

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be major

Bardill, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beck, Wilbur L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beckley, Leander K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bonner, Harry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boston, Lester E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boyd, William M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brady, Patrick H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brewer, Jerry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, Perry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Burton, Nelson L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carter, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cobbs, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cohen, Meyer W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Corn, Poe R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Covell, Bruce W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Crow, Kenneth E., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cygan, Herbert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Diffie, Dale P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dix, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dryden, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Duffy, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dupuy, Lloyd C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fain, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fechner, Ruben F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gilchrist, Alexander, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Giroux, Arthur R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Good, Roger S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grodt, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gutin, Howard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Habeck, Edgar J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hanson, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harris, Leonard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hatfield, Earl P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hayes, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Helgeson, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Heller, Kyle M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Helser, Carl W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Higgs, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hill, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hoke, Mark L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hubbard, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jackson, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jenkins, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, Harry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, John P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keim, Walter H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kelling, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx

Kennan, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kielman, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lampert, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lander, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lanier, Daniel, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Lavalley, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Leach, William O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Madden, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McLeod, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Milske, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moore, Douglas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Murphy, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Odonnell, Frank P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Osborne, Harold S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Paul, C. Peter, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Payne, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Picha, Norbert O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pittman, Thurman M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Proe, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roberts, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rockwell, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Roles, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rumley, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Schiefer, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Short, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Simpson, Calbrieth, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sites, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slyman, George L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sobocinski, Philip, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Summary, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, Edward J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tuten, William E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Marvin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Jack R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wilson, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Woods, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wunder, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be major

Allen, Nina R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baker, Gertrude E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Balkema, Sarah A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berry, Dorothy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bradley, George P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brown, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Campman, Keith L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fore, Curtis W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ghrvan, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx

Goldsmith, Marie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gonzales, Luis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gosling, Bernandine, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hawkins, Roberta W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hill, Perry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hines, Eugene D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Huber, James O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kamensky, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kelley, Joan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Martin, Melvin M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Matthews, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McLeod, Darlene K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nakama, Shizuko, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pavlakovic, Dorothy, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Petro, Andrew P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rando, Joseph T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rasmussen, Doris S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rausch, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reddy, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Scheerer, Marjorie, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Segura, Maria, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Seufert, Helen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sinclair, Janie A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Soltys, Anthony W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Vancamp, Maryanne, xxx-xx-xxxx
 West, Nina, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Whitmire, Betty A., xxx-xx-xxxx

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be major

Brady, Barbara R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carmona, Louis S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cover, Joseph D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hamal, Fay S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hummel, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Pavlis, Patricia M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walker, Hilda L., xxx-xx-xxxx

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 12, 1972:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Thomas Patrick Melady, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, we are celebrating on June 21 a Salute to Education sponsored by the National Education Association, and as my contribution to that Salute, I wish to describe briefly the tremendous impact that several dedicated individuals in the teaching profession have had on my particular life. It would be difficult to mention all teachers during my career in public education that had a meaningful impact upon the direction my life has taken because there were many. As a matter of fact, I suppose there was no period of time in my life where more people contributed more in assisting me in selecting the course that my future life would take than was the period of public education that began for me in Antioch, Calif., continued through the elementary and secondary schools in Antioch, and after a brief interruption for service in World War II, resumed at Santa Rosa

Junior College and then the University of California at Berkeley, and culminated in my receiving my L.L.B. degree at the University of California School of Law, Boalt Hall.

But, during that long period of time, I believe the most important impressions upon me as an individual were those contacts that I had with some deeply dedicated teachers in the elementary and secondary system in Antioch.

Among those were Betsy Lull, a high school teacher brought out of retirement to teach in the Antioch school system and whom I had for world history and Latin. I acquired a love of history from Miss Lull that has not diminished since that time.

Jack Danilovich, my high school coach, and his ultimate bride, Alice Walsh, my junior high school teacher, were two individuals that have had an enormous impact upon my attitudes toward life in general and who have, in addition, remained close personal friends offering me continuous direction and assistance in any of my endeavors.

Normally you would not expect a typing teacher to contribute much towards attitudes or philosophy, but that certainly was not the case with Marion

Beede, my typing teacher in high school. Mrs. Beede did much to shape my views on a variety of attitudes toward life in general, both while I was in her class in high school as well as during the many years that have passed subsequent to those days.

Mrs. Arch Roberts was a third grade teacher of mine and inculcated in me, even at that early age, a respect for education and teachers that I possessed throughout the rest of my school days and that I possess even now as a result thereof.

Wayne Hawkins, the Dean of Boys at Antioch High School, and Mr. Swenson, my chemistry teacher, were two of the few male teachers in the public school system of those days, and their direction has meant much to me to this very day.

I do not mean to exclude by this brief list the very many other teachers and professors with whom I came in contact during my time pursuing an education, and who contributed so much to me, but there were so many that it would be awkward to attempt to list them all.

In short, Mr. Speaker, what I am attempting to say is that aside from my parents, no group of people had greater impact upon my life and the di-

rections it has taken and will take in the future than those dedicated teachers who attempted with varying degrees of success to impart to me their values.

Our system of public education is indeed a valuable and important institution that has done much to hold this Nation together as one nation with common ideals and objectives and at the same time has recognized and is beginning to recognize even more clearly that diversity of backgrounds and cultures in no way diminishes the unity that we possess in America as one nation of diverse peoples.

What we are as a nation is largely attributable in terms of its positive aspects to what we as individuals learned about ourselves and our neighbors in the public education system. What we will be as a nation and what we can be as a nation will be largely dependent upon the successful continuation of that responsibility by the dedicated and committed teachers of this country who man the most important posts in the institution of public education.

WHERE "LIVIN" IS EASY

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the cost of living is on every one's mind these days. Some people have even looked into the places in this country where living costs are the lowest, hoping at the first opportunity to move to one of them.

Some interesting recent living cost figures were released after a study by the U.S. Department of Labor. The details of the study reveal the marked advantages of Southern living, amounting to annual savings of \$425 to \$2,500.

This saving is substantial enough to encourage people to think about the South when work opportunities appear, or retirement age rolls around.

The Savannah News of May 15, 1972, quoted an editorial from the Augusta Chronicle-Herald, entitled "Where Livin' is Easy," as follows:

WHERE "LIVIN" IS EASY

Readers who glanced at a recent wire news service story on the trends in average family living costs, may have been impressed only by the extent of the upward shift from spring 1970 to fall 1971.

Getting one's teeth into the details of the U.S. Department of Labor study, however, can provide far more food for thought. Those details demonstrate dramatically the marked advantages of Southern living. They offer tangible evidence, as well, of the flimsy nature of the labor bosses' drive to force the same wage-scale in a Georgia city as in ice-bound Minneapolis, and of professional welfareists' efforts to compel payment of the same number of dollars to the South Carolina rural welfare family with orchard and garden plots at hand, as to the family living in a New York City slum.

In studying 38 mainland American metropolitan areas, it was found that the typical medium level of a four-member family budget in Atlanta ranked 36th in size (the austere budget there ranking 35th, and the more

opulent budget 37th). It was found also that in non-metropolitan areas, the averages in the South were well below the national averages, being for the low, middle and high standards as follows: \$6,694, \$6,267; \$9,805; \$9,180; \$13,657; \$12,742.

As for Southern cities comparable to Atlanta, the respective finding for the national metropolitan averages and Atlanta (in low, middle and high brackets for families of four) offer similar contrasts: \$7,330, \$6,681, \$11,232, \$9,813; \$16,408; \$13,883.

Certainly, the cost of living is up. In Atlanta during the time covered, it rose approximately 5.5 per cent. The fact is documented, however, that you live in the South on comparable standards, at anywhere from about \$425 to about \$2,500 less money.

This accounts, in part, for the present migration of population to many parts of the South.

MEMORIAL DAY TRIBUTE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, Jim McCarthy, Washington bureau manager for CBS radio, delivered on Memorial Day, May 29, a most thoughtful and moving address honoring the memory of those who helped make possible American freedom.

Mr. McCarthy's tribute to those who died in defense of freedom is worthy of the attention of every Member of the House.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that they take here the opportunity to read it.

The tribute follows:

MEMORIAL DAY TRIBUTE

This is Memorial Day, or Decoration Day as it was called for many years—and for those too young to know its history and origin, I'd like to tell its story.

Memorial Day started in the mid-1800's when wives and mothers of Southern servicemen who died in the War Between the States laid garlands of flowers across the graves of their husbands and sons in remembrance. Early in May of 1865, the adjutant general of the Grand Army of the Republic, an organization of Union veterans, had witnessed this ceremony in several of the Southern States, and recommended to the GAR's Commander-in-Chief, General John Logan, that their organization make arrangements to similarly decorate the graves of Union soldiers throughout the United States on a uniform date. General Logan approved the plan ordering all GAR posts to "strew flowers and otherwise decorate the graves of their departed comrades on May 30th" . . . an order generally obeyed, especially in the smaller communities.

Memorial Day was not a legal holiday in any of the states until veterans of New York state succeeded in persuading their legislators to pass an act in 1873, designating the thirtieth day of May, to be known as Decoration Day, as "one of the public holidays for all purposes whatsoever." Other states quickly followed New York; and in the course of time, the Congress established holidays should be three-day weekends, so Memorial Day falls on the 29th this year.

At the National Cemeteries in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, and Arlington, Virginia, the ceremonies have come to be a celebration of national unity. Five presidents have spoken on the Gettysburg battlefield on Memorial Day since President Lincoln delivered his Gettysburg address November 19, 1863. The

first was Rutherford B. Hayes; the last was Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In his 1934 address at Gettysburg, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt used the words of our first president, George Washington, in his plea for national unity . . . "The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any other appellation derived from local discrimination" . . . and he closed with the words . . . "My brethren, if we know one another, we will love one another" . . . words appropos for this time and day.

This day, established to honor the memory of those who died in the Civil War, has come to be observed in memory of the dead from succeeding wars . . . the World Wars, Korea and now Vietnam. And as taps echo over the rolling hills of our national cemeteries on this Memorial Day, let us pause for a moment to pay tribute to those who have died that we might continue to live in freedom.

In my son's bedroom there hangs a motto dedicated to those we honor on Memorial Day. I'd like to share it with you. "If their deaths have provided anything beyond question, they assured us freedom. Other people don't have it in many parts of the world, but we do . . . and we have it only because we were willing to fight to preserve it. However, we have no God-given first mortgage on liberty. Whatever liberty we have ever had we had to fight to maintain . . . and there is no assurance that we won't be tested again. To those who gave their lives that we might live free from tyranny, we may only pledge that we will hand that freedom on to their posterity . . . a freedom for which they died and a freedom they placed trustingly in the hands of those of us who lived."

THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA: REMARKS OF HON. LESTER WOLFF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 4, Congressman LESTER WOLFF addressed the Jewish members of the graduating class at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, N.Y. His remarks are extremely poignant and directed to a subject of great current concern, the role of the professional military man in American society today. It was delivered in the Academy's chapel and was well received by over 100 cadets who were in attendance. I believe that it behooves all Members to read the remarks of my friend and colleague, the Honorable LESTER WOLFF of New York.

The address follows:

THE SPIRIT OF AMERICA

Let me begin by saying that I am honored to be here and to have been asked to share these few, but significant, moments with you in final preparation for a great event—your graduation.

I know of no other academic institution in America that symbolizes excellence more than West Point or none possessing a greater tradition.

I want to spend a few moments today talking with you about the "Spirit of America," and what that means to the defense of this Nation.

It was Pericles who said:

"If Athens shall appear great to you, consider then that her glories were purchased by valiant men who learned their duty."

It is a single honor to graduate from West Point and to join so great an array of alumni—Lee, Grant, Pershing, MacArthur, Patton, Eisenhower—whose careers crowned America with greatness and glory.

The world facing you is vastly different from the one faced by those celebrated graduates of yesterday who went from these plains high above the Hudson to serve their country, secure in the knowledge that there was no higher task they could undertake than to become a professional soldier. But today no West Point graduate can expect what was pro forma before—gratitude from America. Indeed, in some quarters you will confront the greatest contempt, representing as you do a professional military elite—the object now of so much scorn and abuse.

The road ahead of you is an uncertain one, filled with an extraordinary void as to what Americans want from the military as an institution or what it expects from those of you who will one day be chosen to lead the Army of the United States. This uncertainty is by no means confined to the military alone, but affects much of American society.

In this difficult and troubled time, Americans are asking questions that in a simpler past they took for granted. Our institutions are under attack and our values are being challenged. People want to know what has gone wrong with America? They wonder whether the burden of world leadership is worth our bearing any longer? Mistrust is everywhere and we doubt today what we once believed. Change is rampant, much of it unprecedented, and no institution is safe from its reach—most certainly not the military.

As a public figure I know something about change because I was first elected to Congress on the theme that change was needed and that time had passed my opponent by. He argued for the status quo, but that wasn't good enough, and he lost. But even I did not anticipate the measure of change that was coming or the swiftness of its arrival. But change is here and many of our institutions—and more than a few politicians—are badly shaken by it.

My purpose, however, is not to talk about change in the abstract. But rather to discuss its effect upon the military and more importantly—its effect upon you.

The great demand for military change has been occasioned by one principal, overriding concern—the war in Vietnam.

The low state of military morale in America has been brought about by this hopelessly protracted conflict wherein no clear, consistent definition of purpose has ever emerged.

Our reasons for being in Vietnam are as changing as the tides of American public opinion. It has been a war fought for political purposes, governed by political decisions, enforced by Presidents who were and are unsure why we are there or what it is we are fighting for. They have spoken of "peace with honor," but we have neither "peace" nor "honor." They have promised "light at the end of the tunnel," but there is only unending darkness. Everyone from Spiro Agnew to Bob Hope has said the "end is near," but a disbelieving American public has repeatedly found the opposite true.

But I did not come here today to this Citadel of military excellence to catalogue once more the evils of the Vietnam war: To cite again what it has cost this country; to remind you of the divisions it has produced; to call attention to the cynicism it has spawned; nor have I come as one more Congressman to tell you that I told you so.

I am not here to castigate the military, to heap coals of fire upon your heads, to warn you of the dangerous consequences ahead because of the folly of Vietnam. Far be it for me or anyone else to hold the Army of the United States up to ridicule or to blame the American military for this Nation's fall-

ure in Southeast Asia. The failure of Vietnam may not be laid at the doorstep of the military, but rather the blame must be placed where it belongs—with those who bear the ultimate responsibility for deciding when and where and under what circumstances America goes to war. In short, we politicians are to blame.

It has become very easy to blame the military for the Vietnam quagmire, to accuse this general or that, to make the Joint Chiefs of Staff appear as some select group of fools.

How easy for the President, any President, to say, "My generals misled me." Generals were never meant to make policy, their duty is but to enforce those decisions made by the executive—for that is both the genius and glory of our system.

I am not suggesting that generals do not make mistakes, for they as a group are no less infallible than other men, but they cannot be accused of having led us into Vietnam, for that decision was never theirs to make in the first place. We cannot blame Westmoreland because of Lyndon Johnson, nor Abrams because of Richard Nixon. No, the generals and their armies are not to blame.

There is another myth that needs putting down: To be anti-Vietnam does not mean that one is therefore anti-military or to believe Vietnam to be folly is not to believe the military foolish. No greater myth comes out of Vietnam than the myth of duplicity on the part of the military for getting us in or leading us on. How wrong then to say, "the military is to blame."

I will tell you when the tide of American public opinion turned against the war: It was when President Johnson said that "we are not trying to win a military victory." Americans said if we are not trying to win, then what are we fighting for?

When President Johnson made that statement the moral pretext of our involvement in Vietnam was forever stripped away. Americans understand fighting to win. But they neither understand or support policies that send our soldiers half a world away to fight and die for a cause that has already been decreed as not worth winning.

Here then is the moral bankruptcy of American policy in Vietnam: The Government of the United States conscripts young men to wage war, to confront the possibility of death, while being unwilling for political reasons to give a similar commitment.

What kind of people do our leaders think we are that we should support a policy that engages in such moral double-dealing while they wrap it in the flag and remind us of our duty to be patriotic.

Any time any nation finds that it must remind its citizens to be loyal, to hold up the flag, to be patriotic, it has already lost whatever right it had to expect such displays of patriotism. George Washington warned to "guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism." And one might add: To guard against those who call for patriotism to support immoral policies.

Was Lincoln forced to remind the Army of the Potomac to be patriotic? Was Churchill called upon to instruct British soldiers on their duty to England? Were pleas needed by Stalin to turn back Hitler at the gates of the Kremlin? Does Golda Meir find it necessary to admonish the Israeli Army of its responsibilities? Did MacArthur have to urge his men to retake the Philippines?

The answer to all of these questions is the same and you know it as well as I do. It is no! For the difference between America today and those other nations—both past and present—is singular in nature and yet overwhelming in its consequences—a clear definition of purpose.

The military in America needs to be reassured of the fundamental rightness of those objectives they are assigned to ac-

complish. No such fundamental rightness has ever been evident in Vietnam. All of us, every American and every American institution, has suffered grievously as a result of this failure to define our goal. We failed because we did not know what our purpose was in the beginning and we do not know today—so long after the fact. The military has been forced to bear much of the blame and out of this unjust assignment of responsibility has come the demands for change. Committing the Armed Forces of a democracy such as ours to limited wars that are essentially no-win by definition, but then demanding a military victory is a serious dichotomy of purpose contributing mightily to the virtual collapse of spirit within our Armed Forces.

This loss of spirit is a greater threat to America and freedom than all the combined might of all the potential foes in the world. It is this more than any other single thing the American military needs to regain, for the spirit of America to soar again is more important than for the latest advance weapon system to be funded by the Congress. Surely the men and women of our Armed Forces understand this and equally understand their own dependence upon it.

I said that I wanted to talk to you about change and its relationship to you and the Army. The change that I refer to is not the fear of change, but that which masks itself as change when in fact it is nothing less than a destructive force. That which seeks to undermine confidence in our Armed Forces and tries to create the impression that the military tiger must be leashed. The military has been blamed for failures that belong more readily with those who wish to escape responsibility for the disaster of Vietnam—and we understand why they wish to avoid responsibility.

But the Armed Forces of this Nation has been blamed too long for too much at the hands of too few. No national purpose is served by damning the military. The future of America cannot be safe if those who wear the colors of this Nation are made objects of ridicule and contempt.

The change that we welcome, the change that you must welcome, is that which builds a better America, that strengthens rather than weakens America. This change will not come through ridicule or contempt, it will not be realized by creating straw men or the false assignment of blame.

Your duty, the duty that Pericles spoke of, is that of a devoted public servant—in the best tradition of those great military figures who held themselves above ambition, either personally or parochially. The good of America must be paramount in your desires and the interest of this Nation must be placed above that of your service. You must seek only to serve your fellow citizens. To work for the commonweal. You know, finally, what your duty is—for there is where your glory lies. It is our responsibility, our charge, to define that duty for you—and I pledge to you that we shall.

I wish to conclude with these lines from William James and hope that you will not think him inappropriate to such an occasion:

"Democracy is still upon its trial, the civic genius of our people is its only bulwark, and neither laws nor monuments, neither battle-ships nor public libraries, nor great newspapers, nor booming stocks; neither mechanical inventions nor political adroitness, nor churches, nor universities can save us from degeneration if the inner mystery be lost. That mystery, at once our secret and our glory, consists in nothing but two common habits . . . one of them is the habit of trained and disciplined good temper towards the opposite party when it fairly wins its inning. The other is that of fierce and merciless resentment towards every man or set of men who breaks the public peace."

THE FOODMAKERS

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the next time the leaders of the food industry convene, do not be surprised if they pay only brief lip service to nutrition and then turn their full attention to that overriding concern, profit.

Perhaps they will even toast their treasuries with a concoction of fumaric acid, sugar, monosodium phosphate, ascorbic acid, propylene glycol, artificial flavor and color, calcium carbonate, and dioctyl sodium sulfosuccinate. Sound strange? Like the formula of some mad Karlofian chemist? Perhaps you know it best by another name—Kool-Aid.

Profit is the name of the game in the \$125-billion-a-year food industry. Not nutrition. And it is played with a combination of some 3,900 chemical additives, a majority of which are of little or no nutritional value to those who consume them—often unknowingly because of lax labeling laws—and some of which may even be very harmful.

The story is told in a pamphlet by two associates of the Center for Science in the Public Interest, Dr. Michael Jacobson and Rita Poretsky. It points up not only the need for full disclosure of ingredients, but also of the need for better nutritional information about the food we eat and thorough testing of all chemical additives. I am inserting their report in the Record at this point.

The report follows:

THE FOODMAKERS

(By Michael Jacobson and Rita Poretsky)

The American people are fed by a \$125 billion a year food industry. The components of this industry range in size from the Mom 'n' Pop store on the corner to the billion dollar a year giants like Swift, General Foods, and ITT-Continental Baking.

The Foodmakers are run by men (few women) who are concerned primarily with profits, not nutrition. If nutritious foods happen to be profitable, fine; if non-nutritious foods are more profitable, these will be sold. General Foods has an official "nutrition policy" that begins: "General Foods recognizes its responsibility for the nutrient content of the food products it produces," but it

manufactures and advertises such junk as Kool-Aid,¹ Jell-O,² and Cool Whip Swiggle.³ The companies which provide us with our daily nutrients have the general policy that all their foods will be nutritious, except for those that aren't.

Foods these days are frequently developed by food scientists rather than grown by farmers. And it is these scientists who bear a good deal of responsibility for the nutritional catastrophes that line the supermarket shelves. Food scientists, after studying nutrition and biochemistry for several years at universities, trade their ideas to the Foodmakers in return for security and salary. Their independence and influence within the corporate framework is nil: if they are told by the marketing people to produce Swiggle, they produce Swiggle . . . or it's good-bye. And if Swiggle does nothing for the dietary needs of the millions of Americans who are nutritionally and financially impoverished, too bad.

While food scientists share the blame for unwholesome or non-nutritious foods, they do not share greatly in the profits made on these foods. Many food executives make more money in one year than a scientist (let alone a production worker or secretary) will earn in his or her entire lifetime. Donald M. Kendall, for instance, the chairman PepsiCo (Pepsi Cola, Fritos, etc.) and a close friend of Richard Nixon, had a salary in 1971 of \$199,200 plus a \$99,700 bonus; in addition he raked in two million dollars in the past five years on stock option deals. How much Kendall collects from real estate, dividends, stock sales, etc., is anyone's guess.

Because foods like Kaboom and Cool 'n' Creamy do not serve a real need, Foodmakers must create a need in order to reap profits. This, of course, is done through advertising. The advertising drives up food costs, making food even more expensive for those who need it most. At a time when our cities are decaying, our environment disintegrating, and millions of people ill-housed and ill-fed, the Foodmakers spend an astonishing \$2 billion a year on advertising—a large fraction on non-nutritious "fun" foods. Coca Cola and PepsiCo each spend \$37 million a year to promote their cariogenic products; in 1971 General Foods spent \$4 million to promote

¹ Kool-Aid ingredients: fumaric acid, sugar, mono-sodium phosphate, ascorbic acid, propylene glycol, artificial flavor and color, calcium carbonate, dioctyl sodium sulfosuccinate.

² Jell-O: sugar, gelatin, adipic acid, sodium citrate, fumaric acid, artificial flavor and color, natural flavor, BHA.

³ Cool Whip Swiggle: water, hydrogenated oils, sugar, vanilla, sodium caseinate, dextrose, polysorbate 60, sorbitan monostearate, guar gum, artificial color and flavor.

Jell-O. Compounding the problem is the fact that much of this advertising is directed at children, who are seen as easy prey by those whose line of business is "brand indoctrination." General Foods spent as much on advertising as the whole state of Nevada spent on all its public schools. General Mills' 1971 advertising budget was millions bigger than the budget of FDA's Bureau of Foods. (Amazingly, despite fat advertising budgets and market research, 9 out of 10 new products are flops; the costs of these failures are, of course, borne by the consumer.)

The nutritional quality of foods mentioned on the following pages cannot be summarized. Some foods are wholesome and nutritious; others are non-nutritive at best, health hazards at worst. Probably the worst foods are the soft drinks, with their sugar or saccharin, artificial coloring, brominated oils, acids, and total lack of vitamins, minerals, and protein. Some foods that are advertised as being highly nutritious—such as fortified breakfast cereals and some snack foods—are not wholesome. Many of them are essentially vitamin-coated, artificially-colored and flavored sugar pills, and ought to be avoided. Such foods, despite their nutrients, are conducive to tooth decay, obesity, heart disease, and cancer.

This, then, is a brief overview of America's Foodmakers.

Bon Appetit!

P.S.—What should you eat, you ask? Try fresh or frozen fruits, vegetables, fish, and meat; brown rice and whole wheat bread; cheese and skim milk. Note how little these healthy foods are advertised. Avoid anything with lots of sugar, artificial coloring, BHA or BHT, sodium nitrite. Soft drinks and processed meats are probably the two worst foods.

SUNDAY FACTS AND FIGURES

Total food industry sales: \$125 billion per year.

Total health-organic-natural food sales: \$100-400 million.

Total sales of pudding and gelatin desserts: \$250 million per year.

Expected family income during an entire lifetime: \$380,000.

America's annual dental bill: \$5 billion.

FDA 1972 budget: total \$103 million.

Bureau of Foods: \$43.8 million.

Total number of food additives: 3,900.

Permissible levels of food contamination:

Up to one rodent pellet per pint of wheat.
Up to 100 insect fragments or 8 rodent hairs per ounce (actually 25 gms.) of curry powder.

Up to 10 fruit fly eggs or 2 larvae per 100 gms. (3 ounces) of tomato juice.

Annual soft drink sales: \$6 billion.

Annual beer sales: \$6.5 billion.

