

poses; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRASSO:

H.R. 15466. A bill to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment compensation program by amending the Employment Security Amendments of 1970; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 15467. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish and administer a program of direct Federal employment to improve the quality of the environment, the public lands, Indian reservations, and commonly owned and shared resources through a program of recreational development, reforestation, and conservation management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 15468. A bill to establish a National Human Resources Conservation Corps to rehabilitate persons convicted of violating certain narcotic drug laws and persons who volunteer for membership in such corps and to improve the quality of environment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 15469. A bill to quitclaim the interest of the United States to certain land in Escondido, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WARE:

H.R. 15470. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the disposal of certain surplus property for court and law enforcement purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ABOUREZEK:

H.R. 15471. A bill to reduce interest rates on SBA disaster loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BETTS (for himself and Mr. WAGGONER):

H.R. 15472. A bill to amend the tariff and trade laws of the United States to promote full employment and restore a diversified production base; to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to stem the outflow of U.S. capital, jobs, technology, and production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISHER:

H.R. 15473. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to provide that certain additional amounts received by retired servicemen employed in the Junior Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall be treated as subsistence or uniform allowances or as amounts received as commutation of quarters; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GIAIMO (for himself, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 15474. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for programs for the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of and research in Cooley's anemia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts (for herself, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SATTERFIELD, Mr. KYROS, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. ROY, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. HASTINGS):

H.R. 15475. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national advisory commission to determine the most effective means of finding the cause of and cures and treatments for multiple sclerosis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts (for herself, Mrs. ABZUG, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FISH, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. RYAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, and Mr. WINN):

H.R. 15476. A bill to establish in the Public Health Service an institute for research on dysautonomia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 15477. A bill to provide additional readjustment assistance to veterans by providing improved job counseling, training, and placement service for veterans; by providing an employment preference for disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam era under contracts entered into by departments and agencies of the Federal Government for the procurement of goods and services; by providing for an action program within the departments and agencies of the Federal Government for the employment of disabled veterans and veterans of the Vietnam era; by providing a minimum amount that may be paid to ex-servicemen under the unemployment compensation law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 15478. A bill to require contractors of departments and agencies of the United States engaged in the production of motion picture films to pay prevailing wages; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STEELE:

H.R. 15479. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compen-

sation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 15480. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of the grant payable for specialty adapted housing for disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 15481. A bill to provide increases in railroad retirement benefits comparable to those provided by the Social Security Amendments of 1972; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS (for himself and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H.J. Res. 1227. Joint resolution approving the acceptance by the President for the United States of the Interim Agreement Between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SEIBERLING (for himself, Mr. DANIELSON, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H.J. Res. 1228. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS (for himself, Mr. QUIE, Mr. BELL, and Mrs. MINN):

H. Res. 1016. Resolution authorizing travel to the Third International Conference on Adult Education; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON:

H.R. 15482. A bill for the relief of Stefan Wiedersperg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 15483. A bill to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 500th anniversary of the birth of the Polish astronomer Nicholas Copernicus; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHMITZ:

H.R. 15484. A bill providing for the extension of patents Nos. 2,710,876, 2,703,788, and 2,464,240; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15485. A bill for the relief of Olinda Bazen Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A VACATION IN AMERICA

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, summer is the time for a family vacation. At the risk of being labeled a travel agent, I would like to point out the virtues of relaxing in rural America.

I am enclosing an article about Keosauqua on the Des Moines River in the First District of Iowa. Hotel Manning and the natural beauty of the immediate area are examples of what can be found across the Nation. Certainly, one does not need to go far, or spend a great deal to enjoy a vacation.

The article follows:

[From the Iowa City Press-Citizen, June 7, 1972]

HISTORY, ANTIQUES, "IOWANA" STILL UNSPOILED BY COMMERCIALISM: VAN BUREN COUNTY—THE PLACE WHERE IOWA BEGAN (By Lillian McLaughlin)

KEOSAUQUA, IOWA.—For a vacation in Iowa, where better to be than Van Buren County, the place where Iowa began?

A few miles south of Eldon on Iowa 16, you are in Van Burenland. It's a grand entrance along a smooth highway that plays tag with the Des Moines River and a single railroad track down to Iowa 1 into Keosauqua.

Home base is a landmark by the Keosauqua Bridge, Hotel Manning, built by "A Great Builder of Southeast Iowa," Edwin Manning, as a general store and bank in 1854, remodeled into a hotel in 1893.

