually, very few of these so-called "protective" laws remain. In most cases they have been found to be restrictive, rather than protective, and have been ruled discriminatory under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. But we find situations such as that in one State where women earn pay for two and three-fifths fewer weeks than men because they are required to take lunch breaks while men can eat on the job. Nightwork laws in some States prevent women from earning premium pay.

The fact of the matter is that "protective legislation" rarely covered the poorest working women in the country, those in service occupations, like household employment, which have been, generally, outside the coverage of those laws.

It should be noted that under the Equal Rights Amendment, where existing laws confer a benefit on women, such as laws requiring rest periods for women workers, the benefit would be extended to men. On the other hand, where a law restricts or denies opportunities to women, the law would be rendered unconstitutional.

5. INEQUITIES IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE WOULD BE CORRECTED

The poor woman suffers most through inequities in criminal justice. Delinquency and crime breed most frequently under conditions of poverty and the poor are least able to cope with the behavioral problems that lead to crime. Statistics show that one-half of all girls appearing before juvenile courts are referred there for non-criminal behavioral problems while that is true of only one-fifth of the cases involving boys. The family of a poor girl is unable to afford psychiatric treatment or a private school in order to avoid her commitment to a reformatory where she is likely to serve a longer sentence than a boy committing a more serious offense.

Adult women may be given harsher sentences than men for the same offense. If she is head of a family or has dependents, the imprisonment of a poor woman can be devastating to those who depend upon her for the necessities of life.

While the injustices of sex discrimination affect all women, poor women, particularly non-white poor women, are at a special disadvantage. Middle and upper income women can sometimes obtain through private means remedies or opportunities available to poor women only if public policy changes. When the Equal Rights Amendment is ratified we will need to change some existing laws and enact others to eliminate conflict between State and local laws and practices and the new constitutional amendment. We will have to guard, too, against those forces in our society that resist the idea of giving women equal power, forces that can be expected to raise barriers to implementation of the law, that will even seek to play off one disadvantaged group against another—minority men against women, for instance.

---

## TAX CREDITS FOR OVERBURDENED PARENTS OF CHILDREN IN PRIVATE SCHOOLS

### HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 15296, that will provide a tax credit to parents of children in private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools of up to half the tuition paid with a maximum ceiling of $400 a year.

This bill is really not a radical departure from the past in that the Federal Government has without objection aided those going to all schools of higher education, regardless of whether private or Government institutions. Three GI bills bear this out. Therefore, I see no objection in aiding the parents of pupils in elementary schools in the form of a tax credit, since there is no objection to the direct aid of students attending private colleges.

For a considerable period of time, the U.S. Government has encouraged pluralism in education rather than promoting a government monopoly of education.

Today there are over 5 million children in elementary and secondary private schools. The vast majority of these children are in parochial schools. Their 2 million parents pay the same tax bill that other citizens do while voluntarily paying additional sums in order to provide a private education for their children. This voluntary effort results in the saving of $4,290 million in public money since it costs on a national average $858 a year to educate a child in the public schools.

Tax credits are allowed citizens for the payment of interest on mortgages, for interest on car payments and sales taxes. Yet, up to now, we have allowed nothing for the payment of tuition for the education of a child, a far more significant expenditure.

While it is true that up until now parents have borne their double burden of private tuition and school taxes without complaint, they can no longer do so. Private education in the United States is in financial trouble because of the impact of a severe inflation.

If we ignore private education's plight, we will be ignoring its contribution to American society and if we wait long enough we can expect to spend $4 billion a year more on government education. While the costs of my bill to the Treasury may reach $500 million, it is a saving considering the problem.

I believe that the limited competition now existing between private and public education in our elementary and high schools is good for both. Each in effect sets goals for the other as a result in comparison in methods, successes, and failures. Each provides a yardstick for the other. This kind of competition is part and parcel of the American system in my opinion and I believe that my bill is a step in keeping the total American school system alive and well.

---

## TENANT TAX DEDUCTION 25 PERCENT RENT

### HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the need to reform our system of taxation so as to equalize the burden among persons of all income groups; and to eliminate the discriminatory features now embodied in the law. One such feature which has developed operates to the particular-disadvantage of those who rent rather than own their homes. A homeowner is presently permitted a tax deduction for the amount of his property tax as well as the interest on his mortgage. Even the owner of a cooperative apartment is allowed to deduct that portion of his rent or maintenance which represents the property taxes on his building and the interest on the mortgage. A tenant, however, is permitted no such deduction, even though his rent includes a proportion of the property tax passed on by the landlord.

To eliminate this discriminatory feature, and to take an important step toward equalizing the tax burden, I am today introducing a bill which would permit a tenant the right to deduct from his personal income tax 25 percent of his annual rent. This legislation closely resembles a measure proposed in the New York State legislature by Assemblymen Eli Wager and Irwin Landes that would permit a 25 percent deduction from the New York State personal income tax.

Mr. Speaker, by so acknowledging the substantial contribution the tenant makes to the property tax on his building, I believe this legislation will effectively equalize tax treatment for tenant and homeowner alike and thereby restore a long absent measure of justice to the millions of renters who now reap no benefit for the taxes they pay.

REPORT ON THE COLD WAR

## HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Fred Warner Neal, an associate at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Santa Barbara, Calif., recently gave an important address on "American Foreign Policy at the Crossroads: The New Game Plan, the U.S.S.R. and Europe." His talk, before the center's convocation on "The United States and the World After the Cold War," was given in New York on May 6, 1972.

Dr. Neal, an expert on the cold war, testified before the Subcommittee on Europe last year on the subject. His latest statement brings up to date his excellent analysis of our difficulties in dealing with the Soviet Union. I include his speech below:

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY AT THE CROSSROADS: THE NEW GAME PLAN, THE U.S.S.R. AND EUROPE

(By Fred Warner Neal)

The Chinese have a saying that to prophesy is dangerous, especially about the future. It should, perhaps, be amended to say, especially about the future of American foreign policy in 1972. Until a relatively few days ago, at least, the options open to us looked like this:

1. We had the possibility, for the first time, of ending the Cold War altogether, of achieving a detente with the Soviet Union—and with China—and putting coexistence on an assured basis which would guarantee peace and survival.

2. We had the possibility of continuing the comparatively low-key Cold War sparring of recent years while entering into peripheral *ad hoc* agreements and understanding calculated to tamp down those passions not already eroded by ennui, economic considerations and glimpses of thermonuclear reality.

3. We also had the possibility of heating up the Cold War and returning to the era of serious and possibly deadly confrontation and conflict.

The omens for the first possibility, breaking free of the confines of the Cold War and putting our international relations on a new footing, seemed good for a while. The disaster of Vietnam brought popular discontent and the beginnings of a reexamination of our Cold War policies. The Soviet Union, anxious for a formal settlement in Europe, indicated in countless ways, in the diaphanous body language of diplomacy, its desire to put relations with the United States on a new and firmer basis. And President Nixon's comparative restraint in rhetoric and policy led one to hope that after all he might be a pragmatist rather than true believer and would take advantage of the situation to fulfill his promise of establishing a generation of peace.

It was probably too much to hope for realistically. After twenty-five years, the Cold War mentality in our country has become institutionalized, and one could hardly expect the President, major victim (or victimizer) to break free of it entirely. The second possibility, continued Cold War but on a less passionate plane, thus seemed more realistic. The awful anomaly, however, is that our present policy may well be rushing pell mell toward the third alternative, a reheating of the Cold War. Almost certainly this is not something Mr. Nixon wants any more than anybody else, save for a few kooks and extremists. But if we are not extremely lucky it is what we may get nevertheless.

If this indeed be our predicament, the explanation lies, I think, first in President Nixon's continued commitment to Cold War concepts and secondly to Dr. Kissinger's commitment of what I would call the "back to Metternich syndrome."

For a quarter of a century, American foreign policy has been dominated by Cold War concepts. They originated, I think, in the deeply-held and largely psychological-originated fear that the United States faced a military threat from the Soviet Union. I am deeply convinced there was no basis whatsoever for this fear, but, unlike the new revisionist historians, I do think the fear existed and was sincerely believed in. It followed that those who held it in effect abandoned diplomacy and focused on the use of military power to "contain" the Soviet Union, which we saw as the originator of all Communism as well as other evils. From there we went on to try military containment of China, of Communism generally and finally simply revolution, which we subsumed under the totally illogical term of "internal aggression."

UNITED STATES ALONE NOT RESPONSIBLE

I am not suggesting that the United States alone was responsible for the Cold War. It takes two, or more, to make a war, even a Cold War. But I am asserting that our misperceptions of reality—of the world and of the Soviet Union in particular, were a major if not the primary factor.

In any event, in the process of trying to prevent "Communism" from dominating the world—the perennial American nightmare—a number of characteristic Cold War attitudes took a firm hold on American foreign policy thinking. Psychologically, we refused to accept the reality of the Soviet Union as a great power, and later of China. We refused to deal with the USSR as even a potential equal. We refused to negotiate with the Russians meaningfully if at all. We insisted on trying to maintain military superiority and saw Moscow's refusal to accept inferiority as proof of aggressive intent. Our attempted military encirclement of the Soviet Union, and then of China, we saw as defensive, and we objected to their objections to it. All resulting problems—spiraling nuclear arms race, ever-expanding foreign bases, and continual military intervention—were justified by the perceived Communist threat—which had to be contained at all costs.

The Cold War policy, aimed at a threat that wasn't there, failed because it was conceived on the assumption that the United States could maintain unto itself a dominant preponderance of military power. Once this assumption proved to be wrong, not only did the American Cold War policy not work but it became acutely dangerous. Neither Soviet influence nor revolution could be satisfactorily contained, at least without risking thermonuclear war.

FAILURE IN VIETNAM

Vietnam has been the *reductio ad absurdum*, the *reductio ad tragedium*, of all this—Vietnam and the suicidal arms race. But Vietnam, for all its tragedy, could turn out to have a good effect. Up until recently, the Cold War foreign policy was neither debated nor questioned in the United States. The impact of our egregious failure in Vietnam—exposed by the casualty rate, the revolt of the youth, the television and the Pentagon Papers—has now, for the first time, aroused critical attention to the fundamentals of American Cold War concepts. The remarkable article by Senator Fulbright, in the January 8th issue of *The New Yorker*—is a case in point. I don't think Senator Fulbright's analysis goes far enough, but until something like it comes to be widely accepted, I doubt if we will get very far with new foreign policy directions.

As I read the Nixon foreign policy game plan, the way it has unfolded in recent weeks—and days—it is still based mainly on the Cold War concepts. It still seeks the same ends and objectives, only now it is trying to use 19th century balance of power diplomacy, as well as military power, to obtain them. If the original Cold War policy failed because world reality refused to conform to the American view of it, I think failure for the new Cold War policy is likely for the same reason.

The new Nixon Cold War policy reflects an idea dear to the hearts of some professors of international relations, namely that the postwar bi-polar world, in which the United States and the Soviet Union were the only major powers, has been replaced by a multipolar world with five rather than two power centers. In such a world, it is felt, wily diplomacy can achieve the upper hand by playing off various powers against each other, just like Metternich in the 19th century. Nowhere is this system discussed with more enthusiasm than Dr. Kissinger's doctoral dissertation, published under the title *A World Restored*.

A CENTURY TOO LATE

There is only one thing wrong with it as a prescription for policy today. It is a century too late—or, perhaps, a century too early. Because the most important fact about the present-day international system is that peace and a liveable world depend in the first instance on relations between the United States and the Soviet Union. That which contributes to a betterment of these relations contributes to peace. That which threatens these relations threatens the peace. This has nothing to do with what one thinks about the Soviet Union. It is simply the prime, hard, cold reality of the 1970's.

In future years—if we make it through this decade—it is not inconceivable that our relations with other countries may become equally important—our relations with China, for example, with Japan, with Western Europe, if it ever becomes a unified entity. I am not suggesting that these relations are not now important. Indeed, both we and the Russians have to consider them more than before. I am merely saying that in terms of the power to destroy and the power to exert influence, the United States and the Soviet Union remain in a unique category by themselves. In this sense, we still have very much a bi-polar world, however altered its nature.

There is much talk these days about multipolarity, some of it based on wishful thinking, some of it on crystal-grazing. It may be useful for an academic lecture on the international politics of the future. But to the extent it ignores the over-riding priority of American-Soviet relations it is both wrong and dangerous as a guide for foreign policy. Nevertheless, all the signals emanating from the present game-plan indicate that this is the course we have set.

BACK TO METTERNICH

The first major step in the Nixon-Kissinger attempt to resurrect the Metternichian system was the rapprochement with China. The very idea of the President's visit to Peking, of course, is enormously important because it brought about an end to twenty years of total unrealism about China. But it seems clear that much more than this was involved.

For the past three years, the Russians, both here and in Moscow, have been forcefully and seriously telling anybody who would listen that they were worried about American-Chinese collusion against them. It seemed like such a ridiculous idea that I, at least, put it down to the well-known Soviet paranoia about the rest of the world. Several factors, however, suggest that the Russians may have known what they were talking about.

First, the anti-Soviet orientation of Mr.

Nixon's anti-Communism has shown itself repeatedly, most clearly, perhaps, in recent weeks regarding Vietnam. Second, there is Dr. Kissinger's well-known predeliction for Metternich. In his doctoral dissertation, Dr. Kissinger describes in almost adulatory fashion how the cunning Austrian exponent and practitioner of balance of power politics sought to play Tsar Alexander I against Napoleon and vice versa. One cannot read it without the sudden reversal of our China policy coming to mind. Thirdly, there is the recent American position on the India-Pakistan conflict.

In a conflict between two states, one can imagine a third state favoring one side, even if it is certain to be the loser, on the grounds that there is harmony of ideals, that for moral reasons it will lend support regardless of immediate advantage. Or one can imagine supporting one side just because it was going to win, even though its political system is repugnant. But prior to the American stance in the India-Pakistan war one could not imagine support of a sure loser with a repugnant system and opposition to the sure winner which carries the banner for your brand of political ideals. Even granting the extreme limits of irrationality in statesmen, I find it difficult to believe that President Nixon and Dr. Kissinger—who are clever men—would have so ostentatiously supported Pakistan against India without some reason. The only reason likely to come to mind, at least in Moscow, is one which has to do not only with support of Chinese interests but support of those interests against the Soviet Union.

RESPONSE TO HANOI

Finally, we have the current situation in regard to Vietnam. If Mr. Nixon's savage response to the renewed Hanoi offensive illustrates his commitment to Cold War concepts, his virtual throwing down the gauntlet to the Russians seems to illustrate the "back to Metternich syndrome" in operation. If nothing else, it indicates that the President regards preservation of an American-dominated, anti-Communist stronghold in Southeast Asia more important than improving relations with the Soviet Union.

In this Metternich-like approach to Moscow there is likely to be another miscalculation. Often in the past, the Russians when pushed in the East have given in in the West, and vice versa. But this pattern of events characterized a militarily weak and backward Russia. The Soviet Union of today, however much it may seek to avoid being engaged on two fronts, is a different story.

Containment a la Metternich is, of course, not confined to diplomacy. The Nixon Doctrine is designed to supply muscle in many parts of the world. What it can mean we have seen recently in Vietnam. It also involves urging remilitarization of Japan, calling for expansion of foreign military aid and continued stationing of American forces in Europe. But above all it assumes we must have clear military superiority over the USSR. Indeed, forcing the Russians to agree to nuclear inferiority may well be one of the prime objectives of the new game plan. Thus as a prelude we insured the SALT talks would get off to an inauspicious start by opting for ABM and MIRV even before the talks began. The new Cold War policy may in fact be even more committed to a big military posture than the old. With all our economic difficulties internally, the Administration has cheapened the dollar, raised protectionist tariffs and imposed domestic controls while simultaneously proposing a higher military budget than ever. It seems as though those now in power will do almost anything to avoid cutting military spending, despite the fact that it is this, more than anything else, which is at the heart of our economic dislocation.

VIEWS ON "ISOLATIONISM"

Those who raise questions about all this are greeted with stern warnings from the Administration—and such as Dean Rusk—about the dangers of "isolationism." Such warnings seem to me to be aimed less at isolationism than at efforts to ward off restraints which Congressmen would impose to prevent a repetition of tragedies like Vietnam. We must stand in no confusion about what isolationism really is. It is, I think, primarily a state of mind, a psychological attitude, based in ignorance of the realities of international politics, in a refusal to accept the world as it is, in insistence on a unilateral approach to foreign affairs which rejects real international cooperation. This can take the form of head-in-sand ignoring of foreign affairs which characterized our stance between the wars. Or it can take the form of a riding-off-in-all-directions global intervention which characterized our policy since World War II. Both, in my opinion, were equally isolationist-based.

The pre-World War II type of isolation is, of course, impossible today. For good or ill, we are too much entangled with the world. But the syndrome is still with us and exhibited nowhere more markedly than by the Nixon Administration. The blunt unilateral economic moves of the past year, the reaction to the refusal of the United Nations to follow our two-China policy, the high-handed treatment of India, even the sudden, dramatic move toward Peking itself, all smack of a take-it-or-leave-it approach to the world which rejects international cooperation as a basis for policy. Could anything be more isolationist that the idea that our persistence in the Vietnam war, which is so universally condemned in all but the most subservient of our client states, is necessary to guarantee us prestige and world leadership? I think even Metternich, were he not blinded by Cold War concepts, would see this kind of an approach to today's world will not serve the true interests of the United States.

IDEOLOGICAL COEXISTENCE

An alternative approach to foreign policy is one based on consciously seeking a *detente* with the Soviet Union, and for a world in which peace is necessary it is the only rational one. This involves first accepting the idea of coexistence with competing ideological systems. Second, it requires working out clear mutual understandings that we and the Russians will both honor our respective core interest, that each will stay out of those strategic areas considered vital by the other. For us these include Latin America and Western Europe. For the Soviet Union they include Eastern Europe and other areas on the periphery of the USSR, Thirdly, we must try to work out arrangements for neutralization of areas which are not the core interests of either great power, that is, pledging mutually that we will both stay out of them militarily and pledging also that changes in such areas will not add to the strength of either bloc. This last is especially significant if we are to achieve a real sense of security. The Soviet position is that it is an equally great power and will not let such areas as the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean be dominated by the United States alone. And it has the power to make its position effective. The Russians are saying, in effect, if you go in we will. If you stay out, we will stay out. Can any other solution than neutralization, a mutual staying out, insure against dangerous military competition in these seas? Ultimately, can any other solution bring peace to the Middle East? Or to Southeast Asia?

Working out such arrangements with the Soviet Union—and ultimately with China—may not be easy; we won't know that unless we try. But if anything is certain, it is at the moment the Soviet Union sees its interests enhanced by agreements with the United States. While it is obvious that there are lengths to which Moscow will not go—and cannot be pushed—it is equally clear that at the moment the Soviet Union is, by its lights, doing its best to encourage a process of *detente*. If we can let the process develop, free of Cold War concepts and the "back to Metternich" syndrome, we stand a better chance now than ever before of removing the main barriers to a stable and peaceful world.

TO CONTROL ARMS

The end objective must be effective arms control and disarmament. But the most immediately pressing ones involve Germany and mutual withdrawal of troops from Central Europe. This is the place to start because the door is already more than half way open. Chancellor Brandt's West German government has recognized East Germany *de facto* and moved for its own *detente* with Moscow. That these arrangements are presently in such a precarious state is not due only to Brandt's opposition. Whether the United States has actually dragged its heels on them is not clear, but for a country professing world leadership we have demonstrated an abysmal lack of diplomatic initiative. The way is open to us, if we would but take it, for a normalization of relations with East Germany, at least to the extent of having both Germanies in the United Nations, a reduction of our own troops and a move toward elimination of both NATO and Warsaw Pacts.

Essentially, this is what the Soviet proposal for a European Security Conference is mainly about. The Western position is not so clear. We have raised the concept of Mutual Balanced Reduction of Forces. There is nothing wrong with this concept in principle, but we must be very careful, I think, that it is not used as an excuse for maintaining NATO willy-nilly. Here an old shibboleth is always raised. This is, that since the United States would have to withdraw its forces clear across the Atlantic and the Soviet Union only withdraw its forces behind Soviet borders, this would represent an inequality to our side. Since we have only the geography God gave us, this is little more than an argument for a permanent American garrison in Europe under any and all circumstances. No one who raises this argument can be serious about wanting to end the Cold War. Yet this seems to be the present position of the U.S. government.

NO EUROPEAN POLICY

The fact is that aside from NATO the United States has no real European policy, and there is a built-in reluctance to face up to the possibility of a Europe without NATO. In addition, there has developed in and around NATO a substantial bureaucracy which, like any bureaucracy anywhere, is mainly concerned with its own perpetuation and aggrandizement. Not only has it helped perpetuate the myth of a Soviet military danger but it has helped perpetuate the myth that, should such a danger exist, NATO could cope with it. It took General de Gaulle, with all his *grandeur*, to stand up and say that NATO, like the king, wasn't very well clad. NATO has never been the same since.

It may well be that at one time NATO was a necessary means of giving assurance to weak European regimes. But this consideration no longer obtains. To the extent that these governments need armed forces, they themselves are quite capable of providing them. To the extent that NATO has kept Western European governments from thinking meaningfully about foreign policy, NATO has been a device however, unintentional, for blocking East-West *detente*. In one way it may have contributed to Western European unity, but in another way it has been an impediment to unity. Particularly has NATO impeded closer relations between Western and Eastern Europe, and its existence ever tends to make the Common Market not only an economic instrument but a Cold War instrument as well. Western European unity, especially with the addition of Britain to the Market, has gone beyond being a Cold War device.

NATO A HINDRANCE

What is true about Western European cooperation is also true, I think, about Atlantic cooperation. Without NATO, American relations with Western Europe could be on a firmer basis. As it is, it is primarily our military relationships which have been destabilizing. These, more than anything, contributed to our estrangement from France and to the long delay in Britain joining the Common Market, and they have also stood in the way of other non-Communist but neutralist-minded nations coming in. There has been constant pulling and hauling about who should contribute what, with our disproportionate share not only causing economic problems to everybody but also putting our European partners in a poor client relationship, to everybody's detriment.

There has been some talk about non-military cooperation within the NATO framework. I don't think it will work, and it shouldn't if it could. NATO is a military organization with a Cold War orientation. Without its military component and without the Cold War, it would altogether lose its *raisen e'etre*. Surely an alliance whose origin was in Cold War military considerations is not suitable for a post-Cold War period. There is a need to lift our foreign policy thinking about Europe to new horizons, just in case the cynics are wrong and the Cold War is really ending.

SPECIAL TIES WITH EUROPE

It is true that the United States has special ties with Western Europe; cooperation between us and them should be increased, not lessened. A whole variety of forms of cooperation are possible, for instance, dealing with political, cultural, economic, ecological and technological problems. I would assume there would be also some sort of military mutual assistance agreements. And as long as we have nuclear weapons they clearly will stand as an umbrella over Western Europe, for whatever this is worth. But if many of our interests are parallel with those of Western Europe, many are different also, as we may well soon see in regard to the Common market. The world, even Europe, is bigger than Western Europe, and one way we can serve Western Europe's interests, as well as our own, is by avoiding the parochialism which sometimes comes too easily to the Western Europeans. One of the objections to NATO, indeed, is that it accentuated the division of Europe, regardless of what the Russians did, and, if anything, made the Soviet bloc more closely knit. We should promote organizations designed to bring the Communists regimes in, not keep them out. Western Europe clearly should be one of our main interests, but we should not over-focus on it.

It is at least now possible to make a beginning toward such a new, post-Cold War grand design of foreign policy. How much further than a beginning depends, of course, not only on the United States. But wise and courageous American leadership, free of the old Cold War hang-ups and attuned to the realities of the 20th Century rather than those of the 19th, is the essential ingredient. Without such leadership, we are in danger of lapsing back into earlier Cold War patterns, or into isolationism, if not both, with consequences which are indeed frightening to contemplate.

## EAGLES, AFFLUENCE, AND PESTICIDES

---

## HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Roy M. Kottman, dean of the College of Agriculture and Home Economics, the Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, recently brought to my attention a most pertinent and timely statement on the subject of pesticides and the "balance of nature." This statement was made by Andrew J. Rogers, Ph. D., and with the thought that it may be of interest to my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I am pleased to submit his thoughtful comments:

EAGLES, AFFLUENCE, AND PESTICIDES

(By Andrew J. Rogers, Ph. D.)

Modern man has progressed from a point in the misty past where he was part of the vicious animal-eat-animal system, which some now call the balance of nature, to material abundance and a safer, longer life. In order to accomplish this it was necessary to upset this mythical natural balance by eliminating the competition of his food plants, a process now called cultivation, and by domesticating some of the more useful animals, and protecting them from their enemies.

So he moved from a condition of hunter and gatherer to one of farmer and animal husbandman. Not many generations ago almost 100 percent of the people were engaged in farming as a necessity of survival. Owing to improved agricultural technology, the condition now prevails in some affluent countries like the United States where one farmer produces enough food and fiber to supply himself and approximately 40 others. And, the only way that modern man can maintain this condition is to keep nature unbalanced in his favor.

This great achievement in food production has freed more than 95 percent of our people to engage in other vocations, crafts, professions and miscellaneous activities. Some have become so detached from the land that they do not look beyond the suburban supermarket as the source of their food, and there is a small minority which seems determined to destroy the very technology that sustains us all. It is this subject which I wish to discuss.

Many charges have been made against pesticides, i.e., pesticides in the sea, pesticides in Antarctica, pesticides in food, pesticides causing thin eggshells, pesticides causing cancer, pesticides in mother's milk, pesticides in rain, and on and on ad infinitum. One obviously cannot discuss each of these in a brief address; therefore, I have chosen two relevant points of this controversy for examination in some depth.

The members of this Association are well acquainted with the absolute necessity of using insecticides for mosquito control and for protecting millions of people against such scourges as malaria, filariasis, onchoceriasis, yellow fever, encephalitis, and other deadly diseases. And we know of the strong stand of the World Health Organization for the continued use of DDT in the worldwide malaria eradication program. Therefore, rather than repeat this well-known subject, this presentation will emphasize some vital points recently made on the subject of pesticides and food production and the effects of pesticides on bird population, especially the birds of prey, which seem to be of most concern to the anti-pesticide lobby.

As a preface to this discussion, I wish to state that the members of this Association want a clean environment as much as any other group of responsible citizens. It is the policy of the American Mosquito Control Association to use pesticides properly so as to minimize any possible hazard to the environment, and they are used as supplements to water management and other methods of mosquito control in an integrated program of pest management. We are proud of the fine cooperative program of the National Mosquito Control-Fish and Wildlife Management Coordination Committee. The professional wildlife scientists who are a part of that program are not included in the anti-pesticide lobby referred to in this paper. Neither are the many responsible conservationists both in and outside various conservation organizations.

The real hard core anti-pesticide lobby appears to be a very small minority of scientists who seem to think that their scientific training in other disciplines qualifies them to discuss pesticides authoritatively, a classic example of a little learning being a dangerous thing. This group and their supporters make it appear that pesticides are the major environmental pollutants. This just isn't true. The mere presence of a substance in minute quantities does not prove harmful effects, which is the logical basis of judging the importance of a polluting substance.

Harmful pollution is a result of our high standard of living, and all Americans contribute their part, including the environmentalists. Damaging pollution can and should be corrected, but this is a job for everyone—not just industry or those who farm or control insects.

*Pesticides and Food Production.*—While we are an affluent people, this is not true of about 75 percent of the world population. A visiting minister who has been converted by the "ecology" movement came to my church a few months ago and in his sermon blasted DDT for polluting the environment. More recently a Bishop of this church stood in the same pulpit and asked the congregation to help feed those in developing countries where 12,000 people die of starvation every day. We who call ourselves Christians need to speak with one voice on this vital matter.

Dr. Norman E. Borlaug, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1970, is much more qualified than I to tell the story of pesticides and food production, and tell it he did in the McDougall Memorial Lecture at the 1971 Conference of the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations. I have leaned heavily on this great man's lecture for the following points on this subject. Dr. Borlaug developed improved varieties of wheat that are the basis of the Green Revolution which is reducing the number of deaths by starvation in developing countries. The continued success of this program depends not only upon the availability of improved varieties of food plants, it also requires the continued availability and input of agricultural chemicals, including pesticides.

The subject of modern agricultural technology as it affects available wildlife habitat is another very cogent point. This technology including pesticides, has saved 292 million acres of wildlife land in the United States in the past 30 years by increasing the yield per acre of 17 principal crops, thus making it possible to leave this much additional land for trees and wildlife. According to Dr. Borlaugh, this is an area equal in size to the entire land area east of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio Rivers.

On this same subject, the point is also made that within the next 30 years the large animals of East Africa and the elephant, tiger, and peacock of India will all be poached out of existance unless agricultural food production is increased sufficiently to take the pressure off these animals. These startling pronouncements deserve careful consideration by biologists and others who continue to demand the banning of the very pesticides that might help prevent this.

To close this subject, a statement by Dr. Earl L. Butz, Secretary of Agriculture, seems pertinent. He says that we can return to organic farming, which was our production technology of 75 years ago; but first someone has to decide which 50 millions of the American people are willing to starve, for this would be the result without a large production input of chemicals.

*Pesticides and Birds of Prey*. For the purpose of this address, the emphasis will be on eagles with a few comments about other birds of prey. These birds appear to be the basis of most of the opposition to pesticides.

On the subject of eagles, there is one thing about which there seems to be general agreement; these great birds are declining in numbers. But the anti-pesticide minority would have us believe that this unfortunate situation only started or became serious with the general use of persistent pesticides about 26 years ago and that these chemicals are the most important cause of the problem. The published record reveals some interesting information on this subject.