Food allotment in the nation's 2nd wealthiest county (Mont. Co., Md.) for welfare recipients: \$0.16 per person per meal.

VITAL DATA ON AMERICA'S MAJOR FOODMAKERS

Name of company	1971 ad budget ¹	Rank as advertiser ¹	Top executives ²	Compensation ³	Products
American Home Products	\$95,972,200	4	W. Laporte, chairman H. Blades, executive vice president	\$290,000 \$ (2,680) 150,000 \$ (1,625)	Chef Boy-Ar-Dee, Jiffy Pop popcorn, Golden mustard, spaghetti dinners, ravioli, drugs, and household products.
Borden, Inc.	10,801,400	90	A. Marusi, chairman W. Olmstead, vice president E. Sullivan, vice president	192,000 \$ (3,496) 112,400 \$ (1,687) 112,400 \$ (1,687)	Dairy products, Cracker Jack, Campfire marshmallows, Wise potato chips, Cremora nondairy creamer, frozen meats and seafood, chemicals, cosmetics.
Campbell Soup Co.	31,691,000	30			Soups, Franco-American spaghetti and macaroni, V-8 juice, Swanson frozen dinners, Pepperidge Farm bread.
Carnation Co.	21,599,700	48	E. Stuart, chairman H. Olson, president	85,000 173,699	Instant breakfasts, powdered and evaporated milk, coffee-mate, hot cocoa mix, fresh dairy products, canned meat combinations.
Coca Cola Co.	37,134,600	21	J. Austin, chairman C. Duncan, executive vice president	250,000 161,720	Coca Cola, Fresca, Sprite, Tab, Fanta, Santitas coffee, tea, Minute Maid, Snow Crop, Hi-C.
CPC Internat. Inc.	17,842,600	63	H. Harder, chairman J. McKee, president	200,000 \$ (1,235) 170,833 \$ (2,232)	Products from corn refining, cornstarch, ready-to-eat meals, Hellmann's mayonnaise, Mazola corn oil, Skippy peanut butter, Rit fabric dyes, Niagara laundry starch, Nu-Soft fabric softener, Shinola shoe polish, chemicals, drugs.

Footnotes at end of article.

VITAL DATA ON AMERICA'S MAJOR FOODMAKERS—Continued

Name of company	1971 ad budget ¹	Rank as advertiser ¹	Top executives ²	Compensation ³	Products
Del Monte Corp. ⁴	\$9,599,100	98	Eames, president Landis, vice president Verby, vice president	\$138,162 85,800 103,458	Canned fruits and vegetables, dried prunes, raisins, snack foods frozen gourmet foods.
General Foods Corp.	104,793,700	2	C. Cook, chairman A. Larkin, president	292,000 212,000	Post, Birds-Eye, Jello, Alpha-Bits, Post Toasties, Fortified Oat Flakes, Frosted Rice Krinkles, Tang, Kool-Aid, Awake, Orange Plus, Cool-Whip, Dream-Whip topping mix, Burger Chef restaurants, Pet Foods (Gravy Train, Gainesburgers, etc.).
General Mills, Inc.	54,000,000	13	McFarland, president Summer, ex-vice president Kinney, ex-vice president	250,087 175,900 146,606	Total, Wheaties, Kaboom, Frankenberry, Count Chocula, Cheerios, Kix, Trix, Lucky Charms, luncheon meats, frozen convenience doughs, prepared baking mixes.
Heinz Co. ⁴	12,640,000	81	Gookin, president Allen, senior vice president Bogdanovich, president	262,060 126,760 126,924	Soups, catsup, frozen potato products: Ore-Ida, Tater-Tots, Golden Fries, Golden Crinkles; baby foods, Starkist tuna, beans, pickles, Nine Lives Cat Food.
ITT Corp.	27,702,600	35	Geneen, director Dunleavy, president	812,494 342,060	Continental Baking Co., Wonder bread, Hostess snacks, Morton frozen foods, Smithfield ham, Sheraton hotels, Hartford insurance etc.
Kellogg ⁴	36,035,500	24	Bennett, chairman Roll, chairman Harley, executive vice president Leaver, vice chairman	296,800 227,767 128,083 123,098	Corn Flakes, Rice Krispies, Frosted Flakes, Raisin Bran, Sugar Smacks, Special K, Cocoa Krispies, Salada foods, puddings, pie fillings, etc.
Kraftco Co.	41,511,900	16	G. Edwards, chairman W. Beers, president	318,616 251,462	Kraft cheese, Sealtest, Breyers, Breakstone, oils and shortenings, food bases, ind. chems. derived from fats.
McDonalds Corp. ⁴	26,411,800	37	Kroc, chairman Turner, president	175,000 114,188	Drive-in restaurants.
Nabisco Inc.	40,218,200	18	L. Bickmore, chairman R. Schaeberle, president	264,061 140,661	Lorna Doone, Oreo-Creme, Premium Saltines, Ritz, Nabisco, Shredded Wheat, Wheat and Rice Honeys, Chuckles.
Nestle	25,782,400	38	Mahoney, chairman Burnside, director Gelsthorpe, director	287,500 175,500 165,000	Milk products. Hunt's tomato sauce, Canada Dry, Wesson oil, Reddi-Whip, Snack Pak, Sloppy Joe sandwiches, Big John's Beans 'n Fixin's.
Norton-Simon ⁴	30,269,990	33	A. Pearson, president D. Kendall, chairman Keith, chairman	258,900 298,900 162,825	Pepsi-Cola, Diet Pepsi, Teem, Patio, Mountain Dew, Fritos Ruffles, Cheer-Tos, catsup, dips, Wilson sporting goods.
Pepsi Co. Inc.	36,726,100	64	Harold, president McLamore, president	135,687 103,785	Baking mixes, Funny Face drink mix, poultry, restaurants, cookbooks.
Pillsbury ⁴	16,723,700	1	Morgens, president Snow, vice president McElroy, chairman	486,495 278,974 309,640	Mainly a detergent and soap manufacturer (Tide, Ivory, Dash, Cheer, Crest, Gleam, Prell, Spic 'n Span), but also makes Crisco, Jif peanut butter, Duncan Hines baking mixes, Folger's coffee, and paper products Charmin, Pampers.
Procter & Gamble ⁴	197,832,800	43	Stuart, president D'Arcy, vice president Schell, vice president	288,011 203,358 181,413	Quaker Oats, Captain Crunch, Flako, Aunt Jemima, Ken-L-Ration, Puss 'n Boots, candies, toys, chemicals.
Quaker Oats ⁴	22,522,600	25	R. Dean, chairman W. Shapleigh, vice president Durkee, president	235,000 123,000 123,704	Feeds for livestock and poultry, Wheat Chex, Rice Chex, Frooties, Instant Ralston, Purina Chow, Jack-in-Box restaurants, Chicken of the Sea, processed soybeans.
Ralston Purina Co.	35,856,300	96	Crowley, vice president Wells, president Ridgway, vice president	86,125 145,700 126,447	Royal Crown Cola, Nehi, Diet-Rite, Gatorade.
Royal Crown Cola	9,686,600	72			7-Up, Diet 7-Up, Like.
Seven Up Co.	14,789,000	87			Primarily drug manufacturing but also makes Beech-Nut babyfoods, Life-Savers, Tetley tea, Sweeta sweetener, and perfumes: My Sin, Arpege.
Squibb Co.	11,404,100	69	H. Weigl, president O. Applegate, vice president	191,667 113,750	Chase and Sanborn coffee, Tender Leaf tea, Royal desserts, Planter nuts, Fleischmann's and Blue Bonnet margarine.
Standard Brands	16,016,400	42	Wrigley, president Harland, executive vice president	172,920 80,881	Wrigley Spearmint, Doublemint, Juicy Fruit chewing gum.
William Wrigley Co.	22,525,000				

¹ Advertising Age, Apr. 24, 1972; national advertising in radio, TV, magazines, newspapers, and billboards.

² Business Week, May 6, 1972 and proxy statements.

³ Shares of stock. The number given does not include insurance policies, loans, stock options, free houses, promissory notes, free ocean cruises, or consulting fees.

⁴ 1970 salary data.

On women—Is she really astute enough to recognize both products provide approximately the same number of calories per unit weight but that a larger proportion of calories come from fat in Brand X and that Brand Y provides slightly more protein? Of course not!

Hartley W. Howard, Technical Director, Borden Inc.

On women—The women of America, who are the major patrons of our supermarkets and grocery stores, are smart beyond words, are rarely if ever deceived, and are perhaps the keenest buyers that we have in this land of ours.

Exec. V. P. of Scott Paper Co., Senate FPLA hearing.

QUALITY OF DIETS, 1955-65 [In percent]

Year	Good	Fair	Poor
1955	60	25	15
1965	50	29	21

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture food consumption surveys.

PRESIDENT VISITS POLAND

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President concluded his recent visit to Europe

with a stop at Warsaw, Poland, where he was received warmly both on the official and the civilian levels.

There is reason to hope that the visit indicates prospect of improved relations between the two countries.

As part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News for June 3:

BOLSTERING U.S. TIES WITH POLAND

The American and Polish peoples have always felt a warm tie—based on the invisible bonds of kinship and fostered by periodic visits. Even during the chilly days of the cold war, in 1959, the people of Warsaw showed Vice President Nixon their interest in everything American with a reception exceeded in warmth only by his recent return visit as President.

This time, the welcome was warm at both the unofficial and official level. In spite of the lack of advance publicity, some 300,000 Poles lined the streets for Mr. Nixon and almost went out of control when Mr. Nixon left his car to shake hands—a practice, incidentally, that unnecessarily exposes the President on such foreign tours.

At the government level, Mr. Nixon reached accord with the Communist leaders on increased trade, a consular exchange, new air links, and tourism. The three top Polish leaders, like their counterparts in Moscow, accepted invitations to visit the U.S.

Unfortunately, the agreement on trade was less than complete. Last year, former Commerce Secretary Stans envisioned a big potential for industrial cooperation between

the U.S. and Poland and favored the granting of Export-Import Bank credits to Warsaw. Such financing, which would have facilitated new export business from the Niagara Frontier, did not materialize, possibly because of the failure to negotiate similar terms earlier at the summit in Moscow. The problem can, however, be studied by the joint trade commission set up by the U.S. and Poland.

The two governments also hailed the new spirit of co-existence as expressed in the highly significant German-Polish treaty, the plans for a European security conference and the possibility of mutual troop cutbacks. The President's visit raises hopes that, within the limits of Poland's status as a Soviet satellite, the relationship between the two countries will be increasingly friendly and mutually beneficial.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 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?

AN OUTSTANDING PUBLIC OFFICIAL

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, we in New Orleans are fortunate to have as our mayor an outstanding public official, totally committed to meeting the challenge of the urban crisis.

As mayor of our city and as a member of the legislative committee of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, Moon Landrieu is earning a national reputation as the kind of leader we must have in municipal government if we are to rescue our urban centers.

Mayor Landrieu testified last Friday in the Southeastern regional hearings of the Democratic National Platform Committee. His topic was the urban crisis and legislation now pending before the Congress to rush financial aid to State and local governments.

Mayor Landrieu's testimony sets forth the case for revenue sharing, and I am inserting it in the Record and calling it to the attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF MAYOR MOON LANDRIEU

I come to you with a simple message: America cannot afford to abandon her cities. In the history of Western Civilization the one period when the cities were abandoned is called the Dark Ages. It could happen again. Our cities could die not from being incinerated in a nuclear holocaust or from being infiltrated by foreign ideologies. They could die from neglect and abandonment. Some of them are dying now.

The NLC and USOM, whose spokesman I am this morning, would like to see it made clear in the Democratic platform that the Democratic Party views the crisis of the cities as the number one issue of 1972.

The crisis of the cities is a crisis of authority and a crisis of resources.

To deal with the crisis of authority there will have to be a restructuring of the American federal system. City governments must become full partners with the State and National Governments.

The genius of our federal system has been its flexibility. Our only dogma has been that democratic government must be organized to meet the needs of the people.

The issues for us then is not whether our federal system will change, but how it will change and who will change it.

My fellow Democrats, you now have an unparalleled opportunity to help change that system by the way you frame the Democratic platform for the next 4 years.

So you will understand more about why that system needs changing, let me tell you a little about the kinds of problems I face as the mayor of New Orleans.

When I took office in 1970, my city, like every other major city in the country, was facing a serious financial crisis. Funds for bond retirement were so scarce that we could project a five year capital program of only \$25 million. Inflation had so eaten away at our operating budget that we were faced with the closing down of the public libraries and recreational programs. A desperately needed program of additions to our levees for hurricane protection was going to be cur-

tailed, not because we couldn't fund the whole project but because we could not come up with the $\frac{1}{2}$ match for Federal funding. City government, the school board, the levee board, the sewerage and water board, and the domed stadium district were all faced by the probability of being unable to market their bonds because of a 6 percent interest limitation imposed by the State constitution.

The mayor of New Orleans could recognize problems of his city, but he was powerless to act. The city council knew the situation well, but it was powerless to change it. The people of New Orleans could see what was happening, but they were not empowered to decide what to do about it. In some cases, the State legislature could give us relief, but in most instances, solutions to these entirely local problems required the full process of State constitutional amendment: we needed a $\frac{2}{3}$ affirmative vote of the State legislature and a majority vote in a State-wide referendum.

The need for constitutional reform and administrative reorganization have been recognized in my State. A new Democratic Governor and a hard driving new legislature are grappling with the tasks of restructuring State government and its relationships with the National Government and with cities.

In drafting your platform, I hope you will keep in mind the need to articulate a national commitment to making the disjointed federal system work as it should. The approach of the National League of Cities and the United States Conference of Mayors is to vest more authority and discretion in the hands of local elected officials, and to accept municipal government as a full partner in the federal system.

Necessary as it is to grant more authority to local officials, it is also imperative to give them the material resources to get the job done. Because we think the fiscal problems of our cities are so critically urgent, please bear with me now as I quote extensively from the section on fiscal support in our national platform statement which we are submitting to you today:

America's cities today are caught in a four-way vise: Costs are rising. Demands for services are rising. Debt is rising. Resources are dwindling.

On the cost side:

Total city expenditures rose \$12 billion during the most recent five-year period for which figures are available.

Payroll alone accounts for nearly half of the increase in expense of running local government.

Rising costs are a problem for all cities, in all regions of the Nation. Between 1957 and 1970, municipal expenditures per capita rose 180 percent in Rochester, New York; 210 percent in Kansas City, Missouri; 225 percent in the Tampa-Saint Petersburg area of Florida; and 232 percent in the Seattle-Everett area of Washington.

Part of the reason for the rising cost of local government is the increasing demand for municipal services. According to Census Bureau figures cited by the Brookings Institution, between 1962 and 1970, per capita local government expenditures in 41 large cities (and their school districts) went up:

109 percent for education.

264 percent for public welfare.

101 percent for health and hospitals.

The Brookings report, *Setting National Priorities—The 1973 Budget*, points to "proliferation in the number and kinds of services provided by urban governments. For example, local programs for pollution control, consumer protection, drug rehabilitation, family planning, day care, and community colleges were almost nonexistent a decade ago. Many such innovations have been spurred by federal legislation . . . (such as) Model Cities . . . compensatory education . . . Medicare and Medicaid . . .

At the same time, providing the traditional

municipal services costs ever-increasing amounts of money. Between 1966 and 1970, outlays by America's cities for:

Sanitation went up \$319 million.

Parks and recreation went up \$474 million.

Fire protection went up \$551 million.

Police services went up \$1,100 million.

To meet their needs, State and local governments have had to go into debt—and at a much faster rate than either the Federal government or the private sector. Between 1953 and 1970:

Federal government debt rose 33 percent.

Private sector debt rose 320 percent.

State and local government debt rose 367 percent.

Total city debt, now \$44 billion, is rising at an increasing rate. Over the most recent five-year period for which figures are available, city debt rose \$10.1 billion. More than a third of that sum—\$3.8 billion—was incurred in the last of those five years.

Collectively, the largest cities and the smallest cities are going into debt in the greatest amounts:

Cities over 500,000 population accounted for a fourth of last year's overall city debt increase.

Cities under 50,000 population accounted for half of that increase.

To meet the rising costs of personnel, services, and borrowing, cities are taxing themselves in greater amounts. In 5 years, cities have increased their taxes, user charges, and utility rates by \$6.7 billion.

But city governments still can't keep up with the demands within their own fiscal resources. As the Brookings report points out, "In a few older cities, such as Newark and Trenton, New Jersey, the aggregate value of taxable property has actually begun to decline."

Faced with a property and sales tax base that is not growing as fast as demand, or is actually contracting, local urban governments must turn to other sources to provide the human, physical, and environmental services required by their people—which are 70 percent of all the American people.

There has been a dramatic increase in Federal aid to State and local governments in the past decade. Some 656 major Federal programs providing aid for urban areas are now on the books, and several more are in the congressional pipeline. The dollar figures on Federal aid to State and local governments, while increasing at a dramatic rate, are misleading, however. Federal figures imply that U.S. aid to State and local governments as recently as 1970 totaled \$24 billion. In fact, only one-third of that amount went to city governments. The rest went to individuals living in urban areas (in the form of Medicare, income security payments, etc.); support for schools, social services, and health care, which are managed primarily by counties rather than cities; and for use by the Departments of Defense, Agriculture and Transportation for programs that do not directly assist city governments.

What is really needed?

By far the most promising concept of fiscal support for local government is general revenue sharing. Legislation now under consideration in Congress would provide for the next five years an annual Federal sharing of \$5.3 billion (\$3.5 billion to general purpose local government and \$1.8 billion to State government). Each unit of government's share would be based on its population and its need. All civil rights protections now required by other Federal grants would extend to revenue sharing.

As significant as general revenue sharing is in the development of Federal aid to local governments, both in amount and in concept, it does not constitute a total or permanent solution to the fiscal needs of cities. Indeed, it would provide only five to ten percent of a city's annual budget and amount to no more than the equivalent of

one year's growth in locally-generated tax revenues.

Revenue sharing certainly deserves the full support of both major political parties and the American people as a whole. But the search for ways to help cities meet the profound needs of their citizens should not end there.

City governments are emphatically on record that general revenue sharing should not be a substitute for categorical grant programs. Indeed, the categorical programs need to be expanded as well as consolidated.

In our platform statement, we discuss certain Federal categorical programs—manpower, criminal justice, housing, community development, transportation, environmental protection, etc. (My colleague Mayor Henry Bishop will present our recommendations concerning many of these programs.) While the details of the particular programs vary, as do specific suggestions for improving their effectiveness and expanding their scope, certain common themes emerge. In reviewing Federal aid programs, we conclude that:

Funding must be significantly expanded.

Funding must be adequate for planning, construction, operation, and evaluation.

The flow-down of funds from the U.S. Treasury to City Hall must be even, sustained, dependable, and long-term.

In scope, projects must serve the geographic area and the population in need over a time sufficient to accomplish the desired results.

Programs must be subject to the approval and influence of local elected officials so the results will be responsive to local need.

Programs must be planned, coordinated, and managed with maximum flexibility so as to take full account of local, metropolitan, and state circumstances and relationships.

Programs must be balanced among the often conflicting considerations of the area covered, the function provided, and the beneficiary served.

Timing, insofar as possible, should dovetail with local budgetary and decision-making cycles.

Among the many vexing problems facing local governments are the failure of Congress to fully fund critical urban programs and the refusal of the President to spend some of the money that Congress had made available for them.

The Interstate Highway Program has been fully funded, thanks to the Highway Trust Fund. And over the last three years, Congress has appropriated 97 percent of the sum it authorized for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and 93 percent of the amount it authorized for military purposes. By contrast, over the same period, Congress actually appropriated only 75 percent of what it had authorized for urban renewal and a meager 46 percent of funds for poor school children under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Even after Congressional approval of some appropriations, both Democratic and Republican Presidents have chosen to impound some of those funds. Urban programs have been particularly hard hit by Presidential impoundments in recent years. This year the Administration impounded a total of \$680 million that Congress had appropriated for rehabilitation loans and basic water and sewer grants for community development, as well as for public housing.

We recognize the legitimate right of the President to exercise emergency measures to control the Federal budget, but that does not justify thwarting the will of Congress expressed through both authorizations and appropriations.

In discussions of urban programs, much has been said about the need for "innovation" and "demonstration projects." We sub-

mit that the most needed innovation now is for Congress to fully fund, and the President to wholly spend, the money necessary to effect the already tested innovative programs that have proved out in demonstration projects. Such programs include, but are not limited to, urban renewal, Head Start, Title I of ESEA, Public Service Employment, and income maintenance.

Where will the money for meeting all the needs of all the cities come from?

Perhaps the answer lies in recent Federal personal and corporate income tax cuts. The cumulative impact of the Revenue Act of 1969 is a loss of \$75.5 billion in 1970 to 1973, inclusive. Of that sum, corporate tax cuts will have cost the Treasury \$9.4 billion, and personal income tax reductions will have cost \$66.1 billion.

During that same three-year period, city tax increases will total at least \$6.7 billion.

And so, we think it fair to ask: Which level of government should be prepared now to shoulder more of the burden of helping the cities to meet their critical fiscal needs?

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your attention.

PRAYER FOR LITHUANIA

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, Thursday will be the anniversary of the annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, which took place on June 15, 1940. Almost a third of a century has not been sufficient to brainwash the people of that unhappy land into acceptance of the loss of their independence as a nation and their freedom as individuals.

Neither have 2 million Americans of Lithuanian stock accepted the obliteration of Lithuania from the map of Europe and its absorption by the Soviet Empire. Indeed, the United States of America has never recognized the seizure of Lithuania and its sister Baltic republics, Estonia and Latvia.

Vytautas Volertas, president of the National Executive Committee of the Lithuanian-American Community of the U.S.A., Inc., has proposed that Thursday, June 15, be observed as a national day of mourning and prayer for Americans of Lithuanian background. Mr. Volertas believes that this would be a most effective way of demonstrating the support of the United States for Lithuania's efforts to establish religious and political freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily indorse the proposal that has been advanced by Mr. Volertas on behalf of the great organization for which he is an able and eloquent spokesman. All of us who believe in political freedom for all nations and freedom of worship for all men should unite in prayer on June 15. Let us send our petitions to the Almighty and ask that Lithuania and the other nations behind the Iron Curtain may soon be released from bondage and that its people and their fellow sufferers in other lands, be they Christian or Jews, Moslems or Buddhists, be permitted to worship God without further persecution.

MASSACRE AT LOD AIRPORT, ISRAEL

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, few individual incidents have horrified the civilized world as dramatically as the brutal murder of dozens of innocent people at Lod Airport in Israel. This inhuman act, perpetrated by political terrorists supported by so-called Arab Liberation groups, must be totally condemned by world opinion, and strong international action must be taken to root out and isolate those responsible. Nor should those governments which have hailed this criminal action escape censure. It is an error of the gravest moral and intellectual proportions for any government to condone this kind of activity, and we must do all we can to drive this message home.

At this point, as an illustration of the outrage that has been generated by this brutality, I insert in the Record a resolution on the subject adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND CERTAIN OTHER PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO PUBLICLY CONDEMN AND TO TAKE CERTAIN OTHER ACTIONS RELATIVE TO THE MASSACRE AT LOD AIRPORT, ISRAEL

Whereas, The Massachusetts House of Representatives is shocked and saddened by the massacre of at least 26 persons and the wounding of 70 yesterday at Israel's International Airport. Commissioned by one of several Palestinian terrorist groups advocating the mass murder of Israel men, women and children, the Lod Airport Massacre stands as the most deplorable episode in the long series of atrocities perpetrated by these groups; and

Whereas, The complicity of Arab governments in these atrocities is equally reprehensible. They long have supported, both politically and financially, acts of terrorism against the people of Israel. They retreat to a smug silence only when the result of such acts is sufficiently horrible to arouse outrage and sorrow around the world; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives calls upon President Richard M. Nixon, U.S. Secretary of State William Rogers and the United Nations Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim to take the following steps:

(1) To express publicly their shock at the Lod Airport Massacre and their sympathy to the families of the victims.

(2) To condemn all acts of terrorism.

(3) To privately and publicly urge each Arab government to abandon its support of Palestinian terrorist groups.

(4) To demand that Arab leaders denounce the Massacre and all previous incidents of violence directed at the Israel population; and be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President Richard M. Nixon, U.S. Secretary of State William Rogers, Secretary-General of the United Nations Kurt Waldheim, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth.

BRAVE, YOUNG BOY LOST BATTLE
WITH LEUKEMIA

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago a brave young boy in Fairfax, Va., lost a 3-year battle with leukemia. His tragic loss might have been prevented had we moved more quickly in our efforts to find a cure for this dread disease, and his story should serve as an inspiration to those now engaged in cancer research to redouble their efforts toward this end.

As I believe the story of Steve Cox's brief but full life should be known to all who are concerned about protecting our children from their second greatest killer, I insert an article concerning him from the Washington Daily News at this point in the RECORD:

"IF YOU ACCEPT LIVING, YOU ACCEPT DYING"
(By Louise Laque)

The room where Steve Cox lies dying is packed with souvenirs of 12 full years. There are Boy Scout awards, his clarinet and drums, science books and the calico cat that will only sleep on the bed when Steve is in it too, and not off at the hospital.

His mother stood in the doorway watching him sleep and said Steve had asked her if maybe it wasn't better to live really well for 12 years instead of passively for a long time.

Steve, the son of Mr. and Mrs. James Cox, 9610 Commonwealth Boulevard, Fairfax, has leukemia, a fatal cancer of the blood. It is apparently caused by a virus that can hit even the strongest children, but nobody knows much more about it than that. It is the second greatest killer of children up to age 15, right after accidents.

Steve found out about his disease three years ago when a baseball bruise failed to heal. The doctors tested him and told him something about red cells and white cells. Steve, who was already at junior high level in science, told his mother it must be leukemia, and it was.