Fondly known by its patrons as the old "steamboat hotel," it has withstood four floods. Its outside glass door panes etched

with H. M. represents its three owners, Manning, Bertha Mayers and since 1944, Mabel Miller.

Guests rocking on the great second floor veranda no longer see steamboats pass, only recreational craft and an occasional fisherman along the shore.

Only a few of the rooms in the Hotel Manning have private baths, tucked into a corner of the great rooms. The telephone's in the lobby and the color TV in the "lounge," a big central hallway upstairs.

The furnishings are motley: a handsome highback old walnut bed in one room, three iron ones in another. A guest may hang his coat in that big painted wooden wardrobe or on a hat tree made from a small tree-trunk.

But the generous old rooms are kept spic and span. The ceilings are 15 feet high. There are a few great bay windows that are look-outs up and down the river.

On Sundays, Mabel Miller's staff serves up a superb buffet: ham, fried chicken, meat loaf, a delicate casserole of eggplant and corn, mashed potatoes and real cream chicken gravy, a dozen or so relishes and salads and who knows how many kinds of pie, all for \$2.50.

In the lobby are rocking chairs, a fancy old-fashioned dining room table and high back chairs, hump back trunks and a mynah bird that wolf-whistles and appreciates a good joke about himself.

The mynah bird's name is Charlie, says Mrs. Miller.

"Not long ago some young people on a treasure hunt were told to 'meet Charlie Manning.' They came to the desk and asked if a Charlie Manning was at the hotel, and I told them 'yes, right in that cage over there.'"

Eavesdropping across the lobby, Charlie gave a rolling guttural laugh from his cage.

Charlie will greet you as you enter: "What's your name?" As you pass he will give his wolf-whistles. Sometimes, if there's nobody about, Charlie practices his repertoire of bird call imitations.

At 6:30 a.m., he greets each day with a rousing wolf whistle. He doesn't recognize daylight savings time.

By 7 a.m., early risers can be in Lacey-Keosauqua Park just across the bridge.

The largest of Iowa's state parks, Lacey-K is a beautifully wooded area along the bluffs of the river with miles of trails, a 30-acre lake, picnic, and camping facilities for 350 units, cabins, ancient Indian Mounds, a beach and even a nine-hole gold course.

History? Antiques? Iowana? These are everywhere in Van Buren County, still untouched, or at least unspoiled by commercial tourism.

Criss-cross the Des Moines River over the bridges of these little villages and towns.

Farmington: See the old limestone structure, once a manufacturing company that produced 350 wagons and buggies a year.

Bonaparte: The old Opera House (painted silver) and surmounted with Three Wise Men and a star left over from Christmas. Stop for dinner and, if you wish, drinks at Bonaparte's Retreat, an oasis Napoleon's poor shivering men would have embraced, as do natives and visitors for miles around, to taste Bennie John Hendrick's home-cut steaks and his wife's homemade salad dressings.

Bentonsport: Take a walking tour around this village; the Mason House, another old hotel that took care of the steamboat travelers, now a museum; the country store, rebuilt from timbers of old Bonaparte railroad station, the Presbyterian Church, built in 1855, standing on a hill behind an aisle of gaunt old cedar trees.

Douds-Leando: Take a turn through these twin villages and their common river bridge. Near Douds you're driving over a great limestone quarry.

This is beautiful country—in rain, in mist, in brilliant sun.

And may any who follow have the luck to see what this writer saw: A stupendous rainbow arching over the high hills of Van Buren County, to disappear beneath its pot of gold at the north end of the Bentonsport bridge.

MACOMB COUNTY VOTES AGAINST BUSING

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the volume of mail my office has received on the subject of forced busing far exceeds any-

thing I have seen since coming to Congress 16 years ago.

The preponderance of opposition to forced busing, as reflected in my mail, is overwhelming. However, the electoral process should be a better barometer of public opinion than my mail bag.

On May 16, the citizens of Michigan's Macomb County cast their votes in an election on an advisory question that appeared on the ballot. The results:

In favor of cross-district busing, 8,917.
Against cross-district busing, 139,594.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Macomb County Board of Commissioners reflecting the results of the vote be printed in the RECORD.

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

MACOMB COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Mount Clemens, Mich., June 2, 1972.