Fifty years ago (1921) a paper was published in the scientific journal Ecology entitled, "Threatened Extinction of the Bald Eagle". This paper stated in part that the bald eagle was fast becoming a rare bird in the United States. Again, in Science News Letter of July, 1943, several years before there was general use of persistent pesticides, attention was called to the declining eagle population and the author attributed this to the cutting of nesting trees and pollution of nearby streams by sewage and industrial wastes which destroyed the fish that comprised the principal food of eagles. So, scratch one false charge. The decline of eagles started many years before DDT or any other persistent pesticide was ever used.

And here is more from the record about what has happened to eagles in more recent times. Of 147 eagles found dead in the United States and examined at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center in the period 1960–68, only nine, or 6.1 percent, were suspected of being killed by pesticides, only one of which was by DDT. The other 138 were shot or died of disease or unknown causes. But hear this! Prior to 1951, Alaska is reported to have paid bounties on 100,000 eagles slaughtered in a 36 year period because they were believed to be detrimental to the salmon industry. This is almost 3,000 eagles per year for 36 years. In this connection the following statement from Smithsonian U.S. National Museum Bulletin No. 167, published in 1937 is pertinent: "Where eagles are sufficiently abundant and are known to be doing serious damage to salmon fisheries, fur farming activities, or other human interest they should be reduced in numbers. There is no danger of their extermination in the vast uninhabited regions of Alaska. Elsewhere we can afford to protect such a picturesque feature as our national emblem".

And there is more! Although the practice was banned in 1962, the record states that 20,000 eagles were shot from small planes, presumably in the American West. But the ban on this practice notwithstanding, a press report as recently as August 3, 1971 stated that 500 Bald and Golden Eagles were shot from planes in Wyoming and Colorado for predator control that year. And speaking of predator control, it is well known that poison baits placed in the environment for control of other predators have inadvertently killed hundreds of eagles. This has been done for many years with the approval of the U.S. Department of Interior and was discontinued only about a month ago.

Another published report states that the Department of Interior authorized the killing of Golden Eagles in some Montana Counties in 1967 to protect livestock.

Now, this is 120,645 dead eagles, an average of 2,116 per year during the past 57 years, that have been accounted for by the published record, and this does not include the unknown hundreds killed by poison baits, electrocution by power lines, etc., that were not recorded. But of those accounted for only nine are reported as having succumbed to pesticides, only one of which was by DDT.

Much is said about reproductive failures of birds, especially birds of prey, due to pesticides. These chemicals are blamed especially for causing thin eggshells that break before hatching. This charge is based primarily on laboratory studies where various kinds of birds were fed rather large amounts of pesticides daily for long periods. In a frequently cited recent paper on this subject by Hickey and Anderson, there are data showing reductions of average weights of eggshells of Florida eagles of about 19 percent in the late 1940's and the 1950's when compared to average weights of eggshells collected before that time. But the published record also shows that this difference is similar to the normal range of egg size for Florida eagles as determined by measurements of 50 eggs collected prior to 1937. As reported in U.S. Museum Bulletin 167, the length of the 50 eggs varied by 26.2 and the width by 18.4 percent. It seems reasonable, therefore that the difference in weights of the shells of these pre-DDT eggs would have varied by at least the 19 percent reported by Hickey and Anderson, especially since their samples of recent eggs were only 8 and 12 in number. The authors relate their data of eggshell weight to a declining eagle population in Florida.

There can be no debate about another factor that has prevented thousands of birds' eggs from hatching over the past 100 years. This is the practice of egg collecting by some ornithologists and bird protectionists for scientific or private collections. Collecting a reasonable number of eggs for scientific study is understandable and necessary, but the practice appears to be much more widespread than this.

The paper by Hickey and Anderson (ibid.) states that 1729 eggs from 39 museums and private collections were examined in their study. On page 361 of U.S. Museum Bulletin 167 it is reported that the measurements of 312 American Osprey eggs in a private collection averaged 61 by 45.6 millimeters. In discussing possible causes of the osprey abandoning a nesting area of New England we find this statement: "Considerable egg collecting was done in certain parts of the area, but no more than, if as much as, in the area where the birds still breed". Also, there are many references to average sizes of eggs of several of the birds of prey based on measurements of 40 to 50 eggs from various collections. There is another reference to robbing the nest of a pair of peregrine falcons repeatedly until the birds gave up in despair. It seems evident from these and many similar references that egg collectors have probably prevented the hatching of a much larger number of birds' eggs than any pesticide ever has.

The record also indicates that many additional eggs are prevented from hatching as a result of molesting birds on their nests, causing them to abandon the eggs at various stages of incubation. There are many references to this practice in past years, but a more current report also is available. In a recent paper entitled, "The Truth about the California Brown Pelicans", Dr. J. Gordon Edwards blames "scientific persecution" during the 1970 breeding season for the near failure of these birds to bear young that year off the California coast, on Anacapa Island, rather than pesticides as claimed. Dr. Edwards states that the superintendent of Channel Island National Monument, was deeply concerned over the Anacapa Island disruption by biologists and the widely publicized misinformation about the pelican colony there. Moreover, in 1971 the National Park Service refused to permit scientists to hover over or land on Anacapa Island by helicopter, as they did frequently in 1969–70, because noise and excitement are known to upset the birds, causing thin eggshells and nest desertion. Dr. Edwards states further that research biologists were no longer permitted to roam among the nests frightening off the brooding females or shooting them on the nests for analysis, as they had also done earlier.

One final comment on bird hunting should be adequate to make this point. These excerpts are from a letter published in the Monthly American Journal of Geology and Natural Science of 1832. Again the subject is bird collecting and the place is the East Coast of Florida. Quote: "At sunrise the next morning, I and four negro servants proceeded in search of birds and adventures. The fact is, that I was anxious to kill some 25 brown Pelicans. (*Pelicanus fuscus*) to enable me to make a new drawing of an adult male bird, and to preserve the dresses of the others. I proceeded along a narrow shallow bay, where the fish were truly abundant . . . I shot some rare birds, and putting along the shore, passed a point, when lo, I came in sight of several hundred pelicans perched on the branches of mangrove trees, seated in comfortable harmony, as near each other as the strength of the boughs would allow. I ordered to back water gently: the hands backed water. I waded to the shore under cover of the rushes along it, saw the pelicans fast asleep, examined their countenances and deportment well and leisurely, and after all, levelled, fired my piece, dropped two of the finest specimens I ever saw. I really believe I would have shot one hundred of the revered sirs, had not a mistake taken place in the reloading of my gun. A mistake, however, did take place, and to my utmost disappointment, I saw each pelican, old and young, leave his perch and take to wing; soaring off, well pleased, I dare say, at making so good an escape from so dangerous a foe. . . . After shooting more birds, and pulling our boat through many a difficult channel, we reached the schooner again; and as the birds, generally speaking, appeared wild and few (you must be aware that I call birds few when I shoot less than one hundred per day)—my generous host proposed to return towards home again." The letter also states that in celebration of getting their boat afloat, the party set fire to the whole salt-marsh just for fun, and saw marsh rabbits, etc. scampering from the fire by the thousands, as they pulled their oars. The letter was written by John J. Audubon, December 31, 1831. This reference is included only to emphasize how attitudes have changed, not to discredit this famous man in any way.

In concluding this discussion it is pertinent to cite an example from the record concerning pesticides and bald eagles in nearby Everglades National Park. The Park is next door to two of the most intensely sprayed areas in the world, the Everglades muck farms a few miles to the north and the Homestead vegetable farms on the eastern boundary of the Park. These farming areas are cultivated almost yearlong and sprayed almost continuously with just about every pesticide available, including DDT, and this has been going on for many years.

Consider also that South Florida is a network of canals connecting the farming areas with the drainage and water storage areas of the Everglades and that the main source of water for the Park is from this farming district a few miles to the north. Now, a news release datelined Everglades Park of January, 1969, reports a biologist of the National Audubon Society as saying that pesticides are being washed into canals, streams, lakes, etc., in increasing volume where eagles hunt fish, their primary food. One can easily demonstrate the effect of this kind of publicity.

About a year ago my wife and I were riding along listening to an interview on the car radio with an influential official at the Washington level about the fires that were then destroying forever much of the Everglades muck. When asked about his thoughts on this the official stated that the fires were not too important because they had been occurring for years in the glades. He said the real danger was all that DDT in the water that was flowing into the Park.

Now, on the basis of these pronouncements, the Everglades National Park should be the perfect model for conditions which the anti-pesticide people claim are responsible for thin eggshells and declining populations of eagles. Therefore, any citizen who is not knowledgeable on the subject would have to conclude that if there are any eagles left in the Park, they must be just hanging on by one claw and soon will be gone forever, because there could not possibly be any hatching of eggs with all those pesticides building up in the food chain.

But wait! According to the published record this is not the case. The same news release quotes the biologist further as saying that the Everglades National Park has the healthiest Bald Eagle population in the United States, outside of Alaska, and that a Park official estimates the reproductive success of the eagles there at close to 60 percent, while only a 50 percent rate is required for maintaining a stable population. The healthy nature of the eagles in the Park also is confirmed by a scientific report in the Pesticides Monitoring Journal of December, 1970.

But, the news story also points out that of the other three eagle populations in Florida, the two coastal colonies are declining and the one between Lake Okeechobee and Orlando is just holding its own.

Now, when you put it all together, the record clearly shows that the eagles that are getting along well in Florida are those in or near the farming areas that are heavily sprayed with pesticides but are also far removed from people, and the declining eagle colonies are those along the coasts where people are numerous and are intruding on former eagle territory. The news release does mention shooting, habitat destruction, and competition between people and eagles for waterfront property as important factors affecting the coastal populations of eagles. But the most amazing statement of the news release is a quotation attributed to the Audubon biologist which says that unless measures are taken to prevent it, pesticides, and DDT in particular, eventually will eradicate the bald eagles. This Mrak report, a scholarly study of pesticides and environmental health, submitted to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare just over two years ago, seems to put the subject of pesticides and reproductive success of eagles in proper perspective. This report states on page 437 that there is a reasonable doubt that chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides are found in the natural feed of these birds at levels required to adversely affect reproduction.

Now, according to the published record, it appears that shooting, collecting of birds and their eggs, encroachment of suburbia on former eagle habitat, poison baits, electrocution, and molesting of nesting birds are all important factors adversely affecting the populations of these great birds of prey. Based on this evidence, it seems reasonable to conclude that birds might profit a great deal more by a ban on some of these practices than by banning pesticides. If pesticides are an important cause of declining bird populations, this will be determined in time by unbiased, objective science—not by environmental rhetoric. At the present time, the evidence for this is not impressive.

What is impressive about the published record is that wildlife, like people, is dependent upon the continuing use of pesticides—not their elimination. For the simple truth is that people are going to see to their own survival first, and if present high yields per acre of food are reduced by banning pesticides, more wildlife land will be cleared and farmed to make up this loss of production.

I find no more reason to apologize for using a legally labelled chemical pesticide than would a physician for using penicillin, which also is a pesticide, especially when that chemical pesticide has saved more lives than penicillin and all of the other so-called antibiotic drugs combined. But there is a real danger that we will lose these vital tools of food production and public health protection through mosquito control unless more people start telling the positive side of the pesticide story. The challenge I leave with you is to acquaint yourselves with the scientific facts about this matter and use these facts in every possible way in defense of pesticides in your work.

Let's not be members of the silent majority of the affluent 40 while the militant minority destroys the technology that man has developed for his own survival and health, as well as for the protection of wildlife. With 2.8 billion people in the world of 1972, all having a need for housing and food, there might not be enough caves to go around if we are forced to return to the "balance of nature" culture of our prehistoric ancestors; and the few eagles that remain would surely end up in stew pots in those circumstances, anyway. Thank you.

REFERENCES


Audubon, John J. 1832. Monthly American Journal of Geology and Natural Science. Vol. 1, pp. 407–14. Letter to Editor, 1831.

Bald Eagle Facing Extinction in U.S. News Item. Panama City News. Panama City, FL, Jan. 27, 1969.

Bent, Arthur Cleveland. Life Histories of North American Birds of Prey. Smithsonian Institution U.S. National Museum. Part I, Bull. 167, 1937; Part 2, Bull. 170, 1938.

Borlaug, Norman E. 1971. Mankind and Civilization at Another Crossroad. McDougall Mem. Lecture. FAO, United Nations.

Butz, Earl L. 1971. Man and His Environment—Crisis or Challenge? Ag Chem. 26(6): 12-13.

Coon, N. C., L. N. Locke, E. Cromartie, and W. L. Reichel. 1970. Causes of Bald Eagle Mortality, 1960–65. Jour. Wildlife Diseases, Vol. 6.

Edwards, J. Gordon, 1972. The Truth about the California Brown Pelicans. San Jose State College. CA (Mimeograph).

Gruenhagen, Richard H. 1970. Bald Facts about Bald Eagles. In: Selected Statements from State of Washington DDT Hearings and Other Related Papers. Compiled by Max Sobelman. Dec. 1970.

Helicopter Pilot Reveals Slaughter of 500 Eagles. News Item, Fla. Times Union, Aug. 3, 1971.

Krantz, W. C., B. M. Mulhern, G. E. Bagley, A. Sprunt, IV, F. J. Ligas, and W. B. Robertson, Jr. 1970. Organochlorine and Heavy Metal Residues in Bald Eagle Eggs. Pest. Monitoring Jour. 3(3):136–140.

Hickey, Joseph J. and Daniel W. Anderson. 1968. Chlorinated Hydrocarbons and Eggshell Changes in Raptorial and Fish-Eating Birds. Science, 162:271-3.

Losing Out, (and) Single Dose Killed Eagles. News Items, FL Times Union, June 3, 1971.

Mrak, Emil M. et al. (1968). Report of the Secretary's Commission on Pesticides and Their Relationship to Environmental Health. U.S. Dept. Health, Education, and Welfare. Washington, D.C.

Reichel, William L., Eugene Cromartie, Thair G. Lamont, Bernard M. Mulhern, and Richard M. Prouty. 1969. Pesticide Residues in Eagles. Pest. Monitoring Jour. 3(3):142–44.

Reichel, William L., T. G. Lamont, E. Cromartie, and L. N. Locke. 1969. Residues in two Bald Eagles Suspected of Pesticide Poisoning. Bull. Environ. Contam. & Tox. 4(1): 24-30.

The Vanishing Eagle. 1971. Chemistry 44 (8):3.

Wildlife Research-Problems, Programs. Progress, 1968. Resource Pub. 85, U.S. Dept. Int., Wash., D.C., 1970; Resources Pub. 94, 1971.


## VIRGINIA: PROGRESS IN THE OCEANS

### HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday afternoon the Hampton Roads Jaycees celebrated the fourth annual marine festival at Huntington Park in Newport News, Va. It was a festive occasion with entertainment for all and featuring every conceivable type of delicious seafood.

The main speaker on this occasion was a dear friend and former colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable Howard W. Pollock, Deputy Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, whose topic was "Progress in the Oceans."

His speech, which follows, was so interesting and informative that I thought it was deserving of being placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for everyone to read:

VIRGINIA: PROGRESS IN THE OCEANS

(By Hon. Howard W. Pollock)

Distinguished citizens of Newport News, visitors to the Marine Festival, vigorous and energetic members of the Hampton Roads Jaycees, ladies and gentlemen:

It was with the greatest of pleasure that I received the thoughtful invitation from my very dear friend, Congressman Tom Downing to join you for this wonderful celebration and marine festival.

My friends, this is an old and historic area, rich in American history and rich in the heritage of America's seafarers. I am told that the first settlers came to Hampton in 1610, just three years after Jamestown was established; and Hampton has been settled ever since, and Virginians have been going down to the sea ever since—fishing, launching ships, fighting our Nation's battles, manning our merchant marine.

Indeed, one Virginian of note, George Washington, apparently enjoyed recreational fishing when he had the opportunity, for his diary speaks of going out on the river on one occasion and catching great quantities of shad. Thomas Jefferson, another Virginian, a man of many talents and ideas, had a great interest in America's early commercial fishery resources. While he was Secretary of State, in February of 1791, Mr. Jefferson initiated action that led to a subsidy to the commercial fishing industry of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to help that industry recover from the devastating effects of the American Revolution. So far as we know, this was the first direct subsidy arrangement ever made by the Federal Government for any United States industry.

Throughout our Nation's history, the Virginia watermen who fish the ocean, the estuaries, and the rivers of the Old Dominion have made Virginia one of America's leading fishery states, for both commercial and recreational fishing. In commercial fishing, Virginia is consistently among the leaders in annual landings—a fact that is not sufficiently known and appreciated. Last year, for example, Virginia was third among the states, with a total commercial landing of about 489 million pounds of fish and shellfish, with a total value of approximately $22 million.

Our best available information shows that in 1971, Virginia had 4,700 full time and about 2,800 part time commercial fishermen.

Virginia has about 120 seafood processing plants, employing some 3,500 persons full time and about 1,500 more on a seasonal basis. Are you aware that there are about 140 wholesalers in the fishing business, employing an additional 500 to 700 persons, depending upon the season?

And so, the seafood industry is well established, and of great economic importance to the area. The oystermen, the crabbers, the finfishermen and all the others connected with our coastal fisheries are of great interest to us in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. It is part of our charter in NOAA to help ensure the good health of the fishing industry. We try to do this primarily through our National Marine Fisheries Service and our Sea Grant Program.

Today, about 80% of the volume of Virginia's commercial fishing is for menhaden, the volume leader among all fish taken by U.S. fishermen. Of the five billion pounds of fish and shellfish caught by all U.S. commercial fishermen in 1971, 2.2 billion pounds were menhaden.

As an industrial fish, menhaden is the source of numerous products. It provides oils for five lubricants, soaps and paints. It is manufactured into meal as a protein supplement for poultry and livestock feed—so when you eat some of those marvelous Rockingham fowl or Smithfield hams from other parts of Virginia, you may well be getting some of your own fish back in an indirect way.

On a related subject, for the information of the nonfisherman, it might interest you to know that the National Marine Fisheries Service maintains a Market News office in Hampton. The office provides valuable services to the commercial fishing industry. The Hampton office is a collection point for receiving and distributing information from all over the Nation on prices, landings, and other statistical information of vital importance to the American fishermen.

Laboratories of the National Marine Fisheries Service are scattered on all coasts of the U.S. Some of these laboratories are carrying out work of special interest to the Virginia fishing industry. Through the Marine Advisory Service of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science on the York River, there is now an effective way to make the results of this research work known locally. A recent example is the research and evaluation of mechanical fish separators, which are designed to recover fish flesh that would otherwise be thrown away. Up in New England, the National Marine Fisheries Service developed a separator that appears to be both effective and, for some uses, quite economical. So NMFS technicians from Gloucester, Mass., came down to Gloucester Point, Va., to demonstrate it. The VIMS marine resource information bulletin, part of its Sea Grant advisory service, disseminated this important information to Virginia seafood processors for their possible use.

The Sea Grant extension program is a particularly interesting and important example of the wonderful work carried out by the Virginia Institute of Marine Science and by its Director, Dr. Bill Hargis. Many of you know Dr. Hargis, of course. He is also Chairman of the Coastal States Organization, and he is Chief Advisor for marine science to the Governor and to the Legislature of Virginia. I understand that he also works with the University of Virginia and for William and Mary College in marine affairs.

In my capacity as Deputy Administrator of NOAA, I interface with Bill Hargis in yet another capacity in which he serves. President Nixon appointed him as Vice Chairman of the National Advisory Committee on Oceans and Atmosphere. You are fortunate indeed to have such a fine scientist and leader in your area, in addition to my friend and colleague, Congressman Tom Downing.

We at NOAA are proud to be a part of your marine activities. Our largest Sea Grant in Virginia is held by VIMS to support a variety of projects, including advisory and extension activities, shellfish research, mineral inventory on the continental shelf, and coastal zone planning.

Our grant forms a portion of a program also funded by the National Science Foundation, relating to the entirety of the Chesapeake Bay area. Our current grant to the institute, which began January 1 and runs for one year, is for $325,000.

VIMS has been able to obtain an additional amount of about $175,000 from the Commonwealth and from industry as matching funds for the NOAA Sea Grant.

And, incidentally, while we are speaking of the cooperation and support of other groups, permit me to mention the cooperative extension effort recently begun by VIMS and the Virginia Polytechnic Institute, also with a NOAA Sea Grant. VPI has a Food Science and Technology Department, a good one, and has long been active in extension activities with the agricultural industry and terrestrial food processing industries. With the aid of the Sea Grant, VPI is now drawing on this experience to initiate the extension service program for the seafood processing industry in the Commonwealth of Virginia. The VIMS/VPI cooperative effort is designed to help the fishing industry and other users of the marine environment to get answers to some of the problems that they face.

With its food science and agricultural extension background, VPI will make an important contribution to marine advisory work in Virginia. It will provide the first outside addition to the VIMS program, and we should not be surprised to see this grow into a very effective multi-university effort within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

One of the major research efforts at VIMS, which we at NOAA are both supporting and following with a great deal of interest, is the work on crabs. The program is designed to assist the industry in expanding the production of soft blue crabs, and to better forecast the commercial blue crab catch a year in advance, so that the industry can plan its operations more efficiently. VIMS is developing a recirculated sea water system, and is making comparisons of survival in soft crab yield—subjecting the crabs known as peelers to various combinations of water quality and crowding conditions. Some of the work sounds esoteric, I'm sure—for example, biologists there are working to obtain base line data on blood serum constituents of hard, soft and peeler crabs. But information of that sort is urgently needed to develop sophisticated methods for possible early recognition of abnormal conditions in the crabs.

VIMS scientists are also working on developing techniques for estimating spawning success in blue crabs, and estimating the population size, total catch, and fishing mortality in the winter crab dredge fishery.

This is the kind of applied work, combining field and laboratory techniques, that leads to payoffs for the industry and thus for the economy of the area.

Another example of their work that is culminating in success is obtaining edible soft shells from the rock crab for winter consumption. Based on the recommendations of institute scientists, the industry has already produced small amounts of soft shell rock crab the last two winters, and has promising plans for the future.

We all hope that what we are seeing here is the beginning of a new and productive activity for Chesapeake Bay watermen in the wintertime.

Another major research area is the work with oysters, and related work with clams, scallops, and other bivalves. Many of you are aware of the unhappy recent history of oyster production in the lower Chesapeake Bay. Many public beds had been unproductive for decades because of predation on the spat or seed and the effects of diseases and of unlimited harvesting on larger oysters. Large seed oysters from the James River were used to plant thousands of acres of private beds in Mobjack Bay, off Egg Island, and in Hampton Roads. The high salinity areas were places where only large-scale and relatively efficient oyster culture kept this rather precarious industry from collapsing.

Virginia now suffers from a serious shortage of seed oysters; and oysters steadily move farther into the luxury category owing to decrease in supply and increase in price.

Recognizing the grave situation, the Virginia Institute of Marine Science is making a strong effort to breed, test, and select laboratory-bred stocks for disease resistance, primarily for oyster mariculture.

Here again, basic biology that sometimes seems baffling to those of us who are laymen is absolutely necessary to the restoration of a thriving industry. Knowledge and use of genetic factors in the oyster are essential to intensive oyster culture, just as they are in agriculture and animal husbandry.

The VIMS work has been underway for a number of years, with direct support from the Commonwealth, from the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the National Science Foundation, to which we have now joined the Sea Grant support.

These are impressive accomplishments. VIMS is a research organization that is making an invaluable contribution to the continued economic health of this region, and we are delighted to support it and delighted that you support it so well.

In the few brief moments remaining to me, I should like to sketch out some of the interests of my own organization that overlap your own. As you know, President Nixon created NOAA almost two years ago, within the Department of Commerce, because of the clear need for a mechanism for making effective use of the oceans, the atmosphere, and their resources—while conserving them for future generations of Americans.

NOAA is a major Federal mechanism to foster the exploration, development, operation and maintenance of a national system to monitor and predict the environment.

NOAA is one of the new trio of Federal institutions—along with the Environmental Protection Agency and the Council for Environmental Quality—to deal with problems of environmental control.

NOAA is a key agency in solid earth science and service.

Finally, our organization is charged with insuring the Nation's scientific and technological competence for understanding the oceans and atmosphere.

With respect to the living resources of the Sea, one of our very high priority efforts is called "MARMAP", an acronym for Marine Resources Monitoring Assessment and Prediction, of the kinds and quantities of living marine resources available. It will hopefully provide a comprehensive data base for domestic and international management of these resources.

The MARMAP surveys will be supported by biological and physical oceanographic studies conducted by our National Marine Fisheries Service, by universities and colleges, and by other Federal, state and international organizations.

A portion of MARMAP will be directed towards groundfish; that is, those species that live on or near the sea floor such as flounder, cod, and haddock.

Another MARMAP effort will be directed toward the pelagic species such as herring and tuna. Further development of remote sensing capabilities, either through aerospace techniques, hydro-acoustics, or some combination of the two, will be necessary to sample all the species covered in this survey.

In addition to MARMAP, we are increasing our surveys of inshore, continental shelf and deep ocean regions for navigation and for resource development, and are devoting substantial resources to a variety of coastal zone programs, including cooperative projects with states for boundary delineation. In this context, I note again the work of VIMS, with its recent report on the boundary of the territorial sea of Virginia.

Other high-priority tasks will include a major examination of the impact of human activities on the quality of our oceans and atmosphere.

Here I might mention that we have already been very active in the quest to define contaminants in our marine life. We are seeking to define the nature and extent of heavy metal pollution in fish found in coastal and offshore waters. A systematic survey of major commercial and sport species is now underway.

We also intend to extend our system for predicting air pollution potential, and will intensify our programs for the modification of weather processes, especially focusing on the possibility of hurricane and other severe weather modification.

We are convinced of the need to develop certain national capabilities vital to many oceanic and atmospheric purposes. Among the most important of these are the undersea laboratories and submersibles that scientists need to do their work on or near the floor of the ocean. One such project, incidentally, involved the work of a graduate student in oceanography at Old Dominion College.

In closing, let me say what a wonderful experience it has been to be here, and share with you some of our plans and projects, and the progress that is being made in America's oceanic programs. You have a wonderful marine tradition right here in Virginia. We in the Federal Government are benefiting from it, and we are trying to enhance your own maritime efforts and the economic prosperity that you derive from them. My very best wishes, and thanks to all of you.

My friends, I'm told that we are now going to have a crab feed, and I'm delighted, and I'm ready. So, let's turn our attention to some of the culinary benefits provided by Virginia waters. Thanks so much for letting me share your day.

God love you and keep you—each and every one of you.

## THE 1972 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

### HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, knowing the legislative views of constituents is important to me, so I send a legislative questionnaire once every year to each home in the congressional district I represent.

This year my questionnaire contains eight questions—five on domestic issues and three in the area of foreign affairs. The questions follow:

Do you think that the Administration's program to hold down prices and wages (Phase II) is effective and fair?

Do you feel that the Federal government should undertake a comprehensive child care program that would take care of children while their mothers work?

Would you favor the N.J. Commissioner of Education ordering the busing of students across municipal lines to achieve racial balance?

The Administration is considering a so-called value-added tax, which would place a Federal levy on each stage of the manufacturing and distribution process. Would you favor such a tax?

Would you favor providing income tax credits for such educational expenses as tuition, fees, books, and supplies?

Would you approve of withdrawing all U.S. military forces from Vietnam by October, 1972, providing American prisoners of war are released?

Should the United States continue to sell military aircraft to Israel to help maintain a balance of power in the Middle East?

Do you think that President Nixon's trips to Peking and Moscow will significantly improve American relations with China and the Soviet Union?

## MORE IMPROPRIETIES IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

### HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on May 18, 1971, I introduced H.R. 8523, a bill designed to provide a grievance procedure for Foreign Service officers and information officers who had been denied due process in firing through selection out. Since the introduction of my bill, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings on similar measures introduced in the Senate and on May 31, 1972, the Senate approved S. 3526 which would, among other things, establish a formal grievance procedure. Consequently, the House itself will be confronted shortly with the issue of the personnel procedures governing the Foreign Service.

My main concern in introducing H.R. 8523 had been with the evils of selection out. Since then I have repeatedly invited the attention of the House to a long series of unjust actions concerning eminent Foreign Service officers who were the victims of vendettas conducted against them by the Foreign Service. These cases included that of Stephen A. Koczak, a Harvard University graduate, selected out for predicting that the East German Communist Government would build the Berlin Wall and for calling attention to serious security problems in connection with the American Embassy in Warsaw. Mr. Koczak's service included assignments in strategic positions in the Military Government in Germany; on January 31, 1949, he was expelled by the Stalinist Rakosi government in Hungary for allegedly conspiring with Cardinal Mindszenty "to overthrow" the Hungarian state; he had accurately predicted the Israeli-Arab War of 1956.

Other well-known injustices to which I called the attention of the House included the case of John Hemenway, who had a distinguished military record in the Army; then graduated as an ensign from Annapolis; and received his bachelor and master's degrees from Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar. I have also provided extensive material on the selection out of Charles Thomas, one of the most distinguished Foreign Service officers who was an Air Force fighter pilot during World War II; who held two law degrees; and who was authorized to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States. Mr. Thomas, denied a hearing by the State Department, was reduced to poverty and to waiting on the tables of diplomats who were formerly his colleagues. He committed suicide on Easter Monday 1971.

On May 15 and May 17, 1972, I introduced into the RECORD the testimony of John Hemenway questioning the promotion of many of the Foreign Service officers by the most recent selection panels. Mr. Hemenway concentrated on the lack of foreign language competence of many of the officers being nominated for promotion. He pointed out that 35 percent of class 1 Officers and 31 percent of class 2 officers on the promotion list do not meet the minimal standards of having a command of a single foreign language. In addition, he cited two cases in which he charged that both professional competence and basic integrity or honesty are possibly involved.