Three weeks after the baseball accident, Steve fell ill and the doctors gave him five days to live. But he bounced back and played baseball for another year, visiting the outpatient clinic at Children's Hospital every month for treatment.

Six months after the diagnosis, Steve asked if he could look up leukemia in the encyclopedia. "We knew if he didn't do it at home, he'd do it at school," Mrs. Cox said. "So we let him. The last line said 'always fatal.'"

"Steve said he should probably make a will so that his little sisters would get all his stuff, and I told him the state would probably take most of it in taxes anyway. We try to keep a good face and not be morbid."

The Coxes have been frank with Steve and his sisters, friends, and neighbors about the disease. "The girls were upset, but we told them that Steve would die, and they would die, and we would die. Everybody just spends a different amount of time on earth. If you accept living, you've got to accept dying."

In January, 1971, Steve started having relapses—periods of illness that would keep him in the hospital or at home from school for days at a time. Even so, in May, his fellow students at Laurel Ridge Elementary elected him president of the Student Cooperative Association, the student council.

The radiation treatments were making his

hair fall out, and one night, Steve and his father went out and bought a short blond wig, just for the fun of it.

"He wore it to school and the kids loved it," said Mrs. Cox. "The next day half the boys at Laurel Ridge wanted wigs."

As Steve's health failed, his parents grew strong and adamant about the lack of research on cancer. They found a group called The Candlelighters, composed of parents of children dying of leukemia. It is both a lobbying group to get more funds for research and a therapeutic group where parents can talk realistically about a problem which arouses only pity in the parents of healthy children.

"At first," Mrs. Cox said, "I walked my legs off from office to office all over Capitol Hill. Some congressmen were sympathetic, but one threw us out of his office, saying people were in there begging for money all the time. Nobody seemed to care. More Americans die of cancer each year than were killed in both world wars, but nobody seemed to care."

Things are looking up now. Last Dec. 23, President Nixon signed a bill which allots \$530 million to cancer research in 1972 as opposed to \$180 million in 1970.

Also, the Russian-American health pact signed last week provides hope for children with leukemia. For a year now, it has been known that Russian doctors have isolated the virus that causes leukemia. If it were brought back here, it could be made into an anti-leukemia vaccine. The president's visit to Russia may provide that opportunity.

The Coxes have been in touch with John Nidecker, a Nixon aide who is interested in Steve's case, encouraging him to cut thru the possible red tape and get the virus back right away.

"If it comes in six months, it will be too late for an awful lot of children," said Mr. Cox. "And even if it comes next week, it will probably be too late for Steve."

Since the beginning of his relapses, Steve has been thru all the possible leukemia treatments known in America and is in worse shape right now than ever. He has stayed alive this long, Mrs. Cox said, because he is emotionally and physically strong and because "we never pretend we were going to give up. Even now, I just know a miracle will happen."

Still, Steve is the only one in the family who doesn't break down and cry now and then. One night last week as the family gathered to pray around his bed, Steve prayed: "God, I'd like to get well, but if I don't I'll understand."

"Of course," Mrs. Cox said, "we all started to cry at once. But Valerie—she's 11—she just swallowed hard and said 'Oh, Steve, we got your bed wet.'"

CRIME CHECK

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, when the people of the United States more actively support and aid our law enforcement agencies, there can be a major breakthrough in the fight against crime. The first duty of government, as Thomas Hobbes observed in the 17th century, is to provide that protection which is the root of freedom and security.

Because all Members of Congress sup-

port the fight against crime, I call to your attention a new television series entitled "Crime Check," produced by Film Finance, Inc., of Beverly Hills as a dramatic and effective weapon to reach and motivate the vast TV viewing audience and to play an important role in the renaissance of law and order in our streets, our homes, and our communities.

"Crime Check" will present a documented depiction of true unsolved crimes, presenting all the known facts, giving the concerned law enforcement agencies an opportunity to enlist the public at large in the effort to bring the perpetrators of these crimes to justice. The host of the program—to be a figure of national prominence—will invite anyone in the audience who has information concerning the depicted crime to dial "Crime Check's" toll-free number. If the information received aids in the prosecution and conviction of the perpetrators of the crime, the concerned citizen will receive a substantial reward.

I understand this series is being developed in cooperation with Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, as well as with legal and sociological authorities of recognized stature. To Mr. Derek Jones and all those associated with Film Finance, Inc., I wish every success.

TEMPLE SINAI RESOLUTION RE-
GARDING INDOCHINA WAR

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, with the recent intensification of the war in Vietnam, more and more Americans are speaking out against the continued escalation of hostilities in Southeast Asia, and are calling for an end to American involvement.

Temple Sinai, in Roslyn Heights, N.Y., held a special congregational meeting to discuss the serious consequences Vietnam continues to have on the fabric of our society.

I commend the following resolution to my colleagues, which Temple Sinai adopted as an expression of their concern:

RESOLUTION OF TEMPLE SINAI OF ROSLYN

We believe that the United States has achieved its greatest stature in world history when it has led the causes of freedom, justice and peace. Such occasions have been frequent and have served to honor us.

We believe that the present course of our Government in conducting the War in Indo-China fails to serve the causes of freedom, justice and peace.

Deaths of Indo-Chinese people are no more acceptable to us than are deaths of Americans.

Although we recognize the many difficulties, and, despite the intransigence of the North Vietnamese, we believe that the interests of the United States and Indo-China, as well as the rest of the world, will be best served by our Government's immediate declaration that the United States will cease

all military action and immediately withdraw all of its military forces from Indo-China.

We believe that the suggested action will best protect the American men now in Indo-China, speed the release of American prisoners of war and permit the people of Indo-China to pursue their lives as they see fit.

We believe that it will require great courage for our Government to do what we ask but it will earn the honor and gratitude of the entire world.

SPINAL CORD INJURY TREATMENT IN OUR VA HOSPITALS

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, treatment of those veterans who have suffered spinal cord injuries, either in service or in civilian life after military service, has improved tremendously in Veterans' Administration hospitals in recent years. Funding is at an all-time high and President Nixon and Congress have directed that special attention to this kind of care be given priority throughout the VA hospital system.

A story in a recent edition of the National Observer newspaper carried a number of references to the excellence of VA spinal cord injury treatment but, in the view of many who are familiar with the program, erred in a number of points and gave an adverse view of the treatment by the way the story was headlined and illustrated.

Administrator of Veterans' Affairs Donald E. Johnson has written to the publication seeking to clear up some of the items in the story. Mr. Johnson's letter is informative, both for the points it makes relating to the article and for his description of some of the efforts VA is making to progress in this important field of treatment. In the interest of providing full information, I am pleased to submit Administrator Johnson's letter for publication in the RECORD:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1972.

Mr. JOHN F. BRIDGE,
Managing Editor,
The National Observer,
Silver Spring, Md.

DEAR MR. BRIDGE: Although the excellence of spinal cord injury care in Veterans Administration hospitals is reflected in obscure paragraphs of August Gribbin's story in your May 20 issue, the story and layout are designed to convey the exact opposite impression.

With its screaming headline, "Neglected Heroes—Paralyzed Vets Blast VA Care," and its highlighting of questionable negatives, the story reaches only the most careful reader with such buried truths as:

"Hospitalized vets almost invariably praise VA doctors and hard working nurses and paramedical staff." Further down in the story is the description of the miraculous recovery of veteran Harry Purvis about which the writer concedes, "His recovery exemplifies the kind of rehabilitation the VA can and often does give veterans."

After the impact of a front page treatment replete with sensational heads, depressing sketches and editorial generalizations. The

Observer itself brings into question the validity of all the many complaints the paper nonetheless printed. Under the sub-head "Just Moody Gripping?", the article notes:

"The injured (patients) themselves explain that they go through periods of 'mourning' and bitterness at their anatomical losses. During those bleak moods, they say, they tend to abuse even the best (hospital) aides."

Doctors and spinal cord injury patients agree that the disabling and traumatic nature of spinal cord injuries do make these patients more complaint-prone. This is completely understandable, and in no manner diminishes VA's determination to resolve all justifiable complaints.

As to the many specific items and instances of complaint listed in the article, VA is checking these out at the individual spinal cord injury (SCI) centers, and will certainly take corrective action where the facts warrant.

Although all of the checking is not completed, we do have some information on the very first two patients and hospitals mentioned in the article. At West Roxbury, for example, the patient reported as complaining about the height of the water fountains was actually used as one of three wheelchair models by installing engineers to ensure that fountains placed in the SCI area were the right height. As to the request for a special handle for one door, this was installed some 10 years ago by hospital workmen, and the VA—not the patient—defrayed the minor cost.

The records indicate that the patient who complained of verbal intimidation by an aide at the Hines VA Hospital, has not been a patient at that hospital within the past three years, and there is no indication that the incident was reported prior to that time either at Hines or the hospital to which he was transferred.

In fact, preoccupation with the past seems to be a hallmark of much of the article. The reporter dredges up Senate hearings and a magazine article of two years ago, and VA took vehement issue at that time with many of the allegations aired via these two forums.

What is far more disturbing, however, is the fact that the reporter never bothered to tell your readers about these simple—and readily available—facts concerning the tremendous progress made in recent years in the VA spinal cord injury program.

(1) In the current fiscal year (1972), an additional 485 full-time employees and an extra \$4.5-million have been set aside specifically for VA spinal cord injury services.

(2) For the fiscal year beginning next July 1, the President has asked Congress for still more money and employees. In his budget for the new fiscal year, the President is requesting 296 more full-time employees, and an additional \$3.4 million.

(3) What these added resources mean is reflected in the ratio of staff employees to patients in the (SCI) centers.

In F.Y. 1969 the ratio was 1.11 employees to each one patient. The current fiscal year shows a 53-per cent gain . . . 1.7 employees for each patient. The President's request for F.Y. 1973 will bring the ratio to two employees for each patient . . . an 81-per cent gain over 1969.

(4) Since 1969, in excess of \$20-million has been earmarked for expanding and modernization of SCI treatment space. This includes construction projects already accomplished, now underway or programmed for the near future.

(5) In November 1970, VA prevailed on the Civil Service Commission to upgrade the job standards for VA nursing assistants or aides on the basis of higher responsibility requirements. This, in turn, has permitted higher pay, and the recruitment and retention of better qualified and motivated employees for SCI and other VA hospital patients.

(6) Since 1969, the number of SCI treatment centers has been expanded by VA from

10 to 14 . . . and by the summer of 1974 VA will have 18 such centers.

(7) The special needs of SCI patients have been recognized in other innovative ways. For instance:

Social workers and psychologists have been assigned to assist SCI program planners at the VA in Washington in regard to these special needs. The entire Washington team works closely with paraplegic advisors who are VA employees or representatives of veterans organizations, including the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

Employees in SCI treatment centers are receiving psychosocial training to help them recognize the patient's emotional and social needs as well as his physical needs.

Two hospitals are developing pilot home care programs. The hospitals send medical teams on calls to the homes of discharged SCI patients to assist the patient and his family or home attendant in the rehabilitation process.

In addition to the considerably beefed up VA employee staffs, SCI patients share the compassionate and understanding assistance of volunteers from the community who serve in every VA hospital. Each month, nearly 112,000 of these devoted volunteers give their time and services to hospitalized veterans the Nation over, and each year they donate nearly 10 million hours of volunteer time.

Other VA benefits are available to SCI veterans outside the hospital setting. For instance, veterans who suffered their SCI while in military service are eligible for "wheelchair home" grants. These specially constructed homes tailored to the requirements of the service-connected disability are financed by VA grants up to 50 per cent of the home cost with a grant maximum of \$12,500. The balance due on the home may be handled with VA assistance in the form of a G.I. loan.

If they can use them, SCI service-connected veterans are also eligible for VA payments up to \$2,800 toward the purchase of a car. Special adaptive equipment for the cars is maintained or replaced by VA.

SCI veterans whose disabilities were incurred in military service are eligible, too, for VA disability compensation payments that can run as much as \$1,120.00-per-month (for a single veteran with no dependents) when he is not hospitalized, or \$784.00-per-month while he is a VA patient.

Veterans whose SCI disability was incurred in civilian life after they left military service may be eligible for VA pension payments. For a single veteran these monthly payments can amount to as much as \$240.00, depending on outside income.

Of the 1,081 total SCI patients in VA hospitals as of the end of last month, 261 were service-connected for disabilities sustained in military service, and 820 were non-service-connected.

One last comment on the article, which notes that VA's medical expenditure for each hospitalized SCI patient amounts to nearly \$21,000 a year. The story indicates the hospital discharge of these patients "is cheaper for the VA," and that "VA's budget clearly benefits."

This implication of economy at the expense of the veteran is just not true. SCI hospital discharges are aimed at one objective only—to further the patient's maximum rehabilitation and to restore him as nearly as possible to normal living. It should be obvious that the \$21,000 hospital cost continues in the budget as new patients replace those who have been discharged.

I realize that I have written at length, but I do feel strongly that your readers are entitled to this added perspective on the Gribbin article.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. JOHNSON,
Administrator.

MELROSE CIVITAN CLUB "CITIZEN OF THE YEAR" AWARD WINNERS

HON. RICHARD H. FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, this Wednesday I am going to have the privilege of welcoming to our Nation's Capital a group of very outstanding students from Metropolitan Nashville-Davidson County, Tenn.

They are the winners of the Citizen of the Year Award which is given each year by the Melrose Civitan Club of Nashville to 15 outstanding ninth graders chosen from our city's 29 junior high schools.

Mr. Speaker, this is a citizenship project. It is designed to promote and recognize good citizenship.

The program is directed specifically at these students at the junior high school level for two reasons. First, it is felt there is a great need for recognition at this age level and, second, it is believed that the recognition and award received by these young persons from the Melrose Civitan Club will provide emphasis and incentive for "good citizenship during the implementation of the program and will have a continuing or carryover effect for the students through their school life."

To earn a Citizen of the Year Award is no easy task. First, each junior high school's ninth graders vote to select five outstanding students. The ninth graders and the school principal select a finalist from the five outstanding students.

Each of the 29 finalists then must write a statement, "Good Citizenship Is."

Last month the Melrose Civitan Club Evaluation Committee interviewed each of the 29 finalists and chose the 15 students for the Citizen of the Year Award.

At each step from the initial voting by the classmates to final selection by the evaluation committee, each candidate was evaluated on loyalty to school, concern for others, service or contributions to school, service or contributions to community, participation in home, church, community activities, participation in school activities, leadership, and appreciation of heritage.

It is evident that requirements were strict and the standards high.

In addition to recognizing each of the winners in his own school, the Melrose Civitan Club will provide each a 5-day, all-expense-paid trip to Washington, D.C. They will arrive here this evening and begin their tour of our Nation's Capital tomorrow.

The winners making the trip this year as well as their chaperones and sponsors are:

STUDENT AND SCHOOL

Kerry Bradley, McMurray Jr. High.
Virginia Lynn French, Goodlettsville High.
Karen Reynolds, Hillwood High.
Jane White, Linton Jr. High.
Tammy Webb, Cumberland Jr. High.
Kathleen Cleary, St. Cecilia Academy.
Linda Bennett, Tenn. Preparatory School.
Vikki Vaughan, Rose Park.
Timothy Keough, Father Ryan.
Yvette Woodard, Ewing Park.
Keith Boswell, Apollo Jr. High.

Carole Smith, Cameron Jr. High.
Cynthia Lynn Massey, Goodpasture Christian School.

Rebecca Carter, DuPont Jr. High.
Gayle Briley, Highland Heights.
Mrs. Billie Ruth Frey, Goodlettsville High. (chaperone)

Miss Catherine Gardner, McMurray Jr. High (chaperone)

Dr. O. H. Rutherford, Jr., President Melrose Civitan Club.

Karen Rutherford, daughter of Dr. Rutherford.

Pat Kent, McMurray Jr. High.

Chris Kent, McMurray Jr. High.

Mr. and Mrs. Carl Parker, Civitan Club.

Leland Parker, son of Mr. and Mrs. Parker.

Mark Dillingham, nephew of Mr. and Mrs. Parker.

Kenneth Anderson, Civitan Project Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome these young men and women to Washington. They are a credit to their families, their schools, and to the youth of all America.

DEEPWATER PORT FACILITY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, since colonial times Philadelphia has been one of the great seaports of the world.

The city is famous for its ability to handle large and unusual cargoes and it is also well known for its ability to adapt to the changing needs of shippers.

Another example of this ability to meet challenges is the proposal to build a deepwater port facility which will be able to handle the largest commercial ships afloat.

At this time I enter into the RECORD an outline of that proposal:

DEEPWATER PORT FACILITY

The Corps of Engineers was told today that Philadelphia is strongly in favor of establishing a deepwater port facility in the Delaware Bay area.

Director of Commerce Harry R. Belinger outlined the city's position in a statement submitted to Col. Carroll D. Strider, District Engineer, at a public hearing held in the Free Library, 20th and Benjamin Franklin Parkway.

In his prepared statement, Belinger said the location of a deepwater facility 90 miles south of Philadelphia would induce the construction of new oil refining capacity throughout the Delaware Valley. He noted that Philadelphia already is the major East Coast port for bulk petroleum shipments.

The increasing size of oil tankers since 1956 and the future dependence upon imported fuel make the deepwater port a necessity, he added, noting that the United States is the world's only large industrial nation without a port capable of handling vessels of more than 150,000 tons dead weight.

Recent studies indicate that approximately 15 million tons of oil per day will have to be imported by 1985, of which about one-third will be needed in the Northeast.

"The importance of the Philadelphia port can best be visualized against its central location in an \$80 billion market containing a population of about 60 million residents," Belinger said. "By 1985 the 1971 employment picture will more than double, as will wages." With a deepwater port in the Delaware Bay area, Philadelphia, as well as New Jersey and

Delaware, can foresee major economic benefits.

Belinger said it was too early to determine the effects the deep-water facility in the Delaware Bay area would have on Philadelphia's water front activity.

"However," he added, "with modern container facilities at Packer and Tioga Terminals, Philadelphia will continue to make its contribution not only to the economy of our City, but to development of the Region and the Nation."

JOHN PAUL VANN

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, last week the United States lost an outstanding American. The untimely death of John Paul Vann was tragic. Few men relished life as he did. Few men were as devoted to a cause or their work as was John Paul Vann.

When I led a team of volunteers to Vietnam in 1970, at non-Government expense, we were privileged to be able to spend a day with John Paul Vann, who at that time was in the Mekong Delta. He impressed us, as he did others, as the most outstanding individual we encountered in Vietnam. But he would have been outstanding anywhere.

John Paul Vann was a perceptive man. He grasped the nature of the war in Vietnam well in advance of others, particularly the Military Establishment. He recognized that an insurgency could not be overcome with guns alone.

His dynamic leadership will be sorely missed. People like John Paul Vann can never be replaced. But his life stands as an example and an inspiration to us all. It is my hope that John Paul has a successor who will pick up where he was cut off so that his contention and understanding of the real problem there will not be ignored. All of us in leadership must realize more than we do that political, social, and economic problems plague places like Vietnam with a gun or with an army.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post carried an editorial in tribute to John Paul Vann. That is fitting and proper. I invite my colleagues to read it:

JOHN PAUL VANN

John Paul Vann believed passionately in the Vietnam war long after others—who had once shared his passion—had given up on it. He believed it could be won for, and ultimately by, the Vietnamese in the sense that they could have acquired, some years and many thousands of casualties ago, a capacity to defend themselves if properly led and wisely trained and advised and inspired. And he may well have been right. We will never know for sure because his particular concepts, which always sounded so sensible and logical when he expounded them, were never adopted at the time that he was putting them forth. The military establishment, which he loved because it was his career, and which first feared him and mistrusted him and eventually drove him to resign his commission, was so slow to listen and even slower to learn.

That is the tragedy of his life, which

ended—some would say predictably—in a helicopter crash last week. The triumph was that he never stopped trying and that he lived long enough to see a large part of his program, his tactics and his sense of the proper American role in the war actually put into effect, however late in the day. When John Vann has a lieutenant colonel, before his resignation in 1963, they were not listening, and they still weren't listening in late 1967 when General Westmoreland had his forces lunging around the countryside searching and destroying, taking the war to the enemy, taking the play away from the South Vietnamese and absorbing heavy casualties in an effort to "attrit" the enemy, to kill North Vietnamese and Vietcong in such numbers that they would quit. John Vann believed profoundly that this could not work, that the enemy should be forced to attack our side rather than the other way around, that Hanoi would never run out of manpower, that the South Vietnamese would never learn to defend themselves if we did it for them, that firepower by itself was not enough, that killing civilians was almost indefensible, that air power wouldn't be decisive either, that carrying the war to the sanctuaries outside Vietnam would only invite the enemy to find new sanctuaries. Then came Tet and a new administration and slowly, painfully, a considerable part of what John Paul Vann believed in was adopted, not so much by choice as by necessity because the American public would not continue with the war effort the way it was.

John Vann died believing that we are now on the right track, not in every respect but in the important respects and whether he was right about that is less important than the fact that he had the courage and the determination, against the most forbidding odds, to risk his life on a daily basis for his beliefs. There are many who believe he was the ablest and most effective American ever to serve in Vietnam, and while that may be an extravagant statement, he was a great soldier who, ironically, may have rendered his greatest service to the Army he loved after leaving it.

It was not necessary always to have agreed with John Vann's belief in the Vietnam struggle to know that he was in Indo China doing what he could to bring rationality to our war effort and to minimize the awful cost of the war to the Vietnamese themselves, and to know, too, that his loss is a heavy blow.

CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY PRAISES PIKE COUNTY PORK PRODUCERS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride I call attention to a list of the Nation's top 400 hog counties, based on the 1969 farm census, that appears in the June issue of National Hog Farmer.

Pike County, Ill., my home county, has advanced to the No. 2 position, moving up from third place.

In 1969, Pike County farmers marketed 485,958 hogs and pigs. Pike County's population in the 1970 census is only 19,185. This means that over 25 hogs were marketed for every man, woman, and child in the county.

I would also like to congratulate our colleague, Congressman THOMAS RAILSBACK of Illinois' 19th Congressional District. Henry County, located within his

district, holds the No. 1 position with a total of 554,834 hog sales in 1969.

Paraphrasing the immortal baseball pitcher, Satchel Page, I would like to warn Mr. RAILSBACK and Henry County farmers. Do not look back; someone is gaining. The people of Pike County say, like the company that also found itself in second place, "We try harder."

Pittsfield, Ill., Pike County seat, and my hometown, truly deserves its title of "Hog Capital of the World."

And along with all pork lovers in the world, Pittsfield and Pike County residents proudly cheer—Hogs are Beautiful.

VON BRAUN WILL LEAVE NASA FOR JOB IN AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harold M. Schmeck, Jr., in the New York Times of May 27, 1972, provides a capsule summary of the numerous contributions of Dr. Wernher von Braun to our national space program. Few men in our history have so captured the imagination and support of the American public as Dr. Von Braun has for our national space effort. His name has and continues to be synonymous with excellence and achievement, setting the highest example for not only our Nation, but those dedicated people throughout the world who believe in accomplishing something worthwhile and who have the tenacity, skill, and dedication to accomplish it. I offer Mr. Schmeck's article as another small accolade to the many that he has and will receive:

VON BRAUN WILL LEAVE NASA FOR JOB IN
AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 26.—Dr. Wernher von Braun, one of the chief architects of man's first landing on the moon, is retiring from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The German-born rocket expert, who has worked for the United States Government since the end of World War II, will leave the space agency July 1 to become corporate vice president for engineering and development of Fairchild Industries, a major aerospace company.

"Dr. von Braun's decision to retire from NASA is a source of great regret to all of us at the agency," said Dr. James C. Fletcher, NASA's administrator.

"For more than a quarter of a century, he has served the United States as the leader in space rocket development," Dr. Fletcher said in the announcement. "His efforts first put the United States in space with Explorer I. As director of the Marshall Space Flight Center for over 10 years, he directed the development of the world's most powerful rocket, the Saturn V—which has taken 10 American astronauts to the surface of the moon."

Two of those astronauts, Neil A. Armstrong, the first man to set foot on the moon, and Edwin E. Aldrin Jr., his companion on the historic Apollo 11 moon landing, Capt. Edgar D. Mitchell of Apollo 14 and Lieut. Col. James B. Irwin of Apollo 15, plan to retire July 1. The moon exploration program comes to an end, for the time being,

in December when Apollo 17 is scheduled to complete the series.

Explorer 1, the first successful United States satellite was launched in January, 1958, by a rocket system developed under Dr. von Braun's direction. His group was given the job after the Soviet success with Sputnik in October, 1957.

Dr. von Braun's leading role in American space rocket development continued until early 1970, when he left the Marshall Space Flight Center in Huntsville, Ala., to come to Washington as deputy associate administrator for planning at the space agency.

In announcing that move, Dr. Thomas O. Paine, who was then NASA's administrator, said Dr. von Braun "has an unmatched record of looking to the future to choose the most promising avenues of technical advance."

In a comment released today by the space agency, the 60-year-old Dr. von Braun said he was "leaving with the knowledge that NASA has enough well-thought out plans to keep it moving ahead for many years to come, even though some of these may have to be deferred because of budget constraints."

"I would like to devote my time now to help implement some space projects I feel are of particular importance," he said. "I think I can do this best in private industry where the tools of progress are being made."

Dr. von Braun was one of the early and most persistent advocates of manned space flight. He was active in rocketry since 1930 and was one of the pioneers in that field in Germany.

In 1937, after five years as chief of a small rocket development station near Berlin, he became director of the Peenemunde rocket center, where German experts developed the V-2 missile that bombarded London during the closing months of World War II.

When the war ended, Dr. von Braun and about 100 other German rocket specialists surrendered to the Western powers. He and his group came to the United States in September 1945, under contract to the Army.