Hon. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRIFFIN: Increasing concern and much public attention has been focused on the issue of "cross-district busing".

The Macomb County (Michigan) Board of Commissioners has acknowledged the deeply imbedded convictions of our local residents on this issue and was the first governmental entity within the State of Michigan to formally and publicly oppose the "cross-district busing" concept as a means to achieve educational equality in our schools.

In order to more accurately evaluate our residents' reaction to this concept, and rather than recognize any specific organization or citizens' group which may have professed to "speak" for the majority, our County Board of Commissioners placed an advisory question on the Presidential Primary Ballot of May 16, 1972, throughout the County of Macomb.

The official voting results are self-explanatory: 8,917—in favor of cross-district busing; 139,594—against cross-district busing.

The Macomb County Board of Commissioners feel our residents and taxpayers' opinions should not fall along the wayside unheeded.

We urge you to do all within the power of your esteemed office to insure representation of the people on this emotional issue.

Sincerely,
STEPHEN W. DANE,
Chairman, Macomb County Board of Commissioners.

THE BEGINNING

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, last weekend I had the honor of sharing the speaking responsibilities at the Ukiah High School commencement ceremonies with three graduating seniors.

One of these speakers was Dave Dorsey, an honor student at this high school located in the heart of my congressional district. It was obvious from the attention that he received from his classmates, that Dave Dorsey had their respect and their admiration. It was also obvious from the enthusiastic response he re-

ceived from the audience of classmates, parents, and loved ones that his remarks were timely and appropriate.

Having met Dave Dorsey personally and heard him speak so enthusiastically and forcefully about his convictions. I predict that this young man will have an extraordinary future in whatever career he embarks on.

Therefore, I take this means of bringing his speech to the attention of my colleagues because I believe it reflects the responsible and constructive image that is shared by a vast majority of American youth today.

The speech follows:

THE BEGINNING
(By Dave Dorsey)

Someone once said that "Today is the first day of the rest of your life". Well, this is it. High school graduation. For about 345 of us, tonight is a major turning point in our lives. After tonight the graduates of the class of 1972 will have reached the point where we must make the decisions which will determine our entire future. And then we will all go our separate ways, to make our mark on the world. The realization finally hits us, this is it. The age of preparation is over and now we will encounter success or failure, joy or sadness, whatever awaits us in this mysterious world we live in.

For many of us, graduation from high school signifies the end of our formal education. There are no more classes to suffer through, or tests to cram for, or report cards to worry about. But gone too are the dances, and carefree days we used to savor. Our learning experiences are only beginning however. The things we learn and the experiences we will have in the real world will teach us more than we ever dreamed possible. George Bernard Shaw once said "The only time my education was ever interrupted was when I was in school". The educational opportunities we will have in our jobs, in marriage, or even in the service are limitless.

Yes, we've only just begun. We have now reached the real beginning of our existence. Whatever the future holds in store for us, you can be sure that it will be like nothing we have ever experienced before.

Every generation in history has thought that it was special, that they're going to change the world. Mine is no exception. How we will change the world is the question. Let's see what we've got to work with.

We are the first generation to grow up in a world where our modern technology is taken for granted. It's no big deal that we can send a man off to the moon or that we can literally blow up the world at the push of a button. We have grown up to accept television, like the kitchen sink and the telephone as a fact of life. And through the wonders of TV; the war in Vietnam, the violence in America, and the destruction of the environment do not shock us anymore. It is all part of our world. And, if real life should get too depressing we can always turn the dial from the news and tune in some comforting soap opera.

This is the world we now face, with the added responsibility of facing it as adults. It's kind of scary isn't it, inheriting a world filled with assassinations and wars? But before we get too critical we must ask ourselves "How will we change it?" For the better?

"Just wait until we can vote", we used to say when we were younger. Well, now that we can vote, and we're old enough to attend rallies and knock on doors and wave placards, perhaps we can initiate a change. There was an election held earlier this week and 75% of the locally registered voters did. How many of you voted? How many of you voted? Perhaps there is hope for this country yet.

The world is going to be constantly changing. It's inevitable. But how it changes will be up to us, that is our responsibility. It will be the duty of each of us to be aware of the issues and problems which confront our Nation today. A democratic society such as we live in, while it does have its faults, can only be successful when its people are informed. There is a vast difference between a silent majority and an apathetic majority. It will be our privilege to be concerned about the things that affect us and to express our opinions in the voting booth. We must be careful that we don't judge too quickly though, that's just as bad as being apathetic.