In commenting on this promotion list, Mr. Hemenway said the following:

> Mr. Chairman, you will recall that the former Director of Personnel, Mr. Howard P. Mace attempted to explain to this Committee, during his recent confirmation hearing, the complex sequence by which Promotion Boards determine promotions. According to Mr. Mace, Boards consist of objective citizens, who determine objective personnel files (presumably in accordance with the regulations) to determine—competitively and fairly—which officers are the best. Under questioning from you, Mr. Chairman, it was determined that Mr. Mace himself had a large say in who sat on these Boards. This 1972 promotion list is, so to speak, the last "Mace List" in that Mr. Mace helped determine the composition of these Boards. The process sounds orderly enough, when glibly explained; but it is not orderly, Mr. Chairman, nor is it equitable.

I have now received further disquieting news about how promotions are arranged by the Foreign Service from the Charles William Thomas Memorial Legal Defense Fund which is sponsored by the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO. In preparing for suits against the State Department for selection out, the fund has discovered certain practices in the way selection boards are designated that are contrary to the most elemental standards of fair play. I should like to call your especial attention to the following passages which the Thomas Fund has been circulating to interested parties:

> Because the Fund hopes to instruct its counsel to file suit by the end of June or early July, we wish to stress that any person who was "selected out," or who retired "voluntarily" in order to avoid selection out, should communicate immediately with the Charles William Thomas Memorial Legal Defense Fund to obtain particulars about qualifying for participation in the suit. It would be helpful if each correspondent indicated whether he or she had been "selected out"

or had retired "voluntarily" to avoid selection out; the date and composition of the last selection panel rating the Officer; the date of retirement; and any other information which the Officer recalls in connection with the administrative processing of "retirement" or separation. (These data are especially important in light of the discovery by Fund that State Department management had been placing among "public members" of the Promotion Boards persons whose primary qualifications are family ties or service to management in confidential or consulting roles. For example, Deputy Under Secretary William J. Crockett appointed his brother-in-law, William Figy, to the 1963 Selection Board "B" which promoted Idar Rimestad, Howard Mace and seven other proteges of Mr. Crockett to Class FSO-1. Most recently, Deputy Under Secretary William B. Macomber appointed Harry Tyson Carter as FSR-1 to work with Mr. Robert Gordon, the Department's Ombudsman for grievances. Previously, Mr. Carter was a paid "consultant" to the Department serving as special counsel to Secretary Macomber in connection with the unsuccessful attempted confirmation of Howard Mace as Ambassador to Sierra Leone. Prior to that, Mr. Carter served as "public member" of the 1970 Selection Board "II" which promoted among others, Mr. Robert Gordon, the Department's "Ombudsman", to Class FSO-1. We are now assembling lists of Officers "selected out" by Board "B" and Board "II" and by other Boards.)"

* * * * *

Management has also made available to Selection Panels unverified, oral prejudicial material relating to "suitability," and these data have sometimes resulted in placing officers in the lowest percentage of their class.

First of all, I am shocked to have heard that the selection boards do not maintain permanent records of their actions; and that for this reason, any appeals system will have to be based on procedures without benefit of complete records of decisions by selection panels. Second, I am astounded that unverified detrimental and, it appears, even fabricated materials have been orally submitted by top State Department personnel officers to selection boards to assure the selection out of certain officers. Third, I am literally astonished to discover that the top administrative officer at that time, Deputy Under Secretary of State William J. Crockett, appointed his own brother-in-law, William Figy, as a so-called public member, to the 1963 board promoting officers to class 1.

Let us look at some of the people that board promoted. The Thomas Fund has informed me that in addition to Idar Rimestad, who succeeded Mr. Crockett as Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration and Mr. Howard Mace, whom the Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not agree to confirm after hearings about the way he discharged his duties as Deputy Director General of the Foreign Service, the following names of persons closely associated with Mr. Crockett appeared on that promotion list:

Joseph F. Donelan, Jr.: Acting Assistant Secretary for Administration;

Milan L. Egert: Department of State Consultant; Assistant Director Planning Administration; Special Assistant; Deputy Administrative Officer in Rome during the period 1956 to June 1959. He served immediately under Crockett who was Administrative Officer in Rome from Feb. 28, 1954 to June 14, 1957;

Frederick Irving: Deputy Assistant Secretary for Educational-Cultural Affairs;

Marshall P. Jones: Special Assistant to Assistant Secretary of State for Administration;

Howard P. Mace: Consul General, Istanbul, Turkey; previously, Acting Director General of the Foreign Service; previously, Deputy Director General of Personnel; Deputy Assistant Secretary for Personnel; Deputy Assistant Secretary for Organization and Management;

Adrian T. Middleton: (Deceased);

Idar Rimestad: U.S. Representative to U.N. with rank of Ambassador; previously, Deputy Under Secretary for Administration;

Earl D. Sohm: Deputy Director of Personnel for Operations; previously, Deputy Assistant Secretary; earlier, Chief Career Management Assignment Division; Chief, Personnel Operations Division; Deputy Chief, Personnel Operations Division; and

John H. Stutesman, Jr.: Deputy Director of Personnel for Recruitment; previously, Dean of Foreign Service Institute School for Professional Studies; earlier, Foreign Affairs personnel planning program; earlier Special Assistant to Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration.

Many highly qualified Foreign Service officers were "selected out" by selection boards since 1963. In reviewing the role that was played by the William Figy board, I learned from the fund that several persons promoted to FSO-1 by that board subsequently themselves served on selection boards. For example, Frederick Irving and Earl Sohm served on two boards; John Stutesman and Adrian Middleton on one; and Charles Mace, the twin brother of Howard Mace, served on a selection board in 1966.

I question whether the foreign policy of the United States is served properly when career professionals are promoted, fired and assigned by a system where brothers-in-law and twin brothers of top personnel administrators are given crucial roles over the fate of Foreign Service officers.

I include in the RECORD material recently mailed to Foreign Service personnel by the Charles William Thomas Memorial Legal Defense Fund.

The material follows:

IMPORTANT MESSAGE FROM THE THOMAS LEGAL DEFENSE FUND TO RETIRED FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS WHO MAY WISH TO JOIN ITS CLASS ACTION SUIT

The Charles William Thomas Memorial Legal Defense Fund wishes to call the attention of all retired Foreign Service Officers, Foreign Service Information Officers, and other Foreign Service personnel to the possible impact on them of the suits which it is about to file. These consequences should be seriously weighed especially by those Officers *who are "selected out" or who retired "voluntarily" to avoid selection out*. This suit will seek to restore many Officers to the rolls of the Foreign Service; for others it will establish claims for back pay; and it should result in increased annuities for all participants who define the "class".

The legal action which the Thomas Fund will be filing on behalf of "selected out" Foreign Service Officers is defined as a *class action suit*. Thus, this suit differs from all previous suits brought on behalf of Foreign Service Officers, whether as individuals or as a group.

"CLASS ACTION"

This suit will seek redress for all litigants on the grounds that, *as a class*, they were denied due process by certain specific operations of the Foreign Service *as a system*. The individual cases which will be presented will serve primarily as representative examples of the systematic denial of due process to all the litigants as a result of the procedures and the administrative practices and policies of the Foreign Service.

Previous suits against selection out were unsuccessful principally because the Department of State was able to persuade the courts to deny the litigant the right of "discovery". This meant that the litigant could not subpoena records and obtain affidavits. The Department relied essentially on the argument that discovery should be denied because the records sought in the suit related to the performance rating of the individual officer and were not germane to the issue as to how his *relative standing* had been established by the selection boards. Since "selection out" was based on "relative standing", the Department of State argued, "discovery" should be denied.

This suit, in contrast, will address itself primarily to the very process of establishing "relative standing". On the basis of precedents already established by the courts, we have every reason to believe that discovery will be allowed and we will be able to subpoena records and witnesses.

SPECIAL CRITERIA REGARDING PARTICIPATION

There is another important distinction of which all potential participants should be aware.

Class action suits, which are a relatively recent genre of litigation, must comply with certain specific requirements not applying to traditional suits. Especially important for litigants is the manner in which participation in the suit is established.

It is a standard rule that potential participants may join *up to the time immediately before the suit is filed. Once the suit is filed, however, it may be difficult for additional participants to join the suit without the explicit approval of the court. Some courts have refused to grant this permission.*

Because the Fund hopes to instruct its counsel to file suit by the end of June or early July, we wish to stress that any person who was "selected out", or who retired "voluntarily" in order to avoid selection out, should communicate immediately with the Charles William Thomas Memorial Legal Defense Fund to obtain particulars about qualifying for participation in the suit. It would be helpful if each correspondent indicated whether he or she had been "selected out" or had retired "voluntarily" to avoid selection out; the date and composition of the last selection panel rating the Officer; the date of retirement; and any other information which the Officer recalls in connection with the administrative process of "retirement" or separation. (These data are especially important in light of the discovery by Fund that State Department management has been placing among "public members" of the Promotion Boards persons whose primary qualifications are family ties or service to management in confidential or consulting roles. For example, Deputy Under Secretary William J. Crockett appointed his brother-in-law, William Figy, to the 1963 Selection Board "B" which promoted Idar Rimestad, Howard Mace and seven other proteges of Mr. Crockett to Class FSO-1. Most recently, Deputy Under Secretary William B. Macomber appointed Harry Tyson Carter as FSR-1 to work with Mr. Robert Gordon, the Department's "Ombudsman" for grievances. Previously, Mr. Carter was a paid "consultant" to the Department, serving as special counsel to Secretary Macomber in connection with the unsuccessful attempted confirmation of Howard Mace as Ambassador to Sierra Leone. Prior to that, Mr. Carter served as "public member" of the 1970 Selection Board "II" which promoted, among others, Mr. Robert Gordon, the Department's "Ombudsman", to Class FSO-1. We are now assembling lists of Officers "selected out" by

Board "B" and Board "II" and by other Boards.)

Please address all correspondence to: The Charles William Thomas Memorial Legal Defense Fund, P.O. Box 19443—20th Street Station, Washington, D.C. 20036.

## THE TIME TO SPEAK OUT AGAINST MILITARY PLANS TO DESTROY THE NORTH VIETNAMESE DAM AND DIKE SYSTEM IS NOW

## HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, during the long history of the Indochina war, we have heard one President after another announce that a decision had been reached and military action initiated that broadened the American involvement in that tragic conflict. Those of us in and out of the Congress who have opposed these war policies, had found ourselves, time and time again, presented with a fait accompli, and our protests against the stepped up military activities went largely ignored by the White House.

The increased air bombing of North Vietnam could present us with a similar situation. One of the most inviting targets in North Vietnam is its system of dams and dikes, and the military has been known to favor an attack upon these flood control systems. Such an act would bring mass devastation to the civilian population of North Vietnam. Now, not after another fait accompli, is the time to let the President know that such an attack against civilians will not be tolerated by the American people who already must feel some moral compunction about the enormous damage our bombings cause throughout Indochina.

Mr. Speaker, in this respect, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article by D. Gareth Porter which appeared in the June 3, 1972, New Republic:

NIXON'S NEXT OPTION: BOMBING THE DIKES

(By D. Gareth Porter)

North Vietnamese society, based on agriculture and a highly motivated and resourceful labor force, has one major vulnerability—the vulnerability of its food supply to destruction by floods. The destruction of that food supply by flooding is Mr. Nixon's only remaining military option. He's bombing the ports, power transformers, rail lines and bridges; next he can bomb the dams and dikes of the Red River Delta.

The possibility arises because of the extreme unevenness of precipitation in the North; about 85 percent of its annual rainfall will come during the coming months, peaking in July, August and September in the most fertile rice-producing area. During the rainy season the Red River becomes swollen, often nearing the top of its dikes. If those dikes are breached or broken, floods will cause paddy fields to become waterlogged and the rice crop to be lost, even if other damage is minimized. And if the Red River overflows, it will probably mean serious floods in the other river valleys of Central North Vietnam as well.

North Vietnam's people have suffered floods during the rainy reason—and droughts during the dry season—many times in their history, but the worst of all was in 1944 when 25 sections of the Red River dikes were broken and some 225,000 hectares of riceland, or about one-fourth of the total under cultivation, were ruined. That natural calamity became an atrocity when the Japanese occupation authority requisitioned much of the available paddy for its own purposes, leaving an estimated two million Vietnamese to starve to death.

Last year, flood waters smashed through a 30-mile section of the delta's dikes, wiping out large parts of the 1971 autumn rice crop, which was then being harvested and the 1972 winter crop, which is only now being harvested. Because of the importation of food from Russia and China and relief efforts, there apparently was no starvation. When systematic US bombing of the North began in 1965, a civilian army of 200,000 men and women was formed to patrol the branches of the Red River for any ruptures in the dikes, whose destruction would threaten mass starvation.

Air attacks on the dike system would have to be combined with all-out bombing to prevent the import of sufficient foodstuffs overland from China. The Johnson administration gave serious consideration to just such a plan, based in part on the analysis of the Central Intelligence Agency, which said in January, 1967, "Bombing the levee system which keeps the Red River under control, if timed correctly, could cause large crop losses and force North Vietnam to import large amounts of rice. Depending on the success of the interdiction efforts, such imports might overload the transport system." But the military effects of such a policy, the CIA correctly observed, would be "limited and short-lived." Such proposals were rejected, and Secretary McNamara's memorandum of May 16, 1967 explained why: "There may be a limit beyond which many Americans and most of the world would not permit the United States to go," he wrote.

Although the systematic targeting of the Red River dikes and dams was ruled out, this did not mean that they were never hit. Attacks on dikes surrounding the city of Namdinh in 1966 were reported by *New York Times* correspondent Harrison Salisbury during his trip to the North. According to city officials, U.S. planes dropped six bombs on a two-kilometer section of the dike on May 31 and again on July 14. As the water level of the Dao River continued to rise, American planes returned on July 20 and July 31 to hit the dikes repeatedly. The Pentagon responded to Salisbury's report by saying the real target was a transshipment facility in Namdinh, and that, in any case, "repairs would not be difficult and . . . accidental damage inflicted on it would not necessarily show up on later intelligence photography taken subsequent to repairs." Many such "accidents" occurred from 1965 through 1968, seemingly intended to force North Vietnam to divert manpower to repairing the damage. (In the case of Namdinh, the population worked for 20 straight days to repair the dike.)

Nevertheless, U.S. bombing was not intended to cause major flooding in the Red River Delta. As we know from the Pentagon Papers, the joint chiefs were never satisfied with this restriction and pressed for both the removal of restraints on the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong, "with the expected increase in civilian casualties to be accepted as militarily justified and necessary," and the systematic targeting of dikes and dams as well.

The precedent for striking flood control systems as "strategic targets" for the purposes of starving the enemy into submission was set near the end of the Korean War, when the U.S. air force was authorized to destroy all North Korean irrigation dams. On May 13, 1953, 20 air force F-4s destroyed the Toksan irrigation dam, causing a flash flood which inundated 27 miles of valley farmlands. Two other dams were bombed for the same purpose; the remainder were scheduled for attack when the armistice intervened.

American memories are short. Only a few years before, the flooding of agricultural land by a Nazi enemy had been considered a heinous crime. The German high commissioner in Holland, Seyss-Inquart, who opened the dikes of that country at the end of 1944 and flooded approximately 500,000 acres of land, was hanged as a war criminal by the Nuremburg Tribunal—despite the fact that he stopped the flooding after being warned by the Allied High Command and agreed to help in relief efforts.

But that was a crime against white Europeans. In North Vietnam, as in North Korea, the distinction between military and civilian targets is barely perceptible. As marine Commandant Wallace M. Greene, Jr., testified before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee on October 23, 1967, "We are at war with North Vietnam right now . . . , and we shouldn't be so much interested in [the North Vietnamese people's] anger as we are in bringing the war home to every one of them up there." Army Chief of Staff Harold K. Johnson was more blunt: "I put 'innocent civilians' in quotation marks," he said.

The joint chiefs, having lost in the previous administration, are now renewing pressures on the President to attack the dams and dikes. With the fear of direct Soviet and Chinese intervention receding, the Nixon administration may not be as constrained as its predecessor. At any rate, Mr. Nixon has publicly kept this option open. In Texas on April 30, he was asked about bombing the dams and dikes of North Vietnam. His answer, carefully phrased, could be interpreted both as a warning to Hanoi and a trial balloon at home. First he called the dikes and dams "strategic targets," indicating his acceptance of the joint chiefs' doctrine that they are legitimate targets. He went on to say that bombing the dikes and dams could cause "an enormous number of civilian casualties" and that this was something which "we need to avoid" and also "something we believe is not needed." But he did not rule out such attacks at some future time.

Twelve days later, after serious reversals had been suffered by the Saigon army, Hanoi radio reported that US bombers had knocked out a section of the dike protecting Hanoi from the waters of the Red River. *Nhan Dan*, the Lao Dong Party's newspaper, reported that flood control dikes in many areas of the country's four southern provinces had been hit. These breaks, which could presumably still be repaired in time to avoid flooding from the coming heavy rains, might have been accidents, but they might also have been intended to remind Hanoi that the dikes could be breached. If the President does choose to use this remaining option, he will move swiftly and secretly. Congress and the public would once again be faced with a *fait accompli*, and left once again, with nothing to do but express regrets. Those in Congress who want to prevent this crime would be well advised to raise the issue now—while there is still time.

## JUNIOR PHILHARMONIC ORCHESTRA OF CALIFORNIA

## HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to applaud the work of Dr. Ernest Katz and his Junior

Philharmonic Orchestra of California for 35 years of outstanding musical achievement.

In 1937 Dr. Katz started his young people's symphony which has now been recognized by contemporary composers and musicians as one of the finest junior symphonies in the United States.

One amazing fact about this orchestra is that while it has never accepted any financial support from local, State, or Federal Government, it has helped raise over $8 million in funds for noteworthy causes.

Composed of 125 boys and girls between the ages of 12 and 19, the orchestra has been honored by personal appearances of such famous composers as Oscar Straus, Jerome Kern, Sigmund Romberg, David Rose, Meredith Wilson, Ferde Grofe, Rudolf Friml, and Dimitri Tiomkin. Included among its honorary members are pianist Jose Iturbi, violinist Isaac Stern and comedian/violinist Jack Benny.

The orchestra has received special commendations from Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon. I wish to extend my congratulations to Dr. Katz and his young people's symphony for their many cultural and civic contributions, and I invite my colleagues to join with me in honoring them today.

## A PROGRAM TO COMBAT THE MYSTERIOUS INFANT DEATH SYNDROME

### HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would assure that an extensive and concentrated effort is made to discover the cause of the sudden infant death syndrome—SIDS. This disease kills one of every 300 babies born during their first year of life—almost 10,000 infants a year. So ignorant is the public about SIDS that even the labeling of this killer as a disease has been a major step forward in the past 3 years.

Due to a lack of medical research, virtually all we know about SIDS is that it affects babies between the ages of 1 month to 1 year and fatalities reach a peak at age 3 months. Most infants die silently in their sleep without the slightest indication when they were put to bed that anything was wrong. Very often, an autopsy is performed but it fails to disclose the precise cause of death. "Crib death," as it is also known, is the explanation offered to parents. Ignorance of the cause of death leads many parents to despair over the way they cared for their child and makes the entire experience especially traumatic for them. Occasionally, parents are even subjected to a police investigation because the authorities suspect some wrongdoing on the parents' part. Thus, lack of knowledge compounds the tragedy for the parents.

The resolution I am proposing would rectify the appalling ignorance about SIDS. It would call for the dissemination of information concerning SIDS to coroners, medical examiners, social workers, and similar personnel. This information would describe the nature of SIDS and discuss the needs of families affected by it. The Secretary of the Department of HEW would be responsible for researching and distributing this material.

Most important, my resolution would instruct the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development of HEW to search for the cause of SIDS and for its prevention or cure. This would be achieved through the awarding of special research grants and fellowships.

Last, the measure would authorize the Secretary of HEW to develop a reliable index that would outline the national incident and distribution of SIDS. Further, autopsies would become standard procedure for infants who die from SIDS and the results would become immediately available to parents.

We must provide the resources to SIDS research if we are to assure children their right to life and families their right to understand SIDS. Compassion and human decency require the Congress act now before more young lives are lost.

## FOURTH-CLASS TREATMENT

### HON. CHARLES THONE
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. THONE. Mr. Speaker, fourth-class treatment for Nebraska farmers and residents of small towns is proposed with the announcement that the U.S. Postal Service plans to discontinue Sunday deliveries to third- and fourth-class post offices in my State.

The proposed move will delay first-class letter delivery and will make it difficult or impossible for many farmers and people who live in small towns to get a newspaper on Sunday. When mail is not delivered to a post office on Sunday, it is not apt to reach homes on Monday. Many rural Nebraskans subscribe to Sunday newspapers by mail. They go to the post office to pick up their papers on Sunday. Without Sunday deliveries to the post offices, many Nebraskans may not get Sunday papers through the mail until Tuesday.

I was not a Member of Congress when the Department of the Post Office was abolished and the independent U.S. Postal Service was created. Many now believe it was a mistake to free that agency from control of Congress, and I am inclined to agree that something is apparently wrong.

Over the years, the Post Office Department helped to unite this Nation. It aided tremendously in disseminating information and knowledge, especially in rural areas.

The U.S. Postal Service is attempting to convey the idea that it is newly efficient. The high-priced imagemakers, however, cannot conceal the fact that mail service is still deteriorating, while rates go higher.

Today, Postmaster General E. T. Klassen declares that it is unprofitable to make Sunday deliveries to third- and fourth-class post offices in Nebraska. Tomorrow, at the rate he is going, he will declare that all rural free delivery is unprofitable.

Within the next few weeks, Congress is expected to pass new legislation to aid in the redevelopment and revitalization of rural America. I, of course, will support that legislation. Does it make sense, however, for one arm of Government to provide millions and millions of dollars to make rural America liveable, while another arm of Government, the Postal Service, tries to cut off farmers and small-town dwellers from information and service through the mail?

The cost of Sunday delivery to Nebraska third- and fourth-class post offices compared to the cost of contemplated increases in postal rates is similar to the difference in size between a gnat and an elephant.

The new entity to deliver the mail added service to its name. I think it is about time to place service foremost in the management philosophy of the U.S. Postal Service. I am again calling on Postmaster General Klassen to rescind his order to end Sunday service to small Nebraska post offices as of July 1.

## THE WAR AND OPPRESSION—A STATEMENT OF HUMAN VALUES

### HON. NICK BEGICH
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, as is so often the case in our society, the churches represent the cutting edge of enlightened human opinion. Recently I received in my office a copy of two resolutions passed at the Convention of the Episcopal Diocese of Alaska meeting in Anchorage on April 21 of this year. Those resolutions relate to the Indochina war and to the general question of repression everywhere. I believe their expressions of opinion are moving, and deserve the attention of all my colleagues.

The resolutions follow:

A RESOLUTION ON THE INDOCHINA WAR

Whereas the original, radical message of Christ insists upon a real peace and love between neighbors and nations; and

Whereas many different religious groups, including the Executive Council of this Church, have condemned the war in Indochina and its continuation;

Be it therefore resolved that this Convention, aware of its Christian responsibility, urges all governments immediately to stop the war in Indochina. It urges all governments foreign to Indochina to withdraw troops from, and military aid to Indochina.

And be it further resolved that this Resolution shall be communicated to the Alaska Congressional delegation, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of the Alaska State Legislature, the public and the press.

A RESOLUTION ON OPPRESSION

Whereas there appears to many an alarming trend toward repression in this country; and

Whereas this climate seems to have as a goal the discouragement and intimidation of any political dissenters who might think of expressing their views out loud; and

Whereas love and worship of God requires respecting the personhood of one's brother:

Be it therefore resolved that this Convention urges the full protection of the rights of all prisoners and persons being investigated and that their human dignity be respected; and

Be it further resolved that this Convention condemns partiality in enforcement and interpretation of the law and the indiscriminate use of violence to intimidate minority groups and causes; and

Be it further resolved that this Convention condemns the misuse of power to control and manipulate dissenting viewpoints unpopular with those in power; and

Be it further resolved that this Resolution shall be communicated to the Alaskan Congressional Delegation, the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of the Alaska State Legislature, the public and the press.

## MEMORIAL DAY

## HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, for a long number of years, it has been my privilege and high honor to participate in Memorial Day observances in my home city of Knoxville. The program this year was under the auspices of the Metropolitan Knoxville Council of War Veterans Organizations. The officers of this organization are as follows:

President, William E. Fitzgerald, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion.

Executive vice president, Charles H. Dodge, World War I Veterans, American Legion.

Second vice president, Raleigh Wynn, Sr., Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Third vice president, Harry W. Pipkin, Jr., Disabled American Veterans, American Legion.

Secretary, James A. King, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion.

Sergeant at arms, Walter Chandler, American Legion.

This year's program was a most impressive one. One of the finest high school bands in the Nation, Doyle High School in Knoxville, under the direction of Mr. Anthony J. D'Andrea, provided patriotic music for the event.

The occasion this year was in honor of Col. John A. Clancy, Sr. The Clancy family is well known in Tennessee, and have been referred to as the "outstanding patriotic family of Knoxville." I was so impressed by the remarks Mr. Clancy prepared for the occasion that I would like for all my colleagues to have the benefit of the wisdom contained therein.

The remarks follow:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY COL. JOHN A. CLANCY, SR.

I speak for the Clancy Clan, the family referred to by the Arrangement Committee and news media as "An Outstanding Patriotic Family of Knoxville."

I am a poor hand at speaking but if you will bear with me, I will try to get the record straight. First, we make no claim to being outstanding, though we sincerely appreciate the compliment. We are not outstanding, just numerous and healthy. We thank God no member of our family was ever deprived of service because of a physical or mental handicap. But we are similar to thousands of families hereabouts with give or take a few more or less members who like ourselves want to share our burden of defense of our country. Any recognition or honor accorded our immediate family is not for me or my boys but for their sainted mother, the late Ellen Joy Clancy, who went to her reward in 1965. We only stand proxy for her. Any credit is her due. She taught our children to love and serve their God, their country, their family, and their neighbors. She was a true Christian mother and she worked at it hard. God rest her.

Our family has quite a roster of veterans down through the years. Some wore the gray. One was with Major Walter Reed and his Yellow Fever Immunes in Cuba. We have been well represented in all our wars (at least by numbers). Two of our grandsons left the university for Vietnam service. They are now, by the grace of God and the generosity of our government, back with their studies, proud holders of Combat Infantry Badges. Another left high school and joined the Navy. There is nothing spectacular about our service, we are just able and willing and we keep coming along, generation after generation. We have thirteen husky grandsons now and (if women's lib takes over) sixteen equally healthy granddaughters, one great granddaughter and two great grandsons coming along. With natural increment, we feel we can meet any probable quotas in the foreseeable future for our immediate family.

We are both humble and proud and honored to be with our Gold Star Mothers, his honor the Mayor, and that tried and true friend of all veterans, their families, and their organizations, the Honorable John J. Duncan, our representative in the Congress, the reverend clergy, our city and county officials, representatives of our veteran organizations and their auxiliaries, the Honorable William E. Fitzgerald and Charles H. Dodge of the Arrangement Committee and a host of other distinguished guests assembled with you to honor and pay homage to the sacred memory of our departed comrades, friends, and neighbors. May they rest in peace is our prayer.

May I take the liberty of asking you to pray? Please pray. Please, I beseech you to pray.

Pray for our Country

Pray for its Dedicated Leaders

Pray for our gallant defenders in the service

Pray for our vigilant protectors in law enforcement

And last but not least

Please pray for peace and may God be with you all.

Thanks.

## BUFFALO COURIER EXPRESS URGES NO MORE STALLING ON REVENUE PLAN

## HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to cast my vote in favor of the Mills revenue-sharing bill. I am a cosponsor of the legislation and I have been expending considerable time and effort in obtaining a redevelopment designation for Erie County, N.Y. This would enable the county to obtain special benefits from the Economic Development Administration and these are badly needed.

I know firsthand the financial problems of the governmental units, not only in Erie County, but throughout the Nation. This editorial points out that these governmental units must determine the sources of revenue in order to plan ahead. Many will not have much time to plan, so prompt action is a necessity.

I was delighted to read the editorial appearing in the May 31, 1972, issue to the Buffalo Courier Express and I believe this editorial will spark some action on the revenue-sharing plan. I commend this article to the attention of all my colleagues and specifically urge the majority leadership to note the straightforward comments in the editorial. I include the edorial at this point:

[From the Buffalo Courier Express, May 31, 1972]

NO MORE STALLING ON REVENUE PLAN

In putting off action on the Nixon-Mills revenue-sharing bill until after June 5, the House Democratic leadership seems to have taken a calculated risk, apparently hoping to be sure of the votes needed for passage. For the sake of the cities and towns of this nation, the congressional leaders had better be 100 per cent sure of what they're doing.

Perhaps the sudden shift in plans was indeed due to the need to await the return of President Nixon from Moscow, as Rep. Carl Albert and Rep. Hale Boggs indicated. But if prospects for approval of this too-long-delayed bill really are so chancy that it requires more arm-twisting from Mr. Nixon, it does not speak too well for the enthusiasm and effectiveness of Speaker Albert, Majority Leader Boggs and Rep. Wilbur Mills, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee which made several improvements in the original Nixon legislation. This trio certainly should be able to get their own people lined up in the time remaining.

However, the leadership may be in deep trouble if the opposition snag was due to resentment on the 8–7 Rules Committee vote to bar amendments on the floor. And there is a possibility that the bill might lose unless modified to cut out the five-year time span of the $30-billion funding and to make the program subject to annual funding. Perhaps Rep. Mills will be able to work another compromise; perhaps a two-year initial funding would be easier to get.

In order to have any validity for long-range planning, however, revenue sharing needs to be free of the threat of being the victim of a political hatchet job every year. Local communities have to know the funds are there so they can plan their own projects efficiently. So the start of the revenue-sharing plan needs to be funded with specific dollar amounts, not just with an authorization for money which can be torpedoed later on. State and local officials have been put through the wringer long enough in the struggle for this bill and there is no excuse for any further gamesmanship in Congress. It's up to the House leadership of both parties to get it passed with no more stalling.