They are credited with major contributions to United States rocket development for the military and for NASA.

Said Dr. von Braun in the announcement of his retirement:

"I leave NASA with a deep feeling of gratitude for the wonderful and unique opportunities the agency has given me during the last 12 years."

THE WILBUR D. MILLS STORY

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the March 1972 issue of the Arkansas Lawyer, the official publication of the Arkansas Bar Association, paid tribute to the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Joe Purcell, chairman of the Arkansas Democratic Party, wrote the cover story, "The Wilbur D. Mills Story." It is an excellent biographical synopsis of the chairman's distinguished career, and I would like to insert the article into the RECORD so that my colleagues might share it with me:

THE WILBUR D. MILLS STORY

(By Joe Purcell)

"... The persuasiveness of a Franklin D. Roosevelt... the courage of a Harry Truman

... and the personality of an Alben Barkley." This is how Congressman James A. Burke (D-Mass.) describes the man he and many others would like to see President of the United States and the lawyer that the "Arkansas Lawyer" honors this month—Wilbur Daigh Mills.

It is a long way from Kensett, Arkansas (as it is from any city) to the nation's capitol and a position of influence in the halls of Congress where the power lines converge and the waves of influence originate. One hundred Senators and 435 Representatives make the journey successfully during each session of Congress. Wilbur Mills made it in almost record time, arriving as a freshman Congressman in Washington in 1939 at age 29.

Today after 33 years of hard work, a sense of timing, a brilliant memory and a thorough knowledge of fiscal affairs, Mills stands as the single most influential committee chairman on Capitol Hill. A man whom many call the second most powerful man in America.

A product of Grass-Roots America, Mills was born 62 years ago in the White County railroad intersection town of Kensett (pop. 1,444). He attended the public schools of Kensett and graduated from Searcy High School. He then enrolled in Hendrix College where he was the recipient of many honors.

The 1930 Hendrix Troubadour had this to say about Mills, "High above the common rabble Wilbur towers, undisturbed by life's ups and downs. Something fine within him prompts his gay outlook on life. His splendid grades are indicative of much 'gray matter'. Wilbur walks life's straight paths and is a boon companion for anyone who is 'down and out'..."

A classmate of Mills of Hendrix says, "He was always interested in government and frankly, from the very beginning, in the tax structures of the county, of the state and of the federal government. Things came fairly easily to him but he applied himself... his powers of concentration were just far beyond the ordinary."

Mills returned to Kensett during the depression in 1933 with a Harvard law degree. He went to work as a cashier in his father's bank while building his law practice. In 1934, he married the post-mistress of Kensett, his childhood sweetheart, Clarine (Polly) Billingsley. Since both were employed, their wedding trip was brief—one night in the Albert Pike Hotel in Little Rock and back to Kensett early the next morning to their jobs. They have two daughters, Mrs. Richard Yates and Mrs. Jack Dixon and four grandchildren.

Mills' father, a Kensett banker and businessman, was a White County rural political leader. Listening to the political talk of his father and friends, Mills became politically oriented and at an early age decided on a career in politics. His hero was the Second District's Congressman, the Honorable William A. Oldfield, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

According to Mills, "Congressman Oldfield lived in another county. He would come to town by train and visit my father. He would spend the night in Kensett at the hotel and would invite 20 to 25 men to have supper with him and he would tell them what went on in Washington. This was the only way they got to know him."

Just one year out of law school, newly married and aged 25, Mills in 1934 challenged and defeated the incumbent County and Probate Judge of White County, becoming the youngest County Judge in Arkansas history. A Mills campaigner in 1934 says, "He opposed a Judge who was very popular, who had been in office 16 years. Wilbur was just out of Harvard Law School but he had the small town political leaders with him. With their help, Mills was unbeatable."

His four years as White County Probate and County Judge were invaluable in acquainting Mills first hand with the problems

and responsibilities of local government. This has been of great benefit throughout his political career.

His ambition to serve in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and on the Ways and Means Committee, never wavered and during his second term as County Judge, opportunity knocked. Second District Congressman, the Honorable John Miller, was elected to fill a United States Senate seat made vacant by the death of Senator Joe T. Robinson, the Democratic Party's nominee for Vice-President in 1928. Mills won the Democratic nomination for the Second District's congressional seat in the Democratic primaries of 1938 and was not opposed in the general election. He has served continuously in Congress since 1939 and is the top ranking member of the Arkansas delegation in continuous service. He has never been opposed in a general election and has had primary opposition only twice since 1938—in 1942 and in 1966.

Mills, as a freshman Congressman, was assigned to the House Banking and Currency Committee but in 1943, with the help of his friend Sam Rayburn, he moved to the prestigious Committee on Ways and Means. Ways and Means is the oldest of present House committees; established by the First Congress on July 24, 1780. A good many of its members, including James K. Polk, Millard Fillmore, William McKinley and Andrew Jackson, achieved top ranking positions in American history.

The United States Constitution provides that all revenue bills must originate in the House. By House rules, all legislation concerning taxes, Social Security, tariffs and foreign trade, medicare, interest rates, the federal budget and in short, the means of revenue for maintaining the republic, is assigned to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Congress works through committees and only the Appropriations and Rules Committees are considered in the same league with Ways and Means. The three constitute the so-called "control committees" and are involved to some extent in almost everything that happens in Congress.

The popular congressional sport of committee switching does not carry over to Ways and Means. During the past 20 years, aside from death, retirement or defeat at the polls, only five Congressmen have left Ways and Means while 44 have been promoted to it.

Assignment to Ways and Means is particularly good for a Democrat, since in 1911 the Party made its members on Ways and Means its "Committee on Committees", with the power of assignment of Democrats to all the other twenty standing committees.

With the death of the previous committee chairman in 1958, Mills, having climbed the ladder of seniority, assumed the chairmanship of Ways and Means, becoming the youngest chairman in its history. As Chairman, he has been a strong advocate of the "consensus approach" to legislation. He judges the attitude of members of the Ways and Means Committee before marking up any bill and reports a bill only when his careful reading of the mood of the House assures him the bill will pass. Because most bills reported by Ways and Means are considered under a "closed rule" on the floor—not subject to amendment—Mills and his staff are meticulous in their preparation of committee legislation. In Mills' 14 years as Chairman, only three bills reported out of Ways and Means have been rejected by the House.

Walter Little, documentary clerk for Ways and Means and probably with Mills as much as any political associate, says that Mills' hobby is his work. Possessed with a detailed familiarity of federal tax laws, Mills frequently quotes, without notes, lengthy passages from statutes during debates and hearings.

One colleague remarked, "In all the years

I have been in Washington I don't suppose I've seen Wilbur at more than a half dozen evening gatherings around town." When a new administration enters the White House, Mills' office quietly requests that they strike his name from the social invitation list. Mills has stated, "My father always impressed upon me that you couldn't do a day's work and stay out all night at parties."

Despite the rarity of social appearances, Mills is not a loner. To the contrary, he has a deep and compassionate interest in people, is very cordial and friendly. One of his colleagues remarked, "Wilbur is just wise. Washington's social life can be disastrous. The longer you stay here the more you realize you can't go out every night and be an effective legislator the next day."

Politically, Mills is a heavyweight—a Potomac political giant. His strength of character, wisdom, integrity, common sense and fair play have won the respect of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Former HEW Secretary, Robert H. Finch, speaking for President Nixon at Hendrix College on April 28, 1970, described Mills as "Easily one of the ten outstanding legislators in the history of the republic."

Twelve years ago, James Reston wrote "The first question for President Kennedy on the new year is not whether he can get along with Chairman Nikita Khrushchev but whether he can co-exist with Chairman Wilbur Mills."

Mills has served in the Congress under six administrations and as Chairman of Ways and Means under four. He has worked closely and effectively with all administrations, although upon occasions he has had to say "no", even to Presidents. Mills and President Kennedy were close friends and great admirers of each other. When Mills wanted President Kennedy to dedicate Greers Ferry Dam at Heber Springs, Kennedy not only obliged but told the crowd, "The only significant reason I'm here is because of your distinguished Congressman. If he had asked me to sing 'Down by the Old Mill Stream' I would have been delighted."

In 1971, a Draft Mills For President campaign was launched, directed by Congressman Burke. The movement spread rapidly in Washington and by midsummer more than 35 Congressmen, geographically representing all sections of the United States, had publicly endorsed Mills for President. Never before had a candidate (or non-candidate), except an incumbent, had such strong congressional support for the presidential nomination. Although Mills denied publicly that he was a candidate, he did say that if he received the nomination he would accept it, and would be the most active, the hardest working nominee the Democratic Party ever had.

On August 26, 1971, the largest appreciation rally ever extended to any individual of this state was held in Barton Coliseum honoring Congressman Mills. Attending the rally were industrialists, business leaders, bankers, leaders of organized labor and 34 United States Congressmen coming from as far away as Oregon, Michigan and Massachusetts. The Coliseum was filled to overflow capacity with more than 12,000 Mills supporters, and thousands more gathered outside, unable to get in. The closing of the gates 30 minutes before Mills party arrived created mammoth problems for the fire marshalls and the police who were holding back a swarming crowd. The situation forced state legislators, public officials, and many well known Arkansans, to crash the gates through back entrances. On the speakers' platform were Governor Bumpers, the other constitutional officers, the Congressional delegation, and many other out-of-state dignitaries.

Miss Mary Lou Burg, Vice-Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, de-

scribed Mills as "A legend in his own life time."

Leonard Woodcock, President of the United Automobile Workers said, "Few men are more skilled in making this nation work than Wilbur Mills."

Representative Carl Albert (D-Okla.), Speaker of the House, said of Mills, "He is big enough, he is firm enough, he is intelligent enough to hold, with outstanding distinction, any public office in the United States of America."

When the program began at 7:30, approximately 10,000 persons were gathered outside the Coliseum gates unable to get in. As each speaker finished his part on the program he was escorted outside where he again delivered his remarks to the crowd there.

Although Mills consistently denied in 1971 that he was a candidate, during the late spring of 1971 he appeared in more than 15 states on a three-month speaking tour, and addressed joint sessions of eight state legislatures. During the summer of 1971 he appeared on three nationwide television programs, and in the fall continued his speaking tour, visiting the Western and New England States.

In the Fall of 1971 a National "Draft Mills for President Headquarters" was opened in Washington under the direction of Charles Ward, campaign coordinator. Ward states that the Draft Mills for President Campaign is mushrooming and that great progress is being made, especially in the grass roots area. The Arkansas Delegation to the 1972 Democratic National Convention is expected to place Mills' name in nomination for President of the United States.

On February 11, 1972, Mills advised the Secretaries of State of Wisconsin and Nebraska that he could not in good conscience sign the affidavits required to take his name off the primary ballots in those states because this would require him to say, "He is not now and does not intend to be a candidate for President." Mills' name, without his encouragement or endorsement, will appear in the New Hampshire primaries on March 7 as a write-in candidate.

Mills is recognized in Washington by persons in all branches of government as possessing the talents, the ability and the integrity to make America an effective and responsible President. Will he get the nomination? Time will tell!

But, with the persuasiveness of a Franklin D. Roosevelt . . . the courage of a Harry Truman . . . and the personality of an Alben Barkley, Congressman Wilbur Daigh Mills may well become in July 1972 the first Democratic nominee for the Office of President from the State of Arkansas.

SUPPORT ON HIGHER EDUCATION BILL

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 8, 1972

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the higher education bill, S. 659, I remarked that I had received a call from Father Ryan, the executive vice president of St. Peter's College in New Jersey. My statement can be construed as indicating that Father Ryan was calling to express the support of St. Peter's College for the bill.

Father Ryan's call was on behalf of the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities in New Jersey of which he is president. He reported to me that

the 16 member colleges of this association, which includes St. Peter's, had unanimously reaffirmed their support for S. 659.

Father Ryan was not speaking for St. Peter's College when he spoke to me on June 8. However, included in a memorandum of June 6 from Chairman PERKINS of the Education and Labor Committee and the ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. QUITE, was an excerpt from a letter of support for the bill from Father Yanitelli, the president of St. Peter's College. Thus St. Peter's College was among the supporters of the bill. I apologize for any embarrassment or misunderstanding that my remarks may have caused.

NEWSPAPER CARRIERS—PRIDE OF OUR YOUTH

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently two of the outstanding newspapers in Florida, the Fort Lauderdale News and Sun-Sentinel held a contest for its carriers who received the greatest amount of new subscriptions for their papers. The contest was one of those typically-American methods for inspiring the competitive spirit in our youth and, it was a very exciting and noteworthy effort for those boys who tried their best to win one of the top prizes.

At this time when some of our youth have obviously "lost" their way and seem unable to cope with the demands which our society imposes, I am glad to see that the help our media is giving to the young people, not only to help them to find part-time jobs, but also to help them through that very important period in a boy's life just prior to his achieving adulthood.

I am sure that most of us can look back, as I can, to the time when; we delivered newspapers either in our hands, in baskets on our bicycles, or the small wagons we had; when our mothers got us up from bed earlier than we wished in the morning, and no doubt "went" with us in spirit, as we trodded in rain or sunshine from one home porch to another. I am sure you remember the first "pay-day" and what we earned for our efforts. How we suddenly felt matured and grown up and proud with the feeling of responsibility—because this was our first job.

Mr. Speaker, I remember my own paperboy route well, and also the sense of accomplishment that I felt each time the task of delivering was done. I can empathize with the parents of today's young whose children are experiencing a similar feeling but their efforts and that of their children will be more than worth the effort.

I include some of the letters which these parents wrote to the News & Sentinel circulation promotion manager, Mr. John J. Gorry, in the RECORD along with the material on the contest. I also

heartily congratulate all the contestants—those who won, as well as those who tried their best and will, perhaps, win next time, but in any event no matter, win or lose, may God bless them all.

The material follows:

FT. LAUDERDALE NEWS.

DEAR MR. GORRY: Please express my thanks and appreciation to the News and everyone responsible for the wonderful opportunity given my son.

He has gained the confidence he needs to be independent, and after earning the Europe trip, he knows anything is possible if you work for it.

This has been a good year for him. He was inducted into the national honor society at school, and April 8, while in Europe he will be 18, suddenly a man. A man not by age alone, but due to the guidance from station managers, and the influence and opportunities offered by the News, he is truly a man in character and spirit.

I will be forever grateful.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. HELEN LAHTI.

Mr. JOHN GORRY,
Circulation Manager, Fort Lauderdale News & Sentinel, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

DEAR MR. GORRY: We are very pleased and thankful that you and your fellow workers have selected Shawn as a winner of the "Young Columbus" subscription contest. We know that he has spent many hours soliciting for new subscribers to the "News" besides his school studies and varsity sports participation. He has shown much persistence in all of the "Papers" circulation contests and has usually finished very high in all of them. If we seem to sound proud of his many accomplishments please don't feel that we are being overly so.

We also know that without the impetuous and extra push that was provided by "Mike," Mr. Kelly and yourself the results would be different.

Shawn is a natural born fighter but needs to be prodded at times and shown the merits of good hard work. He is like any other boy his age and does have his shortcomings to say anything else would be to color the truth or "color the bush."

We as parents are indeed proud and once again wish to thank you all for affording our son this "once-in-a-life-time" opportunity.

We hope that his relations with the paper and as a representative of the other carriers for the "News" will reflect very favorably wherever he goes.

Thank you again from the bottoms of our hearts.

God's grace surely covers us all—we say this not because of a material gain but more because of a good and healthy family.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JOSEPH P. O'CONNOR.

THE LAW AND ORDER POLITICIAN

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, it has often struck me that those who argue longest and loudest about "law and order" and the need for increased public protection many times are the same persons who voice outrage when police and firemen engage in rightful protest in their efforts to gain proper wages and fringe benefits.

This would seem to be a rather paradoxical situation for such a person.

I have long held that public employees should have the rights to collective bargaining that other members of the working force of this Nation enjoy as long as the public safety is not endangered.

I would include the right to political activity as one of these rights.

Granted that political activity in uniform, or on duty, would seem to be contrary to good policy, the fact remains that public employees, including policemen, presently are being denied the tools to achieve wage and fringe benefit equity.

In the May issue of the San Francisco Police Officers' Notebook, Association President Jerry D'Arcy eloquently told of his views on this very issue.

I think that it is an important and meaningful article and I would like at this time to have it included in the RECORD.

The article follows:

PRESIDENT'S CORNER—THE LAW AND ORDER POLITICIAN

(By Jerry D'Arcy)

Last month I appeared before the Labor Relations Committee of the California State Assembly. We were there to testify on A.B. 206, a bill which would make it mandatory that all cities in California set up a system whereby Police Officers could bargain for wages, hours and working conditions with representatives of their City government. To us in San Francisco it would mean that many of the various working conditions that we have been trying to get for years through Charter Amendments would be subject to negotiations with local representatives in City Government. In other words a San Francisco Police Officer would finally reach the level of other employees and be granted the right to bargain collectively regardless of the provisions of the City Charter which has been holding us back for many years. The sponsor of this bill was Assemblyman John Burton (Democrat S.F.).

Two weeks later I was in Washington, D.C. lobbying as Vice President from the International Conference of Police Associations for a bill that was introduced by Congressman Mario Biaggi, (Democrat, N.Y.) which would provide for the following:

- (1) The right of a Police Officer to engage in political activity during his off-duty time.
- (2) Guarantee Police Officers the same civil rights enjoyed by all other citizens.
- (3) Set up a grievance panel to hear the grievances of Police Officers who claim their Civil rights had been violated.
- (4) Would deny L.E.A.A. funds to any community that did not conform to the provisions of this bill locally.

Now what is the point of telling you all this? What is so very strange about this is that legislators who have gone on record as supporting these beneficial bills, which incidentally, are benefits for the rank & file cop—not the Administration, are some of the most liberal legislators in Government.

Let me give you an example—

In Sacramento: one of the Assemblymen on the Committee who voted against A.B. 206 was a guy who wears a big American Flag pin in his lapel and a "support your local police" bumper sticker on his auto. This guy goes around crying about how much he supports law and order, and it is strange that all four law and order candidates on this Committee voted against a bill which would give the Cops on the street basic collective bargaining rights. These are the same men who would go into hysterics if they thought a Cop would even think of going on strike or consider it unprofessional for a Cop to

consider a "job-action" of any kind in order to gain vital bread and butter issues.

Each and every one of the "liberals" on this Committee voted YES which enabled the bill to get out on to the floor for a vote.

Again while in Washington, D.C. representatives from the I.C.P.A. visited with Congressmen in order to get a recommendation from legislators on the Judiciary Committee to get H.R. 7332 on the floor for a vote. The Bill of Rights now has over 125 cosponsors and would have an excellent chance for passage if it could get out of committee, on the floor of the House. But again—who are the men bogging it down? For the most part, the great Law & Order Candidates—

In working for the passage of bills vital to the benefit of our Brothers in Law Enforcement it has become increasingly clear that we are continually being sold down the river by candidates who profess to support the banner of law and order.

It's about time we started taking note of the voting records of these legislators and let our Brothers, in their voting districts, know what they really stand for. This is the only way people, who are truly concerned about men who do the day to day job of law enforcement, can know who to support at election time.

The next time one of these "law and order" candidates stands up and takes credit for being a supporter of the Cop—the working Cop—that is; ask him how he voted or intends to vote on the issue of granting the same rights to the Police Officers as he does to the Administrators of Police Departments, and big business.

"ART IN THE COURTROOM SERIES": A FIRST FOR TENNESSEE

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the first one-man show in the "Art for the Courtroom Series" at Jackson, Tenn., opened June 1 at the Municipal Court Building on North Church Street. The month long exhibition, which is part of a continuing project, features the paintings and watercolors of Jackson artist Don Carmichael, who has just been named to "Who's Who in American Art," 1973 revised edition, and is a member of the visual arts advisory panel for the Tennessee Arts Commission.

According to Robert Michie, public information director for the city of Jackson, who originated the project, the idea of using the courtroom as an art gallery is unique.

Mr. Michie said:

With this art series, Jackson becomes the first city in Tennessee, and possibly in the Nation, to use the otherwise bare walls of the courtroom for displaying art. The art series will be a good education program for a cross section of the public, exposing some who would never take time to go to an art exhibit.

The adaptation of courtroom into art gallery was accomplished by the installation of an inexpensive picture rail. Local government leaders who encouraged the project were Mayor Bob Conger and Municipal and Juvenile Court Judge Walter Baker Harris.

This initiative is another indication of the community spirit and civic pride which make the city of Jackson a model to the entire Nation.

HIGHER EDUCATION CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. RALPH H. METCALFE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. METCALFE. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks I have had to spend a great deal of my time in my own First Congressional District of Illinois, because of my commitment to the struggle being carried out in Chicago by the Concerned Citizens for Police Reforms, to eradicate police brutality, harassment, and insults to innocent minority citizens in the city of Chicago.

Of course police harassment in Chicago against innocent citizens just because they are black or brown is nothing new. Excessive police harassment to any citizen is completely unwarranted. What is new in Chicago now, is that I, and other members of both the black and brown, and other communities of Chicago, have engaged in an all-out, unified effort to put an end to the harassment now. I feel very strongly that this can only be brought about through a complete overhauling of the Chicago Police Department. I am committed to this change and I have decided to devote as much of my time as possible to our efforts in Chicago.

My present involvement in Chicago, however, caused me to be absent last week when the very important Higher Education Conference Report was debated and voted upon.

I know the financial needs of our universities and colleges. I have taught on the college level myself. Education has long been one of my priorities and I know that the educational needs of our young people are not being met.

Because of the importance that I place on the Higher Education Act and because I was absent on the day that it was voted upon, I would like to express to you my position on this bill.

As is generally conceded, nothing is ever all good or all bad. This at least, seems to be the case with the conference report. The basic good is primarily that the bill provided \$18.5 billion for the extension of present higher education programs and the creation of new ones. However, it is essentially bad, at least in a philosophical sense, because it turns back the clock on school integration.

As I see it, the strongest argument made against the antibusing provisions of the conference report is the question of their constitutionality. The equal protection clause of the 14th amendment has been consistently upheld in school desegregation suits since Brown against Topeka. In that decision, the court held that it was inherently unequal if schools were separately maintained for both black and white students. Again in

the case of Swann against the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education (1971), Nixon Supreme Court appointee, Chief Justice Burger, stated:

We find no basis for holding that the local school authorities may not be required to employ bus transportation as one tool of school desegregation. Desegregation plans cannot be limited to the walk-in school.

In practice and in legal philosophy, busing has been established as a legitimate and practical means of desegregating the Nation's schools. The purpose of the antibusing provisions, as submitted by Nixon, is to prevent the Supreme Court and the lower courts for a time from enforcing, as they deem necessary, the constitutional right of blacks and other minorities to nonsegregated schools under the equal protection clause.

I am also opposed to this legislation because I believe the issues of school aid should not be combined with the desegregation problems. Indeed, they should be settled on their own merits and the issues should not be clouded by overlapping arguments.

It is for these reasons that I could not—would not, have voted in favor of the conference report had I been present. Important as the higher education provisions are, they cannot, in my opinion, justify suspension of the historic 1954 Brown decision.

ANNIVERSARY ON RUSSIAN INVASION OF THE BALTIC STATES

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked the 32d anniversary of the invasion and subjugation of the free Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania by the U.S.S.R. During the weeks and months which followed that fateful day in June of 1940 literally hundreds of thousands of these brave people were arrested and deported to slave camps in Siberia.

Today, I suggest that it is appropriate that we pause to remember the death and suffering of so many innocent people at the hands of a brutal dictatorship. History tells us of suffering, it relates the loss of liberty in the Baltic Nations but it fails to convey even in the smallest way the strength and the determination of these brave people to be free once again.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more eloquent than I who have told the story of the forceable occupation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. They have chronicled and have given witness to the slaughter and to the sorrow and pity of three nations which were robbed of their freedom. One such group is the Baltic Nations Committee of Detroit. In commemorating the anniversary of the Russian invasion of their homelands, they have served to remind all free people

that our own freedom is in a sense only as strong and safe as the liberty of those who live under the heel of tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD, the resolution which this dedicated group recently passed on the occasion of the 32d anniversary of the invasion and incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R. In the text which follows, I would like to call to particular attention of my colleagues the suggestion that Radio Free Europe broadcast cultural language programs to the people of the Baltic States. I feel strongly that this is a commendable and important idea. I, therefore, intend to introduce a resolution to bring about that very end and invite my colleagues to give this measure their consideration and support.

THE BALTIC NATIONS COMMITTEE OF DETROIT, INC.

We, the Americans of Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian origin living in the metropolitan area of Greater Detroit, County of Wayne, in the State of Michigan gathered at Mercy College, 8200 West Outer Drive, Detroit, Michigan to commemorate the 32nd year of the forcible occupation of the Baltic Republics by the Soviet Union and the 31st anniversary of the mass deportations of hundreds of thousands of the Baltic people to slave labor camps in Russia, at a Commemorative Concert sponsored by the Baltic Nations Committee of Detroit, Inc., hereby firmly resolve to reaffirm our belief in the democratic principles of our government and pledge our unstinting support to our President and the Congress of the United States to attain lasting peace, freedom and justice throughout the world.

We further resolve to urge the Congress and the Administration to continue its position of maintaining that Soviet rule of the Baltic Republics is unlawful and at the same time demand that the Soviet Union practice what it preaches regarding colonialism by immediately withdrawing all Soviet troops, ruling apparatus and colonists from Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and that our government insist that this liberation be the basic condition for any further treaty negotiations with the Soviet Union.

We appeal to the President, the Secretary of State and the Congress of the United States to promote in all diplomatic dealings with the Soviet Union as well as in the assembly of the United Nations and other international bodies, the restoration of the freedom and independence of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

We request the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the initiation of cultural radio language broadcasts over Radio Free Europe to the peoples of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

We, who are free, assure the Estonian, Latvian and Lithuanian people presently under the Soviet occupation of our unswerving determination to spare no efforts and sacrifices for the attainment of the sacred goal—total freedom and independence.