I hope that when we all leave dear old Ukiah that we do not forget the things which we were so concerned about as students. Dress codes and the closing of the main seemed pretty important to us at the time. I hope it doesn't slip from memory. And how about that, we'll be the last class to have gone through high school in the main!

This year I had the privilege of serving as the first student advisor to the board of education, giving me the opportunity of seeing, firsthand, the educational process at work, from both a student and administrative point of view. If more people had a chance and took the time to see an issue from both sides of the fence maybe they wouldn't be so critical. There is a short little poem which I think expresses what I am trying to say very well. It's entitled "The Wise Old Owl."

The wise old owl
He sat in an oak
The more he saw,
The less he spoke.
The less he spoke,
The more he heard.
Why can't we be
Like the wise old bird?

Thank you very much.
National graduate week!
Hug a graduate!

FUNDS TO SAVE SALTON SEA

HON. VICTOR V. VEYSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. VEYSEY. Mr. Speaker, included in the bill before the House today is a \$100,000 line item for the final stage of the Salton Sea feasibility study.

The purpose of the study is to determine the most practical and economical way of preventing the largest lake in California from dying. Preserving the Salton Sea would be a badly needed shot in the arm for the economy of the whole southwestern corner of the United States. It would also permit development of a massive new recreation resource for millions of city-constrained people. Thirty of my congressional colleagues joined with me to recommend this project to the Secretary of the Interior last year. Five Bureaus within the Department are presently cooperating in the project, along with the State of California which has appropriated \$47,500 to cover its share of the study.

Authorization of the feasibility study will be one more milestone in the 6-year effort to enhance the recreational potential of California's largest body of water.

In December 1965, as State assemblyman, I began meeting with the broad

spectrum of groups interested in saving the sea. We met every 3 months to develop legislative solutions to the alarming increase in salinity and nutrients that is suffocating the sea. The result was State legislation which established the California Salton Sea Advisory Committee.

The committee, the State of California and the Federal Bureau of Reclamation conducted a major reconnaissance investigation to develop alternative plans to stabilize the sea level, limit the salinity, and control the nutrient problem. They also developed engineering and financial data on the project.

The reconnaissance report documented for the first time the extent of the camping, fishing, swimming, and water skiing recreation presently enjoyed at the sea. It estimates that if the sea can be kept alive it will support 4,804,000 recreation man-days a year by the year 2000.

The report concluded that further studies are necessary to determine the specific measures required to formulate a plan, and to evaluate its engineering and economic feasibility.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this vital project.

RURAL MINNESOTA MANPOWER PROGRAM PRAISEWORTHY SUCCESS

HON. BOB BERGLAND

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. BERGLAND. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation is concerned about the high rate of unemployment and the increasing costs of welfare, it is indeed encouraging to know of successful efforts to provide jobs for those previously living in poverty. Enclosed are some facts presented to me by Emil W. Marotzke, director of the rural Minnesota concentrated employment program—a manpower program serving 11 counties in rural northwestern Minnesota.

I have nothing but praise for the efforts of Mr. Marotzke and the benefits this kind of a program is bringing to people who reside in Minnesota's Seventh Congressional District—the district which I am proud to represent. Members of Congress interested in manpower programs will find the following facts of interest:

First. All persons placed in the rural Minnesota concentrated employment program were disadvantaged by Manpower Administration poverty guidelines upon acceptance into this program. The average annual wage at the time of entrance for 1 year prior to entrance was \$1,362.

Second. For the period covered—November 1970 through April 1972 inclusive—corresponds to 1971 fiscal year plus the first 6 months of current 1972 fiscal year—771 individuals have completed training and were placed in employment. Placement in the CEP project means 30 days with the same employer without any Federal or State assistance.

Third. The average placement wage per hour was \$2.25 for an average yearly starting wage of \$4,684. This is not as high a quality as Mr. Marotzke would wish, however, it is in any case above the poverty guidelines and he feels that these entry level positions do give these individuals an opportunity for upward mobility on their own.

Fourth. An average individual would spend approximately 7 to 9 months in training prior to placement.

Fifth. Last year's cost for placing a man in a full-time job was \$2,830. This included all operation, administrative, and enrollee costs for the CEP.

Sixth. Our 60-day followup placement indicates a stick ratio varying between 85 and 90 percent.