## JOINT RESOLUTION TO MANDATE TAX REFORM

## HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution which would require Congress to begin the task of reforming and recodifying the Federal tax laws by June 30, 1972. It is my belief that the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 has been amended and reamended so many times in the last 18 years that the course I am recommending is the only sensible way to give the American people the comprehensive tax reform they seek and deserve.

My resolution would direct the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to hold hearings on each tax preference contained in the Internal Revenue Code no later than June 30. By tax preference, I am referring to the adjustments, credits, deductions, exclusions, and exemptions which are found throughout the code. The resolution directs the executive branch to fully cooperate with the hearings, and it further directs the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee to report to the floors of the House and Senate, respectively, comprehensive legislation to reform and recodify the Federal income, estate, and gift tax laws. This approach to tax reform neither singles out a certain small percentage of tax preferences for review, nor does it cause provisions in the present tax laws to lapse prior to the completion of congressional action, and thereby create hopeless uncertainty for the Nation's taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, it is often said that one man's tax loophole is another man's tax incentive. While everyone would wish tax lopoholes to be closed, the problem is to determine what, in fact, is a loophole.

The term "loophole" generally refers to a legislative oversight—a gap in the law which allows particularly clever people to violate the intent of Congress with impunity. This is not the case, however, with so-called tax loopholes. Here we are talking about tax preferences which have been accorded by the Congress for the purpose of achieving socially desirable decisions in the private sector.

Personally, I view the whole question of tax reform with an open mind. Certainly the growing dissatisfaction with various provisions in the Internal Revenue Code justifies thorough hearings, of the sort called for in my resolution, and I believe they should be commenced in the very near future.

The resolution also establishes certain ground rules for the consideration of tax reform which I deem essential if we are to view this matter in its proper context. First, we must ask if the particular tax preference seeks to implement a desirable policy in the public interest. Second, if the policy goal is a good one, we must ask if the present language in the Internal Revenue Code does the best possible job of implementing that goal. Third, tax preferences must be assessed as to their compatibility with the overriding social goal of equitably treating all taxpayers. Finally, it must be determined if the tax preference in question is one which is compatible with the revenue needs of the Federal Government.

The Nation needs, Mr. Speaker, a new tax law. It does not need additional random consideration of individual sections of the present code, and it most assuredly does not need a methodology of tax reform which leaves the Nation's taxpayers unable to wisely plan their financial decisions over the course of the next several years. For these reasons I urge the quick approval of the joint resolution I have today introduced.

## WELFARE IS NOT AN EVIL WORD

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, 1972, The New York Times published an essay by former Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court Earl Warren entitled, "Welfare is not an Evil Word." Knocking welfare has become a political pastime, that, evidently, few national figures can resist. President Nixon has repeatedly thumped for "workfare" over "welfare." People, more than ever before, perceive welfare clients as an affront to the American way of life. "Welfare people," says George Sternlieb, director of the Center for Urban Policy Research of Rutgers University in New Jersey, "are now the closest thing to untouchables that this country has got."

Justice Warren's comments put the problem in a better perspective.

The article follows:

WELFARE IS NOT AN EVIL WORD

(By Earl Warren)

Many of the poor who came here struggled out of ghettos to a more favorable position in life for their children. But there are still more recent arrivals who have not yet been able to escape their sordid surroundings. What a breach of trust it is—as well as a betrayal of a commitment to our own ideals—whenever any of these people, because of their race, or color, or creed, find hostility here instead of hospitality, or are awarded not light and warmth from the "lamp beside the golden door" but a badge of inferiority for conditions they are powerless to change.

Those without color have found it comparatively easy to work their way out of the slums. But the colored, particularly the blacks—almost twenty million of them—have carried a cross throughout our history, not because of anything they could change but because of well-known reasons not flattering to the rest of us. The condition of these citizens presents one of our greatest national problems.

It is imperative to remember in all of our actions that our nation has developed as a plural society composed of people of every racial origin on earth. Our ancestors were urged to come here to populate the country, to develop its resources, and to build its economy and its institutions. We have enshrined in our Constitution the principle that all men are created equal and have made everyone born or naturalized in the United States a citizen with all the privileges and immunities inherent in that status. We must realize that the only way we can have unity throughout the nation is to accord the full spectrum of constitutional rights equally to everyone. There is no other way. The color of a man's skin or the religion he espouses must not be a factor in according him rights.

We have for centuries segregated certain groups from the mainstream of American life. Now that that exclusion has caught up with us, we do not know how to communicate with them, and in effect, while using the same words, we speak different languages. Our boast for years has been that we have developed the most affluent society in recorded history; yet, admittedly, millions of Americans go to bed hungry every night. This does not add up to affluence. It is, at best, a paradox. Here we are, plagued with problems of unemployment, relief and frustration, while surrounded on every side with extravagance of all kinds.

Recently, resistance has developed to what is compendiously called "welfare." Because of disjointed statutes, faulty administration, and abuse by some, all of the categories of aid to the unfortunate are lumped under that term, and welfare has acquired a somewhat sinister meaning. But it is not, of course, an evil word. Indeed the Preamble to the Constitution includes the general welfare as one of its objectives. Many functions of the government are undertaken with welfare in mind, for the benefit of different segments of society, but as a term of debasement it seems to apply only to assistance to the unfortunate.

When hundreds of millions of dollars are given to bankrupt railroads, failing defense manufacturers, shipping interests and the like, the words "welfare" or "relief" are not used. Instead, such things are done to "strengthen the economy." Perhaps welfare to needy individuals can some day be discussed with the same particularity and with the same equanimity as subsidy to industry and other impersonal beneficiaries.

The same metamorphosis is occurring in the field of health and medical care. Only a very few years ago any proposal for medical assistance that called for governmental participation in the health of the public was denounced by vested interests as the work of the devil. It was "Communism" in its purest form. But today we have Medicare and Medicaid, and the questions under review are primarily how and when aid can be extended to other groups whose ill health, caused by the inaccessibility of medical attention, is weakening our society.

In considering the problems of intolerance and neglect in a multiracial society, we must not close our eyes to the danger to the rights of all inherent in the denial of rights to the few. That danger is visible all around us, today as never before.

## JOINT RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING EMPLOYMENT OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS MEMBERS BY THE PRIVATE SECTOR

### HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution which would authorize the assignment of Neighborhood Youth Corps members to employment in the private sector. By thus enlarging the scope of utilization, I hope to open up to these youngsters meaningful job training opportunities, as well as jobs capable of incorporating career ladders.

On May 17, commenting on the appropriation levels voted this year for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, I stated that not only do we woefully underfund this program, but that we are also critically underutilizing its potentials. The joint resolution I am introducing today calls on the Secretary of Labor to rectify this situation by making available funds appropriated for manpower training services under the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1972 for employment and training opportunities with private for-profit employers.

For years, especially in connection with this program, many unkept promises were made. For years a large majority of eligible youth, more than eight out of 10 in New York City last year, were excluded from the opportunities which were allegedly created for their benefit. As a result, our disappointed youth and communities have come to regard the Summer Neighborhood Youth Corps program as the establishment's efforts to buy peace. This belief has been reinforced by the types of jobs into which we have been channeling participating youth. To date the public and nonprofit sectors have often had to put the corpsmen to work in make-work situations, employing them in dead-end jobs which the youngsters were quick to see would lead them nowhere and provide them with no salable skills. The youth drew the minimum wage and were confirmed in their disillusionment with and disappointment in "the system."

New York City, as many of our other cities, is experiencing high levels of unemployment. It is also experiencing disastrous levels of juvenile delinquency. On the night of June 1, three youngsters were shot in the Bronx. The day before that 12 were knifed.

Out of work, excluded from meaningful opportunities, deeply disillusioned with the idea of working within the framework of "the system," these youths turn to destructive behavior—thus making the already bleak and deprived neighborhoods they inhabit even more intolerable. If allowed to continue, they are destined for a life of crime and dependency.

But troubled though they are, these youth represent one of our most precious resources. We must reach them, we must give them meaningful opportunities. And as far as the Neighborhood Youth Corps program is concerned, we can only do this fully by utilizing the resources of the private sector so that they can, during their term as corpsmen, acquire skills that are genuinely helpful and have the potential of preparing them for the existing job market. I do not stand alone in this belief. A subcommittee of the Bronx Task Force on Gang Activity passed a resolution on June 1 calling for the immediate implementation of such an approach.

The legislation I am introducing is an emergency measure to meet an existing dramatic need. By making funds available for such programs this year we can pave the way for comprehensive legislation in this area in the future. The 1-year authorization contained in the measure will be sufficient to set up programs this year, establish meaningful and profitable ties with business, and accumulate data to guide us in our deliberations in this area next year.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting here, for the information of my colleagues, the text of my joint resolution. I believe it represents an effort very much worthy of support and I am asking my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to aid me in this endeavor.

Text of the joint resolution follows:

Joint resolution to authorize the assignment of Neighborhood Youth Corps members to employment in the private sector

Whereas, by restricting the utilization of neighborhood youth corps summer employment opportunities to public, nonprofit employers, the potential of the Neighborhood Youth Corps program for providing training and meaningful work experience is severely restricted;

Whereas, the youths eligible for participation in this program are in severe need of meaningful work training and experience which is capable of leading to permanent jobs in the private industry and to job opportunities which have the potential of incorporating career ladders; and

Whereas, it is necessary to harness and call upon the resources of private for profit businesses to achieve the above two objectives. Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the funds appropriated for manpower training services under the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1972 shall be available to carry out a program to fund employment and training opportunities with private for profit employers: *Provided,* That the program shall not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services, or result in the substitution of Federal for other funds in connection with work that would otherwise be performed.

---

## H.R. 15361—A BILL TO INCREASE THE RATES OF COMPENSATION FOR DISABLED VETERANS BY 10 PERCENT

### HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which would increase the rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans by 10 percent.

We all know that there is no way to adequately compensate a veteran who has lost a limb or an eye, or a veteran who has suffered irreparable psychological damage in the service of his country.

Who can place a price tag on the value of one's eyesight?

Who can attach a dollar value to a man's ability to be a working, productive member of society?

Compensation payments for disabled veterans have always reflected an inadequate amount. But, we have an obligation to at least insure that we are compensating our veterans for their average economic loss resulting from a disease or an injury.

I am not convinced that we are computing rates to reflect the actual loss suffered by the veteran. The Veterans' Administration is undertaking an intensive study on this question and I believe that a reform should be forthcoming in order to adequately compensate those who gave so much of themselves in the service of our country. However, the study is not yet available in its final form.

Thus, I am introducing this legislation today in order to adjust compensation rates to the increases in the cost of living. Hopefully, this increase will be met with further increases after the results of the VA study are revealed.

Disability rates were last adjusted July 1, 1970. Since that time and by the end of this year the cost of living will have risen an estimated 9 percent.

Therefore, a 10 percent increase will do little other than allow the disabled veteran to have the same purchasing power than he had in 1970.

Under this proposal, the veteran with a 40 percent disability would receive $106 per month, instead of his present $96 per month. The veteran with an 80 percent disability would receive $245 per month, rather than the $223 he presently receives.

But, Mr. Speaker, even with the 10 percent increase as proposed by my bill, the disabled veteran still does not receive adequate compensation.

Let us compare the 100-percent disabled veteran with his counterpart, who also served, but, only through the grace of God, was spared from receiving totally disabling wounds. The veteran with a 100-percent disability presently receives $450 a month, or $5,400 per year. His comrade, without a disability, earns $721 a month or $8,660 per year—based on the median income of male veterans in the civilian noninstitutional population for 1970.

Thus, the disabled veteran not only receives $271 a month less than his comrade, he also suffers the psychological burden of not enjoying a prosperous career, such as a skilled carpenter, or a dentist.

In addition to the 10 percent increase in rates, this proposal would establish a $150 annual clothing allowance for disabled veterans who wear prosthetic devices. The Congress has recognized that the use of these artificial limbs results in unusual wear and tear on ordinary clothing, and the VA has furnished repairs to clothing damaged by prosthetic devices.

However, this VA service has not proven adequate, and veterans now pay for needed repairs out of their own pockets.

Thus, by establishing an annual clothing allowance, the seriously disabled veteran would have a relatively low-cost benefit that will be well worth the expense.

I urge the Veterans' Affairs Committee to make this legislation a top-priority item, and enact no less than a 10-percent increase in benefits within the coming months.

---

## GEORGE WHITE: CLEVELAND'S SUPER-QUALIFIED ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

### HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, at the time the 92d Congress convened in January 1971, a distinguished Clevelander, George M. White, entered the service of the Federal Government in

Washington, as the ninth Architect of the Capitol.

The job of Capitol Architect is very demanding, for the one who holds it must possess skills not only in architecture, but also planning and management. The importance of his post cannot be understated either, for through his decisions, the Architect shapes the physical makeup of our Nation's symbol of democracy.

I am extremely proud of the job done by my close friend, George White, and I was pleased to see that the Cleveland Plain Dealer recently carried a feature article about him in its Sunday magazine. I commend this article, which appeared on April 23, to the attention of my colleagues:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL: CLEVELANDER IN THE HISTORIC HOT SEAT

WASHINGTON.—In January last year, when President Nixon appointed Clevelander Malcolm White to the prestigious position of architect of the Capitol, there was a feeling that there would be an easing of the tensions that had so long typified relations between Congress and White's late predecessor, firebrand J. George Stewart. But there is every evidence that the new architect has inherited at least one of the controversial issues proposed and pursued with great diligence by Stewart—extension of the west front of the Capitol. It was Stewart who conceived and directed the extension of the east front of the building between 1958 and 1962 and who, before he died, charged that present west front of the building was in imminent danger of collapse and should be rebuilt and extended in the same manner. This, since it involves the last vestige of the exterior of the original Capitol building, caused some instantaneous hackleraising in Congress and inspired new heights in anti-Stewart oratory.

An ex-congressman himself but without official architectural qualifications, although he was an engineer, Stewart responded in kind. But congressmen, many of whom view the last wall of the original building with the same reverence they accord to the flag and motherhood, had been calling down anathemas upon Stewart's head consistently through his 16-year tenure without swaying him from his views or stilling his sharp repartee.

So constantly did turmoil reign that former Sen. Paul Douglas would periodically rise in the senate chamber and implore in resounding tones:

"Architect, spare our Capitol
Touch not another stone.
In youth it sheltered our Republic.
O, please let it alone."

The vision of peace at last on Capitol Hill was inspired by White's known position on the thorny extension issue. He was in favor of restoration and preservation, entirely in agreement with the announced policy of the American Institute of Architects, of which he was vice president. The $38,000-a-year job although considered a political plum, does not require congressional approval and traditionally is not affected by changes of administration. There have been 37 presidents, who appoint the architect, but in all history there have been only nine Capitol architects. Strangely, or maybe not so strangely, only four of them have been really architects in the professional sense. It has sometimes been an uneasy position only because the Capitol is every American's symbol of freedom and government. Any dalliance with the gods of change therefore is regarded with suspicion and invites scorching condemnation.

After a year on the job and much soul-searching, White has now reversed his position and favors an extension of the west front, not only to save the hallowed original area which has required much buttressing and reinforcing, but to provide 163,000 square feet of space for offices, restaurants, committee rooms and auditoriums. The estimated cost has been put at $45 million.

Actually, the decision was made, with White's professional concurrence and as a member, by a seven-man Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol, a commission set up by Congress with the specific responsibility of determining whether the aged west front should be restored or extended. The other six members are Carl Albert, speaker of the House; Spiro T. Agnew, vice president of the United States and president of the Senate; Hale Boggs, majority leader of the House; Mike Mansfield, majority leader of the Senate; Gerald R. Ford, minority leader of the House; and Hugh Scott, minority leader of the Senate. Any way you figure it, this is a pretty good hand in anybody's poker game.

But, since he is the professional, the flak drops down on the holder of the architect's job and scarcely had the decision been announced than Rep. Samuel S. Stratton (D-N.Y.) suggested that White had allowed himself to be swayed and pushed around. Said Stratton, "his performance was a disgrace and he should resign."

Even Sen. Ted Kennedy, long an advocate for preservation and renovation, rose to speak his mind . . . "Today, the debate has entered a new and much more critical stage. George White, for whom I have immense respect, was with us in the fight in other days. Now, he wears a different hat, and we now hold different views."

The New York Times, without mentioning names, took violent issue with the plan. "The United States Capitol does not belong to the seven congressmen of the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol. It belongs to the people of the United States and to history . . . the controversial extension of the Capitol's west front is a gross error of art and judgment . . ."

Even the American Institute of Architects which had long been lobbying for appointment of one of its members, announced its intention of marshaling forces to save the old west front, refusing to accept the commission's decision as irrevocable.

But the urbane White, unruffled by the furor, proceeds with his plans, knowing that the issue is still far from resolved and that the halls of Congress will long echo with the thunder of voices raised in protest and accepting the fact that voices raised in protest are always louder than those raised in accord.

"You have to remember that this is a very emotional issue," smiles White. "Actually, I was seated next to Sen. Kennedy and he told me that he was going to say something about the project. Then, when he finished and sat down he turned, smiled and said, 'there, that wasn't so bad, was it?' And I saw Rep. Stratton shortly after his remark and he assured me that there was nothing personal about his remarks."

To attain a true perspective of the ramifications involved in being the architect of the Capitol, White has only to peruse the careers of the men who held the job before him to realize that conflict and travail have frequently been part and parcel with the job.

William Thornton, first architect of the Capitol and designer of the original building, held his successor, Benjamin Latrobe, the first professional to hold the job in such low esteem that he was fond of quoting his feelings in verse:

"This Dutchman in taste,
This monument builder,
This planner of grand steps
and walls,
This falling-arch maker,
This blunder-roof gilder,
Himself still an architect calls."

Thornton, actually a physician, was the $500 top prize winner in a competition for design of the Capitol. But because he was unfamiliar with building procedures, the runner-up in the competition, Edienne S. Hallet, took charge of construction. But Hallet was so overly fond of adding his personal touches that a third person, James Hoban was finally put in charge. Hoban had won a competition to design the White House. George Washington laid the cornerstone on September 18, 1793. The north wing was completed in 1800 and Congress met in Washington for the first time that November.

Then along came a rear admiral of the British fleet, Sir George Cockburn, who ordered "this harbor of Yankee democracy" set afire on Aug. 24, 1814. As a result Congress met temporarily in a "Brick Capitol" on the site of the present Supreme Court building while Latrobe efficiently set about rebuilding the "magnificent ruin."

Latrobe resigned under pressure in 1817 as a result of friction with others involved in the restoration but the present interior reflects his own work in which he closely followed Thornton's original designs.

Charles Bulfinch, America's first native-born architect of distinction, was appointed to succeed Latrobe by President James Monroe. Bulfinch supervised construction of the Capitol's midsection linking the two wings and built the building's first low, wooden dome. His reward for diligent service was typical of an ungrateful Congress. They abolished the office of Capitol architect. The necessary services, from 1829 to 1851, were performed by either the commissioner of public buildings and grounds, or the architect of public buildings.

Ironically, during this period, the same congressional grumbling over lack of space that inspired today's proposed extension, resulted in another design competition for extending the building north and south. Jefferson Davis, later president of the Confederacy, was chairman of the Senate committee which supervised the contest.

After some controversy and personal involvement by President Millard Fillmore, Thomas Ustick Walter, a Philadelphia architect, was named the winner. And in a rare example of presidential initiative during his administration, Fillmore re-established the office of architect of the Capitol in 1851, appointing Walter to the post.

Under Walter's architectural direction the House and Senate extensions were both finished by 1859. Although the interiors have been remodeled, these extensions contain the present House and Senate chambers.

During Walter's regime, too, came the huge nine million pound, cast-iron dome rising 385 feet above the eastern plaza and topped by the 19½-foot, seven and one-half-ton Statue of Freedom, the figure of an Indian with headdress. Construction continued under Walter during the Civil War at the urging of President Lincoln who logically concluded that, "if the people see the Capitol going on . . . it is a sign we intend the Union shall go on."

The 90 years following the Civil War were relatively uneventful but busy for the men who held the title of Capitol architect. The Senate and House Office Buildings, the Library of Congress and the Supreme Court buildings sprang up nearly although changes to the Capitol itself were purely functional. Steam heating was added in 1856, elevators in 1874, fireproofing in 1881, modern drainage in 1882 and electricity in 1884. The Capitol architects of that era, Edward Clark, Elliott Woods and David Lynn, perhaps cognizant of past history, fiddled around with repairs and maintenance or busied themselves with nearby construction. They wisely left the Capitol alone. The most lasting Capitol development was the hiring of landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted to lay out the magnificent Capitol grounds, a job that began in 1874 and lasted until 1885.

Over those peaceful years, however, the infirmities of an aging building grown too small for the services expected of it began to become apparent. The ambitious and single-minded J. George Stewart was appointed architect of the Capitol by President Eisenhower and the tranquility of past decades evaporated almost immediately. During his regime Stewart, a caustic, undiplomatic man, managed to enrage nearly everyone but a tightly knit coterie of powerful congressional leaders and favored architects. It was at his insistence and under his direction that the east front of the Capitol was extended 32½ feet at an approximate cost of $12 million. The anguished wailing from those who relish antiquity and tradition above all was loud, long, bitter and unavailing. Stewart had the congressional muscle.

And now comes George M. White and, as fate would have it, just in time to figure in the hornet's nest of public and congressional wrath over the proposed extension at the west front by 88 feet—plans inherited from the crusty and controversial J. George Stewart who possessed, according to his critics, an "edifice complex." He was, they pointed out, forever altering the face of Capitol Hill with untold tons of gleaming marble. His last "monument" on the hill was the Rayburn House Office Building, roundly scored for its excessive cost and "early Halloween" architecture.

It is somewhat prophetic that White took command only a day after a bomb exploded in the Senate wing, creating an unholy mess and costly repair job that his department inherited. The uproar would probably have delighted the late J. George Stewart.

By the questionable and mysterious criteria employed by some of today's corporate personnel people, White is undoubtedly the most "overqualified" man ever appointed to the post of architect of the Capitol. Not only is he an architect of international fame and stature, but he holds bachelor and master's degrees in engineering from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a master's degree in business administration from the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration and a law degree from Case Western Reserve University. The law degree was earned while he shared architectural offices with his father, Maxwell H. White, at 750 Prospect Avenue, where the senior White still holds forth. During World War II he worked as an electronics engineer at General Electric, designing radar transmitters. Later he taught physics at Case Western Reserve for eight years, scheduling early morning classes after which he went to work in his architectural office. He has made a specialty of and is a recognized authority on the legal aspects of the building business and the architectural profession.

"My physics classes usually began at eight o'clock," he recalls. "This gave me a chance for an hour of skating at the Cleveland Skating Club before classes. The classes were over in time for me to still put in a full day at the architectural office."

How does a man, still young at 51, manage to achieve such scholarly stature and acquire so much varied knowledge?

"I've always been interested in intellectual pursuits," he explains. "Study to me is what golf or fishing are to others, fun and relaxation. There was no planned goal for seemingly diverse subjects but, strangely, it seems as though fate has directed me to the one single job in the country where all of them, engineering, business administration, architecture and law, are immensely important and interrelated."

With a staff of 1,900, from professional status architects, engineers and accountants to charladies and groundskeepers, White has supervision of not only the Capitol Building, but the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Supreme Court, the Library of Congress, the Botanical Gardens and the power plant that serves all of them.

A complicated, detail-ridden assignment, the job carries with it collateral responsibilities that consume time and energy. The holder of the office automatically becomes a member of the Capitol Police Board and the District of Columbia Zoning Board.

"I had to learn as much about the city and its development as possible," says White. "It involved an amazing number of fields, factors and important considerations. I had to get the feeling and 'aura' of the community, its historic background and its future growth potential. The job is not one of dwelling on the past, but of trying to anticipate the needs of the Capitol and other governmental offices and facilities 40, 60 and even 100 years from now and to plan accordingly without being callous to the needs of preservation. As far as the extension of the west front, I have had to change my position after studying all the factors and stripping away all the emotional issues. It's a question of what will best serve the people as a nation. It is the 'people's building,' the shrine of freedom and democracy. And it is fitting that the present controversy is about the home of the most deliberative body in the world. Actually, the old west front isn't going to disappear. It will still be visible within the extension, after being buttressed, restored and strengthened. Keystones have slipped, cracks extend the height of the wall and pieces of the west front have fallen off the building. For that reason it has already been subjected to considerable shoring and buttressing. We have had to install screens to keep pieces of the upper cornice from tumbling down. The very same architectural lines will be carried forward in the new west front when and if it is finally approved. Again, it is an emotional issue with many people and when emotion is in the forefront of reasoning one seldom arrives at a reasonable or wise verdict. The proponents for restoring the original west front have sort of a 'save at any cost' philosophy which is something like 'peace at any price.' "

Much of the deterioration of the west front is in the nature of flaking and cracking of the sandstone, partly because of the heat when the British torched the building in 1814 and 158 years of alternate freezing and thawing of the porous stone. Some historians say that Washington insisted that native sandstone from nearby Virginia be used in the building, possibly in a laudable attempt to boost his state's economy.

"Not so," says White. "The Capitol Building was begun with funds so modest that economy was the watchword. Sure, Vermont marble would have been preferable because of its durability, but they just couldn't afford the marble or the shipping costs."

Not a political activist, White is a registered Republican who recalls that his lone expedition into partisan politics was in 1960 when he turned his station wagon into a sound vehicle to campaign for Nixon against Kennedy.

Divorced, White has four children and is renting a townhouse in the Georgetown section of Washington. Two daughters are in college, a son is presently a page in Congress and will return to University School. Another daughter is in high school in Washington.

When he was in Cleveland White was an enthusiastic yachtsman and long time member of the Mentor Harbor Yacht Club. Shortly after his Washington appointment he went to Grand River to prepare his Tartan 34 for the season. The boat had been laid up for the winter at Merriman-Holbrook, Inc., manufacturers of marine equipment and a firm he was once president of. Somehow, late on that Sunday afternoon he forgot to deactivate the burglar alarm system which protected the anchorage docks and buildings. Soon he was confronted with police officers and sheriff's deputies. Fortunately, membership on the Capitol Police Board involves an impressive badge which in this case convinced the gendarmes that all was well.

"We had a good laugh over it," recalls White. "But at first I'm sure they thought the joint was being raided by the feds."

But the badge will carry no weight in committee hearings where, as tradition has it, he will spend a good deal of time justifying to Congress his decisions, actions and recommendations with regard to its hallowed home. There is precedent, of course, for his immediate predecessor, the volatile J. George Stewart, spent much time in similar pursuits.

"I never met the man," philosophizes White. "But I suspect he got a lot of abuse he didn't deserve."

## WHAT'S SAUCE FOR THE GOOSE OUGHT TO BE SAUCE FOR THE GANDER

### HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, a sense of humor has been likened to the pole which adds balance to our steps as we walk the tightrope of life. I had that thought in mind when I replied to a request from the Nader Task Force on Congress.

Would I, the letter asked, supply the task force with my speeches, newsletters, news releases and the like so that the task force could make a nonpartisan study of Congress? Yes, I would.

Inasmuch as the study had the backing of Mr. Nader, I was certain, of course, that it would be conducted fairly and without partisanship; but I deemed it prudent, nevertheless, to be reassured. So I asked that Mr. Nader supply me with copies of his speeches, news releases and position papers on the assumption that what is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander.

It did not quite work out that way, as you will perceive from a perusal of our correspondence.

The material follows:

NADER TASK FORCE ON CONGRESS,
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SIR: An institution with as much impressive authority and power as the United States Congress deserves the full understanding of its citizens. Under the guidance of Ralph Nader, we are forming a large, nonpartisan study group to conduct a year-long inquiry into the structure and operations of Congress.

Our goal is to provide citizens with additional and comprehensive information about their Congress. We shall focus on the activities, procedures, and composition of the Senate and House of Representatives and examine their impact both in Washington, D.C. and at the local level.

Research will be conducted in Washington, D.C. by about 80 young professional and graduate students from all parts of the country during the spring and summer of 1972. In addition, information will be gathered in as many of the Congressional districts as possible. The end product will be a detailed and constructively framed report.

To ensure the accuracy and completeness of our analysis, we look forward to working and talking with you and your staff. We also hope that our findings and suggestions will be reviewed and considered by the Congress.

Your experience and guidance will be valuable in helping us transmit an active understanding of the legislative branch of government to the American people. We would welcome receiving any addresses, articles, or debates which you have prepared or conducted on Congressional activities and public issues, including your newsletter to constituents. Thank you.

Very truly yours,
ROBERT C. FELLMETH,
*Project Director.*

MAY 24, 1972.

Mr. RALPH NADER,
*Center for the Study of Responsive Law, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. NADER: In response to your recent request, I have asked a member of my staff to cull from my files for your Congress Study Project a copy of each of the press releases, questionnaires, and other public statements that I have issued over the past two years. The stack will also include copies of several of the speeches I have made, but not all, the time and expense involved preclude my duplicating all of them.

This collected material, I suspect, will be of such volume that it will travel better by hand delivery than by mail. For this reason and another, I would appreciate your sending someone to pick it up. The other reason is that I would like that person to deliver to my office a copy of each of the addresses, articles, reports and press releases that you have prepared and conducted on public issues over the past two years.

When an institution or an individual achieves a position of power and influence over the government or the press, the public interest is necessarily involved; and public curiosity is aroused. So that the public may understand the influence you exercise, I would like to conduct an in-depth, nonpartisan study of your operations.

My goal is to provide the public with a comprehensive analysis of the development of your expertise in the host of problems that beset us. I shall focus on the activities, procedure, and composition of your various task forces and examine your impact both in and out of government.

Additionally, I am happy to add your name to my press release mailing list and hope you will add my name to yours.

By this reciprocal trade agreement, we should be able to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the study each of us is making.

Very truly yours,
JOHN N. ERLENBORN,
*Member of Congress.*

MAY 29, 1972.