We also urge that this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, to the Senators and Congressmen representing Michigan in the United States Congress, to members of the Foreign Relations Committee in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

Unanimously accepted and adopted at Detroit, Michigan, this 11th day of June, in the year of our Lord, 1972.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES IN 14TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OHIO

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I sent a questionnaire to every postal patron in the 14th District of Ohio asking for his or her opinion on important issues before the Congress. I received 10,000 completed questionnaires, representing the views of 17,500 individuals when husband and wife opinions are counted separately. This is a significant number of views and I thought that my questionnaire results should be brought to the attention of the House of Representatives.

I would especially like to note that 62 percent of the respondents favored a withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam by June 1972, contingent upon the release of U.S. prisoners. Ending the war in Vietnam remains the national issue of most concern to the residents of the 14th Congressional District.

At this time, I include the complete results of my questionnaire in the RECORD:

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRES

1. Do you think Congress is meeting the basic needs of the country such as housing, health care, jobs, and stable prices?

Total yes..... 11
Total no..... 81
Men, yes: 12; women, yes: 9.

2. Do you favor restricting the power of the President to carry on military actions against other countries without specific Congressional approval?

Total yes..... 70
Total no..... 26

3. Do you favor stricter federal laws to control pollution even if it means higher prices for some products or possibly shutting down some manufacturing plants.

Total yes..... 69
Total no..... 21

4. Do you favor a Federal law strictly controlling the sale and possession of handguns?

Total yes..... 65
Total no..... 30
Men, yes: 61; women, yes: 71.

5. Do you believe the Federal Government attempts to keep more information secret than it should?

Total yes..... 68
Total no..... 23

6. Would you favor giving the Congress, rather than the Executive Branch, the final say in deciding whether classified information should be kept secret?

Total yes..... 45
Total no..... 40

7. Do you favor increased use of the United Nations by the United States in solving international problems?

Total yes..... 68
Total no..... 24

8. Would you favor a Federal law prohibiting all stripmining of coal?

Total yes..... 43
Total no..... 33

Men, yes: 46; women, yes: 51.

9. Do you think the military—the Army, Navy, and Air Force—have too much power in determining U.S. policy and where our money is spent?

Total yes..... 66
Total no..... 23

10. How well do you think Phase II of the President's Wage and Price Control Program is working? (Check the statement that comes closest to your viewpoint):

Not very well..... 40
Fairly well, but there are still some serious problems..... 30
Too early to tell..... 15
We would be better off without it..... 9
Very well..... 2

11. To help us compete more effectively with foreign industry, which of the following do you approve? (Check the two you favor most.)

Increase productivity of U.S. industry..... 51
Hold down wages and prices with tougher controls..... 47
Reduce U.S. trade barriers if other foreign countries will do the same for U.S. products..... 37
Set tougher restrictions on imports even if it causes foreign governments to do the same thing to our exports..... 30

12. What policy do you favor on the Vietnam War? (Check only one.)

Announce that all U.S. servicemen will be withdrawn by June, 1972, provided that all U.S. prisoners of war are returned..... 62
Continue Nixon policy of gradual withdrawal (but no deadline)..... 20
Keep some American troops in Vietnam until we are sure that the South Vietnamese government can stand alone..... 6
Escalate as much as possible for a military victory..... 4
Undecided..... 6
Breakdown by sex: Withdrawal by June, '72. Men, 59; women, 65.

13. If it is necessary to raise additional revenue to support the basic needs of the country, which would you prefer:

Reform of the federal income tax system to eliminate special subsidies such as the oil depletion allowance..... 81
A national sales tax ("value added" tax) on everything you buy..... 7
An increase in the federal income tax rates..... 4

14. Which of the following statements is closest to your views on the need for a national health insurance program paid for by the Federal government. (Check one.)

A program should be established covering all medical expenses..... 39
A program should be established covering only major expenses..... 36
No program should be established..... 22

15. What is your position on the present level of military spending? (Check one.)

Too much..... 70
About right..... 13
Too little..... 6
Undecided..... 11

Breakdown by sex: Present level of military spending is too much. Men, 67; women, 73.

16. What do you think our nation's priorities should be? (Please check the three items that you believe are the most urgent.)

	Percent
1. End Vietnam war.....	40
2. Reduce unemployment.....	32
3. Control inflation.....	31
4. Control crime.....	26
5. Control pollution.....	25
6. Tax reform.....	17
7. Reduce military spending.....	16
8. Eliminate poverty and slums.....	15
9. Control drug abuse.....	15
10. Aid senior citizens.....	12
11. Reduce cost of health care.....	9
12. Halt nuclear arms race.....	9
13. Improve consumer protection.....	7
14. Explore outer space.....	2

(NOTE.—For questions 1 through 9, when total yes and total no are added to percentage of undecided and no response answers, the sum total is 100 percent for each question.)

(For question 11, the difference between the sum and 200 percent represents the number of non-responses.)

(For question 16, the difference between the sum total and 300 percent indicates the number of non-responses.)

RAY McHUGH VISITS ZAIRE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the respected Washington bureau chief of the Copley Press, Ray McHugh, visited Zaire to take a good look at this huge, potentially great but still struggling nation on June 1. His articles were carried in the Aurora, Ill., Beacon News, and I believe they are of such widespread interest that I am putting them into the RECORD.

The articles follow:

ZAIRE

Change is a watchword in this city that used to be called Leopoldville in the country that used to be called the Congo.

Naked children still play along dusty roadsides on Kinshasa's outskirts, mothers carry their babies in colorful cloth papooses, clerks struggle with basic arithmetic, wooden hoes scratch the lush equatorial soil, straw skirts are still in vogue and crocodiles, lions and leopards still claim human victims in the interior, but these are part of a past that Zaire is leaving behind.

A hundred miles away on the narrow Atlantic coast oil rigs are probing for black gold. At Inga on the lower Zaire (Congo) River a hydroelectric dam is nearing completion that will dwarf Hoover and Grand Coulee. Model farms, factories, luxury hotels are beginning to dot the sun-drenched hilltops around Kinshasa. A \$400 million international copper operation—the biggest in the world—is taking shape in the southern Shaba province that used to be known as Katanga. (Standard Oil of Indiana is the key company in the consortium.) A 2,000-kilometer electric power line, the longest in the world, is under construction to bring Inga's energy to the Shaba copper fields.

This country, the size of the United States east of the Mississippi River, has become a special kind of black African testing ground and showplace. In the sixties it represented the worst. In the seventies, President Mobutu hopes, it may represent the best. The

orderly charm that France still visits on the Ivory coast or the starched British influence still felt in Kenya is missing here. Nor is there any of the dulling mediocrity that Socialist-Communist experiments have brought to Tanzania and Guinea.

Given political stability by Mobutu after the strife-torn sixties, Zaire has set out in search of its own identity or "authenticity" as the President calls it.

If it succeeds, Zaire can be the keystone of American policy among fledgling sub-Saharan nations. Only English-speaking Nigeria to the north overshadows it in size and resources.

Since its birth in 1960, Zaire has been a focal point of U.S. attention in Africa. While world opinion stormed over the Congo civil war and the United Nations struggled with jungle savagery and the obvious ambitions of the Soviet Union and some west European nations, four American presidents persisted in efforts to help the country find itself. The United States provided the major financial support for U.N. operations despite often sparse popular support at home.

For a time it appeared that the Congo would fall into Moscow's lap. The late President Patrice Lumumba even made full-dress trips to the Kremlin. At another moment it appeared that European mercenaries would succeed in partitioning the old Belgian colony, setting up copper-rich Katanga as some kind of fief.

For a decade this huge land wallowed like a sick whale, unable to influence conditions inside its own borders, much less beyond.

For Washington the survival of Zaire is at once a reward and a challenge. In one respect there is a U.S. commitment here to black America whose leaders identified fiercely with the Congo-Zaire story.

President Nixon has successfully held back those who would capitalize on U.S. political successes to establish an American beachhead. Instead, an intelligent, experienced career ambassador from Minnesota, Sheldon Vance, has pursued a policy he calls "helpful patience."

The tall angular, good-natured Ambassador has toured Zaire repeatedly in the last three years, emphasizing American willingness to help, but carefully avoiding any suggestion of interference or dictate.

"Sometimes it has been a narrow line," Vance admitted in an interview in his air-conditioned Kinshasa office. "But I think Mobutu and his government are satisfied that we are honestly interested in their success and their independence."

American blacks who attended the recent first Congress of Mobutu's popular revolutionary movement (MPR) admitted their surprise.

"Our black militants have criticized Mobutu for being too orthodox, too 'establishment,'" said one. "We should be proud that Washington has helped him get this far."

Ethel Payne, prominent columnist for a chain of black American newspapers, sees Zaire as a potential link between U.S. blacks and their African heritage.

Working with the World Bank and U.S. companies, Vance is now helping steer a public-private investment program designed to strengthen the Zairian economy.

In the past year:

A.I.D. has provided \$10 million toward a \$37 million transport repair program that is vital to revive Zairian agricultural exports.

A 50-man Peace Corps contingent made up of skilled workers—not students—has been committed to the transport program. (Fifty other Peace Corpsmen work in other sectors.)

Gulf Oil has drilled four offshore wells in the Atlantic and is near a decision on full-scale production.

Mobil Oil has drilled on-shore wells in the same area.

Pan American World Airways has joined the Zaire government to build a 10-story luxury intercontinental hotel in Kinshasa that has become a commercial magnet despite prices that would make a New York or Paris visitor turn pale. Pan Am also provides technical assistance to operate the state airline Air Zaire.

Kaiser Aluminum is negotiating on a 1.5 million smelting plant that would be geared to Inga's cheap power. The talks have dragged on, but if concluded Kaiser will bring enriched bauxite from Jamaica to Inga for processing.

Goodyear Tire and Rubber Co. has begun tire production at a new plant that utilizes native rubber and promises to monopolize the market in this part of Africa.

General Motors has completed studies for an automobile assembly plant in Kinshasa. Ford Motor Co. has received a contract for a similar project.

ITT has established a satellite communications system that has helped guide U.S. astronauts and which also puts Kinshasa within seconds of offices all over the world.

City Bank of New York has established a Kinshasa branch to help the country's financial operations.

"It's only a beginning," says Vance. "This country has enormous potential."

Projected American investment figures will begin to rival those of Belgium, the nation that for 75 years dictated every economic decision in this huge area and which still jealously guards its residual interests.

In 1969 the private U.S. investment in Zaire totaled less than \$25 million. Today the commitment is approaching the half-billion-dollar mark. It may soon represent 50 per cent of the total foreign involvement.

"The change came in 1970 when President Nixon received Mobutu in Washington," Vance said. "The President went out of his way to point out Zairian investment potential. The White House even helped arrange meetings between Mobutu and U.S. executives. It was a master stroke."

What now?

By all yardsticks Mobutu can be president of Zaire as long as he likes. He's only 41. His course, he insists, is "neither left, nor right, but African."

If he succeeds, Zaire could become a classic vindication of U.S. policy in Africa. President Nixon has surprising support in this black African capital for his "get tough" tactics against North Vietnam.

Local editors do not hesitate to point out the links between Hanoi and Moscow.

The leading government daily "Salongo" (work) says "the nerve of the war belongs to the Kremlin."

"The North Vietnamese are in a habit of getting everywhere but in their country (so) where is the aggressor?" It asks.

A second editorial warns Africans against Communist propaganda that creates "a world of distorting mirrors, a conditioned world that imposes upon us a certain way of seeing reality, so that we become so docile that one day we accept the indoctrination. . ."

There are no illegitimate children in this Central African Nation.

President Mobutu says so.

In a state of the nation speech to the congress of his ruling popular revolutionary movement Mobutu attacked the "stigmatization" of children born out of wedlock as an unwanted import of European colonialists and missionaries.

Mobutu declared that all infants, regardless of their state of their parents, will be considered "Children of Zaire."

"No one will be without a father," he said.

With a noticeable nod to the powerful Catholic church, however, Mobutu added that Zaire would not return to polygamy. The

custom, he said, is no longer practical in a country that is moving away from primitive village agriculture.

PRESIDENT MOBUTU

President Mobutu has reached a perilous crossroad in the African heartland that used to be known as the Congo.

Buoyed by seven years of success in leading one of the world's most important black nations onto the highway to peace and progress, Mobutu is now struggling with emotions that every black African leader must feel.

On one side is the tug of technology, engineering and science and the honest urge to build a modern nation, to bring 20 million Zairians into an organized 20th century society.

On the other is the xenophobic pull to establish the black African's place in a world that has denied him equal status for much of a thousand years.

On the first score Mobutu has made a remarkable beginning. He has stabilized a country that knew only war and privation during its first seven years of independence from Belgium. Even the casual visitor exclaims at Zaire's physical progress in the last year or two.

Mobutu's record on nationalization or national identification is still to be judged. He has embarked on a campaign to re-establish an "authentic" identity for his people who he claims were saddled with unwanted European traditions and standards during colonial rule. He promises that this will be accomplished without closing Zaire's doors to foreigners, foreign ideas, products and capital. But he has set in motion powerful African forces.

At the congress here of his popular revolutionary movement (MPR) his Africanization program won resounding endorsement not only from the 1,500 delegates of his own political party, but from seven visiting African chiefs of state, two vice presidents and a leader of the Angolan resistance.

The speeches all reflected a common African hunger for history, tradition and national pride. (In toasts, a Zairian pours a few drops of wine on the ground before drinking, a salute to his ancestors.)

Significantly, Zaire and all the other African states represented at the congress are one-party "democracies," ruled by military or political figures who seized power after chaotic experiments in multi-party government.

"I'm convinced that the 'strong-man' approach is the only that can work in these new African nations," said black Mayor Robert Blackwell of Highland Park, Mich., of the official U.S. delegates to the congress. "They simply can't afford the luxury of political debate. But it puts a helluva lot of pressure on the top man to resist corruption and temptation."

Two other black American delegates, State Sen. Coleman Young of Michigan and State Sen. Bob Dalton of Maryland, were less convinced.

"I see too many of the trappings of a dictatorship," complained Dalton, pointing to the constant glorification of Mobutu.

"I can't judge his administration," said Young, "but Mobutu's organized and that's the key to political success in any country."

The African trend to one-party rule is not without danger for men like Mobutu. Even as his congress met in this new planned "party city" 30 miles from Kinshasa, the African state of Malagasy was torn by strife. Confronted by angry students who demanded a switch from French language and culture to native forms, President Philibert Tsiranana turned over executive powers to an army general named Ramanantson.

Even a return to native forms holds dangers.

Reports from tiny Burundi to the east tell of a savage outbreak of a 400-year-old feud between the Watutsi and Hutu tribes. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of natives have been killed, according to press reports.

So far Mobutu has withstood fairly well the pressures and the critics.

When a group of university students demanded political reforms last year, he swept 2,000 of them into the army for two years. When 50 students at another school protested that they, too, were "guilty," Mobutu put them in uniform but ruled that they were "volunteers" and therefore would serve a full seven-year hitch.

He now appears to be riding a wave of genuine respect and popularity. No opposition is in sight. At the congress his MPR followers pleaded that he declare himself "president for life," Mobutu sidestepped the temptation, pointed out that his current term runs to 1978 and promised to stand for reelection "as long as I can serve."

A member of Mobutu's 15-man "politburo" or advisory council says the president is well aware that a life term would provoke questions and suspicion in the United States and Europe where some eyebrows are already arched over his personal living habits that include a sumptuous chateau near Geneva, Switzerland.

The West, the advisor adds, must learn to appreciate the African tradition of tribal and village chiefs who often are elected for life.

"There is comfort in the knowledge that chiefs, or father figures, will remain in power for life, particularly when they achieve such remarkable success as Mobutu," the advisor added.

Now 41, the orphan son of a farmer servant, Mobutu was a sergeant in Belgium's colonial army, turned journalist in 1958 and became an instant colonel with independence in 1960; a prime minister in 1965 and president in 1971.

With massive help from the United States and the United Nations, Zaire weathered the ordeal of civil war, European mercenaries, Soviet infiltration and vengeful tribal politics.

Men like Patrice Lumumba, Moïse Tshombe and President Kasavubu fell by the wayside, but Mobutu survived and grew.

In the seventies he is obviously determined that Zaire will take a leading place among nations. He has personally visited Washington, Paris, Bonn, Athens, Tokyo, Taipei and virtually all the black and Arab capitals of Africa. He has entertained Vice President Spiro Agnew, King Baudouin of Belgium, President Ceausescu of Communist Romania and other world figures.

In a cadenced, unemotional "state of the nation" speech to his colorful MPR Congress, he insisted he will veer neither to the Communist or capitalist spheres of influence.

"These are foreign systems," he told the cheering delegates. "Ours is an African system."

Despite his rhetoric, he has shown a definite preference for western, particularly American, assistance. President Nixon played a key role in interesting private U.S. investors in Mobutu's "under-equipped" country. (He prefers that term to "underdeveloped" or "developing.")

American A.I.D. experts play a pivotal part in Mobutu's No. 1 priority project—the restoration of Zaire's war-wrecked and neglected internal transportation system. Belgian-built roads, railways and river systems must be reestablished if Zaire's rich agriculture is to be revived.

Before 1960, agriculture and copper each represented half of the area's exports, by 1970, the ratio had fallen to 20-80 as the farm-to-market transport system collapsed.

The copper fields of Katanga, now called Shaba, remain Zaire's most important single resource, but the economic pattern is slowly changing.

Nationalist Chinese and American agriculture teams are demonstrating the region's dramatic potential. The Chinese are building poultry, livestock and rice programs that can become models for all Africa. Americans have introduced pineapple and other exportable fruit crops and hybrid grains that can thrive in the equatorial lowlands and the cooler highlands of the interior.

Pineapple fields outside N'sele along the Zaire River (formerly the Congo) have become a Hawaii-like showplace, complete with a modern cannery.

Taipei's Ambassador to Kinshasa was a central figure at the MPR Congress—evidence that Mobutu is not joining the African rush to recognize Peking.

"Mobutu has always emphasized his loyalty to friends," explained one American diplomat. "The Nationalist Chinese have made a major contribution here when President Nixon was in Peking in February, Mobutu was paying a state visit to Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in Taipei."

Despite pockets of progress like N'sele, however, Zaire remains a nation with most of its "solongo" or work ahead of it. Public services sputter in Kinshasa, still straining to bridge the chasm left by the Belgian withdrawal a dozen years ago. Villages a few miles distant appear almost untouched by progress. The installation of a one-inch water line and communal spigot is still a major accomplishment.

The enormity of Mobutu's task raises obvious questions about any detour towards African "authenticity." Anything that threatens to disperse national energies inevitably alarms some foreign investors.

The President's order changing the name of the country from the Democratic Republic of the Congo to Zaire, his insistence on the removal of all reminders of colonial rule, even the famous statues of explorer-journalist Henry Stanley and King Leopold, his demand that Zairians drop their Christian forenames in favor of tribal names, and his own emphasis on native life forms and styles has caused some to hesitate.

The Catholic church became alarmed when Mobutu ordered the elimination of Christian names. (He changed his own from Joseph Desire Mobutu to Mobutu Sese Seko. Roughly translated, it means "Brave Earth.")

The church-state differences were perhaps magnified when Cardinal Joseph-Albert Malula, Archbishop of Kinshasa, criticized Mobutu in a letter to priests. Mobutu retaliated by banning the Catholic weekly newspaper. The Cardinal left the country, presumably to avoid a personal confrontation with the President.

About one-third of Zaire's citizens are Catholic and the church is the most cohesive social element in the country. The stage was set for a test of wills. Vatican diplomats, however, interceded. They acknowledged precedents in many parts of the world that permit Catholics to be baptized with local names. In return Mobutu permitted Cardinal Malula's return.

The near-confrontation apparently served as a caution signal. Although Mobutu continues to stress "authenticity," he has not tried to dictate a return to African dress or language. He wore a western cut suit and spoke French in his appearances at the MPR Congress.

Language is a special concern to U.S. and European businessmen. The widespread use of French is one of Zaire's most important bridges to the West.

In states like Guinea and Tanzania where radical leftist leaders have tried to beat out every vestige of the European colonial past, the price has been stagnation and restless accommodations with Moscow and/or Peking.

Africanization, however, can be a powerful local issue. If Mobutu is able to balance its application with continued modernization, he could emerge as the leader of a substantial bloc of black nations. At the MPR Congress the chiefs of state from Togo, Mauretaulia, Zambia, Gabon, Upper Volta, Chad, the Cameroon and Equatorial Guinea all appeared ready to follow his lead.

The Congress also offered Mobutu a chance to counter claims that he has been less than enthusiastic in opposing white rule in the Portuguese colonies, Rhodesia and South Africa.

Roberto Holden, self-described leader of one of Angola's exile revolutionary groups, shared the platform with African chiefs of state and praised Zaire's support. Mobutu, in turn, applauded President Kenneth Kalunda of Zambia pledged black rule over Rhodesia and promised a bloc of allied "Z" nations in Central Africa—Zambia, Zaire and Zimbabwe (the African name for Rhodesia).

The impression persists, however, that ouster of white rule is not Mobutu's top concern. He again rejected any dialogue between Zaire and South Africa, but he pointedly offered to assist if any talks develop between South Africa's white leaders and its black population.

In sum, Mobutu's Congress was a political show of the first order. No American political convention or pro football halftime could rival the leopard skin hats on the delegates, the impressive array of diplomats from 48 countries, the bongo drums, native dancers in grass skirts, Israeli-trained paratroopers in blood red berets, moaning spirituals and gay chanting cheerleaders.

To paraphrase Stalin, in Zaire politics Mobutu-style is a kind of "oplate" to the people. So long as they're kept inside his MPR, they look like fun.

And what politician at any convention wouldn't be delighted to hear his followers chant:

"We gave him five years, he did well;
"We gave him seven more.
"Now we want him for 100 years.
"He put an end to the palavers.
"Mobutu, Mobutu, Mobutu!"

HEALTH APPROPRIATIONS

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the matter of health appropriations has received a great amount of attention by the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-HEW in recent weeks. With the leadership of its chairman, DANIEL J. FLOOD, and the ranking minority member, ROBERT H. MICHEL, the subcommittee has given thorough consideration to many health spending proposals. Over 150 witnesses appeared before the subcommittee in its recent hearings.

The levels of health appropriations established by the subcommittee are responsive to the national goals and national need. As a member of the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am most pleased to learn of the increased health appropriations.

The proposals of Mr. FLOOD and the subcommittee should receive close attention from every Member of the House. The subcommittee deserves our praise

and thanks for its diligent efforts this year. I am glad to give mine.

DRS. ISABELLE AND EARL DIBLE

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, in 1970 the Times of India reported that a 7-week science workshop for more than 500,000 children of municipal schools in Bombay marked "one of the more remarkable crust-breaking achievements in recent years." The science workshop was conducted by two of my constituents, Dr. (Mrs.) Isabelle Dible and Dr. Earl Dible, consultants for the National Science Foundation.

I commend the efforts that have been made to encourage new interest in science and technology in India, and include the following editorials from the Times of India in the RECORD:

SEVEN-WEEK WORKSHOP IN SCIENCE FOR 500,000 CHILDREN

More than 500,000 children of municipal schools in Bombay will complete this week-end a seven-week workshop in general science.

The workshop is conducted by Dr. (Mrs.) Isabel Dible and Dr. Earl Dible, consultants for the National Science Foundation. The foundation is affiliated to the U.S. Agency for International Development and the programme is sponsored in co-operation with the National Council for Science Education in India.

Further, a revised science curriculum for schools has been prepared by officials of 22 Bombay schools and the new courses will be tried out this school year in several primary schools.

Further changes will be incorporated based on the trial period in the classrooms. Prior to this, staff in selected schools will receive intensive in-service training.

The revised curriculum will establish six themes—energy, matter, earth, universe, living things and personal health and safety.

SCIENCE WORKSHOP

There is no surer way to foster the spirit of science than directly exposing the very young to its methods and wonders. That is why the science workshop conducted in Bombay by two consultants of the U.S. National Science Foundation must be considered one of the more remarkable crust-breaking achievements of recent years. Thanks to this enterprise, a half million municipal school children will soon complete a seven-week workshop in general science. Equally heartening is the revised curriculum for schools prepared by a group of teachers. The new courses based on six themes—energy, matter, earth, the universe, living things, and personal health and safety—are to be tried out this year in many primary schools. Excellent; these are the first stirrings of a revolution. There have been a few tentative and sometimes successful attempts at creating a new interest in science and technology. Science fairs are organized in schools and colleges in which several scores of youths enthusiastically participate. But there are far too few science clubs in the country. A start can be made in this field by some energetic visionary undertaking to form clubs modelled on the famous Molecule Club of London, which invites large groups of school children and lets them find out things for themselves and also have fun.

WHO PUT "CLOUD" ON KLEINDIENST? BEN COLE SETS THE RECORD STRAIGHT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, after the sound and fury over the President's nomination of Richard Kleindienst to the Attorney General abated, the U.S. Senate confirmed him by the sizable majority of 64 to 19, after having rejected, by 63 to 20, a move to send his nomination back to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

I suggest these votes show that the sound and fury belonged, very much so, in the category Shakespeare put them:

A tale told by an idiot . . . signifying nothing.

Ben Cole, Washington correspondent for the Indianapolis Star, turned the harsh and glaring—and uncomfortable—light of truth and accuracy on the whole sordid performance that marked the opposition to Mr. Kleindienst's nomination. His column from the June 7, 1972, Indianapolis Star follows:

WHO PUT CLOUD ON KLEINDIENST?

Just pretend for a moment that Richard G. Kleindienst is a flaming Democratic liberal and his senatorial critics are right-wingers cast in the image of the late Joseph R. McCarthy.

There would be heart's blood running all over the place, and the editorial columns of the left-wing press would be brimming with acrimony.

Kleindienst, alas, is a moderately conservative Republican who ran Barry Goldwater's 1964 campaign and helped elect President Nixon four years later. He also offended liberals in another way—he directed the safe keeping of the nation's capital a year ago when it was overrun by peace kooks bent on destroying public and private property while attempting to stop the operation of the United States government.

And instead of latter day Joe McCarthys, the senators baying over his nomination to be attorney-general are three musketeers of liberalism—Senator John Tunney of California, Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana and Senator Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts.

Tunney, it turns out, recently used a little of his senatorial clout to keep his old buddy, singer Frank Sinatra, from being subpoenaed before the Pepper Crime Committee. Representative Claude Pepper (D-Fla.) wants to ask Sinatra if it's true he is "fronting" for a Mafia don in the ownership of a Florida hotel and a Las Vegas casino.

Bayh, also, has employed a little of his prestige to help out friends. His intervention figured in a Potomac River land-fill scheme at Alexandria, Va., where promoters were eager to turn a buck by lousing up the ecology with the lawmaker's help.

And of course there is Teddy Kennedy, the chap from Chappaquiddick.

Their song is, "Send the Nomination Back to the Committee," and they drone it over and over, accompanying themselves by harping that the seven weeks of hearings in Kleindienst weren't enough to dispel a "cloud" over the nomination.

Evidently the "cloud", such as it was, disappeared sufficiently for an overwhelming majority of the Judiciary Committee to vote to reaffirm their previous recommendation that Kleindienst be confirmed.

The truth of the matter is that the "cloud" was manufactured by the pious threesome themselves as they smirkingly warped and twisted and contorted every shred of testimony they heard. Now they raise their eyes to Heaven and reiterate that it was Kleindienst, not they, who asked for those hearings.

Indeed, Kleindienst did request a chance to be heard on allegations made against him by Columnist Jack Anderson whose interpretation of a few disjointed facts produced the ITT controversy for which the liberals so dearly longed. Kleindienst expected, as he had a right to expect, to be given a respectful hearing and that the rules of fair play would apply despite the political nature of the proceedings.

Other witnesses were heard, too—Former Attorney-General John N. Mitchell, Former Assistant Attorney-General Richard W. McLaren and a whole parade of people whose answers were supposed to shed light in the situation. The President even allowed one of his aides, Peter Flanigan, to testify on points the senators insisted they needed to have "cleared up." But Flanigan's appearance failed to satisfy the trio, for they sought to range outside the limits of executive privilege set by the White House and this was the excuse for further expansion of the "cloud."

When Allen Drury wrote his great novel about the Senate, "Advise and Consent," he had in mind demonstrating that liberals employing the same tactics they found so reprehensible in Joe McCarthy would be equally censurable. Events have shown his point was well taken.

REPORT ON U.N. LAW OF THE SEA CONFERENCE—SECTION ONE

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming Law of the Sea Conference involves issues of immense significance to the future of the United States and the world.

These issues affect our national defense, our economy, and our relations with many nations. Their solution will have a profound effect upon the future of our fishing industry, our energy resources, and our environmental balance.

As a congressional adviser to the U.S. delegation to that Conference, I feel it is important that I report the progress of the Seabed Committee's deliberations to you, to the Congress, and through the Congress to the country.

First, if I may, let me present a bit of background. Over the past half-dozen years, an effort to review and enlarge upon existing concepts of the law of the sea has gained momentum in the international community. The roots of this effort are many and diverse, including:

Widespread dissatisfaction with the results of the 1958 and 1960 Geneva Conferences on the Law of the Sea;

Intensified commercial fishing throughout the world which has accelerated the decline of many important species of fish; and

Growing interest of developing nations in the sharing of the resources of the sea.

These trends were encouraged by a doctrine first enunciated by Ambassador

Pardo of Malta in the now-famous "Malta Resolution." His philosophy was that the world's oceans should be treated as the common heritage of mankind, and his speech prompted the U.N. to establish several working groups to explore the implications of this concept.

These working groups reported favorably, and their reports led to the creation of the Committee on Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Ocean Floor Beyond the Limits of National Jurisdiction.

During the past few years, the more traditional law of the sea concepts agreed upon during the 1958 to 1960 period have been seriously questioned. The contested concepts include the limits of coastal State jurisdiction over fisheries; conservation of fish resources; the breadth of territorial seas; and the so-called right of innocent passage through international straits.

All these questions and concerns led to the broadening of the seabed's committee's U.N. mandate to prepare for a law of the sea conference.

The committee's broadened jurisdiction was accompanied by a substantial expansion of the committee's membership, from 47 to 91 nations.

This enlarged Seabed Committee met in New York and Geneva in 1971. Its work, however, continued to center around the seabed regime, gaining momentum from the U.S. initiative of 1970 when the United States first draft convention was introduced as a working paper.

It was my privilege to attend a number of the sessions of the committee held in New York this past March. I was able to participate in many fruitful discussions with members of the U.S. delegation and advisers to the delegation from various segments of industry.

From this experience, I have, I believe, developed a much better appreciation of the United States' position in the many different aspects of our law of the sea posture.

In my view our position not only protects our own citizens whose well-being is so dependent upon the sea and its continued productivity, but, in my view, it also takes into account the legitimate interests of the developing nations of the world.

Our position with respect to fisheries, for example, as enunciated by Ambassador Don McKernan at this session, is one that deserves strong support.

Mr. McKernan proposes that jurisdiction over those coastal species dependent upon the relatively shallow waters of the Continental Shelf be delegated to the contiguous coastal state, and that foreign fishermen wishing to utilize these stocks contribute financially to the conservation efforts of the coastal nation having jurisdiction.

He likewise proposed that jurisdiction over anadromous species such as salmon be vested in the nation whose inland fresh waters provide the breeding grounds for these stocks.

The pelagic species, such as tuna, which spend their entire life in the high seas and migrate vast distances in international waters, do not lend themselves to conservation by any one na-

tion. Therefore the United States has proposed that these species be the subject of international conservation measures.

The Seabed Committee, composed of 91 members of the United Nations, reflects a multiplicity of outlooks and concepts. Its progress has indeed been slow, as might well be expected when so many complex issues are presented to such a broad forum. While thinking with respect to the seabed regime has crystallized to a significant extent, I regret to report that up to now, agreement with respect to fisheries is barely perceptible.

Pressures are building in the American fishing industry to forgo the complex international negotiation route in favor of a simple, nationalistic declaration of a 200-mile limit. It is this understandable feeling of frustration which causes America's fishermen to support this 200-mile limit. They have seen one species after another "fished out" by foreign fishing fleets; they have seen other nations' vessels fishing in restricted areas without punishment, while they pay the penalty for doing the same thing. They have heard talk of international agreements for years and years—and have found that the only agreements made are too little and too late.

The American fisherman is angry—and he has a right to be. He has a right to expect now that the United States will assert itself in the upcoming Geneva Conference. He has a right to believe that the discussions which take place will be substantive. He has a right to feel that his vision will be understood and supported by our State Department and negotiators. He was not happy with what took place in New York last March.

We cannot afford to let opportunity go by again. The sea can be a barrier between nations or a bridge. The results of the Law of the Sea Conference will, in all likelihood, determine which it shall be in the decades ahead. These deliberations are too little known and understood within the United States. It is the responsibility of all of us who understand the importance of the law of the sea, as it is now evolving, to keep the Nation informed. When international agreement comes—as we hope and believe it eventually will—our people should be prepared to understand and welcome these innovations in the relationships among coastal states.

Mr. Speaker, as part of this effort, I would like to conclude my remarks by appending—in three installments—a statement by the Honorable John R. Stevenson, legal adviser to the U.N. Seabed Committee.

It reflects his views as they relate to the current position of the United States as we approach this final preparatory meeting in Geneva. The conference will be held from this coming July 17 to August 18.

His statement deserves the widest possible dissemination, and I commend it to the attention of all who share an interest in the sea and the wise utilization of its resources.

The first part of the statement covers the background on the crisis we face in the Law of the Sea; the second covers

the current U.S. oceans policy; and the third covers the details concerning the preparations in the U.N. Seabed Committee for the 1973 Law of the Sea Conference. I will submit the second and third installments in Tuesday's and Wednesday's RECORD.

The first part of Mr. Stevenson's statement before the Subcommittee on International Organizations and movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives April 10, 1972, follows:

I welcome the opportunity to appear before this Committee today to discuss preparations for the Law of the Sea Conference.

BACKGROUND

Mr. Chairman, the nations of the world are now facing a crisis in the Law of the Sea. Basic principles that have governed the activities of men and nations on the seas for centuries are being challenged, and international procedures for adapting these principles to modern conditions are under severe strain. While we should not minimize the implications of this situation for specific uses of the seas, I believe there are also broader implications for the international community that should not be overlooked.

First, the Law of the Sea lies at the heart of modern international law as it emerged in the 17th century. Should it collapse under the weight of conflicting unilateral actions based almost exclusively on immediate national interests, the result will be a severe blow to the prospects for the rule of law not only in the oceans, but in the international community generally.

Second, the Law of the Sea governs the activities of States on, under, and over two-thirds of this planet. The importance of the oceans to the security and well-being of all mankind is increasing at an extraordinary rate. It is clear that as the magnitude of interests in the seas increases, the danger of conflict—and hence the need for law—increases as well.

The United States is a party to the four Conventions on the Law of the Sea adopted at the 1958 Conference on the Law of the Sea. While these Conventions represent a very significant codification of the Law of the Sea, there are several problems with them. The 1958 Conference, as well as a subsequent 1960 Conference specifically called for this purpose, were unable to resolve the question of the maximum breadth of the territorial sea and coastal State fisheries jurisdiction. Moreover, there was no agreement on a precise seaward limit for coastal State sovereign rights over seabed resources of the continental shelf. The issue of an international regime for the seabeds beyond this limit was considered premature at the time. The dangers of pollution were not yet fully appreciated.

At the same time, many technological changes have occurred. Offshore oil and gas production is becoming a very significant source of energy. Technology is being developed looking to extraction on a commercial basis of hard minerals from manganese nodules on the deep ocean floor. Nuclear submarines and super tankers have become important users of the oceans. Sophisticated methods of fishing have developed that increase the danger of overfishing and economic dislocation. Scientific research in the oceans is growing in importance not only to our understanding of the oceans, but to our total understanding of our planet and its environment, including the weather.

During the period since 1958, coastal State claims over the oceans have proliferated. While the United States adheres to the traditional 3-mile limit for the territorial sea, a plurality of States now claim 12-miles. Some even claim more than 12-miles, and

up to 200. Others have limited the substance of their claim to seabed resources and fisheries, but have also asserted such limited claims as far as 200 miles or more. Needless to say, should this trend continue unchecked, what would result is a partition of the oceans by coastal States. I should point out that a universal 200-mile limit would in itself embrace over 30% of the oceans—Soviet geographers calculate that it might be as much as 50%. This expansionist trend in maritime jurisdiction is also intensifying the nature of disputes regarding sovereignty over small islands and other land areas that would otherwise be of little significance, but that might be used to calculate extensive maritime jurisdiction.

For all these reasons, the 1973 Law of the Sea Conference acquires particular importance. The essential questions are whether we as a world community can adapt to technological change and act quickly enough to assure that such change benefits all of us, and whether we can outpace the trend in unilateral claims that will render negotiation far more difficult, if not impossible.

President Nixon clearly indicated our assessment of the seriousness of this situation at the start of his Statement on United States Oceans Policy of May 23, 1970:

"The nations of the world are now facing decisions of momentous importance to man's use of the oceans for decades ahead. At issue is whether the oceans will be used rationally and equitably and for the benefit of mankind or whether they will become an arena of unrestrained exploitation and conflicting jurisdictional claims in which even the most advantaged states will be losers."

The issue arises now—and with urgency—because nations have grown increasingly conscious of the wealth to be exploited from the seabeds and throughout the waters above, and because they are also becoming apprehensive about ecological hazards of unregulated use of the oceans and seabeds. The stark fact is that the law of the sea is inadequate to meet the needs of modern technology and the concerns of the international community. If it is not modernized multilaterally, unilateral action and international conflict are inevitable.

This is the time, then, for all nations to set about resolving the basic issues of the future regime for the oceans—and to resolve it in a way that redounds to the general benefit in the era of intensive exploitation that lies ahead. The United States as a major maritime power and a leader in ocean technology to unlock the riches of the ocean has a special responsibility to move this effort forward.

A MASSACHUSETTS HOUSE RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE MASSACRE AT LOD AIRPORT, ISRAEL

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD today a resolution passed by the Massachusetts House of Representatives, memorializing the President of the United States and certain other public officials to publicly condemn and to take certain other actions relative to the massacre at Lod Airport, Israel.

This resolution expressing outrage and indignation at the heinous crimes committed on innocent travelers highlights the need for imposing sanctions on those

governments who harbor international criminals.

I want to express my appreciation to the author of the resolution, Representative Jon Rotenberg, of Brookline, for introducing this timely measure. Representative Rotenberg has brought this deplorable incident to the fore, and I am sure that both those in the Commonwealth and those here in the Massachusetts delegation are deeply grateful.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTIONS

Resolutions memorializing the President of the United States and certain other Public Officials to publicly Condemn and to take certain other actions relative to the Massacre at Lod Airport, Israel.

Whereas, The Massachusetts House of Representatives is shocked and saddened by the massacre of at least 26 persons and the wounding of 70 yesterday at Israel's International Airport. Commissioned by one of several Palestinian terrorist groups advocating the mass murder of Israel men, women and children, the Lod Airport Massacre stands as the most deplorable episode in the long series of atrocities perpetrated by these groups; and

Whereas, The complicity of Arab governments in these atrocities is equally reprehensible. They long have supported, both politically and financially, acts of terrorism against the people of Israel. They retreat to a smug silence only when the result of such acts is sufficiently horrible to arouse outrage and sorrow around the world; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives calls upon President Richard M. Nixon, U.S. Secretary of State William Rogers and the United Nations Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim to take the following steps:

- (1) To express publicly their shock at the Lod Airport Massacre and their sympathy to the families of the victims.
- (2) To condemn all acts of terrorism.
- (3) To privately and publicly urge each Arab government to abandon its support of Palestinian terrorist groups.
- (4) To demand that Arab leaders denounce the Massacre and all previous incidents of violence directed at the Israel population; and be it further

Resolved, That engrossed copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to President Richard M. Nixon, U.S. Secretary of State William Rogers, Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kurt Waldheim, and to all the members of Congress from this Commonwealth.

AMERICA, THE WARRIOR STATE

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of my colleagues to a review by Ronald Steel of a recent book, "Roots of War," written by Richard Barnet.

As Mr. Steel, in the New York Times Book Review of June 11, points out, Dick Barnet has presented a provocative, yet cogent, analysis of the formulation and conduct of U.S. foreign policy during the past 30 years, and it is not pleasant history. There will be those, particularly in the foreign policy and Military Establishment who will take exception to Barnet's

central thesis that the external business of the United States since 1940 has been war and the preparation of war. Yet, it is precisely this bureaucratic structure which has been responsible for the promotion of a militaristic definition of our national security which, in the process, has turned America into a warrior state. For others, however, who want to free America from the militarist control of national security and foreign policy, the "Roots of War" is essential reading.

Mr. Speaker, the review by Mr. Steel follows:

"Roots of War"—By Richard J. Barnet

(By Ronald Steel)

For the past three decades one President after another has been telling us that we must make the world safe for America. F.D.R. preached the Four Freedoms, Harry Truman dropped the atomic bomb, Ike and Dulles set up a global system of bases, J.F.K. told us we were the "watchmen on the walls" of freedom, L.B.J. warned us that others wanted what we have, and Nixon seeks respect for his office by B-52 raids on small Asian states. Security through terror, peace through war, truth through lies: this has been the model for United States foreign policy for nearly two generations.

Richard Barnet argues in this provocative and disturbing study of the Thirty Years' War waged in the name of peace that instead of trying to make the world safe for Americans we should be looking for a way to make America safe for the world. It is not our enemies, he maintains, but we ourselves who are the greatest threat to world peace, pursuing what we insist is our national interest by "spreading death, terror, and destruction," and behaving in a way that America is "surpassed by none in the fear and hatred it has inspired around the world."

Since 1940, Barnet argues, the external business of the United States has been war and preparation for war. We have the world's most powerful military force, maintain some 400 major overseas installations, have waged two land wars in Korea and Vietnam, and have intervened either through the C.I.A. or with our own troops from Guatemala and Cuba to Lebanon and Laos. Until Vietnam we assumed that the feeding of a permanent war machine was the price we had to pay for living in a threatening world.

"We are the Number One nation," Lyndon Johnson said as he was devastating Vietnam, "and we are going to stay the Number One nation." But the price of being the world's Number One military interventionist is getting to be more than the country can support. Inflation is rampant, unemployment is persistent, the balance of payments is disastrous, the vaults at Fort Knox are emptying, and the public mood is turning from disenchantment to confusion and even to an ugly search for authoritarian order. The world is not going the way we want it to, and—judging from President Nixon's kiss-and-make-up visits to Peking and Moscow—maybe the menace is not so terrible as we were told it was all these years. If not, what is the purpose of murder in Indochina and the most gargantuan war machine the world has ever seen?

This is the question that many are beginning to ask, but few have approached it with the incisiveness and originality shown by Richard Barnet. Drawing on his experience in government and his work at the Institute for Policy Studies, which he founded in Washington 10 years ago with Marcus Raskin and has helped transform into a brains trust of the radical left, he has looked at foreign policy from the inside. Instead of asking how we responded to external threats, he tries to find out what it is about our society that led us to create situations that would justify the

wars of intervention, why for three decades we have been organized for war.

Barnet is not the first to view foreign policy as an outgrowth of domestic policy. But the special value of his book lies in his examination of the domestic political, economic, and social forces that determine that amorphous thing we call the national interest. For the elite who have evolved our foreign policy, that national interest demands war, the threat of war and the preparation for war. "War is primarily the product of domestic social and economic institutions," Barnet insists, and those who control these institutions decide which threats are important enough to justify war.

In Barnet's scheme the roots of war are three-fold: the concentration of power in a national security bureaucracy that plays by rules of its own making and is largely self-perpetuating; the capitalist economy and the business creed that sustains it; and the vulnerability of the public to manipulation on national security issues. To sever the roots of war means more than just a change of leaders or of policy. It means sweeping institutional changes within the society: shrinking and controlling the bureaucracy, eschewing the growth mystique that feeds economic expansion and military interventions, and making the public aware of how it is directly affected by the decisions of the elite. Only in this way, he believes, can the United States "renounce militarism and war as primary instruments of policy and accommodate its fears and appetites to the postimperial world."

The centerpiece of Barnet's argument is his dissection of the national security bureaucracy, an organization that permits individuals to "get medals, promotions and honors by committing the same acts for the state for which they would be hanged or imprisoned in any other circumstance." These men are able to commit what he calls "bureaucratic homicide" "because their official roles insulate them from personal responsibility for their actions. They direct the "Green Machine," as the G.I.s call the war juggernaut in Vietnam, and decide from their desks and push buttons which governments shall be overthrown and which nations destroyed. They do so in the name of the national interest, which they are solemnly pledged to uphold and defend.

These men are not monsters, nor do they see themselves operating as oppressors and aggressors. They are, Barnet holds, deeply moral men who are convinced that what they are doing is best for the nation and, by extension, best for the world. They are always saying so, and there is no reason to believe that they do not mean it, however much those they are subverting and bombing may disagree. These men are talented and intelligent, the "brightest and the best" by every standard American society holds dear. They have been to the right schools, hold the right jobs in finance, law and business, belong to the proper clubs and organizations, and succeed one another in all the important governmental posts—regardless of which political party is in power.

Barnet shows how between 1940 and 1967 all the first- and second-level posts in the national security bureaucracy were held by fewer than 400 individuals. Of the 91 people who held the very top jobs—the Secretaries of Defense and State, and of the three services, the chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the director of the C.I.A.—70 have been businessmen, lawyers for business, and investment bankers. Not only do they all know one another, lunch together, and attend the same meetings at the Council on Foreign Relations, but they succeed one another in the same jobs.

This does not mean that there is a Wall Street-Ivy League conspiracy, or that the elite is closed to outsiders. Indeed, the Establishment is always open to talent, so long as

bright newcomers share the government assumptions and rules of conduct. But the elite is cohesive, remarkably small, and vigorously self-perpetuating. As in any elite, the highest virtue is loyalty to the team, even when the ship is on a disaster course. Criticisms are made from within; linen is never washed in public. As we know, not a single high official of the Johnson Administration resigned in protest over the Vietnam war, even though many criticized it privately. The most damning indictment made by the elite against Daniel Ellsberg and Senator Gravel is not that they gave away Government secrets, but that they broke the unofficial rules of the club.

Barnet argues that this elite is dangerous because it is cut off from the mainstream of American society and from the aspirations of the world's dispossessed, because it is enamored of a technology that institutionalizes and depersonalizes violence. "The basic characteristics of our institutional structures," Barnet declares, "the rewards and incentives that operate on men when they become national security managers, and the elaborate private language and ideology that has been developed to absolve men from personal responsibility for bureaucratic homicide all reinforce each other. The actors in the Vietnam tragedy by and large did what they were trained to do, and, under happier circumstances, would have been praised for doing. In short, they were following the rules of governing an empire."

If the national security bureaucracy is the first root of war, the second is the creed of economic expansion. "Many of the nation's leading industrialists and bankers," Barnet maintains, "are convinced that the projection of American power and influence abroad is rooted in economic necessity, in the needs of an expanding economy for new markets and new resources unavailable at home." This leads them to support military and political interventions, and helps create an identity of interest between the national security bureaucracy and the business community.

However, this is not the same thing as saying that the military machine is the servant of big business. In fact, Barnet shows how the ambitions of the nation-state are increasingly at odds with the interests of the giant corporations which are organizing globally. In its quest for power the nation-state threatens economic stability, imperils the international monetary structure, and impedes the rationalization of the world economy. It has become an anachronistic institution, launching uneconomic wars, imperiling its own population, and getting in the way of the international development process that is the goal of the multinational corporation.

Barnet clearly is not an economic determinist and rejects the easy argument that capitalism is the cause of imperialism. He realizes that socialist states can be equally imperialistic, and even has qualified words of praise for the anti-chauvinist multinational corporations. This, however, leaves him without any clear alternative to the current system of unequal distribution and exploitation—other than the hopeful wish that we will turn away from our obsession with growth and thereby refrain from the more "egregious imperialist practices of the past." The sympathetic skeptic may well question whether such an act of self-abnegation will occur unless it is imposed from the outside.

Barnet's analysis of the third root of war—manipulation of public opinion by the national security bureaucracy—reinforces skepticism about the ability of the society to change along the lines he desires. Like most critics of foreign policy, Barnet is stronger on attack than on solution. While this doesn't detract from the importance of his critique, it leaves a good many unanswered questions. One wonders whether his cure—trimming the

bureaucracy, curbing economic growth, arousing the public—is feasible, or even likely to work. Will a smaller, more responsive bureaucracy view the world differently? Is it possible to run a complex society without some form of "governing class," and has our national security bureaucracy behaved more irresponsibly than any likely alternative group? Is the "growth game" and dependence on foreign raw materials really a root of war? How much more agitated over foreign policy can we reasonably expect the public to be?

One of the problems is that nations with unlimited power tend to use whatever means are required to maintain that power. It is the job of government officials to pursue this goal and find eloquent phrases to rationalize actions they sincerely believe are just. They used to call it making the "world safe for democracy." Now they call it exercising our "world responsibilities," or more pretentiously, insuring the "rule of law." The quest for empire is likely to go on so long as others allow us to get away with the unilateral exercise of these self-assumed "responsibilities." The emergence of a four-power world and the decline of American power may be what will save us from ourselves.

Barnet has not answered all the questions, and it would be unfair to expect him to do so. What he has done is to pose with great insight some of the questions we should have been asking all along. He has once again, as in his earlier book, "Intervention and Revolution," shown himself to be one of our most perceptive younger political analysts. "Roots of War" is an eloquent, important, and timely study that breaks new ground. It clarifies the issues, stimulates the mind, and enriches the debate it is certain to trigger.

DR. JEAN MAYER SUPPORTS TRUTH IN FOOD LABELING

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the longer we delay in providing the American people the proper protection of a safe food supply, the more we risk illness and even death.

The case of 10-year-old Michael Grzybinski is a good example. Michael was allergic to peanuts, and from the age of 3 had learned to ask what the ingredients of candy or cake was before eating them. On April 17, 1972, he ate some ice cream which did not list the contents on the container. The ice cream had peanut butter in it, and Michael died within a few minutes.

This tragic, needless death could have been avoided if the manufacturer had simply listed the ingredients in his product. There is no justifiable reason why food producers and packers should conceal from the American people the knowledge of what is in the food they eat.

Millions of Americans have food allergies and other reasons which make knowing ingredients of what they eat an absolute necessity. The callous disregard of industry for their welfare is unpardonable.

But it is not just the allergic who care about what is in the food they eat. There is a growing concern throughout the Nation. Slowly, all too slowly, a few manu-

facturers are beginning to recognize this and label their products accordingly. But that is not enough. Voluntary industry action has been a flimsy excuse for no action at all. That is why I have introduced legislation, with more than 30 co-sponsors, to require full disclosure of ingredients on food labels. That bill is H.R. 8670, the Truth in Food Labeling Act.