Representative JOHN N. ERLENBORN,
*House of Representatives, Congress of the United States, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. ERLENBORN: Your May 24, 1972 letter of misunderstanding deserves some clarification. First, the request to your office for recent speeches and other public statements was for the purpose of obtaining your views and positions on issues relating to the performance of your public trust as a public servant. It is certainly within your power to exercise a negative and deprive us of your unedited positions on the issues. It is obviously your choice to make.

The remainder of your letter reflects a quality of unfamiliarity and prejudgment that is most unbecoming to your official status. The Congress project has not issued any reports, speeches, articles and press releases thus far, with the exception of an announcement of the study which was sent to your office last November. Furthermore, all other reports and statements which you requested not related to the Congress Project, are either in the Library of Congress—readily accessible to you—or in Congressional hearings. Are all your public materials as readily available in the Library of Congress or in Congressional hearings?

In addition, it is surprising indeed to note your lack of awareness of critical appraisals conducted on our activities by dozens of investigative reporters, authors, corporations, trade-associations and members of Congress. Again, a simple reference to various and accessible indices will inform you of their presence, inasmuch as you have apparently been unfamiliar with these materials.

It is interesting to note that your curiosity arises from this citizens' study of your office. Perhaps, you are espousing a new premise to your operation—namely, that when citizens, some from your own District, decide to study their elected representative in Congress, (who is supposed to represent all Americans, not just his District residents,) "a trade agreement" must be entered into whereby the Representative studies the citizenry. It should be clear, Mr. Erlenborn, that it is you who are elected and who are endowed with such awesome powers for the present and future of this country, not the citizens who must be served by you. Such citizen evaluation, particularly during these years of great challenges before the Congress, should be welcomed and not described with such demeaning phrases as a "reciprocal trade agreement." These citizens, after all, are not like the ordinary lobbyists who come to you with such regularity that you might be forgiven the misuses of such commercial analogies.

At any rate, should you choose not to forward the requested materials, our desire to have your most complete views represented in the basic research compilations must regrettably accede to your decision to refuse.

Sincerely,
RALPH NADER.

JUNE 7, 1972.

Mr. RALPH NADER,
*Center for the Study of Responsive Law, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. NADER: Your May 29 letter of misunderstanding deserves some clarification. First, the request to your office for recent speeches and other public statements was for the purpose of obtaining your views and positions relative to the performance of your public trust as self-proclaimed Public Citizen. It is certainly within your power to decline the invitation. The choice obviously is yours.

Second, your letter declares, ". . . All other reports and statements which you requested not related to the Congress Project are either in the Library of Congress—I have inquired at the Library of Congress. It seems likely that your definition of "readily accessible" differs from mine.

In addition, it is surprising to note your lack of awareness of critical appraisals of Members of Congress by dozens of investigative reporters, authors, corporations, trade associations, academic leaders, the Committee on Political Education, the Americans for Democratic Action, the Americans for Constitutional Action, consumer groups and environmentalists, to mention only a few. Persons investigating Congress need not even fear a suit for invasion of privacy if they press their investigations beyond the limits of good taste or fairness.

Throughout my tenure in Congress, I have gone far out of my way to make sure that the people of the Fourteenth Congressional District—*and they are my constituents*—know where I stand and what I believe. My constituents often disagree with me, and are not bashful about saying so; but I hear no complaint that they lack information on which they may make a judgment when they vote every other November.

Now comes Ralph Nader, who has elected himself Public Citizen in a campaign financed by those privileged bastions of entrenched wealth, the Foundations. He announces that he will use his access to the public press to tell the people of the 14th Congressional District what to think about their Representative in Congress.

It is curious, I repeat, that such a Public Citizen should seek to deny the private citizens of the 14th Congressional District information which will help them make a judgment about his activities. Such citizen evaluation, particularly during these years of great challenges before Congress should be welcomed by you.

At this point, permit me to apologize. I did not intend to offend you by the phrase, "Reciprocal Trade Agreement," and I hasten to withdraw it. The material which you asked for is collected here in my office. As I explained in my May 24 letter, it is of such a nature that it would not travel well by mail (and there is an additional question in my mind whether it should properly be sent by frank).

Hence, if you will send one of your aides to my office, I will be glad to turn all this material over to him, without reciprocity, without trade, and without agreement.

I would hope, however, that you would now voluntarily send your materials along.

Yours very truly,
JOHN N. ERLENBORN,
*Member of Congress.*

## THE DEFEATISTS ARE AT IT AGAIN

### HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Richard G. "Dick" Capen, Jr., is well known to Washington officialdom since he served with distinction as Assistant to the Secretary for Legislative Affairs.

He has moved on to become vice president of Copley Newspapers.

On May 26 Mr. Capen addressed the district convention of Lions International in San Diego, Calif., and I believe that his words need repeating, and I insert them at this point in the RECORD:

THE DEFEATISTS ARE AT IT AGAIN

Events of the past few days have moved the world's two great powers a few steps closer to President Nixon's goal of building a generation of peace. The President's statesmanlike leadership during the substantive talks in Moscow can be a source of pride for all Americans.

We now have a major understanding to halt the arms race. We have treaties with the Soviets on conquering pollution and disease. A joint Soviet-United States space effort is planned by 1975. An agreement has been reached to reduce incidents at sea.

Through the spirit of negotiations, an outbreak of war has been averted in the Middle East. The access to Berlin has been reestablished. A treaty involving the use of the world's seabeds has been developed and we have renewed a dialogue with the more than 800 million people of Mainland China.

Regrettably, our desire to negotiate differences has not led to an end of the war in South Viet Nam. But that has not been due to any lack of effort or reasonableness on the part of the Nixon Administration. Rather, our initiatives toward an honorable settlement have been met with only obstinate, negative response from the enemy.

Today it's a new ball game in Viet Nam. It's a new game because the North Vietnamese have made it so, not the United States. The enemy has violated the demilitarized zone. They have rocketed population areas.

They have killed more than 20,000 civilians in the past two months alone.

To invade South Viet Nam, the enemy has committed virtually all of its combat forces—12 of 13 divisions. Their goal has been to choke off South Viet Nam's freedom at all cost. The North Vietnamese have undertaken this massive effort in clear violation of international accords and understandings which they themselves agreed to follow.

Despite these facts, the American defeatists are at it again.

They have called The President's decision reckless, foolish and irresponsible. They were convinced that the Moscow talks would be sabotaged, that the Red Chinese would be forced to intercede. To hear these defeatists talk, one would think that the North Vietnamese invasion was our fault instead of the other way around.

Some of these critics, I am convinced, would rather see America defeated than support any responsible means for extricating this country from a long and frustrating war.

In the frantic search for expedient solutions, they have openly supported resolutions which would tie The President's hands as he withdraws from Viet Nam. Yet, several years ago they were giving full approval to decisions that got us into Viet Nam.

Today, they favor resolutions to condemn President Nixon for seeking to stop the enemy's aggression, but they direct not one single word of criticism against the enemy that started that aggression. Some have gone so far as to believe enemy propaganda while deliberately refusing to accept statements by our own government.

Now these defeatists are seeking to cover up their own errors, and the mistakes of earlier administrations, by labeling this battle "Nixon's War." It's a simple matter for them to criticize their country's current military initiatives. After all, they have no responsibility for the consequences of such casual words. Nor would they be accountable for the loss of credibility in our nation's commitments around the globe should we desert South Viet Nam at this, their most critical, moment.

Some critics have built their entire political career on platforms of obstructionism. They have placed their political interest first and their country's interest last. They have expressed moral indignation when it was convenient to do so.

They have generated the impression that there would be no war in the world if the United States were not in Viet Nam. They have naively convinced others that once the last American soldier was out of Viet Nam, that there would be peace in the world. Do they really believe that settling the war in Viet Nam will settle the war in Ireland? Or the war in the Middle East? Or the confrontation in India and Pakistan? Or the dispute along the Chinese-Russian borders?

No, Catholics and Protestants, Arabs and Jews, Hindus and Moslems and Russians and Chinese have battled for hundreds of years. It's not likely to stop soon. This, of course, is regrettable, but, I cannot really believe that restoring peace in Southeast Asia will restore peace in the world.

Because it's a new ball game today in Viet Nam, I believe it is essential to place recent developments in proper perspective. One cannot do so without taking stock of what has occurred in the past three and one-half years.

In my opinion, President Nixon has shown incredible restraint in the face of irresponsible criticism by those who run away from their responsibility for past actions by seeking to saddle others with the consequences of these actions.

Today, from the privacy of Washington law offices, a former Defense Secretary and a former U.S. negotiator in Paris have all the answers for getting America out of Viet Nam—now. But, where were those ready solutions when these former officials were in positions to act? These were the people who got our country into a war they could neither win nor end. That, in a sentence, is the sad legacy President Nixon inherited when he assumed office.

Since January 1969, conditions have changed substantially through President Nixon's leadership and through his Vietnamization program. It was not President Nixon who sent 550,000 Americans to Viet Nam. He has brought 500,000 home.

It was not President Nixon who was in office when as many as 500 Americans were being killed each week. Under his administration combat deaths have been reduced by more than 95%. And I might add that those low levels have been maintained despite the current intensity of ground combat in South Viet Nam.

When the Nixon Administration took office, American troops were handling ground combat. In fact, there was no authorized plan whatsoever for turning that combat role over to our allies. Today, the South Vietnamese have that responsibility and they are doing amazingly well. Sure, they are not winning every battle, but no one ever predicted they would.

In short, Vietnamization is working. We have provided the equipment. We have helped to train South Vietnamese forces, and we have assisted with air and naval support as necessary. As a result, substantial numbers of Americans have been withdrawn. Do you realize that there are fewer Americans in Viet Nam today than there were Americans in Korea when President Nixon took office in 1969. It took 10 to 15 years for the Koreans to take over their own internal security responsibilities. But the South Vietnamese have been forced to assume that responsibility in less than three years. I think they have come a long way.

Three and one-half years ago, there was no comprehensive peace plan for ending the war in Viet Nam. That, too, has all changed. Through secret initiatives and public talks in Paris, the President has sought every reasonable avenue for ending the conflict through negotiations. But the enemy has balked every step of the way, greeting each peace offer with insult and escalation of the war.

I don't see how anyone can possibly criticize the President for failing to do all that was humanly possible to end the conflict. He has offered every reasonable alternative to Hanoi. Even while negotiating—as frustrating as that was—he proceeded to withdraw thousands and thousands of Americans despite any visible progress in Paris.

Today, not only has the President decided to stand up against the enemy's blatant aggression, but he also has made it clear that the North Vietnamese will have to prove their sincerity to negotiate before such talks are resumed. In the meantime, their war-making capacity is being destroyed. It is being destroyed rapidly and effectively.

Overlooked in the dramatic announcement to mine the harbors of North Viet Nam and to step up our bombing of military and strategic targets has been the significant negotiating move made by this country.

That involves our proposal to withdraw all U.S. forces from Viet Nam within four months after American prisoners of war are released and after an internationally supervised cease fire has begun. There are no commitments for linking our withdrawal to the progress of Vietnamization. There are no commitments linking our agreement to the stability of the South Vietnamese government. In short, it is about the most liberal peace plan anyone—most of all the enemy—could hope to expect.

Even the Senate Doves should be able to support this proposal, but I sometimes think that they are more concerned about defending the Communists than protecting the South Vietnamese.

Fortunately, I feel that most Americans understand what has been accomplished to date and realize what is now at stake. They respect the President's efforts. They recognize that he has taken every possible public and private step to end our involvement. And they know that it is the enemy—not the United States—that is responsible for the current actions in Viet Nam.

Public support from a majority of Americans has come through clearly. It has been seen in the thousands of letters and telegrams to The White House and Congress. It has been seen in the Gallup poll indicating that 74% of the American public supports The President's efforts toward building peace. It has been seen in the Harris poll showing that 59% endorse The President's decision to mine the enemy's harbors.

It has also been seen in the low level of protest around the country. Sure, there have been some riots and demonstrations, but there always will be regardless of the issue. Those who carry the Viet Cong flag today will carry another banner tomorrow. But you can be sure that their banners will urge the destruction of America not the improvement of it!

If there is to be a negotiated settlement, the time is now. In the meantime, the President has asked for the support of a unified nation. I believe he deserve that support and I believe, for the most part, he is receiving it.

Today this nation has a new direction. The Peking trip has dramatized that fact. The substantive agreements in Moscow have dramatized that fact.

Hopefully, the world can arrive at a point when its leaders can safely discuss and resolve mutual problems. If so, we will truly be moving toward our nation's goal of a generation of peace.

## LET US END CRIME AND VIOLENCE NOW

## HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as part of my continuing effort to keep my constituents abreast of the latest events here in Washington, I have mailed to the residents of Oakland County, Mich., my Washington Report. In this newsletter I have related the latest news on the firebombing of my district congressional office, the progress of my amendment to halt court ordered busing and other issues which are vitally important to the people of Oakland County.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, the privilege of holding public office carries with it the responsibility of taking a stand on a wide range of crucial issues. In addition, good government requires that we make every effort to express those views and positions to our constituents. Newsletters such as these are one of the best ways that I know of to meet that commitment.

I, therefore, insert my Washington Report be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of all my colleagues.

The report follows:

WASHINGTON REPORT

LET'S END CRIME AND VIOLENCE NOW!

In the days since the firebombing of my Congressional District Office in Oakland

County, I've tried hard to understand the motives and the meaning behind this shocking and destructive attack.

Although police and the F.B.I. are still working on the case, most of the evidence suggests that the bombing may have been a "protest" against the war in Vietnam, my stand against forced school busing, or any number of other positions I am required to take almost every day on controversial issues.

Make no mistake about it, this violent attack was no more a "protest" than was the attempted assassination of Governor Wallace later the same day. Plainly and simply, they were criminal acts and should not be dismissed or excused as political activism.

In writing about the bombing, a friend of mine observed that: "Freedom does not justify anarchy any more than respect for order justifies oppression." It is important to identify these acts of criminality for what they are and to see that those who are responsible are punished as criminals and not glorified. We must insist that judges enforce the full penalties of the law, that the courts give at least equal weight to the rights of law-abiding citizens as they do to the rights of the accused, and we must not be afraid to stand up in full support of those whose job it is to preserve order—the police officer, the prosecutor and the courts.

In the days ahead and hopefully with your support I am going to devote myself to doing just that and to finding new ways of putting an end to the crime and violence that touches each of our lives in some way everyday.

Our only hope of progressing further along the road to a more perfect democracy lies in strengthening the bonds of mutual trust and tolerance that allow us to function as an open society. The assassin and the bomb-thrower do as much damage to these fragile links of our society as they do physical harm.

SPECIAL PROGRESS REPORT: U.S. SENATE APPROVES BROOMFIELD BILL TO HALT FORCED BUSING

Hopefully, as you read this newsletter, Congress will have given final approval to my bill to halt forced school bussing and it will be on the way to the President for his signature.

Last week the Senate voted its final okay of a package of anti-bussing amendments which includes my bill to prevent Federal District Courts from implementing bussing orders until all parties have had an opportunity to exhaust their appeals, hopefully to the U.S. Supreme Court.

My bill is the only measure now pending in Congress which has a chance of preventing cross-district bussing in the Detroit Metropolitan area this fall. Stronger legislation ultimately may be needed. But there is not enough time left in this session of Congress to get new legislation approved to affect the Detroit case and others like it throughout the country.

It is vitally important to get one of these cases before the U.S. Supreme Court since it has never ruled on one like the Detroit or Richmond, Virginia situation involving cross-district bussing. In view of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which was explicit against bussing to achieve racial balance, there is reason to believe the court might oppose cross-district bussing.

While I have signed the discharge petition calling for a vote on a Constitutional Amendment to prohibit bussing, it is doubtful there will be a vote in Congress on it this year. Many members of Congress feel that efforts should be made to resolve the matter by legislation or through the courts before beginning the lengthy process of amending the Constitution. Immediate approval of my bill will provide the necessary time to accomplish these things and to permit us to concentrate on the most important problem—providing a quality education for everyone.

FEDERAL COURT DIVIDES OAKLAND COUNTY INTO FOUR CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

PLUS CHANGE IN COURTS: CRIME CONTROL NEEDS FIVE-FRONT ATTACK

Serious crimes have continued to increase nationally and in the Oakland County area. Most important in changing that trend, I believe, is a new attitude on the part of the courts to insist that the law be upheld and enforced for the protection of law-abiding citizens as well as the accused.

Beyond this, however, there are five broad areas in which I would like to see increased emphasis by the Federal Government. First, we need higher priorities in allocating Federal funds to the fight against crime which still ranks low in comparison to other social problems. Second, we must provide better pay and equipment for police agencies—our first line in the battle against crime. Third, we must attack inefficiency and delays in the courts; fourth, vastly improve our correctional system; and finally, continue the attack on organized crime and control drug addiction.

Oakland County was divided into four Congressional Districts by a Federal Court decision recently which re-drew the boundaries of Michigan's 19 seats in Congress.

The judge's ruling meant that five Michigan Congressmen have had to move their residences including both of us in Oakland County.

Because I was born and raised in Oakland County and represented all of it for 8 of my 16 years in Congress, I have decided to seek re-election in the new 19th Congressional District which remains mostly in the County.

I represented all of the County for 10 years from 1954 to 1964, first as a member of the State Senate and for eight years as a Member of Congress.

This decision means that I will continue to represent many of the people I have served in Congress for 16 years. It means also that I will have the pleasure of renewing acquaintances with people in other parts of the county.

MORE THAN 100 BROOMFIELD BILLS PENDING BEFORE CONGRESS THIS YEAR

Since the 92nd Congress convened, I have sponsored more than 100 pieces of legislation. Some of these measures which may be of special interest to you are summarized below. Additional information and copies of the bills are available on request.

War powers: H.J. Res. 1—To define the powers and responsibilities of the Congress and the President in committing this nation to armed conflict.

Strikes: H.R. 10433—To provide procedures by law for resolving national transportation strikes which threaten the public's interest.

Cancer: H. Con. Res. 128—Calling for a national commitment to control and cure cancer within this decade.

Firearms: H.R. 7176—A bill to make it a Federal crime to commit a felony with a firearm.

Drugs: H. Con. Res. 129—Requires that U.S. aid be cut off to nations which permit the flow of illegal drugs into this country.

Property taxes: H.R. 9071—To provide additional relief for homeowners by allowing increased Federal tax deductions.

HOUSE LEADER NAMES BROOMFIELD TO UNITED STATES-CANADA INTERPARLIAMENTARY

House Minority Leader Gerald Ford has appointed me a delegate to the U.S.-Canada Interparliamentary Conference this year, an assignment which I have had in the past.

This year, I am also serving as a Congressional Adviser to the 26-nation Geneva Disarmament Talks. These assignments are made because of my position as a ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

In this role, I served in 1967 as U.S. Ambassador to the 22nd General Assembly of the United Nations.

VIETNAM QUESTIONNAIRES ARRIVE BY THOUSANDS

Thousands of Oakland County residents are returning my May questionnaires on Vietnam. All replies will be tabulated and the results will be sent to the President and transmitted to Congress.

If you need additional ballots, please let me know. Later this summer, I will forward a summary of the results to you so that you may compare your views with those of your neighbors in Oakland County. These periodic surveys are to encourage those who would not otherwise write to let me know their thinking on important issues. I welcome your detailed comments by letter at any time.

WELCOME TO WASHINGTON

My staff and I will be glad to help you plan your trip to Washington and to arrange tours of the Capitol, museums, the FBI, State Department and the White House.

If you can, let me know about a month before your visit. You can write me at 2435 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONCERN

The destruction of my District office brought many very kind and considerate expressions of concern from people throughout Oakland County for which I express my sincere appreciation. One of the most moving messages came from the Prisoner of War Committee of Michigan. The text of the message from Secretary Treasurer Robert J. Farr follows:

"The Prisoner of War families of Michigan are deeply indebted to Congressman Broomfield for his untiring efforts and long-standing record of aggressively pressing for humane treatment, and identification of our men held captive in S.E. Asia. To those of us who have carefully watched the actions of our Senators and Congressmen, in respect to our involvement in Vietnam, we feel Congressman Broomfield deserves the support of all Americans, and is entitled to recognition as an outstanding representative of his constituency. This reckless act of symbolically bombing the principles for which he stands, by physically destroying his office and endangering his staff, is a depraved act representing those things which have enslaved people and subjected them to untold horrors from tyrannical despots from the beginning of time. We, and I am sure all rational Americans, deplore this flagrant act of violence towards an honorable man."

1971 YEARBOOKS AVAILABLE

A limited supply of the 1971 Agricultural Yearbook, "A Good Life for More People," is still available through my office. I will be glad to fill requests for them on a first-come, first-served basis as long as they last. Please let me know if you would like a copy by writing me at 2435 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

## VIETNAM PROTESTS

## HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been a noticeable atmosphere of caution in the Congress among those Members who have been constant critics of the President's Vietnam policy, even among those who have gone out of their way to agitate groups congregating near the Capitol, the White House, and the Pentagon. A hard-hitting editorial commentary on the subject of the Vietnam protests was carried by the Tri-City Advertiser of May 31 which I think eloquently speaks for itself:

VIETNAM PROTESTS

We find it rational to try to understand those of our people who express their views on the Vietnam war because it is not too difficult to comprehend their viewpoint.

By the same token we are sympathetic to those in authority who were initially responsible for getting us into the conflict despite warnings by men who understood Asians. It is admitted by most everyone that these men made a mistake and it is well to recall they are not the first to have erred.

It is true that two Generals, MacArthur and Wainright who, perhaps more so than any others, knew, as they said, that we could never win that war because we did not understand the Asian mind. How right they were!

What we abhor is the growing list of various so called "peace" organizations who persist in staging demonstrations when the purpose of those demonstrations appears to be to lay the blame where it does not belong.

For example, the TV carried a scene where one of those organizations staged a protest in the midst of ceremonies honoring our war dead on Memorial Day. The leader and the loudest speaker was a man who said he was a Veteran of World War I and gave his age as 81.

He proclaimed his violent opposition and insisted that we must get out at once.

We wonder why such men as this one didn't protest when the war started instead of waiting until now.

We have a faint suspicion that much of the protesting is to gain attention for political power.

We feel that steps to end the war are meaningful and will be successful. We believe the conflict can be ended.

It cannot be ended just exactly when Joe Soap wants it to be.

## GENERAL MOTORS WINS NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL AWARD

## HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a few minutes to congratulate the employees of General Motors for their outstanding on-the-job safety record.

For the 23d time in 30 years General Motors has received the National Safety Council's highest award for on-the-job safety.

Many of these employees live in my congressional district. I understand their safety programs and commend them for their effort.

The United Auto Workers Union stresses safety programs and I also commend the UAW for their work in this field.

The accident frequency rate for GM employees last year was less than one accident per million man-hours worked.

The National Safety Council estimates that less than one-half of 1 percent of all companies or plants in the United States could qualify for the award in a single year.

GM's safety record for 1971 has to be better than the average experience of both GM and the automotive industry for the 3 preceding years in order to win the award.

## WATER—WILL IT LAST?

## HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, it is widely recognized today that our environment is in great need of a general clean up. It has taken a long time for man to become aware of his effect on the environment. Unfortunately, it has been too long, and now that we do recognize the detrimental effects of our daily lives on the environment, we must strengthen our efforts to clean and protect it.

Water has played a vital role throughout man's history. Not only is it basic for man's survival, it has provided indispensable services for man, as a form of transportation and as an inexpensive element to be used in the industrial production process. With the advent of modern-day industry and appliances, the waters of our country have become receptacles for many chemical wastes which are not readily reclaimed by natural sources.

The transportation of oil products by ship has proved to be a major cause of pollution of the oceans. Movement of crude oil or its products now accounts for half of the world's ocean tonnage. More than 4,000 tankers carry over 600 million tons of oil each year. The American Bureau of Shipping reports that, during the 1960's, there were 553 collisions, 17 underwater collisions, and three damaging collisions with ice involving 488 American tankers of 30,000 tons of deadweight or more.

In 1971 alone there were nearly 10,000 oil spill incidents throughout the world. Many of these spills cost more than $3 million to partially alleviate the environmental and other damages caused by the spread of oil from these spills.

Oil spills are but one source of pollution of the waters. Combined with the many other causes of water pollution, not only is the water polluted and made unfit for human consumption or recreation, but the national wildlife, which depends upon water for its survival and livelihood, dies or is maimed by the pollutants.

As pointed out in "Water, Water Everywhere, and Not a Drop To Drink," an article published in the May issue of Textile Labor, we do not have an endless supply of water. Although we have begun the fight to prevent further water pollution, there is still further work to be done to insure that our water supply does not become exhausted and that our seas, lakes, and rivers do not die.

An excerpt from the above-mentioned article follows:

WATER, WATER EVERYWHERE, AND NOT A DROP TO DRINK

Despite the fact that man has no hope of surviving without it, water is perhaps the most carelessly abused and taken for granted of all our natural resources.

Falsely secure in the knowledge that an endless supply of water is virtually assured, we tend to think only in terms of its quantity with little or no concern for its rapidly diminishing quality.

We drink it, bathe in it, shave with it, swim in it, fish from it, make steel with it, distill it, dump chemicals and human and animal wastes in it, store it, cool our power plants and cars with it, and create scores of amusement or tourist attractions in and around it.

In the process, however, once crystal-clear lakes are becoming stagnant cesspools and sparkling rivers are being turned into flowing sewers which pour endless tons of filth into the seas around us.

Each day, 2,600 billion gallons of water—more than six times the daily flow of the vast Mississippi River—are used in the United States, according to the Dept. of Interior. Of this total 2,285 billion gallons are used for the generation of hydroelectric power and returned uncontaminated to their source.

It is with the still formidable 315 billion gallons remaining that problems arise and pollution results. Industry uses 177 billion of these, 120 billion go for irrigation and 18 billion are used by the general public.

Of the water used by industry, much carries a heavy load of various contaminating wastes and poisons when it is returned to lakes, rivers and streams. Most of it—approximately 90%—is heated to high temperatures when discharged, posing a further threat to the purity of the waters and the life within them.

About half of water used for irrigation evaporates and leaves the area from which it was taken as vapor. The other half picks up varying quantities of harmful salts, minerals and chemicals before emerging from soil or subsoil into a ditch or stream.

With the third major category of water use, that by the general public, comes the most publicized form of water pollution—sewage and domestic wastes generated in increasing quantities by every city and town in the nation.

Just a small percentage of the pollutants produced by any one of these three sources—as little as 1% in the case of sewage—can ruin any stream for swimming or fishing, kill any lake and everything in it, or contaminate any estuary in which a river merges with the sea. Combined at full strength they can spell the eventual end of humanity.

This grim process is already well underway. Citing New York as an example, the Interior Dept. pointed out in a 1970 Environmental Report that the nation's largest city dumped 24,000 tons of waste each day into a nearby swampland, once the home of a wide variety of birds and animals but now populated only by rats and foraging gulls.

It estimated that the 5.3 pounds of solid waste discarded daily by each New Yorker in 1970 would increase to 7.5 pounds in 1980 and to 10 pounds by the year 2000.

"This is only part of the picture," the report declared. "The continuous dumping of sewage sludge in the New York harbor area has killed all marine life in a great expanse. In a recent four-year period, that metropolitan area expected the ocean to assimilate 10 million tons of such waste solids. Overwhelmed by such affluence, part of the sea simply died."

Surface bodies of water are not the only ones threatened, the report continued.

The quality of precious water far below the ground, which serves so many cities and towns from coast to coast, also faces a pollution peril. "Untold millions of gallons of poisonous liquid, mostly from industries, are being pumped into the earth each year, hopefully to be assimilated safely."

What we can see of water pollution is sickening and frightening enough, but the unknown effects of underground waste disposal on subterranean waters is, in the words of former Interior Sec. Walter Hickel, "a potential environmental Frankenstein's Monster."

Occasional periods of drought notwithstanding, the natural cycle of water from sea to clouds to rain still produces an overall average annual rainfall of 30 to 40 inches. There are 326 million cubic miles of water worldwide—97% of it in the oceans. We will never have any less, but there will never be any more either.

Scientists in the U.S. and abroad are universally agreed that when an estimated 6 billion people occupy the Earth by the year 2000, the world's oceans will be expected to produce four times today's animal proteins and minerals while at the same time being asked to double their intake of man's wastes. This will be impossible unless all nations join in finding technological solutions to man-created water problems before it is too late.

Water is in a class by itself among all of Earth's tangible resources. No living organism—animal or plant—can exist without it. Man cannot run any machine or produce a single product without water in some form. Yet water, just as in the case of the intangible air we must breathe in order to live, cannot itself be produced or replaced. It can't even be consumed as other resources can. Water can only be ruined by perpetual abuse through misuse.

As of 1970, "the number of chemical compounds reaching the ocean from rivers, from sewers, from the air and from vessels is (was) in the neighborhood of 100,000," according to Calvin Menzie, a chemist for the Interior Dept., and "we really don't know much about the sea's ability to process them."

However belatedly, the battle lines against water pollution are now being drawn tighter throughout the world.

## DELAWARE LEGISLATURE EXPRESSES RESPECT FOR WORK OF FBI UPON DEATH OF J. EDGAR HOOVER

### HON. PIERRE S. (PETE) du PONT

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. Speaker, the General Assembly of Delaware recently passed a resolution commending the FBI and J. Edgar Hoover for many years of outstanding service to the Nation.