I am inserting in the RECORD at this point the tragic story of young Michael Grzybinski as reported in a recent column by the noted nutritionist, Dr. Jean Mayer of Harvard University. The column follows:

BETTER LABELING LAWS ARE NEEDED

(By Dr. Jean Mayer)

Over the years, some of us have insisted that the public has a right to know what they eat, and the only way to be sure of this—when it comes to processed food—is better labeling. This means labeling that informs you of the caloric content of common portions of processed foods, the proportion of your needs of protein, vitamins and minerals it provides, and exactly what ingredients it contains.

We think food manufacturers should no more be allowed to hide behind "the need to protect recipe secrets" than drug manufacturers are. In both cases, lack of information can be not only unhealthy, but even deadly.

For lack of such labeling, 10-year-old Michael Grzybinski died. That's right, died. If anyone thinks that I am exaggerating the urgency of improved labeling, read this letter I recently received from Dedham, Mass.

Dear Sir: On Monday, April 17, 1972, my 10-year-old son Michael, passed away from natural causes due to glottic edema and anaphylactic reaction due to ingested peanuts. This was caused by eating ice cream that had peanut butter whipped into it, made by a Boston ice cream company and called "Butterfinger."

My son had an allergy to peanuts all of his life and, even at the age of three years, would not eat candy bars or cakes unless someone told him what the ingredients were. As he got older, he would read the ingredients himself before eating.

On the day this accident happened, he was playing ball with some friends of his, who invited him to have some ice cream at their house. The friend asked him if the ice cream was okay to eat, as there was only a picture of a Butterfinger candy bar, and no ingredients on the plastic cover. So he said he guessed it was okay to eat since it did not say anything about containing peanuts.

Shortly later, he came home and the allergic reaction had already started. We sent across to the friends house to see what he had eaten, and were told of this ice cream. In a very few minutes my son was dead.

The reason I am writing this letter to your office . . . is my wife's and my hope that this tragedy does not happen again to other people who have this allergy, and that the container would be marked with the contents spelled out instead of only the picture of a candy bar.

We intend no legal action against this ice cream company, but only wish that they can see their way clear to change the container cover and identify the contents.—Yours truly, Chester J. Grzybinski.

Michael's parents, with great courage, have allowed me to make this letter public in the hope that, as a result, other parents would not be faced with the tragedy that has struck them.

Meanwhile, what is happening to the proposals for universal ingredients labeling? Some industries oppose labeling vigorously—ostensibly because the public would "be con-

fused." This might apply to full chemical names of certain ingredients, but hardly to the natural contents of ice cream, or soft drinks for example.

Government agencies have been curiously unwilling to enter the arena. The Food and Drug Administration and the U.S. Department of Agriculture argue that they haven't the legal power to require full ingredient labeling. The FDA at least agrees it would be useful to have such power, and has had a bill introduced into Congress.

But the bill is woefully weak. And the FDA has been unmoved by the challenge of a group of young lawyers banded together as LABEL, Inc., who claim that there's nothing in the law to prevent the FDA from taking action right now.

In desperation, a number of congressmen—chief among them Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D-N.Y.)—have introduced bills into the House and Senate. All of the bills have gone to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

If any action is to result, vigorous pressure by aroused citizens is needed to get these bills out of committee—favorably. Only if the legislators know that the voters are deeply concerned, even angry, will we get the laws that will make us nutritionally better informed and, hopefully, guarantee there will be no more needless deaths of 10-year-olds.

THE 195TH ANNIVERSARY OF FLAG DAY

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 14, we in the House of Representatives and our fellow citizens throughout our country will commemorate the 195th anniversary of Flag Day.

I have received an interesting and timely letter from my good friend, Comdr. Robert W. Collins, regarding Flag Day and the proper way to observe it. Commander Collins is a devoted student of the American flag, and he makes a compelling case for publishing a chart, depicting the history and development of Old Glory.

Because we are approaching Flag Day, 1972, and because we are nearing the bicentennial of our Nation, I am inserting Commander Collins' letter in the RECORD and calling it to the attention of my colleagues.

To the Members of the House from all the States of our Union:

14 June is Flag Day. On 14 June the House will mark the 195th anniversary of Flag Day. For many years the House has had proper observations commemorating the Resolution of the Continental Congress of 14 June 1777 which gave us our first national flag and ensign known as The Stars and Stripes.

Congress has enacted only two statutes regulating our national flag and ensign: the flag law of 8 January 1794 effective 1 May 1795 and our permanent flag law of 4 April 1818 effective 4 July 1818. It is still in effect and has given our Nation the design for all of our flags and ensigns since the 20-star flag and ensign of 4 July 1818 to our present flag and ensign of 50 stars and 13 stripes of 4 July 1960 to date.

At this time permit me to urge the Members of the House from all our States to direct their attention to the laws on the design of our flags and ensigns, the symbols of our great Nation. Herewith is a compila-

tion of those laws which I call Our Flag Laws—A Chronology.

No illustrated chart of the flags and ensigns of the United States of America authorized by law is to be found anywhere. The time has come for such a chart. What this country needs is an illustrated chart portraying the authorized flags and ensigns of our great Nation. Our Bi-Centennial is near at hand. Accordingly, the premises considered, the Members of the House from all the States are urged to enact a Resolution authorizing and directing the Public Printer to produce a chart portraying the Grand Union Flag which General Washington hoisted over his headquarters at Cambridge, Massachusetts on 1 January 1776 and the 27 National Flags and Ensigns authorized by the Continental Congress and the Congress from 1794 to date.

Respectfully submitted,
ROBERT W. COLLINS,
Commander, U.S. Naval Reserve (Retired).

BASEBALL IN ALASKA

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, I would imagine that few of my colleagues realize that Alaska is one of the most enthusiastic baseball States in the country. In the past few years, the Anchorage Glacier Pilots have captured the national championship of the American Baseball Congress on two occasions, and the Fairbanks Goldpanners have been one of the most consistently fine teams nationally for years. In addition to this, the Little League program throughout Alaska is enthusiastically supported and participated in by great numbers of youngsters.

To call attention to this enthusiasm for baseball in Alaska and to show commitment to the participation of youth in this fine sport, Governor Egan has recently declared June 11th as the beginning of Little League Baseball League in Alaska. I am glad to have this opportunity to call this event and the enthusiasm for baseball in Alaska to the attention of my colleagues. The resolution follows:

PROCLAMATION

LITTLE LEAGUE BASEBALL WEEK

Little League Baseball is symbolic of America and the highest concepts of democracy, citizenship and teamwork. This great movement embraces more than two million boys under 12 years of age who are helped to become responsible Americans of the future.

Thousands of adult volunteers whose only motive is to cultivate a wholesome, beneficial climate of formative training give unstintingly of their time and energies to this end. The Little League Foundation has become an important keystone of the future and the cornerstone of permanency for this great movement in the broad area of our country's youth.

I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, do hereby proclaim the week beginning June 11 as the period for observance of "Little League Baseball Week" in Alaska, and urge all Alaskans to recognize and give support to the program of Little League Baseball.

Dated this 30th day of May, 1972.

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

OLIVER S. TWIST

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished son of Philadelphia, Oliver S. Twist, is to again be honored by a grateful community. On Thursday evening, June 15, 1972, the Oxford Circle Realty Board will hold a testimonial dinner in tribute to Mr. Twist, whose unique career spans a half century in the banking and real estate professions.

It is with pleasure that I call to the attention of my colleagues the notable achievements of this fine gentleman, whom I am privileged to call my friend, by including the following article from the June 8, 1972 edition of the Northeast and Feltonville Weekly, and other Philadelphia newspapers:

TWIST CITED FOR DEVOTED NE COMMUNITY SERVICE

A milestone in the history of the Greater Northeast Philadelphia-Lower Bucks County area will be observed this month (June) when Oliver S. Twist, President of Frankford Trust Company, marks his fiftieth year in the banking and real estate professions.

Widely recognized for his prominent role in the development and growth of the area, the veteran executive is also regarded as one of the community's foremost citizens.

Twist will be cited for his outstanding contributions to the community at a testimonial dinner sponsored by the Oxford Circle Realty Board on Thursday, June 15, at Valle's Steak House on Roosevelt Blvd.

In announcing the tribute dinner, Morris S. Smallow, President of the Oxford Circle Realty Board, stated:

"For fifty years, Oliver S. Twist has served his chosen profession and community with honor and distinction. His distinguished career has been marked by many achievements, all of which played a vital role in the growth and development of Greater Northeast Philadelphia. In grateful appreciation of and tribute to the man and his outstanding contributions to the community, the Oxford Circle Realty Board tenders this testimonial."

Serving as chairman for the event is Ray Richman, head of his own real estate firm, with Irvin Buck as co-chairman. J. Walter Eppehimer, vice president of Frankford Trust, is ticket chairman. The committee and honorary committee for the dinner is composed of leading realtors, bankers, businessmen and representatives of civil organizations in the Northeast-Lower Bucks area.

Oliver Twist was born in South Fork, Pa., but has been associated with the Greater Northeast community since, as a boy, his family moved to Philadelphia. He attended Frankford High School, where he immediately became an outstanding student and activities leader. In 1969, he received the school's Ninth Alumni Pioneer Achievement Award.

Following graduation in 1922, he was employed by Frankford Trust Company, rising rapidly through the ranks as Assistant Title Officer, Assistant Secretary, Secretary, Title Officer, and Vice President. He was elected President in 1967, climaxing a colorful career during which Frankford Trust Company has grown steadily and played a key role in the financial affairs of the Northeast.

In both business and community activities, Mr. Twist has earned the admiration and respect of people everywhere. His professional associations include posts with the Banking Board of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; Director, Home Unity Savings

and Loan Association; Director, Commonwealth Land Title Insurance Company; and Director, Life Assurance Company of Pennsylvania, among many others.

His civic and philanthropic activities over the years include leadership roles with many of the area's foremost organizations. Among them are the Loyal Order of Moose, Shriner's Hospital, Cancer Society, Frankford Hospital, National Jewish Hospital, Police Athletic League, and Lighthouse of the Blind.

In recognition of these activities, he has been the recipient of many honors and awards from such groups as Greater Northeast Business Men, Bright Hope Baptist Church, Jewish War Veterans, American Legion, Half-Century Square Club, the State of Israel, and others.

Reservations for the June 15 testimonial dinner are being accepted by Mr. Eppehimer at JE 3-4400.

SPECIAL ACTION REPORT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as part of my continuing effort to keep my constituents informed about the issues facing the Congress and my endeavors to represent them, I include in the RECORD at this time the contents of my "Special Action Report" which is being prepared for imminent distribution:

SPECIAL ACTION REPORT FROM CONGRESSMAN BOB PRICE

CONSERVATIVE VS. LIBERAL VOTING RECORDS PUBLISHED

The so-called "watchdogs" of the Senate and the House are the recognized associations and groups which give a rating to the voting record of each Member of Congress. These ratings are published for the public to see how their particular congressman performs. The following chart shows the most popular ratings with a foot-note of who publishes the ratings:

[In percent]

Congressman	N.A.B.	A.C.A.	A.D.A.	AFL-CIO C.O.P.E.
Archer	(1)	100	(1)	(1)
Brooks	18.2	12	33	83
Burleson	83.3	75	0	23
Cabell	60.0	57	11	24
Casey	58.3	64	11	33
Collins	90.9	92	0	8
de la Garza	37.5	30	28	66
Dowdy	63.6	84	0	13
Eckhardt	0.0	4	89	100
Fisher	80.0	80	11	11
Gonzalez	8.3	8	67	98
Kazen	25.0	20	17	84
Mahon	66.7	48	11	35
Patman	20.0	18	17	73
Pickle	72.7	37	11	62
Poage	63.6	49	6	43
Price	88.9	90	6	0
Purcell	50.0	42	11	47
Roberts	54.5	57	11	37
Teague	50.0	57	0	28
White	41.7	48	33	46
Wright	18.2	21	22	68
Young	18.2	20	17	69

1 Indicates Member not in office at time of rating.

N.A.B.—National Associated Businessmen's Economy Voting Record 1969-1970; A.C.A.—Americans for Constitutional Action—cumulative rating through 1971; A.D.A.—Americans for Democratic Action—Liberal Quotient 1969-70; C.O.P.E.—AFL-CIO Committee on Political Education—cumulative rating through 1970.

PRICE AMENDMENT WOULD FIRE ABSENTEE CONGRESSMEN

I have introduced a Constitutional Amendment which would require Members of Congress to be recorded on at least 70% of all roll call votes during a session of Congress or lose their jobs.

The American people have a right to expect that the men they elect to Congress are going to do their job—and that is to be present and voting an important legislation involving the spending of billions of taxpayers' dollars and affecting their constituents.

While there are certain times when a Member of Congress must be necessarily absent, and my bill provides for absences due to illness or official business, nevertheless, the attendance record of all too many Congressmen is shamefully bad. In fact, if many of these Members had the same rate of absenteeism in private industry as they do in Congress, they would be fired from their jobs. My own overall attendance record since coming to Congress stands at over 90% as indicated by chart at right, and it is my belief that every American citizen has a right to full time representation in the Congress of the United States.

Attendance records *

Congressman:	Percent
Archer	97.0
Brooks	79.2
Burleson	89.8
Cabell	80.6
Casey	86.9
Collins	88.5
de la Garza	82.8
Dowdy	73.2
Eckhardt	85.6
Fisher	82.4
Gonzalez	99.8
Kazen	96.8
Mahon	98.2
Patman	72.2
Pickle	85.0
Poage	83.6
Price	90.4
Purcell	68.8
Roberts	87.2
Teague	67.8
White	95.0
Wright	76.6
Young	86.8

* Attendance record percentages for Texas Congressional delegation based on composite of yearly attendance averages for recorded "yea" and "nay" votes for period 1967-71.

Source: Congressional Quarterly.

PRICE NAMED RANKING REPUBLICAN MEMBER OF SPACE SCIENCE AND APPLICATION SUBCOMMITTEE

The Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications is responsible for directing NASA unmanned space programs. The unmanned space programs are aimed at eliminating air and water pollution, reducing urban congestion, improving transportation systems, solving critical energy problems, and developing more efficient techniques for food production.

Having been appointed to this important Subcommittee, I intend to press for greater emphasis in fields where the American taxpayer will see an immediate return on his investment, especially in the four areas of agriculture, geology, oceanography, and hydrology. To manage the water resources of the earth more intelligently, we must have more information about the surface and subsurface flows of water. My other important Science and Astronautic Subcommittee assignments concern Manned Space Flight and International Cooperation in Science and Space.

TEST-FLIGHT EVALUATION OF SR-71 RECONNAISSANCE AIRCRAFT PREPARED FOR SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

As one of two or three qualified jet pilots presently serving in the Congress, I recently accepted an invitation by the Secretary of the Air Force to test fly and evaluate the capabilities of the highly sophisticated SR-71 reconnaissance aircraft. Because of the large annual expenditure for defense purposes, I believe it is important for the Congress to have a first-hand look at where the money is going, and I am presently drafting a report based upon my test flight to be submitted to the House Armed Service Committee and the Secretary of the Air Force.

PRICE INTRODUCES BILL TO AMEND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT OF 1970

Thanks to the many letters and comments from concerned area citizens, I have recently introduced legislation to relieve small business firms and farms from hardships and unnecessary problems brought about by the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. Among its many provisions my bill will exempt from the law employers with fewer than 25 employees, both agricultural and non-agricultural, and will assist employers in numerous ways in familiarizing them with the requirements of the law and aiding them in meeting compliance requirements.

ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS INCLUDE TWO PRICE PROPOSALS IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Recent House passage of the Rural Development Act of 1972 was a step in the right direction toward the encouragement of business and industrial development in rural areas. As a co-sponsor of this measure, I am pleased that two of my bills to increase the size of operating farm loans from \$35,000 to \$50,000 and convert from farm operating and farm ownership loans from an appropriated funding to an insured loan basis were incorporated into this significant piece of legislation.

WEST TEXANS EXCHANGE VIEWS

Frequent appearances before college and high school groups provide me with the opportunity to visit with students, to listen and learn from them, and to share views on the many important issues of today. It is my firm belief that good government is the responsibility of every citizen, and I welcome hearing from all constituents, young and old, concerning problems and issues affecting the Federal Government. In addition to my Washington office, I maintain two fixed District offices, a traveling assistant who calls on communities throughout the District, and schedule as many public "town hall meetings" as possible so that I can personally keep in close touch with the thinking and concerns of the citizens of Northwest Texas.

DISTRICT CORRESPONDENCE AT ALL-TIME HIGH

One of the primary functions of the staff in a congressional office is the handling and sorting of mail. Currently the rate of letters flowing into my office has reached an all-time high level. I don't want to discourage anyone from writing to me; I do want to apologize for what may seem like a long time in replying in some cases. By the time I have read a letter, had a staff member gather information when necessary, it sometimes takes several weeks to answer. Emergency correspondence that requires immediate attention is first separated from the stacks of mail by my staff. Such letters receive my personal attention and are given first priority. Recently we mailed a series of brief questionnaires into several areas and received over 25,000 responses—this is democracy in action.

NEW CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

New boundaries for congressional districts have been drawn and the 18th and the 13th Congressional Districts have been merged into a new 13th Congressional District. I will continue to represent the people in the 6 counties not included in the new district until January, 1973. The map gives a better picture of the new 13th district. I am looking forward to traveling throughout the entire 35 county area and to meeting you and obtaining the benefit of your views on the issues affecting your community, Texas, and the Nation; we all have much in common and by working together we can expect to accomplish much for our area of Texas.

LETTER FROM POW'S

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the case for a prompt and total withdrawal of all American land, sea, and air forces from combat in Indochina grows stronger every day. Last week Secretary Laird came to Congress to ask for increased funds for the proxy part of the war; it is clear now that the overall expenditure for the war this year will be billions more than we were told it would be a few months ago.

No one in or out of the administration is capable of presenting any rationale whatever for our continued involvement. The President and his spokesmen do little more than to propound the theory that errors should be prolonged; that having made a terrible mistake, we are somehow obligated to remake it and readmit it for the indefinite future.

This morning I received two letters: one from Prof. George Wald, a Nobel Prize winner who has devoted much of his time in recent years to expressing the brutal senselessness of our policy; and a second forwarded by him, from eight prisoners of war.

Professor Wald's personal endorsement of the validity of this letter entitles it to a good deal of weight. It makes clear what almost all of us outside the Pentagon and White House now realize—that the POW's are among the main victims of the President's stubborn insistence on pursuing a futile war.

I urge all Members of the House and Senate to read these letters, and to weigh their well-argued positions against the feeble justifications for continuing to lay waste to four countries in an alleged effort to save them.

The letters follow:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., June 8, 1972.

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HARRINGTON: The enclosed letter was recently received from eight U.S. Prisoners of War in Hanoi. We received it via the Committee of Liaison with Families of Servicemen Detained in North Vietnam, in New York.

It has, as you see, an important message for the people of our country and the Congress.

I have no doubt that this letter is authentic, since I interviewed two of these men, Wilbur and Hoffman, in Hanoi last February, and what they told me was much like what is said here.

Apart from the central message, two points are interesting: the POW's are in Hanoi, and when we bomb Hanoi we bomb them. The other point is a little more remote. It is that these bombings come for some strange reason on Sunday mornings. It is curious that though only about one tenth of the Vietnamese are Christians, mainly Roman Catholics, the government of North Vietnam observes Christmas as a national holiday. When I was in North Vietnam last February, I was taken to visit a hospital outside Thanh Hoa, bombed on Sunday morning, December 26, the morning after Christmas. As the letter here says, the first bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong was on a Sunday morning, April 16.

You have a few remaining weeks to take advantage of your power over the purse as members of Congress. The only way to bring these men home is to cut off funding of the war and of the present government of South Vietnam. Then, and only then, can families of POW's be reunited with their loved ones.

With all good wishes,
Sincerely,

GEORGE WALD.

TEXT OF LETTER FROM EIGHT U.S. PILOTS
DETAINED IN NORTH VIETNAM

MAY, 1972.

To: The People of the United States and the Congress of the United States.

From: American pilots captured in North Vietnam.

Despite the bombing halt announcement of 1968 the President ordered the resumption and authorized the continuation of the bombing of North Vietnam and a variety of excuses to justify the raids. On Sunday morning April 16, 1972 the peace of Hanoi and Haiphong were shattered by American bombs. Many innocent people died a totally needless and senseless death.

We, the detained Americans in Hanoi cannot help but be struck by the futility of such actions. We have come to know the Vietnamese people and we know that no bombing or threat of death is going to still the spirit that lives in them. We believe that widespread bombing of North Vietnam serves only to turn world opinion more strongly against the U.S. and risk the death and capture of many more Americans, as well as endangering the lives of those already held captive.

No bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong will cause the PRG of South Vietnam or the Government of North Vietnam to come begging for peace for while they truly desire peace it will not be a peace short of freedom and independence. No bombing of North Vietnam serves to make the withdrawal of American forces any safer. It only make it more likely that they cannot be withdrawn at all, and serves only as an admission of the failure of Vietnamization policy.

We appeal to the American people to exercise your rights and responsibilities to demand an end to the war now. We appeal to the Congress to take firm positive action to go with the words already spoken against the war. The resumption of the Paris peace conference and serious negotiations based on the seven point proposal of the Provisional Revolutionary Government are obvious first steps. We require these steps and much more. Americans, the hope of the world is in your hands. Bring us home now.

Very Respectfully,

Walter E. Wilber, Commander US Navy,
Captured June 1968; David Hoffman,
Lt. Commander US Navy, Captured
Dec. 1971, USS Coral Sea; Kenneth J.
Fraser, Capt. US Navy, Captured Feb.

1972, Korat, Thailand; Lynn E. Gunther, Capt. US Air Force, Captured Dec. 1971, Nakoon Phanom, Thailand; Edson W. Miller, Lt. Col. Marine Corps, Captured Oct. 1967, Korat, Thailand; James D. Cutter, Capt. US Air Force, Captured Feb. 1972, Korat, Thailand; Edwin A. Hawley, Jr., Capt. US Air Force, Captured Feb. 1972, Udorn, Thailand; Norris A. Charles, Jr., Lt. jg, US Navy, Captured Dec. 1971, USS Coral Sea.

HOPE NEEDS EMPHASIS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very searching and stimulating editorial in the Des Plaines Valley News of June 8th by that publications veteran editor, Harry Sklenar, placed a very positive emphasis on the attitude which we should maintain toward the future.

This profound commentary should, I believe, receive widespread attention and, therefore, I insert it into the RECORD trusting it will receive the attention it merits:

HOPE NEEDS EMPHASIS

(By Harry Sklenar)

An evaluation of student literary efforts as expressed in their annual publication, "Showcase," for the past two years discloses a widespread attitude toward morbid topics, especially that of death.

As the writers are teen-agers and there is necessity in developing creative thought, this editorial is no more than a discussion of the attitude, rather than criticism of the writing itself.

Perhaps the news stories and national policy toward war have influenced youthful thought to such an extent that a majority seek expression in writing morbid themes.

However, the current involvement in Vietnam cannot be the total answer as the United States and its people have faced disaster or threats of one manner or another since the land was first settled. First, there was the Indian worry, then the Revolutionary War, then the Civil War, plus the Mexican War, the Spanish War, and the many South American Revolutions, plus the battles in Canada, Ireland, and Africa.

It can be surmised that concern with sudden death is a topic of concern to the teenager. However, past literary efforts of youth elsewhere reveal a spark of hope in the future.

New approaches require a certain amount of courage at the outset. Courage to do new things, think in new ways, entertain new ideas, some of which may be startling. The teen-ager requires confidence in the value of his goal, and has the inherent ability to plunge into unfamiliar territory when testing his ability to grasp new concepts or presenting new viewpoints.

There are infirm and incurable persons that have a great relish for living and hold no morbid fear of death. They find it rather satisfying to be alive. Each day is another adventure in accomplishment.

There are famed men that did their best work well after the age regarded as "senile." Take Michaelangelo, Goethe, Rembrandt, Victor Hugo, Titian, Emmanuel Kant, Rabalais, and Benjamin Franklin who proved that one should seize opportunities missed when they were youths.

It is not possible for anyone to place a limit on the age in which one can do their best work. Opportunity to change things occurs often. Rather than to accept the attitude that there is nothing one can do to switch attitudes of others, we should all look forward to the challenges of changes in concepts, for new and interesting things will be happening forever.

The idea of being panicky with the dismal thought of death while still young is one that should be left to pastors and those knowledgeable in religion. Even there, hope seems to be the attitude expressed, not that of despair and finality.

Our question then is this, is this sort of dismal attitude toward death something that youths everywhere possess at the high school level or only within our Argo High school area? If the attitude is only present within our high school district, perhaps some thought should be given to changing the attitude toward hope. Gloom surely is not an attitude to enter middle age. Life never quiets down. The attitude of gloom is merely a maladjustment to life.

The secret of hope lies not so much in "willing" as in "wanting." Why not switch the attitude of wanting hope rather than wasting energy on morbid topics.

It is necessary to develop the habit of controlling one's self and the life one lives instead of allowing one to be controlled and pushed around by outside forces. As life goes on, energy can and does increase. The solution is in a positive attitude of mind.

PLUMBING AND PIPING INDUSTRY WEEK

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues my introduction of a resolution today which designates the second week of June as "Plumbing and Piping Industry Week."

We take for granted what the plumbing and piping industry provides to us in our daily lives, but actually it holds a major responsibility for the protection of public health and the advancement of living standards, and has contributed immeasurably to the quality of life in the United States.

Does the average person know that plumbing and piping are ancient professions that have provided sanitation and fresh water since man began to gather in communities? It seems to me that recognition should be given to America's leadership in building construction, public works, industrial development, chemical manufacturing, education, medical advancement, and national defense, all of which are greatly enhanced by the work of America's plumbing and mechanical contractors and their women's auxiliaries.