The resolution follows:

EXPRESSING THE RESPECT OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE FOR THE WORK OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION UPON THE DEATH OF ITS DIRECTOR, J. EDGAR HOOVER

Whereas, the death of J. Edgar Hoover on May 2, 1972, has brought attention again to the people of Delaware of the need for the highest type of dedicated citizen to serve in the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

Whereas, during his career as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a career which began on May 10, 1924, J. Edgar Hoover exemplified professionalism; and

Whereas by this example, J. Edgar Hoover inspired tens of thousands of Federal Bureau of Investigation agents as well as state, county and municipal policemen to regard their work with pride; and

Whereas, through the creation of the FBI Academy and other units within the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover underlined the importance of training and the need for scientific training in the constant war against crime; and

Whereas, through the creation of a national fingerprint system, J. Edgar Hoover developed an additional method for apprehending criminals and for assisting victims of crime; and

Whereas, J. Edgar Hoover employed outstanding young men in whom the community and nation could have complete faith; and

Whereas, J. Edgar Hoover saw corruption in local police units as destroying all that the professional police officer stood for and helped wherever he could to eliminate it; and

Whereas, J. Edgar Hoover filled his years of service with courage, dedication and integrity in the public annals of this nation. Now therefore:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 126th General Assembly of the State of Delaware, the Senate concurring therein, that the State of Delaware expresses a deep sense of gratitude for the many years of unselfish and dedicated service that J. Edgar Hoover rendered to his fellowman and country as its chief law enforcement officer.

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States and the Delaware Congressional Delegation for inclusion in the Congressional Record as a permanent expression of respect by the people of Delaware.

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution of appreciation be made a part of the Archives of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

## MEMORIAL DAY

### HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, the June 4 issue of the Washington Post carried an unusual entry which caught my attention. The item appeared as a paid advertisement sponsored by the Montgomery County Memorial Day Committee of Huntingdon Valley, Pa., and it included an eloquent address delivered by an unidentified young veteran.

The heading on the advertisement was as follows: "In All the Fun and Excitement of Memorial Day Weekend, Did We Forget Something?" This is a talk given by a young combat veteran to one of a myriad of groups of Americans that gathered under the flag to remember the meaning of Memorial Day. It is presented as a reminder for those distracted by traffic exhaust and holiday exhaustion, from sharing in the pulse and purpose of America's heart.

It does seem that, increasingly, Americans focus on personal plans for their long Memorial Day weekend, thus tending to disregard the real significance of the holiday.

Our ancestors of the last century knew what it was like to live in a land beseiged by the horrors of war. They experienced what I pray will turn out to be the last major conflict fought on American soil. Perhaps that is why they ascribed so much more significance to that special day than do we.

Our Nation has come a long way since that devastating era which produced the Memorial Day observance. Life today is better in so many ways; yet, there are valuable lessons we can learn from those who saw her through one of our most difficult periods.

We must maintain a reverence for those who have preserved, and are preserving, for us the precious gift of freedom.

In the event some of my colleagues missed the profound expression of patriotism printed in the Post of June 4, 1972, I insert it at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The address follows:

MEMORIAL DAY

Memorial Day was begun to honor soldiers killed in the Civil War.

Annual celebrations were conducted in several of the Confederate States even before the end of hostilities. A date was first fixed when John A. Logan, commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, named May 30, 1868, for the purpose of "strewing flowers or otherwise decorating the graves of comrades." He hoped the practice would continue.

Rhode Island, in 1874, was first to legalize the May 30th date, now recognized by all states; some Southern States still celebrate a Confederate Memorial Day, usually on Jefferson Davis' birthday, June 3rd.

Today, Memorial Day is an occasion in which we honor the soldiers who have died in that and all subsequent wars.

Memorial Day holds a special significance for me, and should for all of us. For at this very moment there are Americans actively engaged in combat, defending an allied nation threatened by a belligerent whose clearly expansionist and totalitarian leadership intends to impose its will by force.

The war is geographically distant, as were our past three major conflicts. Our children don't hear the terrors of enemy artillery crashing into their towns, or sickeningly see mutilated bodies in their streets.

I pray they never will. But we cannot isolate ourselves from the fact, intellectually or emotionally, for our allies are not so fortunate and we are not immune. Our physical separation has not been without terrible cost in life, limb, and resources. We owe this insulation to people who have willingly sacrificed their lives for it.

On Memorial Day, I cannot help but have mixed feelings. I feel a permeating sadness and remorse in the immeasurable tragedies inflicted on families, relatives, friends and communities of those who have died.

But I also feel a tremendous debt of gratitude to the servicemen and women who made the ultimate sacrifice, who subordinated themselves to their beliefs, for the protection of a way of life and of their loved ones, for the generations to follow, and for freedom.

The fruit of their sacrifice is what we enjoy today: freedom, prosperity, religion, schools, perhaps life itself. Ours is not a Utopian Society, but it is the one they died for. And how many of us would prefer a different citizenship?

We owe these men a debt we can never pay; we should not even attempt to pay it in mourning, for nothing is gained by lingering in sorrow. The only meaningful reconciliation is to perpetuate the ideals for which they stood, to accept our responsibilities as free men and women of a free nation—and not to shrink from them.

We must conscientiously and meticulously guard our freedoms, and curb the erosion of our national foundations from subversion and apathy, and actively resist our enemies.

This requires dedication and unity of effort. Our unique form of government encourages dissent, and this is a right we should never compromise; we should not only welcome change but strive for it. But at the same time we must be alert to the insidous dangers of subversion and sedition which bring anarchy, and ultimate destruction or enslavement.

War is the most horrible event man has brought on himself, but tyranny and avarice have made it prerequisite to survival. Nobody wants war—our enemies would prefer to conquer without violence—but they cannot because free men have refused to betray their beliefs for personal safety.

One of the best descriptions of this national character was in the late President John F. Kennedy's 1961 Inaugural Address: "Let every nation know, whether it wishes well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, to insure the survival and the success of liberty . . . United there is nothing we cannot do. . . divided there is little we can do—for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split us asunder."

The generations before mine have known the ravages of war. Now, my generation faces a determined enemy whose ruthlessness, disregard for human life and willingness to sustain appalling casualties has left many of my contemporaries dead.

Perhaps my generation's challenge is even greater than those before. We have seen Viet Cong flags paraded in the streets. We have seen men dedicated to the destruction of every princple for which we stand—Ho Chi Minh, Mao Tse Tung, Che Guevara, Fidel Castro—made heroes by elements of our society. We have even seen that unbelievable desecration, the burning of America's flag, on nationwide television.

This is a time of fear and confusion, of real danger to the human rights that others before us have shed their life's blood for.

We should now more than ever reaffirm our commitment to liberty, our responsibility to the men and women we honor today who gave their lives for it and for us. Their memory should give us not only pride, but confidence and inspiration to move forward so they shall not have died in vain.

On a plaque at the entrance to the headquarters of a combat group in Viet Nam, this was anonymously inscribed:

"War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things. The decayed state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks nothing is worth war is much worse. The individual who has nothing for which he is willing to fight, whose only concern is for his own personal safety, is a miserable creature who has no chance of being free unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself."

## IRAQI OIL TAKEOVER

## HON. MIKE McCORMACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, as one who has been deeply concerned with the fuel and energy situations in this country, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an article and an editorial on the Iraqi Government's nationalization of a major Western oil company. As Chairman WAYNE ASPINALL recently said in discussing the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee's hearings on fuel and energy:

The United States is about to be caught in a Middle Eastern squeeze-play and I believe the American people ought to know about it.

It appears that the squeeze-play has begun and I hope that, once the American people become aware of it, they will support the research and development necessary to end our dependence on foreign energy sources.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, June 6, 1972]

### BAGHDAD'S GAMBLE

Iraq's seizure of the Western-owned consortium, the Iraq Petroleum Company, is a blow to the West, a boon for the Soviet Union and a high-risk gamble for the radical regime in Baghdad.

The expropriation directly affects consortium partners from the United States, Britain, the Netherlands and France who stands to lose much, if not all, of an investment estimated at up to $1 billion. It threatens Western access to an important, though not major, component of Middle East oil—fields which, over-all, encompass about 70 per cent of the world's known reserves. And it could adversely influence delicate negotiations now under way between Western companies and other Middle East oil-producing states.

The West's loss is another gain for Moscow, which has been vigorously exploiting its support of the Arab cause against Israel for military, political and economic advantage throughout the region. The Russians already are helping to develop Algerian oil and are purchasing from Libya small amounts of oil seized from the British last December. Last April Soviet Premier Kosygin participated in the opening of a rich, new Iraqi oil field, developed with Russian assistance after its seizure from the consortium eleven years ago.

The question for the Iraqis is whether the Russians or others can furnish a ready market for the output of the newly seized fields and provide the hard cash urgently needed to sustain development programs that until now have been heavily dependent on revenues from the consortium. If they cannot, the Baathist regime could be in serious trouble. Even if the Russians do come through with a substitute for Western markets, the regime, already obliged to accept two Communists in high government posts, can expect to pay a heavy political price for its abrupt break with the Western consortium.

In the long run, there is an inevitable trend toward the acquisition of foreign-owned assets by the oil-producing states, both as an expression of national sovereignty and as a means of maximizing returns from oil resources for domestic development. Although this trend may be accelerated by Arab-Israeli tensions and by Soviet opportunism, both sides should be constrained to moderation by two hard realities—the West's compelling need for Middle East oil, which is increasing even in the United States, and the concurrent need of Middle Eastern states for Western markets and the hard cash they provide. If the jubilant Russians press their present advantage too far they may well end up cast in the onerus role of the ousted "imperialists," with embittered and unmanageable clients.

### IRAQ TAKES OVER BIG OIL COMPANY AFTER TALKS FAIL

BEIRUT, LEBANON, June 1—Iraq tonight nationalized the Iraq Petroleum Company, owned jointly by American, British, French and Dutch oil companies, the Baghdad radio reported.

The company, which produces 10 percent of the Middle East's oil, was nationalized after negotiations between it and the Government broke down over a variety of demands.

Chief among Iraqi demands was one that the Government be given a 20 per cent share in the London-based company of which the United States concerns Mobil and Standard of New Jersey each owns 11⅞ per cent of the shares. The main shareholder is the British Petroleum Company.

President Ahmed Hassan al-Bakr announced that the ruling Revolutionary Command Council had issued a law nationalizing the company effective immediately.

NO COMMENT IN LONDON

In London, a company spokesman refused to comment on the nationalization report. "We have been waiting all day for something to happen," he said, "but until we hear from our people in Iraq I'm afraid we can't say anything at all."

Under the nationalization law the company's properties and concession areas become property of the state, the Iraqi News Agency said.

The law also provides for the formation of "the Iraqi Company for Oil Operations." This will run all the nationalized properties, but will not be responsible for previous commitments. The company will have an eight-man board, including its chairman.

The law also provides for the state to pay compensation to the foreign interests involved after allowing for debts, taxes, wages or any other sums that the Government may demand, the news agency reported.

In his announcement, President al-Bakr said "the struggle against oppression and imperialistic exploitation" would not end, except by the destruction of the foundations and vital interests upon which "imperialistic existence" was founded.

Foreign Minister Murtada al-Hadithi and Geoffrey Stockwell, the company's managing director, met for two hours in Baghdad last night, when a two week deadline imposed by the Government expired.

The meeting ended with Iraq's rejection of the company's latest offer and the deadline was extended 11 hours.

But no word of further developments was received until President al-Bakr's announcement of nationalization.

The talks first started last January between Government and the Iraq Petroleum Company and its affiliates, the Mosul and Basrah petroleum companies.

The three companies faced a host of demands, including a minimum share of 20 per cent in existing assets, as well as more than $250-million in claims starting in 1956.

The dispute came to a culmination in March, when the oil companies reduced production from northern oilfields.

The Iraqi Government charged that the three companies during March and April and early in May, had sharply cut back production of its northern fields, ostensibly for commercial reasons, thus causing great loses to Iraq's revenues and the national economy.

Iraq is heavily dependent on oil revenue, which provides more than 80 per cent of the foreign exchange needed to finance numerous development projects.

The Revolutionary Council demanded an immediate response by the oil companies to a Government request that production be raised to the maximum. It also called for the companies to adhere to their agreement with the Oil Ministry to work out a long-term program of steady production.

FOURTH LARGEST OIL PRODUCER

Iraq is the fourth largest oil-producing country in the Middle East. In 1971, the nation's production amounted to 1.7 million barrels a day, slightly more than 10 per cent of the region's total production of 16,165,000 barrels a day. Output has increased about 71 per cent over the last decade.

The Iraq Petroleum Company accounts for the bulk of the country's oil production The company is owned jointly by the British Petroleum Company, Compagnie Francaise des Petroles, the Royal Dutch-Shell group and a company owned by the Standard Oil Company (New Jersey) and the Mobil Oil Corporation.

The Government and the company have been in a continuing dispute over increasing oil exports and prices, both of which affect royalties paid to the Government by the company, and Iraq's claim to oil concessions previously assigned to the company. Iraq has been developing some of the disputed concession areas with Russian help.

---

## THE SOVIET UNION, THE UNITED STATES, AND MIDDLE EAST OIL

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the nationalization of the Iraq Petroleum Co., by the Iraqi Government last week has focused attention once again on Middle East oil. The increasing importance of Middle East oil to the United States, the growing interest of the Soviet Union in Middle East oil, and the changing relationship between international oil companies and oil exporting countries are the topics of concern in two excellent articles by Ray Vicker which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on June 6 and 7, 1972.

The articles follow:

WINNING FRIENDS: IN A FOUR-PRONG DRIVE, SOVIET UNION INCREASES INFLUENCE IN MIDEAST—MOSCOW USES DIPLOMACY, OIL, MILITARY AND ECONOMIC AID TO UNDERMINE THE WEST

(By Ray Vicker)

BAGHDAD, IRAQ.—Three perspiring Soviet oil technicians in disheveled suits wait in line at the air terminal here along with other passengers leaving Middle East Airlines Flight 320 from Beirut. Among the others waiting to clear immigration are several Iraqis attired in Western garb except for their Arab headdress; they stand patiently. Not so patient is a Kuwaiti sheikh in white robes who fans himself with a passport from which several banknotes protrude conspicuously but, as it turns out, futilely.

Seeing the Russians' passport, an immigration clerk beckons to the technicians to go to the front of the line. "We go Rumaila," the leader of the Russians says in English. He is referring to Iraq's new oil field, which was developed with $200 million of Soviet-bloc aid.

Quickly the Russians are cleared through immigrations and customs and whisked away. Less elite passengers—like the Iraqis and the sheikh with the banknotes—continue to swelter in the crowded terminal building.

The incident in the terminal has broader implications than simply fighting the international travel bureaucracy here in Baghdad. For Russians are being favored in many parts of the Middle East as Moscow increases its influence in the Arab world at the expense of the West. Militarily Israel's crack army may dominate the Mideast, but economically and diplomatically the Russians have been scoring most of the gains lately in this area—one that posseses two-thirds of the world's known oil reserves. That total is so large that even the U.S. is expected to become increasingly dependent on this oil for its supplies.

EFFECT OF THE RUSSIAN PRESENCE

The Soviet presence in Iraq undoubtedly is hardening the attitude of this Communist-leaning nation toward Western oil companies. Only last week Iraq nationalized part of the holdings here of Iraq Petroleum Co., a consortium owned by British Petroleum Co., Royal Dutch-Shell Group, Compagnie Française des Petroles, Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), Mobil Oil Corp. and the Caloste Gulbenkian Foundation of Paris.

Immediately after the nationalization, Iraq's foreign minister led a delegation to Moscow for talks with Soviet officials. Tass, the Soviet news agency, strongly supported the nationalization, calling it a move toward liberating Iraq "from the sway of foreign capital."

"The Russians would like to see the U.S. and other Western nations as well as Japan pay a heavy price for that oil and perhaps even be forced to obtain their supplies through the grace of Moscow," one Western oilman here says.

The Soviet drive into the Middle East is four-pronged. First, military assistance links Arab armies to Soviet munitions plants. The total of all Soviet aid to Egypt thus far is estimated at more than $5 billion. Soviet MIG jets break the sound barriers over Arab skies in Syria, Iraq and Egypt. Soviet weaponry is evident almost every time any part of an Arab army stages a parade.

The second prong involves economic assistance, which creates an image of a benevolent big brother. In Syria, for instance, a giant dam on the Euphrates is widely touted by Soviet propagandists. The dam, being built with Soviet aid, will irrigate 1.5 million acres and generate 300,000 kilowatts of power when completed. Soviet help in developing Iraq's North Rumaila oil field is listed as another major project. The field was nationalized in 1961 but placed in production only last April by Iraq's state-owned oil company.

THE DIPLOMATIC PRONG

A tabulation of Soviet aid shows that there are 100 projects under way in Egypt, 80 in Algeria, 70 in Iraq, 50 in Syria and 40 in South Yemen. They range from a $125 million aluminum plant on the lower Nile to irrigation programs in Yemen and from reequipping Egypt's commercial airline with new planes to prospecting for oil in Syria. It is difficult to put dollar tags on some of these projects because they may be repaid in oil or other commodities.

The third prong of the Soviet drive into the Middle East is diplomatic. Moscow gained its first foothold in the Mideast through its ties with Gamal Abdel Nasser, the late Egyptian president. Early last month Russia tightened up its links to Cairo through a series of diplomatic meetings.

Later in May Iraq's government placed two Communists in ministerial posts, an action evolving from the 15-year treaty of friendship the two nations recently signed. This was the first time Communists have been invited into a Mideastern government in this fashion. One Western European diplomat here says: "The timing of these appointments shows that Iraq certainly wanted to place its relationship with the Soviet Union on a firm foundation as it nationalized oil properties."

On May 14 Russia strengthened its ties to Syria with the signing of a military treaty between the two nations.

Algeria, another Arab nation, has rebuffed any tightly binding pact with Moscow, and it is the most independent of Russia's Arab friends. Nonetheless, it usually leans more to the East than to the West in politics. Its key oil-technicians' training center is controlled by more than 250 Soviet instructors and Algeria's oil industry is infused with Russian experts and technicians. Last year Algeria nationalized 51% of French interests in its oil; in 1970 five other foreign companies were nationalized.

THE FOURTH PRONG

Oil—the fourth prong in the Soviet drive in the Mideast—is especially important today, with nationalization more than just an idle threat over oil properties. The Communists provide the Arab nations with oil markets, which give the Arabs more flexibility in their moves to squeeze international oil companies. For instance, a Soviet tanker recently picked up the first cargo of oil exported from the North Rumaila field—about 157,000 barrels destined for the Soviet port of Odessa. About 20,000 barrels a day are scheduled to be shipped this year to Russia and about 40,000 barrels a day in each of the next three years.

Other East-bloc nations have been turning to the Middle East for oil also. Estimates are that the Soviet bloc imported 157,000 barrels a day in 1971, up from 131,000 the previous years. The main suppliers were Iran, Egypt, Algeria, Libya, Iraq and Syria.

With the Russians able to meet all their own oil requirements, the question is why the Soviet Union should seek Mideast oil. The answer is that although Russia can meet its own demands, it isn't sure that it can meet those of its East European satellites. In the future Russia would like to become the middleman for Mideastern oil, supplying its satellites and perhaps other nations as well.

Still, the Soviet Union will be hard-pressed to take all Iraq's nationalized oil. It may not have the tanker capacity. It doesn't need that oil for itself at the present time. It doesn't have the hard cash to pay for it. This, of course, doesn't mean that it won't try, probably funneling part of the oil back into Western markets in one way or another.

AN EYE ON THE PERSIAN GULF

Russia's real goal in this area is the Persian Gulf, where most of the Mideast oil is located, Western diplomats say. Iraq borders on the gulf and thus provides a stepping-stone for further Soviet advances. Already Soviet diplomatic feelers have been extended to some of the little states on the gulf. For decades Britain dominated this area militarily while American oil companies did so economically. Britain's military pullout has left a political vacuum that Russia would like to fill.

So would Iran, a non-Arab oil producer that would like to squeeze Western oil companies for its own benefit, not for that of the Soviet Union. Iraq has had a long feud with Iran and is willing to play along with Russia to further its own expansionist hopes in the gulf area. Along the border between Iran and Iraq there have been a number of shooting incidents recently and some diplomatic sources believe these have been created in an attempt to isolate Iran from Arab nations on the gulf.

"Iraq now has the Soviet Union behind it," explains one diplomat in Bahrain, one of the oil principalities on the gulf. "So all the little sheikdoms along here are reading those border incidents as Russia's way of telling Iran that it had better not try to control the Arabian Gulf." (In Arab lands, it's the Arabian, not the Persian, Gulf.)

Until recently, all of Iraq's oil was produced by Iraq Petroleum Co., which has been battling with the government for over 10 years. Soviet assistance hasn't been confined only to developing the fields but also has involved pipelines.

THE SECOND AND THIRD STAGES

The Russians currently are helping Iraq with the second stage of development, which will expand production by about 3½ times in 1974. A third stage is then scheduled to raise output to 40 million tons, or about 800,000 barrels daily, in the late 1970s.

Now Russia has the task of helping Iraq produce and sell oil from IPC's fields in northern Iraq. IPC, of course, is likely to try legal means to keep that oil from reaching Western markets. This is what it has been doing since oil began to flow from the North Rumaila field. Only last April IPC ran ads in numerous newspapers in Europe warning potential buyers against taking that oil.

The East bloc provides convenient markets for Iraq in these circumstances, yet it is apparent that the field is expanding so fast that the East bloc won't be able to take all that oil. Even with Soviet help, all the cards aren't on the Iraqi side, since Western oil companies have the marketing organizations that can dispose of Iraqi oil much better than can any Soviet-Iraq combination.

---

### COMING CONFLICTS OVER ARAB OIL

(By Ray Vicker)

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—"Within 10 years all the oil properties in the Middle East and North Africa will be nationalized."

"The prediction comes not from a radical Arab but from a conservative American banker with considerable knowledge of this area and of the people who make decisions in it. He marshals impressive data to bolster his thesis.

Even now, international oil companies are reeling from Iraq's nationalization of the northern Iraq properties of Iraq Petroleum Co., Ltd., the consortium owned by the Shell Group, Compagnie Francaise des Petroles, British Petroleum Co., Ltd., Mobil Oil Corp., Jersey Standard and Gulbenkian interests. Without doubt, international oil companies are in a turbulent financial era which looks as if it will get worse. There are no signs at all that it will get any better. Arab oil nations other than Iraq are pressing for 20% equity participation in petroleum production companies. Arab leaders have made it clear that this is only the beginning. Nadim Pachachi, secretary general of the 11-nation Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), is only one of many Arab leaders who stress that the ultimate goal is a minimum 51% of company equity for the host nations.

That equity control is enough to dictate the rate of expansion and the divided payments. Still it isn't beyond the realm of possibility that an Arab nation alone or several in conjunction may seize all of certain properties and well within that 10 years estimate. Iraq did just that when it seized the North Rumaila concession of Iraq Petroleum Co. Ltd. in 1961, and with its latest action against IPC. Algeria already has nationalized its oil industry. Libya has taken over control of British Petroleum Co. holdings in that country.

#### A GIANT POKER GAME

Today, there is a feeling of volatility in the Arab world, of muscle flexing based on a belief that Arabs hold all the aces in a giant poker game.

Wide-ranging effects of that game can be envisioned. Oil companies may be forced to revise their whole way of doing business. Changes in oil payment patterns may create revisions in the world's monetary structure. Oil consumers in Western Europe, Japan, the U.S. and elsewhere face sharply higher fuel costs for automobiles, some heating, industrial uses and power generation. The mechanized farmer, for instance, may find his fuel costs soaring. Airline fares of the future are likely to reflect considerably higher fuel costs. Economically, the trend injects a worldwide built-in inflationary factor, for oil companies are likely to pass along most of their increased costs. Already the profit return on net worth of international oil companies is down to around 9.5% versus 14% in 1960 and 11% in 1970.

The trend promises to hasten development of competitive energy sources. Nuclear power is likely to be stimulated. Coal may stage something of a comeback in some areas although it has ecological problems to surmount. Colorado oil shale and Athabasca oil sands may become more competitive. And technology will place more stress on achieving fuel economies. The electric car could have much more appeal when gasoline sells at $2 a gallon than when the gasoline price is 50 cents a gallon.

But technology is unlikely to show any measurable effects on the pattern of energy consumption before those sharply higher oil prices hit the world. Sir Eric Drake, chairman of British Petroleum Co., says, "The competing fuels are unlikely to achieve any substantial substitution for oil in the 1970s."

The Middle East is important in the worldwide energy picture because of its enormous reserves. At the start of 1971, oil authorities estimated that two-thirds of the world's published proved reserves of recoverable oil were located in the Middle East and in North Africa. Except for non-Arab Iran and a small amount obtained by Israel in the Sinai, this is all Arab oil.

"There is no substitute for Middle East oil," says Christopher Tugendhat, a British member of Parliament who also is an oil expert. Several hard economic facts lie behind the present turbulence on the oil scene. Over the last few years, the world's dependence on oil has increased substantially as home dwellers have switched from coal to oil for heating, power plants have changed to natural gas or oil, the auto population has expanded and industrial users have found new applications for liquid fuels. Today, just under 50% of total energy in the non-Communist world is supplied by oil. Shell Oil Group studies indicate that if oil consumption continues along the present road the world will use as much oil in the next 10 years as it did in the previous 100 years. Moreover, in the second decade ahead oil consumption would double from the level of the decade now starting. The consumption pattern shows that Middle East oil will become much more important in the future to users because it is the richest petroleum area in the world.

In the 1960s decade 44% of all the oil discovered was found in the Middle East, 24% in the Communist world and less than 1% in the U.S. Since that time important fields have been discovered in Alaska and in the North Sea. Yet when measured against total needs of Western Europe and the U.S. over the next two decades, these new producing areas are swallowed up by an inexorable demand. Even if the North Sea finds prove as rich as anticipated, they will only supply about 15% of Western Europe's needs in 1980.

As for that North Slope Alaskan oil, ecologists have inhibited its exploitation even though the U.S. may be headed for an energy shortage of crisis proportions. Some oil men aver that, even if all stops are pulled soon to produce North Slope oil, total U.S. oil output in 1980 may be below the 1970 rate. That, of course, means the U.S. will become ever more dependent on imports and an increasing percentage will be coming from the Mideast.

There are some astute Arab petroleum experts too. They can analyze the meaning of oil statistics as well as can executives of Western corporations. And authorities in the producing nations are convinced that they literally have the Western world over an oil barrel. This is what conditions the thinking of OPEC and its members. They seem convinced that the West's need for oil is so great that oil companies have no recourse but to accept a step-by-step nationalization of their properties.

It used to be standard whenever producer country-company relations deteriorated for oil executives to claim that Arab nations "can't drink their oil." But company-country negotiations over the last 18 months indicate clearly that oil demand plus the unity of producing nations have strengthened the latters' hands immeasurably.

Oil company officials now sound rather hollow when making that same remark about oil's lack of drinking appeal. Oil men in this part of the world don't even want to discuss the possibility of nationalization, as if their silence might encourage the whole matter to disappear. One executive of a major international company in a reluctant discussion utters platitudes about "Arabs seeing the light and recognizing that they need companies.

Then he adds, "We have the downstream operations and that gives us some cards, too. I can tell you one thing: We will never take a barrel of nationalized oil into our operations." (By "downstream" he means the refining and marketing operations which involve heavy investment.)

This remains to be seen. The history of nationalization in the minerals field shows that somehow countries do find markets for their output. It may be that after nationalization some nations are worse off owning their own resources than when properties were in the hands of outside companies. Some Iranian figures, for instance, suggest that Iran earns less per barrel of oil generally in fields where it has participation than from those fields operated exclusively by well-managed foreign companies.

Still this is not likely to deter the trend toward ownership of natural resources. Nationalism plays an important role. It isn't merely a case of earning revenue, it is a matter of steering oil investments and decision-making in a way that benefits the nation. This requires more participation on boards of the companies, say Arab spokesmen.

#### MARKETING AND DIVERSIFICATION

Of course, it won't be the end of the world for corporations if they do lose equity control through nationalization which either are forced or negotiated (there really isn't much difference but it might be diplomatic to pretend that there is). Producing corporations may become contractors for governments in pumping that oil. The marketing end of their businesses may become much more important. Already some outfits are diversifying into new or related areas.

The fate of international oil companies rides on two key matters which will be the subject of tough negotiations: the compensation to be paid for participation and the price per barrel of oil to be delivered by nations to companies. OPEC suggests compensation should be on the book value of properties with no allowance for any of the oil which companies may have discovered. In effect, companies would be paid only for the machinery and equipment above ground, an assessment which would have payoffs set at about a tenth of their true worth, the companies claim. Still, that may be more than companies will collect from a radical country like Iraq in the way of compensation for oil properties. Iraq, for instance, has placed claims against the companies which could total a few hundred million dollars in revenues. The government says these claims should have been paid years ago. By presenting claims which exceed any possible level of compensation, a radical nation may thus not only wipe out that compensation but have the companies owing money, at least in the opinion of the radical nation.

Moreover there's likely to be little cash in any transaction. Payments will be made in oil. Companies could be hit again if an unrealistic posted price were established by the governments on the oil used in payment.

Here though, the goals of producing nations should be understood. Their aim is to nationalize properties, yet have companies cooperating with them under the new arrangement. If nationalization alone were the goal, producer countries could do that tomorrow by decree. It is the compensation which will determine whether or not companies cooperate after the governments take control, not the anti-socialist prejudices of individual executives.

Most thoughtful Arabs realize this, which is why nationalization in a step-by-step procedure is considered better than any "one-swoop" seizures. Companies must be led carefully into the harness which Mideast nations are preparing for them. Nations certainly will suffer if the hassle leads to any halting of production.

Companies want to get as much as they can in any settlement. Their capital needs in reorganizations and new exploration strategies will be immense. Downstream operations have never been very profitable for companies and some firms may be left with direct control of only this end of their businesses. Higher prices may make some of those downstream operations more profitable. Higher prices are likely to come on a steeply rising curve.

UNEASINESS IN WASHINGTON

Balance of payments effects of this trend on the U.S. already are a cause for uneasiness in some Washington offices. A greater total of U.S. oil requirements must be imported at sharply higher prices. Today, oil earnings from the Middle East are a plus factor in the U.S. balance of payments. Looking ahead, it's a different story. Currently the U.S. imports less than 4 million barrels of oil a day with less than a tenth coming from the Mideast and North Africa; by 1985 nearly 15 million barrels a day will have to be imported, most from North Africa and the Middle East. Some estimates place the cost of that oil in the $30 billion to $35 billion-a-year range. Obviously it will take a substantial amount of U.S. exports if this trade is to be balanced. So finally, the U.S. faces some balance of payments problems along with all the other problems posed by the Arab oil nations. In other words, there are a good many headaches in store for Americans where the Middle East is concerned.

## ONE MAN'S OVERVIEW OF PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON

### HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. ROBISON of New York. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's efforts at, alternatively, waging war and then waging peace have captured the headlines of late, with widely varying viewpoints as to the wisdom and correctness of his policies. Such divergencies are probably inevitable, in a presidential election year, as the political tides in the Nation move ever more swiftly.

Too often, however, emotions supersede objectivity, and prejudices overshadow logic, in arriving at an overall assessment. This is why my attention was so captured by the following letter to the editor of the Evening Press, of Binghamton, N.Y., in my district. The writer's thoughts are unusually direct, and to the point, and whether one agrees with his conclusions or not, the substance thereof is well worth considering. The article follows:

IN RUTHLESS WORLD, NIXON DESERVES RESPECT

BINGHAMTON, N.Y.

To the EDITOR:

The recent run of events in Southeast Asia has disturbed me so little that I feel compelled to be outspoken. The science of brinksmanship as practiced by all nations is either a competitive exercise by their PR men without genuine consequence, or it has subtle ties which escape us average citizens.

At best there is a double or triple standard here. Citizens think of the Vietnam war in terms of national uneasiness, those killed, wounded, missing, all with the shadows of nuclear weapons looming in the background; meanwhile, back at the conference table, ambassadors shout expected insults at one another on weekly schedule; and meanwhile back at the hotel room, special advisers and privileged emissaries sip cocktails and trade off real estate for battalions, bombing rights for military rights of way, tactical support for future trade agreements.

At least in part, I am ready to believe the worst about our conduct in international affairs; but at the same time, we must assume a similarly cynical posture for other nations. I do not believe that the coldness and calculation in our negotiations with foreign powers is predisposed, but is reactionary, defensive and absolutely necessary.

I believe this because American foreign policy is a confusing agglomeration of cherished, privileged and often outmoded tenets from economic, social, religious and military quarters, which are inconsistent with one another. Small wonder that national leaders and citizens alike shift easily from one viewpoint to another and often seek security on the nearest bandwagon.

America is wrongly accused of imperialism, because currently we have no clear foreign policy to execute. At least, we have nothing to match in scope and detail the game plans of China, Israel, Japan, and those emerging countries who are nationalizing themselves.

Keeping in mind that our foreign political adversaries are clever and dedicated and that international politics are ruthless. I would like to state that I admire, respect and support Nixon in his role as President.

Mr. Nixon is an excellent politician. He is less than satisfactory as a spiritual leader; his public relations crew still has some blind spots, and endless hours of practice have not humanized his smile. But when I voted for him, I was not trying to match him with some father image, and I did not intend to evaluate his competency as President by the amount of charisma he was able or unable to generate.

Nixon's job is 1) to oversee the improvement and balance of the economic and social climate at home and 2) in the international arena, to look out for the selfish interests of America. Evaluating the first depends upon point of view, and is largely another issue.

Considering the second, I voted for Nixon as my representative in the dirty sandbox of international relations because, given the rules of the game, I believed he could make better mud pies than anyone else. Nixon brought a professional attitude to this complex and corrupting job and did quite well. Very well, considering that a number of amateur politicians tried to disrupt his efforts with a campaign of oversimplifying and overemotionalizing the issues.

In short, I pay and praise Nixon for doing what I and most other Americans don't have the insight, patience, skill or stomach for—to protect American interests, just as other presidents (premiers, prime ministers, etc.), are committed to looking out for their own.

I really hope Nixon enjoys sports, patting babies, returning fallen birds to their nests, saluting the flag and other harmless things. But when American interests are challenged, I expect him to do his job and tell the other party to "buzz off." I don't want him to be any more understanding or tolerant or forgiving than any other national leader.

"Americans Shocked at Calley Massacre!" screamed the headlines. Don't make me laugh! We knew it all the time. We knew we couldn't be holding our own against another skilled slaughter machine without retaliation in kind. We knew deep down that you can't fight a Nice war.

We knew it all right, but it was way over there, and we were hoping to get it over with soon, and it was probably for a good cause and . . . how dare that Calley get caught and make us realize how brutal and inhuman America has been!

I have been deliberately provocative to make a point. There is a moral problem here. Nixon's dilemma—mine and yours, once we face it—is that the policies and techniques needed to maintain our posture in the world are mainly inconsistent with the Christian-social ethics we espouse. What we call virtue in the private sector (love, brotherhood, peace, sacrifice, forgiveness) are international liabilities in an era of conflict and disagreement. The now question is: Can this nation, fully aware of how cruel and inhuman modern war can be, ever have a just reason for being at war?

There seems to be a strong current of guilt rippling through America because we are ashamed of the killing and maiming in Vietnam which we are a part of. We like to think, if only we can get out of this war, the shame will fade. Should the people of South Vietnam be subsequently overrun, as many predict, we are going to acquire a different kind of guilt. Only a Christian could be in such a dilemma.

How can a Christian country, with its well-known turn-the-other-cheek attitude, possibly deal with a country which has no moral hang-ups of this sort, no adverse press, no angry citizens, no moral outrage at hurting one's enemy? With a country which intends to gain its objectives through any expedient means, and has said so frequently?

We learn of no dissent from North Vietnam, we learn of no guilt, no demonstrations among the people. While America seems to be weakening its resolution to fight there, the North Vietnamese, without the Christian guilt Syndrome, are fighting with as much determination as ever. Perhaps more so, as they read their daily reports from America.

Boy, have they got our number! America, with unprecedented charity, guilt, fear and compassion, is publicly turning the other cheek.

I hope we're ready for this conclusion. We are doomed to lose this war. After all, that is the only thing a decent Christian can do. Because, ironically, we are the good guys, after all. And you know what that makes ol' stick-to-his-guns Nixon.

For Nixon's conduct of the war has not put him at odds with many Americans. They have set themselves apart from him, have moved out from under their original, and his current, position. He has already liberalized and re-liberalized this position. If he gives in completely, history will remember him as the President who betrayed the principle of honoring treaties and who shut off assistance to a friendly ally.

On the other hand, if the war doesn't end pretty soon, we will have all convinced ourselves that this is Nixon's war, that he started it against our wishes, that he could end it right away if he weren't such a stubborn cuss, and that all future blood spilled is on his hands.

Just as many Americans sloughed off their guilt on scapegoat Calley, who didn't know how to fight honorably against a savage and unrestrained enemy, anyone as intransigent as Nixon is about this war has got to be guilty of something.

Those who have disassociated themselves from America's role in the Vietnam conflict ought to be glad that the bloodthirsty Calley and "stone-ears" Nixon came along. They provide a convenient dumping station for any type of guilt feelings you could do without.

Well, as I said before, Nixon is a pro. That's the way it goes in war biz.

Spiritual leaders need to give some attention to this problem. There is guilt involved in letting a friend be victimized without our lifting a finger; and there is guilt involved in helping him, if pain and death are the known consequences.

There is only one sure way to avoid war—just lie down and let whoever walk over you. Publish your plans and they will wait in line for the privilege.

Even if sparks generated in this country were to result in genuine love, respect and understanding, we would still have to cope with threats from other countries, ideologically opposed, and with a thousand creative ways to let you know it.

America needs Presidents with perseverance and highly developed political skills. Maybe a small compromise here and a secret deal there. But we are still a long, long way from resolving international disputes with other nations according to the Marquis of Queensbury and Robert's Rules of Order.

Maybe the day will come. Until then, I'll keep voting for the Nixons, bless their tricky hides.

ROBERT J. KRETZ.

## BLACK CHANCELLOR SETS GOALS FOR UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

### HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, one of the 13 fine institutions of higher education in my district is the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. It is indeed fortunate to have as its head Dr. Randolph W. Bromery, who was named chancellor this past April.

Having joined the university in 1967, he quickly distinguished himself in the classroom, became chairman of the geophysics department, and won the post of vice chancellor of student affairs before ultimately being named chancellor of the university. I am pleased to count this fine gentleman and educator as a close friend.

The June 7, 1972, edition of the Christian Science Monitor includes an article about Dr. Bromery and the university, to which I now respectfully call the Members' attention:

BLACK CHANCELLOR SETS GOALS FOR UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

(By Luix Overbea)

AMHERST, MASS.—"It is extremely lonely—being the only black here, one of only a few there, a black among a throng working in a non-black job."

So spoke Dr. Randolph W. Bromery, a black, a scientist, a New England migrant, an educator with only four years of full-time classroom experience—now head of a growing state university of 21,000 students with a $52 million budget.

Dr. Bromery was named chancellor of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst in April. He had become a full-time teacher in 1967 when the university hired him as associate professor of geophysics and deputy departmental chairman. The move to academic quarters followed 20 years in geology, most of them as an exploration geophysicist with the U.S. Geological Survey, Branch of Regional Geophysics.

RANGE OF IDEAS

As a neophyte chancellor, Dr. Bromery has a variety of ideas on what a "today" university should be:

It should attract students who are adult in mind.

It should not become a mammoth education factory turning out computerized graduates.

Black students and other minorities must have greater opportunities for higher education.

A chancellor must lend an ear to student desires, needs, and trends. He must relate to students and alumni.

A great university must serve the community, not only through special adult programs but also with imaginative educational options.

"The University of Massachusetts is not a place for parents to send their children," Dr. Bromery said as he recommended that young people in college should be mature individuals.

PARENTS CITED

"A great university is not a place for children," he explained. "The campus is a place for individuals who are young men and women. I often feel in working with students that parents are part of student difficulties. Many students want to be talked with, not just talked to. They want an adult father figure. The agitated, frustrated student is really never understood by his parents."

The chancellor feels that "we must challenge students to make something of themselves."

Being black in a "white world" has been a challenge to Dr. Bromery most of his adult life, he says. "My 20 years as a geophysicist most of them as the only black in my field, taught me to try to be the best there is in my field. Then I tried to recruit blacks, most of them untrained in the airborne geophysical discipline, as geophysicists."

TO FACULTY IN 1967

His efforts in recruitment, he said, caused him to decide to teach geophysics. He joined the University of Massachusetts faculty in 1967 as an associate professor. He later became chairman of the geophysics department, and he worked to recruit blacks to study in the sciences.

These efforts, he said, were often thwarted when black students were channeled into other fields. "This pushed me into running for vice-chancellor of student affairs," he said. He won that post, which included offices of admissions and financial aid, residence halls, dining commons, Student-Union-Campus Center complex, and security.

CHINESE OUTNUMBERED BLACKS

To bring more blacks to the campus and establish a program to help them, Dr. Bromery founded and became first president of the Committee for the Collegiate Education of Black Students (CCEBS), an educational opportunities program on campus that now includes students of all races.

As one of the first 10 black faculty members, Dr. Bromery said, he noticed there were only 33 black undergraduates and 2 black graduate students on campus in 1967, compared with 72 students from Taiwan, China.

He established CCEBS to bring more blacks to campus, to provide academic and social counseling to these students, to develop a program to help black students become more creative, and to change the environment for black students by encouraging the employment of blacks on the professional and nonprofessional staffs of the university.

SMALL INITIAL BACKLASH

"There was a small white backlash at first," Dr. Bromery said, "but more openings for black students resulted."

Today the university has nearly 50 black faculty students, and 200 graduate students. The 1972 class will have 50 black graduates, more than the total number of blacks graduated in the university's history, he said.

"What surprised me about CCEBS," he said, "was that students on campus supported our program verbally and financially. The student government allocated $30,000 a year to CCEBS. The faculty contributed from their salaries $75,000 a year.

A GREETING IN SPANISH

Today the committee helps Spanish-speaking students, American Indians, and even some whites. Dr. Bromery welcomed 200 Spanish-speaking students in Spanish and English last fall. He said he expects more progress in bringing minority students to the University of Massachusetts campus.

A good university, he feels, must appeal to all students with exciting new programs and improved continuing activities. He sees progress in small residential colleges within the campus complex, a university year-for-action program, an improved graduate studies program, and better relations between his office and other elements of the campus, including students and faculty members.

CEILING AT 25,000

The chancellor has set a ceiling of 25,000 students for the Amherst campus. "If we get too big, I will hardly know my students nor my faculty members," he said.

One way to keep the family spirit on campus, he noted, is the residential college concept, which provides a campus within the big campus atmosphere for students in the same field of study. Another is the university year for action, giving juniors and seniors a work-study program with academic credit while providing community service.

## SIGNIFICANCE OF CUBAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

### HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper to recall the historic events in the independence of a nation. May 20 marks the anniversary of Cuba's independence from Spain.

Seventy years ago, in 1902, a new government came into being in this neighboring country. It then became a government dedicated to the principles of political freedom. This was a culmination of a four century struggle for freedom led by Cuba's great men, such as Maximo Gomez, Antonio Maceo, and Jose Marti.

Jose Marti, called the "Apostle of Cuban Independence" was born in Havana in 1853, received his early education there and at 15 began to understand the plight of his Cuban people and their need for independence and self-determination. A year later his political activities brought him a 6-year prison sentence at hard labor, however, a short time later he was exiled to Spain by the Governor who feared his political activities. Marti did not, however, cease promoting independence for his country. He was a skilled orator and came to the United States and worked ardently as a journalist and literary critic to create good will and sympathy for the Cuban cause and at the same time uniting other exiles from Cuba, raising funds and supplies in a plan to win freedom for his people.

Marti, 10 years before his efforts were successful, founded a movement which united all Cuban exiles and gave Cuba a formal constitution, which proclaimed belief in the dignity and equality of all Cubans and propounded the ideal that the general happiness of a people rests on individual independence.

Realizing that Cuba's independence could not be won with words, Marti and his followers launched an attack on the military colonial oppressors of his land and landed a force near Santiago in eastern Cuba, and joined with other Cuban exiles from the Dominican Republic, Mexico and the Caribbean islands. In the battle Marti was mortally wounded, but others took up the cause for Cuba's freedom.

The effort was a feeble one and the military power of Spain made his early effort futile. Antonio Maceo was also killed in the battle and although he and Maximo Gomez succeeded in outmaneuvering the conquistadors, in the end the Spanish Army dispersed the greatly outnumbered patriots. The population was rounded up and held in concentration camps and the leaders tried for treason. News of the inhumane treatment by the Spanish of the political prisoners reached the United States, and demands for U.S. intervention was made throughout our country.

Finally, in February 1898, the American naval warship, U.S.S. *Maine*, was sent to Havana for the purpose of protecting American citizens living in Cuba. While in Havana Harbor, the ship was blown up and 266 American lives were lost. The sinking of the battleship *Maine* led to severe patrotic outbursts against Spain and the cry, "Remember the *Maine*" rang throughout the land.

The rest is history. As a final result the U.S. Congress declared war against Spain and ultimately was instrumental in gaining for Cuba its independence, on May 20, 1902, which lasted until 1959 when Fidel Castro, in the guise of freeing the Cuban people from the military dictatorship of General Batista, created the present Communist dictatorship.

Today, over 10 percent former Cubans are living in exile from Fidel Castro's present Communist regime. Most of these fled to the United States and have contributed much by assimilating themselves into the mainstream of our Nation. Most who fled from Cuba were doctors, lawyers, artists, teachers, and engineers and have accepted our land as one of opportunity and justice.

Some have become leaders of Cubans in our own Government process and most have proved themselves to be worthy of American citizenship.

## FREEDOM OF PRESS DAY

## HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, June 7, is Freedom of the Press Day. Americans should appreciate the freedom our press enjoys, and especially so when it is contrasted with the total control of the news in countries dominated by communism.

A very timely, succinct editorial on the subject was carried in the Southwest Messenger Press of Cook County, Ill., on June 1 which I am pleased to insert into the RECORD:

FREEDOM OF PRESS OUR GREAT BLESSING

As the nation prepares to observe Freedom of the Press Day on June 7, it is fitting to consider what freedom of the press means to U.S. citizens in the crucible of the nuclear age. Freedom of the press allows an honest evaluation of the President's efforts to achieve peace and a "working arrangement" with former communist enemies. Although sometimes harsh in its approach, the free press permits every citizen to make an unvarnished assessment of political candidates. It probes the motives and principles of public figures who enjoy positions of leadership. The free press is the only genuine disciplinary force that can be exerted against government. It is the articulate focal point of public opinion.

A free press is literally the watchdog of a free people. At times wrong conclusions are drawn from what the press reveals, but over the long pull, its batting average is good. If every nation enjoyed the vision that is given by a free press to the people of the U.S., the cause of world peace would be immeasurably brighter. The purpose of Freedom of the Press Day is "To celebrate and promote press freedom in the Americas." In observing the Day, we should remember that it is an occasion for free men only.

## MEMORIAL DAY 1972

## HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the following is the text of the Memorial Day keynote speech delivered by George T. Nickolas of Davenport, Iowa, at services held on the lawn of the Rock Island County Courthouse in Rock Island, Ill.:

MEMORIAL DAY 1972

(Mr. Nickolas, a Contract Specialist with the U.S. Army Command, is the immediate past National President of the State Commanders and Adjutants Association of the Disabled American Veterans.)

Ladies, Gentlemen, Distinguished Guests, my brother and sister Americans. There are many reasons and purposes that bring us together this morning. Some of us have come to pay honor to a departed loved one, some of us have come to pay honor to a close friend or comrade in arms who died in service. Some of us have come because we are part of a veterans or service organization, and others just to participate in a patriotic program.

It is only fitting and proper that we annually set aside this time in our busy schedules. It is only fitting and proper that across the breadth of our great country we pay honor to those who gave the ultimate, their lives. It is only fitting and proper that we reflect in memories of those our departed loved ones. As the years wane our wounds of the body and mind heal. The grief that we once experienced at the loss of our loved ones diminishes. Visions of those departed loved ones become clouded and often we consciously forget them except when we are specifically reminded as we are today.

The roar of cannon still echoes around the world, bullets still pierce living flesh, and the suffering and the dying continues. It is no different this day than it was 30 years ago, and the only difference in the dying is that the name of the place may differ. It is Da Nang instead of Bataan. Men and women continue to fight for many reasons. Many who died did so doing what they believed was right, and others died not in total agreement with the objectives of the Government, but served because they had a sense of duty and obligation to their country. These servicemen have paid their dues for the freedom of man.

But, my friends, I do not propose to further praise these honored dead. They, the dead veterans, whose names are etched on stone have written a far better epitaph in their deeds and devotions to the perpetuation of the Republic and its principles.

All American citizens, no matter how they choose to commemorate Memorial Day, owe these honored dead more than just words of praise, a volley of rifle fire, the sounding of "Taps", or even a tear or two. We owe these American dead the renewed devotion and sworn adherence to the principles of freedom, equality, justice and the American Way of Life for which they were willing to give their lives.

To say, "I am an American!!! I was born here! I pay Taxes! I vote! These are simple words and they don't require very much sacrifice on the individual's part. It may require a little effort to go to the polls and cast your vote. It may hurt the pocketbook a little to pay the taxes. These are really insignificant payments for the privileges and the protection of the laws that are afforded the citizens of this country. I personally do not feel that these actions are adequate services or payments for the rights and privileges of living in this free society.

Today America is engaged in a war that seems to be unpopular with a great number of Americans who have hit the vital cord and have gained a great deal of free publicity. To be a patriotic individual is not in vogue. To support the war or the participants of that war can bring condemnation, scorn and even threats. It now takes a little courage to speak out for America and our free society. This may be more courage than most of our average citizens possess at this time. In order to perpetuate this country we must love it and be willing to defend and aid in the protection of the principles in which it was founded. Every man and woman in this society should endeavor to serve his country in some manner. To salute and pay homage to the flag, to nod one's head in agreement when someone makes a patriotic speech, or to do as Milton suggested when he wrote, ". . . others serve who only stand and wait," is not fulfilling the requirements of a good citizen. Since we all cannot fight in the Armed Services of this country, we must find other activities through which we can demonstrate our support and loyalty. We can not "stand and wait" for these activities and opportunities to seek us as individuals, we must seek these ways of service to our country, state, and community.

In these times too many of the people of this country have accepted the notion that the passive way is the only way out of this country's problems. Freedom as the average American enjoys and evisions was not achieved nor can it long endure with passiveness.

These famous words of the past hold true today—". . . Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? We are not weak if we make a proper use of those means that the God of nature has placed in our power . . . armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a country as that which we possess, we are invincible to any force which our enemy can send against us. Besides we shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations . . . The battle . . . is not to the strong alone; it is to the vigilant, the active, the brave. It is in vain to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry Peace, Peace, but there is no peace. The war is actually begun. Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!" We all know that one of the greatest American Patriots, Patrick Henry, made that speech nearly two hundred years ago.

We may not be facing the same battles he envisioned, but we do face the battle to preserve our society. It takes a positive response on the part of all Americans. Seldom do we think of those who helped on the home front during World War II as patriots, but they were and so are their counter parts today.

My hope is as America commemorates this Memorial Day, citizens will solemnly and sincerely resolve to express in some positive manner the pride of being an American and to keep that resolve everyday of their lives.

In addition to the voiced thanks for the rights and privileges that all citizens enjoy as free Americans, citizens in their own way must contribute time and effort in order that our freedoms can continue. If we fail to contribute—if we continue to seek the easy way and thus fail to do our share—the dead that we honor may yet have died in vain and their services and sacrifices may have been wasted.

I charge each and every American to volunteer to do something constructive for their community, state, and nation. Take an active part in the service organizations to which you belong and help your neighbor. With the help of each citizen and the grace of God this nation will continue to be the home of the brave and the free .

## MONTHLY CALENDAR OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

### HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to insert in the RECORD the Monthly Calendar of the Smithsonian Institution. The June Calendar of Events follows:

JUNE AT THE SMITHSONIAN

*June 1, 1972*

Creative screen: *With These Hands.* A look into the studios of eight artist-craftsmen working with equipment ranging from a weaver's loom to heavy machinery. Artists include Peter Voulkos, James Tanner and Toshiko Takaezu. 11 a.m., 12 noon, 1 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts.

Exhibition: *Insect Zoo.* Live insects on display, including bees and termites and featuring a typical Allegheny mound ants nest. Colonies of bees and termites are also included as well as a butterfly flight cage. Highly magnified images of insects will be projected on a TV screen through the use of a videotape camera. Through August 31, Natural History Building.

Exhibition: *Arts and Physics.* "Astralites," light sculptures by Washington artist Adam Peiperl. Museum of History and Technology, through September 31.

*June 3, 1972*

Creative screen: *With These Hands.* Repeat. See June 1 for details.

*June 4, 1972*

Concert: *Fernando Astilleros,* flamenco guitarist. A student of Manolo Gano of Madrid, Mr. Astilleros has made public appearances on three continents. Sponsored by Adelante, an organization of Spanish-speaking professionals in D.C. 3 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts. (Note: A tour of the collections will be given in Spanish at 2 p.m.)

*June 5, 1972*

Exhibition: Art from D.C. Junior High Schools, including paintings, drawings, prints and three-dimensional works. National Collection of Fine Arts, through July 31.

*June 6, 1972*

Suzanne's lament: Multi-media commentary on man's development of the spectacular Alaskan Coastal Wilderness. Created by Dr. Miles Hayes, Director of Coastal Research Center, University of Massachusetts, and introduced by Dr. Erie Kauffman, Smithsonian Division of Invertebrate Paleontology, 8:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Smithsonian Associates.

*June 7, 1972*

Design film: *The Music Rack,* with wood craftsman Wendell Castle. Continuous half-hour showings from 11 a.m.; last showing, 2:30 p.m. The Renwick Gallery.

Lecture: *The Last Tribes of Mindanao,* by The Honorable Manuel Elizalde, Presidential Assistant for National Minorities, (Panamin), Philippines. Slides and a film are included in the lecture, presented in conjunction with the Smithsonian Department of Anthropology. 7:30 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium.

*June 8, 1972*

Seminar: *The Forging of New Alliances.* Final seminar in a series on the "Dynamics of the American Political System 1972; Trends and Directions," sponsored by the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. Moderator: Neal Peirce, journalist and Fellow, Woodrow Wilson Center. Speakers: Peter Lisagor, John Saloma. Commentators: Chris Aldrete, Channing E. Phillips, James Reichley, William Rusher and James Sundquist. 8 p.m., Natural History Building auditorium. The public is invited.

Exhibition: *The Art of Simon Yavitz.* Unique botanical subjects sculptured in gold and silver and enhanced with gems and ivory. Gem Hall, Museum of Natural History. On display indefinitely.

*June 9, 1972*

Exhibition: *Washington Print Club Collection.* Selected from the private collections of the Club members. National Collection of Fine Arts, through July 9.

Folk concert: *Rick and Lorraine Lee* performing "Old-Time and Modern" American music on guitar, banjo, dulcimer and piano. 8:30 p.m. Natural History Building auditorium. Sponsored by the Folklore Society of Greater Washington. Free to FSGW members: $1 non-members.

*June 10, 1972*

Exhibition: *The Swedish Touch.* Contemporary Swedish textiles including wall-hangings, patchwork, fabric collage, stitchery and plaiting by 25 artist-craftsmen. Sponsored by the Embassy of Sweden. At the Renwick Gallery, through July 30.

Lecture: *Swedish Textiles Today,* by Dag Widman, Curator of the Craft Department, National Museum in Stockholm. Presented in conjunction with The Swedish Touch exhibition. 3 p.m., The Renwick Gallery.

*June 13, 1972*

Exhibition: Prints by six Swiss sculptors: Bill, Corbusier, Giacometti, Luginbuhl, Muller and Tinguely. Fifty-nine works—mainly silkscreens, lithographs and etchings—from the Zurich collections of Hans C. and Walter A. Bechtler, show how sculptors think in another medium. Organized by the Mint Museum of Art, Charlotte, North Carolina, and circulated by the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service. At the Embassy of Switzerland, 2900 Cathedral Avenue, N.W. 10 a.m. to 7 p.m. daily. Free admission. Through June 29.

*June 14, 1972*

Design Film: *Glas-leerdam*—the design and manufacture of glass. Continuous showings from 11 a.m.; last showing, 2:30 p.m. The Renwick Gallery.

*June 15, 1972*

Creative Screen: *Penland Summer*—The intensive courses in pottery, weaving and other media offered by the North Carolina Penland School of Crafts; *The High Lonesome Sound*—a film by John Cohen, founder of "The New Lost City Ramblers," Two-film program begins at 11 a.m., 12 noon, 1 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts.

*June 17, 1972*

Creative Screen: *Penland Summer; The High Lonesome Sound.* Repeat. See May 15 for details.

*June 19, 1972*

Demonstration: Gemstone carving by four master craftsmen from Idar-Oberstein, Germany. Museum of Natural History, through June 23.

*June 21, 1972*

Design Film: *The Music Rack.* See June 7.

*June 22, 1972*

Demonstration: Master potter Rick Flannery making pottery using designs of the Moravian potters of Old Salem, N.C. Museum of History and Technology. Reproductions will be sold in the Museum Shop. Through June 25.

*June 23, 1972*

Exhibition: *National Parks and the American Landscape.* Paintings, drawings, and photographs from the National Park Service's collections commemorating the park system centennial and focusing on the Hayden and Powell surveys of the West in the 1870's. Works by Moran, Bierstadt, and Thomas Hill are included. National Collection of Fine Arts, through August 23.

*June 24, 1972*

Concert: *Dupont Circle Consortium.* Sponsored by the National Park Service, in connection with the *National Parks and the American Landscape* exhibition. 3 p.m., National Collection of Fine Arts.

*June 28, 1972*

Design Film: *Design and Man*—A look at industrial and commercial design, and the design process. Continuous showings from 11 a.m.; last showing, 2:30 p.m. The Renwick Gallery.

*June 30, 1972*

Festival of American Folklife 1972 (Opening day). The sixth annual festival will feature the State of Maryland—including its horse country and the Greek community of Baltimore—with a special auxiliary site on the Potomac River depicting the water traditions and skills of the Eastern Shore. American Indians of the Southwest—tribes from 19 New Mexican pueblos—and the American working man as a member of organized labor will be the other two featured areas of the festival. Performances and demonstrations will be held from 11 a.m. to 5 p.m., June 30–July 4, Musical performance will continue until 8:30 every night. (Detailed schedule of activities will appear in the July Calendar of Events.)

DRUGS: A SPECIAL EXHIBITION—SCHEDULE OF SPECIAL ACTIVITIES, ARTS AND INDUSTRIES BUILDING

June 1.—*The Circle,* from the National Film Board of Canada. 11:30 a.m., 2:30, 4:30 and 6:30 p.m. Question/answer sessions follow.

June 2.—*The Circle,* 11:30 a.m., 2:30, 4:30 and 6:30 p.m. Question/answer sessions follow.

June 3.—*Trash,* filmed by Andy Warhol. 1:30, 3:30 and 6:30 p.m. Question/answer sessions follow.

June 4.—*Trash.* 1:30, 3:30 and 6:30 p.m.

June 5.—Panel discussion: *Drug Use: Historical Perspective and Current Parallels,* presentation of original papers by Richard Blum and Andrew Malcolm. Panel discussions follow presentation of each paper, followed by question/answer session.

June 6.—Video replay of June 5th panel. 10:30 a.m. and 12:30 p.m.

June 7.—*Inner Voices of Lorton.* Performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m.

June 8.—*To Find Our Life,* documentary by the Peyote Hunt of the Huichols of Mexico. 11:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. *Ebena.* Showings at 2:30 and 6:30 p.m.