My resolution recognizes that the citizens of America and the world are aware of their reliance on the plumbing and piping profession for its skills and devotion to high principles and active participation in State and National programs for community betterment. What better way can there be to get this recognition than requesting the President to issue a

proclamation designating the second week of June as "Plumbing and Piping Industry Week," and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such a week with appropriate ceremonies and activities?

I ask my colleagues to support my request.

MINORITIES ALSO OPPOSE BUSING

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, an unusual citizens rally to oppose busing was held in Augusta, Ga., on Sunday, May 21. Two of the three speakers belong to minority groups, the blacks and the Chinese.

Clay Smothers, a former Dallas, Tex., black newsman, declared:

We must stop racism and work together against this thing.

Instead of busing, Smothers said:

The judge should have ordered quality education.

"Together, victory will be ours," said James Wong of Chinatown, San Francisco, Calif. Wong was instrumental in beginning "freedom schools" after Federal orders to bus children out of Chinatown were handed down. He said:

We're a minority and we feel the minority is being used.

Mrs. Irene McCabe, who walked from Detroit to Washington to protest busing, said:

We must have all sections—North, South, East, West—working together.

The busing issue is still one of the most acute problems in the Nation. It will not go away as long as the unwise orders from Federal judges that have been issued are hanging over the heads of the people like the sword of Damocles. The pressure from the people is for relief and their desires will be felt at the polls this fall.

The news account of the most recent Augusta rally was carried in the Augusta Chronicle on May 22, 1972, as follows:

ANTIBUSING TRIO URGES UNITED EFFORT (By Don Ferrell)

Three national anti-busing leaders told a Citizens for Neighborhood Schools rally at Richmond Academy Sunday that the fight against forced school busing must be a united national effort to be effective.

"Together, victory will be ours," said James Wong, of Chinatown in San Francisco, Calif.

"We must have all sections—North, South, East and West—working together," said Pontiac Michigan's marching mother, Mrs. Irene McCabe.

"We must stop racism and work together against this thing," said Clay Smothers, a former Dallas, Tex., Black newsman.

During the rally, which was moved from the Richmond Academy stadium to the gymnasium because of a downpour, Mrs. McCabe urged Richmond Countians to stop paying property taxes, stage a one-day shutdown of everything in the county—with the exception of necessary services—and raise money through foundations who "give thousands to every militant group" in the country.

C. Dan Cook, CNS chairman, said following the rally that the CNS will meet—possi-

bly today—to consider the protest moves outlined by the Michigan mother.

Smothers, a former Dallas radio station news director, renewed his attack on the NAACP.

Smothers charged that the NAACP is getting involved in the school situation when they should be trying to help the black community.

"Little black children are in the most crime-ridden section of our cities," the tall black man in the white suit said. "When is the NAACP going to start worrying about their homes instead of their schools?"

Smothers further charged that a black Augusta businessman has been involved in the statutory rape of a 12-year-old black girl.

"Let's see if the NAACP is going to spend some legal fees to see that this black man is prosecuted and put in jail," Smothers said.

Turning back to the busing situation, Smothers said he does not believe that racially balanced schools guarantee quality education.

Instead of busing, Smothers said, the "judge should have ordered quality education."

In charging those at the rally to work for their beliefs, Smothers said, "don't you sit down because they call you a racist. I've been called white folks house nigger for my stand."

Wong, who was instrumental in beginning "freedom schools" after federal orders to bus children out of Chinatown were handed down, said, "we're a minority and we feel the minority is being used."

RESOLUTION OPPOSING ESCALATION

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the Greater Democratic Club of Roslyn, N.Y., in its meeting of May 31 adopted a resolution in opposition to the President's escalation of the war in Southeast Asia.

The members of the Roslyn Club specifically asked that the United States take whatever measures necessary to bring an end to the mining and bombing of North Vietnam.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that their resolution, representing as it does the considered opinion of many Americans, deserves to be widely read and the RECORD helps to serve that purpose.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

The mining of Haiphong and other North Vietnam harbors is an act which demeans the most powerful nation of the world. When considered alongside the increased Naval and Air personnel around Vietnam and the massive increase in the bombing of South Vietnam, we must conclude that the Nixon Administration has violated its own promise to end the war and has, in fact, escalated the conflict.

The mining of the harbors in particular is an act which by any interpretation is in violation of International Law. We deplore the fact that the Nixon Administration has placed the United States in this "out law" position.

We express our support for the position taken by Senator J. William Fulbright and the majority of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

We call for an immediate end of the mining, an end to the bombing and a total with-

drawal of our land, Naval and Air forces from South East Asia.

We see this as the only way to achieve the return of our prisoners and to end the horror and tragedy in South East Asia.

A HARVARD STUDENT SUPPORTS PRESIDENT NIXON'S VIETNAM POLICY

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bruce E. Johnson, a constituent of mine and a junior at Harvard University, has written a most interesting letter expressing his views concerning the conflict in Vietnam. It seemed to me that Bruce had given the matter considerable thought and that he makes some valid points which deserve public dissemination through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The letter follows:

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass., May 11, 1972.

Hon. CHALMERS WYLIE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a resident of Columbus, Ohio and currently a junior at Harvard College. As you probably realize this campus is not exactly in lock step with political attitudes back home in Columbus. For nearly three full school years I have listened to the overwhelming majority of people I have met here condemn Richard Nixon's policies in South East Asia in unequivocal terms. I try to read the Washington Post or the New York Times daily, and they too are neither Nixon nor Viet Nam enthusiasts in the least.

As you can see I have listened to all that these people say. For the most part I believe in their sincerity and their dedication to what they believe is right.

But as I listened to them, somehow, somewhere, I have come to opposite conclusions about Viet Nam. Three years ago I supported President Nixon's policy of gradual withdrawal as a good way to extract ourselves from a war we should have tried to avoid. Now that it seems that the North Vietnamese are dedicated to winning the war militarily and spurning any sort of compromise, negotiated, settlement, it is time to rethink again our policies concerning Viet Nam. If this nation is committed to the cause of self-determination and freedom, which I believe has been shown in this case by our previous proposals for a negotiated political settlement, if this is our goal, then we cannot avoid this conflict now and we must—with all the force necessary short of nuclear weapons—stop the North Vietnamese invasion.

Arguments have been presented by many which are based on the assumption that the conflict was a civil war in the south. Certainly, the clear character of the conflict is now one of North Vietnam invading the South. But still some go on and argue that the war is still only a civil war since the Vietnamese are all one people and were once one nation. Those who say this must ask themselves how they would react to a North Korean invasion of South Korea, an East German invasion of West Germany, a mainland Chinese invasion of Taiwan. Through the course of history nations have been born, existed, and have vanished. National boundaries have changed and changed again. A nation is a nation not by any law of God but by mutual agreement among all men concerned—including foreign powers. South

Viet Nam is undeniably a nation being attacked by another nation.

The next question to consider: Should the United States oppose the use of military force by one government in a dispute with the government of a neighboring state? The question answers itself does it not? World peace depends on the use of peaceful negotiations instead of military force in disagreements among nations. The United States must insist on this rule to maintain world order.

But yet another question remains: Should the United States do more than verbally protest the military conquest of one nation by another? Some argue that the military conquest of South Viet Nam will not irreparably damage our national interest and our role as the primary military power in the Western world. I believe this to be untrue. If North Viet Nam were to be successful in militarily conquering a neighboring country in the absence of firm American support, other South East Asian nations may not be directly invaded later but certainly they will be forced to come to terms diplomatically, militarily, and economically with the North Vietnamese, the Russians, or the Chinese. Europe is already doubting our ability to support her militarily, diplomatically, and economically. The nations of Western Europe will certainly check the United States off as unreliable in difficult moments, and she too will have to come to terms with the Soviet Union and her Eastern European allies. The United States must show the determination and strength to oppose successfully the North Vietnamese use of military force.

If the United States is not to be relied upon as a counter weight to the two other great superpowers, who shall take our place? Western Europe? I don't believe anyone seriously believes that within the foreseeable future Western Europe will be united to a sufficient degree to counterbalance the Soviet Union without significant American support. Japan? She is now a great power economically but Japan and the rest of the world show great reluctance to build that nation into a military power of sufficient strength to replace the United States in the Pacific.

There is no such thing as a power vacuum in world politics. If the United States does not show the will to continue being a great power in this moment of crisis then we may as well call the whole game off and retreat into our "Fortress America" just as we did in the 1930's.

It might be remarked that Harvard students were at that time one of the more vocal groups opposing American involvement in the European conflict. History proved the folly of their views then and I believe history will likewise show them to be wrong again.

People here are fond of speaking about being committed, about acting on your principles, about trying to influence the government to make the right decisions. So far I have been silent. Now I feel that I must speak out to those who are to make the decisions. I lend my voice to the support of President Nixon's decision to oppose the North Vietnamese invasion with all the force necessary short of nuclear weapons. I urge other Americans to support him also.

Sincerely,

BRUCE E. JOHNSON.

THOMAS STARR KING—"THE PREACHER WHO SAVED CALIFORNIA'S SOUL"

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, one of the two distinguished Californians who are hon-

ored by having their statues in the Capitol of the United States is Thomas Starr King. The Unitarian minister was perhaps the deciding factor in keeping California in the Union during the Civil War.

Recently, William Wingfield, California author, wrote an article, "Thomas Starr King—The Preacher Who Saved California's Soul," for Real West magazine. I would like to have the article printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

THOMAS STARR KING—THE PREACHER WHO SAVED CALIFORNIA'S SOUL
(By William Wingfield)

When he first walked to the pulpit of the San Francisco Unitarian Church, the eyes of the congregation turned on the frail, delicate little man.

Many asked, "Could this slender, youthful young man with his beardless, boyish face be the celebrated preacher, Thomas Starr King?"

King laughed in reply, "Though I weigh only 120 pounds, when I am mad, I weigh a ton."

To be "mad" was going to be King's stock-in-trade during his years in California from 1860 to 1864. President Abraham Lincoln finally believed that it was the Rev. Thomas Starr King alone who kept California from seceding from the Union during the dark early days of the Civil War.

King's reputation had led the San Francisco church to rather wistfully ask him to become its minister. During his 11 years as minister of the Hollis Street Unitarian Church in Boston, he had increased its congregation to five times its original size and gotten it out of bankruptcy.

After hearing one of King's sermons, Ralph Waldo Emerson, considered the wisest man in America of his time, commented, "That is preaching!"

As a lecturer on scholarly subjects, King had traveled as far west as St. Louis.

Both Chicago and Brooklyn churches had sought him as their minister, but the popular Boston pastor rejected them, feeling that San Francisco out in the raw west offered the greatest challenge.

He was right. At that moment, California was heading into a crisis. The showdown between the free and slave states was at hand. The governor and most members of the California Legislature were sympathetic to the Confederacy. The only effective voice in California against slavery, Sen. David C. Broderick was killed in a duel only the year before.

Leadership of the forces of the Union was a vacuum that was only to be filled by Thomas Starr King.

The initial sense of disappointment by San Franciscans at his slender and boyish appearance quickly gave way to wonder and then to delight as his rich, golden voice poured forth.

Those present the first day recalled that sermon decades later. They said he literally had the audience in his hands. Not only was his reputation as an orator and preacher established that very first Sunday in San Francisco, but it soon spread statewide. Many worshippers even came from places as far away as Stockton and Sacramento.

Less than a month after King arrived in San Francisco, the Republican National Convention met in Chicago and nominated Abraham Lincoln as its candidate for President.

In the ensuing election, Lincoln carried California by a mere 711 votes, receiving only 28 per cent of the votes cast. The only reason Lincoln carried California was because the Democratic Party was split in two, with Sen. Stephen A. Douglas and Vice President John Cabell Breckinridge each claiming to be the Democratic nominee.

Following Lincoln's election, one by one, the stars in the American flag began to blink

out. Even before Lincoln was inaugurated, the Southern states began dropping out of the Union. The crucial question was if California would join them, delivering its immense gold resources into Jefferson Davis' hands.

A majority of citizens of Los Angeles were known to have favored California seceding and joining the Confederacy. Indeed, on the Fourth of July in 1861, it was the Confederate Flag rather than the American Flag that flew over the Plaza in Los Angeles.

King wrote a friend in Boston about touring the Sacramento Valley "You see in glaring capitals 'Texas Saloon,' 'Mississippi Shoe Shop,' 'Alabama Emporium.' Very rarely do you see any Northern state thus signalized."

Congress was so convinced of a secessionist plot in California that it required easterners to secure passports before they could go to California. To justify Congress's fears, a secret paramilitary secessionist organization called the Knights Of The Golden Circle had a minimum of 16,000 members.

In February 1861, when Lincoln still had not yet been inaugurated, King fired his opening salvo toward saving California for the Union.

On Washington's Birthday, 1861, he spoke for 2½ hours to an auditorium holding over 1,000 people on how people should remember George Washington preserving the Union that Washington created.

Afterwards, King recalled, "Mrs. (John C.) Fremont was out and told me she hadn't been so stirred in years. A son of old Vanderbilt, a lieutenant in the army, stayed to be introduced and tell me his joy. I pitched into Secession, Concession and Calhoun, right and left, and made the Southerners applaud."

"I pledged California to a Northern Republic and to a flag that should have no treacherous threads of cotton in its warp," and the audience came down in thunder. At the close it was announced that I would repeat it the next night, and they gave me three rounds of cheers."

On March 10, he spoke to the Masons on "Washington and the Union." King was a Mason himself, and the Masons were especially moved and delighted since George Washington is the Masons' chief hero.

His most powerful talk was "Webster and the Union." Sen. Daniel Webster had been his hero in Massachusetts, and he had conducted the memorial service at his church on Webster's death. His talk emphasized Webster's most moving phrase—"Liberty and Union, Now and Forever, One and Inseparable!" King insisted that Webster's call was more meaningful than when it was made.

King cried out, "Rebellion sins against the Mississippi; it sins against the coast line; it sins against the ballot box; it sins against oaths of allegiance; it sins against public and beneficent peace; and it sins, worse of all, against the cornerstone of American progress and history and hope—the worth of the laborer and the rights of man. It strikes for barbarism against civilization!"

He thundered against Jefferson Davis, "He is a representative to my soul and conscience of a force of evil. His cause is a pollution and a horror. His banner is a black flag. I could pray for him as one man, a brother man, in his private affectional and spiritual relations with heaven. But as president of the seceding states, head of the brigand forces, organic representative of the powers of destruction within our country—pray for him? As soon as for Anti-Christ! Never!"

Speaking up and down the state, he visited the rough and rugged mining camps, and said he never knew the exhilaration of public speaking until he faced a front row of men armed with Bowie knives and revolvers.

His friend Edward Everett Hale, who made a similar contribution to saving the Union through his moving story, "The Man Without A Country," declared, "Starr King was

an orator no one could silence and no one could answer."

When he delivered his sermons at church, his pulpit was covered with the American Flag, and he compared the Rebels with the Fallen Angels and with Judas. He ended all of his sermons, "God bless the President of the United States and all who serve with him the cause of a common country."

His culmination came at a mass rally in San Francisco where 40,000 people turned out.

His appeals were so effective that a group of Americans living in Victoria, British Columbia, sent him \$1,000 to carry on his work toward preserving the Union.

By now, his effectiveness was not lost on his enemies. They realized that he was beginning to turn the tide against them.

For example, in Sonora, one of the mining towns, the newspaper editor called King "a fair representative of the rabid, fanatical, Godless school of Boston political preachers. Their cry is now nigger, nigger, blood, blood!"

At a prayer meeting, a man got up in the midst of prayers and said that God had just summoned him to kill Thomas Starr King. Nothing daunted, King shrugged it off and said the man was only a harmless lunatic who probably really meant him no harm.

During the 1861 state elections, he threw himself into the gubernatorial campaign of his parishioner, Leland Stanford, the Republican nominee. Frequently Mrs. John C. Fremont and the budding author Bret Harte accompanied him and Stanford on speaking tours.

The result was an overwhelming election for Stanford, and a sigh of relief for King.

"The state is safe from Southern tampering," King wrote.

"What a privilege it is to be an American!" he exulted. "What a year to live in! Worth all other times ever known in our history or any other!"

The battle to save California for the Union won at last, King now turned to the needs and concerns of the soldiers themselves.

The Union Army had been thrown together so hastily in the time of crisis that it was ill provisioned and medical care didn't exist. There were few trained doctors or nurses or medical attendants. Much of the food was rotting because war profiteers saw an excellent opportunity to get rich by dumping spoiled food off onto the Army. There were not even sheets or blankets. Disease took a greater toll of soldiers' lives than Confederate bullets.

To remedy this tragedy, the Rev. H. W. Bellows of New York organized the U.S. Sanitary Commission, the forerunner of the American National Red Cross. Starr King immediately pitched in to help.

Fitz-Hugh Ludlow, secretary and historian of the Sanitary Commission, later recorded, "Starr King was the Sanitary Commission in California."

In fact, he came near being the whole Sanitary Commission. Out of \$4.8 million raised by the Commission in the entire United States during the war, \$1.25 million was raised by King in California. King's contribution was over one-fourth of that raised in the entire country.

The \$1,000 sent to him by the Americans in Victoria to help in his fight to save the Union was turned over to the Sanitary Commission. After he wrote the people in Vancouver to thank them and tell them what he had done, they turned around and sent him another \$300 to be used for the Sanitary Commission.

King used their bank draft as an example and inducement for individuals and civic groups in San Francisco to chip in and do likewise. He was able to parlay the \$300 into another \$1,000.

On Jan. 10, 1864, San Francisco gave the fund \$200,000.

His efforts were even more impressive be-

cause during those years, California was hit by a series of natural disasters. One of the worst floods in California history hit and converted the whole Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley into a vast lake as big as Lake Ontario. The following year, an immense drought wiped out the Valley's wheat crops.

As well as working for the Sanitary Commission, King now found himself raising funds for flood and drought relief. As a Mason, he was also active in fund raising for the Masonic Relief Board.

In addition, he found time to work for the rights and betterment of the Negroes and Chinese in San Francisco when these two were very despised minority groups.

Edward Everett Hale observed, "We know that here is a heart as large as the world, so that you can not make it understand that it should hold back from any service to be rendered to any human being."

Because of his success at patriotic and charitable services, a strong movement arose to run him for the U.S. Senate. However, King steadfastly refused to even be considered for the honor. He said he feared it might lead him into political compromises and impair his ability and liberty to speak forthrightly on subjects he felt strongly about.

He said, "I would swim to Australia before taking a political post."

What relaxation he had came from exploring the mountains. At the time, except for the mining districts, the mountains were largely unexplored.

He was one of the first 100 persons to visit Lake Tahoe, and said the blueness of the lake and the greenness of the pines surrounding it seemed to him in harmony with the deepest religion of The Bible.

Yosemite Valley and Yosemite's big trees were a special delight to him. He wrote the Boston Transcript that each time he saw one that amazed him by its size and height, he saw another beyond it that was even larger. The trees, he said, made him think what it would have been like if the Bunker Hill Monument had grown from a single seed of granite.

On entering Yosemite Valley, he exclaimed, "The Ninth Symphony (Beethoven's) is the Yosemite of music! Great is granite and the Yosemite is its prophet!"

He climbed above Nevada Falls and Vernal Falls, and was attracted by one magnificent dome or turret of granite that towered over the valley. It rose 13,600 feet. Today, it is named Mt. Starr King.

In letters to the Transcript about mining towns, he gave colorful descriptions that might have done credit to his friend, protege and parishioner, Bret Harte. He depicted both the color and the dreariness of the cabins, saloons, billiard halls, stage coaches, and the miners at work.

Back in New England, he had enjoyed climbing and exploring the White Hills of New Hampshire. He wrote a book about them, *The White Hills—Their legend, Landscape and Poetry*, which, when published in 1859, was far more popular than Henry David Thoreau's now classic *Walden*.

King hoped to write a similar book some day about the Sierras.

Throughout his many endeavors, his church still had first call. When he arrived in 1860, the church had a \$30,000 debt. By Christmas, he had done such a good job of paying off the debt that the church members gave him a set of silver in appreciation.

Indeed, he had become such a successful minister in such a short time that the existing Unitarian church soon was much too small for its fast growing congregation.

He set about in October, 1862, to raise \$80,000 toward construction of a new church. As one of the means, he gave lectures on the contemporary New England poets. He asked each of them to send a new poem to be read at the conclusion of the talk.

The cornerstone of the church was laid on Dec. 3, 1862.

John Greenleaf Whittier sent a special poem for the dedication services on Jan. 10, 1864. King, himself, donated the organ.

When the new church was dedicated, King estimated that the income of his church was \$25,000 per year, contrasted to \$30,000 per year that Henry Ward Beecher raised in his famous Brooklyn church, and Beecher's church was twice as large as King's. King said that based on membership, his church was the number one church financially in America.

Any one of his labors would have been enough for one man, much less the outstanding success of all of them combined.

With a new and prosperous church, the Sanitary Commission on a solid and functioning basis, and Union victories at Gettysburg and Vicksburg sealing the doom of the South, he had every reason to sit back and relax.

He was now also financially secure personally. Still another of his parishioners, William C. Ralston, the great financier of the Comstock Lode, had given him solid advice on investments in Nevada silver mines.

He was due a sabbatical. He could now look forward to rest, travel, and writing his book on the Sierras.

Yet, as his congregation had deduced on the very first day, his health was never good. Only devotion to what he considered God's will and "being mad" kept him going as long as they did. Now the Herculean labors began to take their toll.

All along, there were indications he was driving himself too hard for his weak little body.

Indeed, in 1861, he collapsed after speaking to the thunderous applause of 3,000 persons at a major Republican rally with Leland Stanford.

When Bret Harte found him almost passed out on a sofa in the dressing room while the applause continued, Harte asked, "What a triumph! How did you manage to get through the long last sentence?"

King feebly responded, "I hardly know. I seemed quite unconscious of my surroundings. My imagination beheld the scenes, my mind worked out the sentences moments before I uttered them."

Frequently his friends urged him to ease up.

Yet, now that he had the chance and every right to take it easy, disaster struck.

On Feb. 28, 1864, he was hit by diphtheria soon complicated by pneumonia. For two days, he clung tenuously to life.

Then a second attack of pneumonia struck.

A doctor was summoned. The doctor told him that he now had only a half hour to live.

King glanced at the calendar.

"Today is the fourth of March," he sighed.

"Sad news will go over the wires today."

Next, he dictated his will.

Then he turned to his wife, "Do not weep for me. I know it is all right. I wish I could make you feel so. I wish I could describe my feelings. It is strange. I see all the privileges and greatness of the future. It already looks grand, beautiful. Tell them that I went lovingly, trustfully, peacefully."

One by one across San Francisco the American flags dropped to half mast. The city hall and all the state and federal offices immediately closed. Soon the foreign consulates and foreign ships in San Francisco harbor joined in dropping their flags to half mast.

The State Legislature in Sacramento adjourned for three days in mourning after passing a resolution that "he had been a tower of strength to the cause of his country."

A military honor guard was posted at his casket. His body lay wrapped in the American flag in front of the altar of his church.

Mrs. Fremont placed violets on his chest.

As King lay in state, some 20,000 people came to pay tribute. Many broke into tears as they passed the coffin. Some kissed the flag that was his shroud.

In the bay at Fort Alcatraz, in Union Square in downtown San Francisco, and at

other federal military installations, the cannons boomed in memorial tribute.

Bret Harte composed the eulogy, "Relieving Guard."

"A Star? There's nothing strange in that." "No, nothing; but above the thicket Somehow it seemed to me that God Somewhere had just relieved a picket."

Such a mammoth outpouring of emotion and sorrow was not equaled on a national level until 99 years later with the murder of President John F. Kennedy.

Services were conducted by the Masons, with ministers of the Methodists and Presbyterian Churches joining in the rites.

His body was buried in the front lawn of the church he had just completed building.

It still lies in a crypt in front of the church today at the corner of Franklin and Starr King streets. In the early 1960's, the state designated Starr King's church and tomb to be a historical monument.

In 1913, the State Legislature voted Starr King and the great Catholic missionary Father Junipero Serra to be the state's two greatest heroes. It appropriated \$10,000 to erect a bust in King's memory in the U.S. Capitol to stand with those of George Washington and Robert E. Lee for Virginia.

The statue was unveiled on March 1, 1931, by King's grandson, U.S. Navy Lt. Comdr. Thomas Starr King.

In addition to the giant granite mountain in Yosemite National Park, one of the great trees that he admired in Yosemite is also named for him. There is another mountain in the White Hills of New Hampshire also named Mt. Starr King.

California has many public schools and Masonic Lodges bearing his name. In Long Beach, there is even a Starr King Presbyterian Church.

The Unitarians have named their major seminary the Starr King School of Theology.

However, like his compatriot and admirer, Abraham Lincoln, his greatest monument is the dream he labored for, "One nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

SENATE—Tuesday, June 13, 1972

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. GALE W. MCGEE, a Senator from the State of Wyoming.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, whose mercies are new every morning, we raise to Thee our grateful praise.

For the glory of sunrise and sunset, for shelter and raiment and daily bread, for work to do and good colleagues with whom to do it, for the blessings of family life and good neighbors and friends, we give Thee thanks.

For joys that hearten and refresh us, for afflictions that bring new insights, for better understanding and compassion for trials whereby we are tested and for the power to triumph over disaster, we give Thee thanks.

Above all, we thank Thee for Thyself, O Thou whose faithfulness is unto all generations. For the love which endures despite our neglect and ingratitude, for Thy guiding hand upon us and Thy watchful care over us, we give Thee thanks.

Now accept the service which we offer here in Thy name that it may enhance

the welfare of the Nation and advance Thy kingdom on earth.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 13, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. GALE W. MCGEE, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MCGEE thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of

yesterday, Monday, June 12, 1972, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESCISSION OF ORDER TO RECOGNIZE SENATOR HARRIS TODAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the recognition of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) today be vacated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HUGHES TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, following the remarks of the two