June 9.—Repeat of June 8 Program.

June 10.—*Mike Malone's Group.* Performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m.

June 11.—*Mike Malone's Group.* Performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m.

June 12.—Informal drug education talk by Capt. Ralph Greene, Chief of Police, Crofton, Md., 10:30 a.m. 1:30 and 3:30 p.m. *The Answer Is Understanding,* documentary. 6:30 p.m. Discussion of film follows.

June 13.—Informal drug education talk by Capt. Ralph Greene. 10:30 a.m., 1:30 and 3:30 p.m. *David,* a documentary film. 6:30. Discussion of film follows.

June 14.—Informal drug education talk by Capt. Ralph Greene, 10:30 a.m., 1:30 and 3:30 p.m. *Brian at 17,* a documentary film. 6:30 p.m. Discussion of film follows.

June 15.—Informal drug education talk by Capt. Ralph Greene. Lecture: *Drug Education—A Community's Answer.* 1 p.m. Question/answer session follows.

June 16.—Informal drug education talk by Capt. Ralph Greene. 10:30 a.m., 1:30 and 3:30 p.m. *Anything for Kicks,* a documentary film. 6:30 p.m. Discussion of film follows.

June 17.—*Long Day's Journey Into Night,* film directed by Sidney Lumet. 11:30 a.m., 2:30, 4:30 and 6:30 p.m. Discussion of film and question/answer sessions follow.

June 18.—*Long Day's Journey Into Night.* 11:30 a.m., 2:30, 4:30 and 6:30 p.m.

June 19.—Panel discussion: *Socio-Cultural Patterns of Drug Misuse.* Two-hour sessions beginning at 10:30 a.m. and 2 p.m.

June 20.—Video replay of June 19th panel. 10:30 a.m.

June 21.—*Inner Voices of Lorton.* Performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m.

June 22.—*Skeezag,* a documentary film. 11:30 a.m. and 6:30 p.m. *Curious Alice.* 2:30 and 4:30 p.m. Discussions follow.

June 23.—*Skeezag.* 11:30 and 6:30 p.m. *Curious Alice.* 2:30 and 4:30 p.m.

June 24.—Bob Alexander's *Living Theatre.* Performances at 1:30 and 4:30 p.m.

June 25.—*Living Theatre.* 1:30 and 4:30 p.m.

June 26.—Lecture: *Law Enforcement Problems of Addiction.*

June 27.—*Changing,* a documentary film. 11:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. *Brian at 17.* 2:30 and 6:30 p.m.

June 28.—*Epitaph.* 11:30 a.m. and 4:30 pm. *Speedscene: the Problem of Amphetamine Abuse.* 2:30 and 6:30 p.m.

June 29.—*To Find Our Life.* 11:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. *Ebena.* 2:30 and 6:30 p.m. A discussion of the film follows each screening.

June 30.—*To Find Our Life.* 11:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. *Ebena.* 2:30 and 6:30 p.m.

OTHER NEWLY OPENED EXHIBITS

Why Teeth. An imaginative story of dental care illustrated by the sculpture and drawings of Provincetown artist Kathleen Ferguson. Museum of History and Technology, Hall of Health. Through July 1.

Helicopters. Five different types of helicopters, including the one used by Eisenhower during his presidency. Arts and Industries Building.

DOMESTIC TOURS

*Winterthur and Hagley.* July 22 (7:45 a.m.—6 p.m.). Special Museum Day for students age 16 and over. Sponsored by the Resident Smithsonian Associates. Available by subscription only. For information call Mrs. King, 381-5157.

The Smithsonian Associates also sponsor tours listed below. For further details, write Mrs. Kilkenny, Smithsonian Associates, Washington, D.C. 20560.

*Windjammer Cruise:* June 25-July 1.

*Solar Eclipse:* July 5-11. Prince Edward Island.

*Archaeology Dig:* August 6-12. New Hampshire.

*Mountain Camping:* August 21-31. Gifford Pinchot National Forest, Washington State.

*Olympic National Park:* September.

*Instruction in Photography:* September 24-29. Maine.

*Sanibel Island, Florida:* November 5-10.

*A Look at Nature's Past:* November 12-19. (Fla.)

VOLUNTEERS NEEDED

*Info '72.* Summer tour guides—students, 16 years old or over. Minimum: one full day or two half-days per week. Training will be provided. Call 381-6471.

*Central Information Program.* Continuing program for Information desks and independent areas of the Institution. Minimum: Three hours per week. Call 381-6264.

*National Collection of Fine Arts/The Renwick Gallery.* Docents to conduct school and adult tours. Training begins in the fall. Call 381-6541.

DEMONSTRATIONS—MUSEUM OF HISTORY AND TECHNOLOGY

*Musical Instruments,* from the Smithsonian's collection, Monday through Friday, 3 p.m. Hall of Musical Instruments, 3rd floor.

*Music Machines—American Style.* Mechanical and electronic music machines. Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Sunday, 1:30 p.m., 2nd floor.

*Spinning and Weaving,* Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, 1:30-12:30.

*Machine Tools.* Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, 1-2 p.m.

RADIO SMITHSONIAN

Radio Smithsonian, a program of music and conversation growing out of the Institution's many activities, is broadcast every Sunday on WGMS-AM (570) and FM (10.35) from 9-9:30 p.m. The program schedule for June:

4th—*Concert.* Sonya Monosoff, violin, Judith Davidoff, cello, and James Weaver, harpsichord, play violin sonatas of Corelli.

11th—*Terms of the Social Contract.* Robert Ardrey, author and anthropologist, discusses the structure of society with Wilton Dillon, Director of Seminars at the Smithsonian.

18th—*The Also Rans.* Lillian Miller, National Portrait Gallery Historian, talks about candidates who ran for president—and lost.

*Are Heavy Metals Dangerous?,* with Dale Jenkins, Director of the Smithsonian's Ecology Program.

25th—*Where is the Melody?* Martin Williams, noted jazz critic and Director of the Smithsonian's Jazz Program, discusses and illustrates jazz fundamentals.

HOURS

Museum of History and Technology, Museum of Natural History; Arts and Industries Building: 10 a.m.-9 p.m. seven days each week.

Freer Gallery of Art: National Collection of Fine Arts; National Portrait Gallery; Renwick Gallery: 10 a.m.-5:30 p.m. daily.

National Zoo buildings: 9 a.m.-6 p.m. daily.

Anacostia Neighborhood Museum: 10 a.m.-6 p.m., weekdays; 1-6 p.m., weekends.

PUPPET THEATRE

The Marvelous Land of Oz. The further adventures of Scarecrow, Tin Woodman, and Glinda the good witch, with many new characters and touched with light political satire. Based on L. Frank Baum's own sequel to his classic *The Wizard of Oz,* the production is designed and performed by Allan Stevens and Company, and produced by the Division of Performing Arts. Through June 11: Wed. through Fri., 10:30 and 11:30 a.m.; weekends, 10:30 a.m., 12:30 and 2:30 p.m. Tom Sawyer. Repeat production. June 14-July 9, 11 a.m., 12 and 1 p.m. Wed. through Sun. Performances are in the History and Technology Building auditorium. Tickets are $1.25 adults, $1 children. For reservations call 381-5395. (*The Marvelous Land of Oz will reopen July 19.*)

CLASSES AND WORKSHOPS—SPONSORED BY THE SMITHSONIAN ASSOCIATES

Classes are available in the following categories on a subscription-only basis. For information, call 381-5157.

*Tiny Tots* (ages 4-17), Two-week sessions every Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, July 11-20; July 25-August 3; August 14-24.

*Young People* (ages 8-13). Same schedule as above.

*Tennagers and Adults:* Twice a week for three weeks. July 20-27; August 7-24.

MUSEUM TOURS

National Collection of Fine Arts:

Monday-Friday. 1 p.m. Introduction to the Collection.

National Portrait Gallery: "Accoustiguide" tour (45 minutes) of exhibition, "If Elected . . ." Unsuccessful Candidates for the Presidency, 1796-1968. Recorded by Dr. Marvin Sadik, Director of the NPG. $1.

Renwick Gallery: By appointment, call 381-5811.

FOREIGN STUDY TOURS

For members of the National and Resident Associates. For further details on tours, listed below, write Miss Schumann, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560.

*1972*

King Arthur's England: July 11-Aug. 1.

The Pilgrimage Road: Sept. 11-Oct. 9.

No-Tour Tour (Dulles-London-Dulles): Sept. 11-Oct. 2.

Russia: Sept. 22-Oct. 3. Waiting list only.

Pakistan and Afghanistan: Oct. 9-Nov. 8. Waiting list only.

*1973*

Peru (archeology tour): Feb. 8-Mar. 5.

Morocco: Mar. 6—3 weeks.

Prehistoric Caves of Spain and France: April 2—3 weeks.

Middle East (Lebanon, Jordan, Cyprus and Israel): April 13—3 weeks.

Sites of Civilization: Oct. 7—3 weeks on the cruise ship *Argonaut.*

African Safari (Tanzania and Kenya Game Parks and Seychelles): Oct.—3 weeks.

## THE ELIZABETH BAPTIST CHURCH OF YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. CHARLES J. CARNEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 23, 1972, Elizabeth Baptist Church of Youngstown, Ohio, celebrated its 50th anniversary. Through a great deal of dedicated service, Elizabeth Baptist Church has progressed both spiritually and financially over the years. I, therefore, would like to take this opportunity to extend my sincere congratulations and best wishes to Pastor Henry Clinkscale and his family; the four living charter members, Mrs. Adline Mixon, Deacon Ernest Jones, Mrs. Annie Battles, and Mrs. Fannie Lee; and all of the members responsible for the wonderful progress that has been made.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a brief history of Elizabeth Baptist Church, a profile of Pastor Clinkscale, and a few words from the pastor at this time:

HISTORY OF ELIZABETH BAPTIST CHURCH

The Elizabeth Baptist Church was organized April 22, 1922, by Rev. C. W. Lee, with approximately 25 members, four of which are still living, two of whom are still with the church. They are Mrs. Adline Mixon and Deacon Ernest Jones. The other two are, Mrs. Annie Battles, Akron, Ohio and Mrs. Fannie Lee of Youngstown, Ohio.

The church had its beginning on Cherry Street, from there we moved to Wilson Avenue. In 1931, the property at 1846 Lawrence Street was donated to the Church by Mrs. Caroline Hazeltine, at this time the Rev. W. L. Ingram was the pastor. Receiving this property were the following Trustees: K. D. Hall, E. S. Jones, Thomas Hall, Archie Hickson and Frank Bennett.

Since 1922, the church has had several pastors, since no records were kept until recent years we have no accurate account of the work of some of the members.

In November, 1954, the church called as its pastor, the Rev. Lonnie Simon. Under the leadership of Rev. Simon, the church membership increased. On January 8, 1956, the church held its last service at 1864 Lawrence Street. The following Sunday, we moved into another church building located at 328 S. Forest Avenue.

On September 1, 1957, dedicatory service was held, at which time the mortgage on the church was burned. This was a six-year mortgage, but was paid off in two and a half years.

In April, 1966, the Rev. Hycel B. Taylor, was called to the church as its pastor. He served till 1966 and moved to Nashville, Tennessee, to enroll in Vanderbilt University.

Rev. Arthur Stevens, pastor of First Baptist Church, Freedom, Pennsylvania, was called to pastor and was then called to St. Peters Baptist Church, Youngstown, Ohio.

Elizabeth Baptist Church sold their property at 328 S. Forest Avenue to Mt. Sinai Baptist Church and moved temporarily to 1452 Wilson Avenue.

The Church then called Rev. Henry Clinkscale, pastor of Beulah Baptist Church. Under the leadership of Rev. Clinkscale the church progressed both spiritually and financially.

In July, 1970, Elizabeth Baptist Church purchased the Emmanuel Baptist Church and Parsonage at 7 S. Garland Avenue for $35,000.00 On September 6, 1970, the Church was rededicated and our corner stone was laid.

November 1970 Elizabeth purchased property at 8 S. Garland Avenue for $4,700.00 for parking facility. In 1970, 21 members were added to the membership roll by Christian experience, 13 candidates for Baptism, 1 reinstated, 7 deceased, 8 dismissal by letter.

In 1970 our church grew spiritually. There was an increase of 58 new members. Of this number there were 38 candidates for Baptism, 17 by Christian Experience, 3 by Restoration and 5 babies were dedicated. Also, a Junior Church was organized.

At the beginning of 1971, our church proposed a budget of $22,700.00. With God's Blessings and your efforts we were able to surpass this goal by $2,484.00. The budget for 1972 has been set at $30,000.00. This year we plan to burn the mortgage on the church and, also, have the church air-conditioned.

To the members who are responsible for the 50 years of progress, we say "Thank You", unto Him who is able to keep us from falling we say, "Bless His Holy Name". Through the Years.

Charter members living: Deacon Ernest Jones; Sis. Fannie Lee; Sis. Adline Mixon; and Sis. Annie Battles.

PASTOR AND FIRST LADY

PROFILE OF THE PASTOR

Henry Clinkscale Jr., the son of Mrs. Mattie Clinkscale and the late Henry Clinkscale, was born in Youngstown, Ohio.

He attended Covington School, Hayes Jr. High School, South High Night School and the International Correspondence School. He attended the Human Engineering Institute of Niles, Ohio for three years, and received a certificate for completing the course in Hydraulic Maintenance, I and II, which was sponsored by the Commercial Shearing and Stamping Company, where he is employed as a Plumber. He also attended the Central Bible College in Cleveland, Ohio for four years.

He served as an Ordained Deacon of the New Bethel Baptist Church for six years and was called to preach in 1965. He was licensed to preach by the New Bethel Baptist Church where the Rev. L. A. Simon is the Pastor. He served as Assistant Pastor of the Antioch Baptist Church where the Rev. Alfred Ward is the Pastor.

Pastor Clinkscale was ordained in 1967 and was called to Pastor the Beulah Baptist Church. In September 1969 he was called to Pastor the Elizabeth Baptist Church.

Pastor Clinkscale is married to the former Odessa Harris and they have four daughters, Rose and Sandra at home, Mrs. Ernest Paul, and Mrs. James Williams of Cleveland, Mississippi. They have three grand-children, Dwayne and Rodney Williams and Ernest Paul Jr.

WORDS FROM THE PASTOR

A COMMAND TO A MARCHING CHURCH

Exodus 14:13.—"Fear not, stand still, and see the salvation of the Lord."

We come at this time to celebrate the Fiftieth Anniversary of our church and again I say to you, it is so wonderful to be a part of such a great organization as the Elizabeth Baptist Church. I cannot express the joy and Christian love which I have felt working with you in the last two years and seven months of these fifty years.

I have been strengthened by the bond of fellowship which exists among the board of Deacons, Trustees and members. I am richer in experience today than I was two years ago. I can say like the poet, "Twas grace that brought us safe thus far and grace will lead us on."

Deacon Jones and Mother Mixon started out marching fifty years ago and are yet going forward.

Elizabeth, God's church must forever go forward, it must not stop, it cannot stop, "for God is in the midst of her."

Let us march forward in the preaching of the Gospel, the world needs the Gospel.

We must march forward in love, "For God so loved the world that He gave, His only begotten son."

The church must march on, in denouncing immorality. Elizabeth, keep on marching, holding up the blood stained banner of the Lord, until Christ comes for His Church.

Pastor HENRY CLINKSCALE AND FAMILY.

## SPRING HILL: A NEW CONFERENCE CENTER

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues, and to those who plan conferences for the Government, foundations, or other private groups, the new Minneapolis area conference facility that will be available this September.

This conference center, Spring Hill, is located 35 minutes from the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport. There are 10 nonstop flights daily between Washington and Minneapolis and excellent transportation connections with New York, Chicago, and the west coast.

Planners of small conferences should investigate Spring Hill. A detailed description of the facility and background information on the concept of Spring Hill follow:

SPRING HILL CONFERENCE CENTER

Spring Hill, organized to become a national and international conference center, is both a facility and a program . . . designed to encourage discussions which raise, illuminate and help to resolve the issues of our changing society.

It was established in 1971 by individuals in the Twin Cities area. It is organized as a non-profit operating foundation for educational, charitable and scientific purposes.

The center is located in the western suburbs of Minneapolis, on a hill overlooking Long Lake. It is accessible . . . within three miles of an Interstate highway which runs 30 minutes southeast to the Twin Cities International Airport. Yet its 62 acres provide an appropriate isolation.

It is a part of . . . as well as simply *in* . . . the Twin Cities community. The intellectual and cultural resources of this innovative metropolitan region will be made available to the users of Spring Hill. Its business, civic and governmental institutions will, in turn, be enriched by the discussions which take place here.

Spring Hill can accomodate conferences of up to 100, and provides guest facilities for 61 persons.

The conference area contains one room adequate for 60 conferees and 40 observers, and two rooms for 30 conferees each.

The guest rooms are arranged for privacy. There are 51 single rooms, each with its own bath and individually-controlled air conditioning. There are five double rooms.

There is a main lounge, a gallery, within the guest room area, four meeting lounges for informal discussion. There is a library, which can be supplemented with resource materials for a particular conference.

The dining room seats 60. Overflow space is available for an additional 40. Refreshments are served either in the lounges, around the fireplace, or outdoors on the terrace.

There are also facilities for relaxation and recreation. There is a fine tennis court, an outdoor pool, a sauna and exercise room . . . and an opportunity for walks across the surrounding fields or through the pines down to the lake.

The center is interested in encouraging discussions which probe the political, social, economic and other aspects of the fundamental changes occuring in our institutions . . . which project these changes toward the end of the century and of the millenium . . . and which examine—in relation to basic human values—both the issues raised by the efforts to direct this change, and the choices that will be required.

Spring Hill is particularly concerned with conferences which bring together a diversity of backgrounds . . . individuals working in different fields who will come, in the course of their sessions, to a larger understanding of the interrelationships of their various disciplines and activities.

A full-time professional staff assists in the preparation of conferences to be conducted by others . . . and prepares and conducts conferences sponsored by Spring Hill itself. For those responsible for the conference, audio-visual equipment, secretarial services and duplicating services are provided.

We welcome inquiries about the center and about its program . . . both of which are available to a broad range of organizations for discussions that share our purposes.

SPRING HILL: A CONFERENCE CENTER FOR SERIOUS PURPOSES

Spring Hill Conference Center serves two basic purposes. First, its facilities are available for rental by organizations and groups for all types of conferences and meetings which are compatible with the general policies of the Center. Second, Spring Hill will conduct its own program: (a) by sponsoring its own conferences, and (b) by serving as a catalyst to stimulate or assist—through subsidy or co-sponsorship—conferences arranged by other organizations.

With these goals in mind, Spring Hill expects to attract conferences of state, national and world leaders to discuss and make contributions toward resolving major questions and problems of our society.

In the quality of both its facilities and its own conference programs, Spring Hill Conference Center intends to become at least comparable with such other leading conference centers as Airlie House, Washington, D.C.; Arden House, Harriman, New York; Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin; and the Aspen Institute, Aspen, Colorado.

For more than a decade, leading Twin City business and professional people have recognized the need for a conference center in the metropolian-Twin City area. Unlike other major metropolitan areas in America, the Twin Cities do not now provide an executive conference center where men and women have an opportunity to address themselves to serious, constructive purposes in appropriate facilities.

In January of 1970 the Wood-Rill Foundation engaged John G. Fischer, former administrator of Wayzata Community Church, to begin researching the possibilities for development of such a center. His search confirmed favorable interest in such a development on the part of the academic and cultural communities, corporations and associations. The University of Minnesota, Augsburg College, Minneapolis Urban Coalition, Minnesota State Arts Council, the Minnesota Executive Program, the Walker Art Center, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, American Society of Training Directors, and many others have already made inquiries of the center's availability.

In selecting a site for the proposed center, the words "accessible isolation" were used as a major criteria. The John Cowles, Jr. property on Long Lake in Orono, Minnesota, which became available in 1971, meets this criteria superbly. The Cowles house is readily adaptable to a conference center, and there is ample room for additional housing and conference facilities.

The environment of the 62-acre country tract of land provides the appropriate atmosphere. Conferees will be free to work and relax without distraction. A tennis court, swimming pool, gymnasium, and walking paths will offer contrast to the conference sessions themselves. Aesthetically, as the style of its architecture suggests, Spring Hill will be a place of simplicity and serenity, a setting conducive to creative inter-action of its conferees.

Functionally, Spring Hill Conference Center will fulfill a definite community need. It will be designed for meetings and conferences; it will be a center that will serve as a program catalyst, bringing together the intellectual and cultural resources of the area; and it will be an organization that will, through its own staff and directors, originate its own programs.

Spring Hill Conference Center is being developed for the benefit and use of all cultural and charitable agencies in the area, as well as service groups, business and government. Already inquiries have been received from many organizations for additional information and possible dates for proposed conferences, which indicates the potential high degree of usage. Construction of the center is planned for completion in September of 1972. Advance reservations will begin April 1, 1972; and it is expected that some smaller, day group meetings will begin in the summer of 1972.

PROGRAMATIC GOALS

Never before has man had greater freedom of choice. Never before have the choices been so numerous, complicated, and fraught with awesome consequences for the future. The technologic skills produced by our exploding knowledge have made almost routine man's historic objective of mere physical survival: food, clothing, protection from the elements and "natural" diseases, etc. Given some restructuring and redistribution of physical wealth, plus reasonable birth rates, mere survival need no longer be a primary concern of this Earth's population. Some of the new questions are: survival for what? Are "bigger," "faster" and "more" necessarily "better"? What do we now mean by progress?

If preservation of the species is now routine—barring nuclear accident or ecologic cataclysm—what might be man's new goals, priorities, value systems? What are the possible new objectives and what are the various ways to move toward them? What are the choices now? What will they be next year? In five years? In thirty years?

The physical "wealth" of this Earth, whether in the form of gold, water or uranium, is, within the human time frame, finite: the Earth's mass and energy are not expandable in perceptible human terms. Relatively, man's knowledge—the new wealth—may well be unlimited. But knowledge which has made possible man's new condition of free choice is also offering, or requiring man to make, many choices that are difficult to make because the subject matter is not familiar and/or the consequences are not clear and/or one or more of the choices conflicts with possibly obsolescent mores shaped during earlier stages of man's evolution.

The accelerating rate of change produced by our exploding knowledge, the multiplicity and interaction of the new choices, and the relative irreversibility of some of these choices (e.g. ecology, genetics) all require the longest possible "lead time" for these choices to be considered by all persons who might be involved or affected. The human psyche is not a computer: we need time to think, to speculate, to investigate, to choose, to adjust, to prepare. Nor can we safely assume that either the human mind or body is infinitely adaptable. The further ahead we can see, the sooner we shall be able to see what our limits might be, and modify our choices accordingly.

Spring Hill's conference program will try to provide this lead time by formulating and disseminating clear descriptions and/or evaluations and/or advocacy of the alternatives and choices that will increasingly confront, or become available to, the citizens of our region, nation and Earth.

Spring Hill will *not* have its own "master plan," though its sympathies might lean more toward pragmatism, heterogeneity, freedom, justice and individualism than toward ideology, homogeneity, security, efficiency or collectivism.

Spring Hill's objective will be to encourage and assist maximum feasible self-government at all levels of our society—from a private citizen's choice of life style to a President's formulation and ranking of national goals, from city councils and school boards to the chambers of the United Nations.

The center's conferences, in general, will tend to (a) formulate and reconcile goals before specifying solutions to real or putative problems, (b) reflect the systemic nature of man's existence by drawing upon all relevant disciplines, (c) recognize that generalists who can synthesize are as necessary as specialists who can analyze, and (d) seek means to reconcile conflicting value systems with a minimum of coercion and a maximum of individual freedom.

In thinking about the future and man's choices, Spring Hill will encourage specificity, application and alternatives: priority will be given to the possible applications of theoretical knowledge and artistic creativity to the improvement of definable spheres of social life, as contrasted with efforts at theory building as such, or speculation about the future as a whole. The spectrum of conferences might include such topics as: new modes of continuing education, socialization of the arts, the judicial system in American life, the changing nature and roles of various professions in modern society.

Our firm intention is that the center to be located here contribute in a major way to the intellectual life of the people living and working here. Spring Hill must be *of* this community, as well as *in* it. We will search for opportunities for individuals and for organizations here to participate in the discussions taking place at the center, even where these are sponsored by non-local groups. And we will try to see that the results of discussions here become available to this community. The persons coming to Spring Hill will represent a tremendous resource; this community can benefit enormously from opportunities we can develop to talk with them. We believe they can benefit, in turn, from an exposure to the changes occurring—in governmental organization, in social institutions, in private institutions—in this remarkably innovative Twin Cities area.

## NATIONAL FREEDOM OF THE PRESS DAY

## HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, June 7, 1972*

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, today, June 7, is National Freedom of the Press Day.

In the course of a year's time thousands of observations are held in America honoring this group or that, commemorating one anniversary or another, paying tribute to the various and sundry organizations to whom it is felt tribute is due. More often than not due recognition is given to these groups and organizations and observations detailing their exploits are found here in the pages of the RECORD. They serve to remind us, if we need reminding, that not all the good that is done, not all the causes that are served, not all the worthy endeavors undertaken, necessarily commence here in the two Houses of the Congress. To say to us that the greatness of America is found in the diversity of our institutions and in the worthiness of the good and just deeds they perform.

But today, Mr. Speaker, is a special day, seeking as it does to call attention to that one American institution which more than any other shores up our freedom—the press.

No group of men or women are more consistently maligned in this Nation than members of the press or more faulted for the ills that affect our society. Not even politicians, upon whose heads coals of fire are constantly poured, suffer as much from the citizenry as do the press. And yet, there is no freedom where there is an absence of a free press. So the very freedom that makes possible this maligning of the press is safeguarded by none other than the press itself.

Now the press, suffering no more abnormalities then the rest of us, chafes somewhat under this collective criticism, but understands in its more somber moments, the necessity of it. Within the past several years a spate of monthly and quarterly publications have arisen serving no other purpose than to cast a critical eye on the performance of the daily press. These journals—they appear in such places as Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Los Angeles, and other cities—vary in size and scope and publishing schedules, but they all seek one primary objective—to keep the press from becoming too complacent. There is no certain measure to their success, but rather a certain measure to their need.

The bottom line of this is our very great need for the press to be free. Thomas Jefferson spoke of the press being chequered about with many abuses, but he knew better than most men, even vilified as he often was by the press, of America's dependence upon it as a means of keeping our freedom. I do not know of a time when our need for the press was greater than today. I say that because of the extraordinary hostility displayed toward the press by the Nixon administration. Flora Lewis wrote some days ago that the Nixon game is to "beat the press." I agree. it disturbs me, this line of attack, for the power of any administration to intimidate the press, is very great.

The press, in most cases—it should be said—does not appear to be backing down. We must hope the opposite never happens. Not if we wish to maintain our freedom.

Today, Mr. Speaker, when we honor the Freedom of the Press Day, I think the words of John Adams worth recalling:

> But none of the means of information are more sacred, or have been cherished with more tenderness and care by the settlers of America, than the press. Care has been taken that the art of printing should be encouraged, and that it should be easy and cheap and safe for any person to communicate his thoughts to the public. And you, Messieurs printers, whatever the tyrants of the earth may say of your papers, have done important service to your country by your readiness and freedom in publishing the speculations of the curious. The stale, impudent insinuations of slander and sedition with which the gormandizers of power have endeavored to discredit your paper are so much more to your honor; for the jaws of power are always opened to devour, and her arm is always stretched out, if possible, to destroy the freedom of thinking, speaking, and writing.

# SENATE—*Thursday, June 8, 1972*

The Senate met in executive session at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, to whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, we thank Thee for the cleansing of the morning hours and for the bright promise of the new day. May this day begin, continue, and end in Thee that we may worthily magnify Thy holy name. Grant to Thy servants in this place grace to hear with discrimination and to speak with wisdom, so that all their actions being ordered by Thy governance, this Nation may be ably served and Thy kingdom advanced.

Through Him whose name is above every name. Amen.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate adjourned in executive session last night, hence it is convening in executive session today; but under the unanimous-consent agreement, the following legislative business will be transacted as in legislative session.

First, the Senate will receive a message from the President.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 7, 1972, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 802, S. 2987.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EISENHOWER MEMORIAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2987) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make grants to Eisenhower College, Seneca Falls, N.Y., out of the proceeds of the sale of minted proof dollar coins bearing the likeness of the late President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I urge passage of S. 2987, the bill I introduced on December 10, 1971, in which Senators PASTORE, GOLDWATER, and FANNIN joined me as cosponsor. This legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make a grant to the Eisenhower College in Seneca Falls, N.Y., of $1 from the proceeds received from the sale of each "proof" Eisenhower silver dollar being sold for $10 to collectors.

In 1963, the late President Eisenhower agreed to the establishment of Eisenhower College as a living, permanent memorial to his years of service to the Nation in war and in peace. In subsequent years, the Eisenhower family and close friends have actively supported the establishment of the school, its development, and the funds necessary for its success. They have been joined by some 12,000 donors who have contributed more than $7 million to the college.

Among individuals who submitted testimony in support of the bill were Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Mrs. Mamie Eisenhower, John Eisenhower of the family, and such close personal friends as Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, and Gen. Lauris Norstad. Organization support came from such varied sources as the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the AFL–CIO. This testimony gives emphasis to the fact that the college is the Nation's memorial to the late Dwight D. Eisenhower and is not to be confused in any way with legislation to aid an institution of higher education, which like so many others, is in financial need.

In 1968, Congress enacted Public Law 90–563 providing $5 million for the Eisenhower College on a matching basis. This amount has been matched by foundation, corporate, and individual gifts and pledges. The $20 million anticipated from this bill for the sale of "proof" Eisenhower silver dollar coins would supplement the $5 million appropriated in 1968. Some $46 million in Federal funds has been expended on construction, bonds, and land acquisition for the Kennedy Center.