COOLEY'S ANEMIA

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, several diseases have received widespread public attention recently. Among these is Cooley's anemia, a tragic ailment affecting many Americans of Mediterranean origin. On June 8, 1972, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Environment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce met in executive session and approved for full committee action a clean bill in lieu of H.R. 14016, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the prevention of Cooley's anemia. The committee is to be applauded for its efforts in this area. Some months ago an intern working in my office conducted a research study of this dread disease. Because of the recent action taken by the committee in preparing this measure for consideration by the House, I am submitting for the Record the report completed on Cooley's anemia by my intern, Miss Susan Fine. I respectfully request that all interested Members read this account of the disease, so that they may be apprised of its character and more fully appreciate the great need to find a treatment and cure.

COOLEY'S ANEMIA

Cooley's Anemia refers to the most severe strain of thalassemia, a hereditary disease which affects the blood. It affects individuals of Mediterranean descent; Greek, Turkish, Northern African and Italian peoples are among those most susceptible to the disease. While the extent of the disease in the United States has never been precisely determined, the best available estimates are that 200,000 Americans carry the gene, and that, in addition, there exist 1,000 known cases of Cooley's Anemia in the New York City Area alone. A study conducted by Dr. Howard Pearson of Yale University showed that 20 per cent of the five hundred Italian Americans tested for the ailment, carried the gene for Cooley's Anemia. Increasing intermarriage between nationalities has caused the trait to become more widespread.

The disease is transmitted genetically according to Mendelian Laws. Thus, both parents must carry a trait in order for the child to inherit the disease. Statistically, 25 per cent of the affected parents' offspring should be normal; another 50 per cent will be car-

riers of the gene. The last 25 per cent would have Cooley's Anemia. Any hereditary situation, however, is valid in a statistical sense, and one family may very well go unaffected by the disease while in another, all children will develop the malady. In this way Cooley's Anemia is similar to Sickle Cell Anemia. However, whereas in Sickle Cell Anemia mutated cells interfere with normal cell production, in Cooley's Anemia too few blood cells are produced to meet the needs of the body.

The disease has two strains. One causes the child to be stillborn. In the other strain, the disease manifests itself soon after birth with the appearance of listlessness, loss of appetite, irritability, and pallor. Eventually, the spleen and the liver become enlarged and the skin appears jaundiced. Deformation of the bones, particularly those in the head cause the appearance of mongoloid features, distortion of the mouth, and teeth. The bones of the skull actually thicken, and the growth is stunted. Other marrow cavities become enlarged. Blood examinations usually reveal changes in the shape and numbers of the red blood cells and a variety of other alterations. Cardiac enlargements and cardiac failure explained by severe anemia and depositions of iron are the most frequent cause of death.

Several genetic defects cause the anemia. First, the marrow produces fewer red blood cells than usual. Also, those cells produced live only one-third to one-half as long as normal cells—about ninety to one-hundred and twenty days. Other complications do develop such as an enlarged spleen and liver, and even gallstones.

At this stage, treatment is at a very basic level with transfusions the only successful technique. Frequent transfusion is not only expensive, but also brings the danger of huge iron buildups. Because no simple test exists to determine whether a person carries the Cooley's trait, parents cannot judge the risk involved in their mating, nor can accurate disease counts be constructed. At present, doctors have learned to reduce some of the symptoms, for example a splenectomy may reduce pain. As yet, there is no cure, and the affected patients usually die before adulthood. Presently, there is only scattered resources being directed to the treatment and cure of Cooley's Anemia.

The National Institutes of Health supports 12 research projects on Cooley's Anemia for a total expenditure of approximately \$631,000, which comes out of the agencies general funds. In addition, various institutes of the NIH support eleven projects which are related to Cooley's Anemia, or in which Cooley's Anemia is a minor component. The total for this group is approximately \$669,000. Fields involved in this research include pathology, physiology, biochemistry, and physical chemistry, and range from studies on protein synthesis to the formation of Hemoglobin.

A newly formed organization, the Cooley's Anemia Foundation, was established to provide blood to victims and sponsor research. However, as Dr. Friedman, executive director of the Foundation, pointed out, the program's efforts are impeded due to dependence on funds from private sources. And as Dr. Lichtman, another researcher in the field stated to the House of Representatives, "basic research on the program of blood formation and destruction offers the only hope available to the sufferers."

Hundreds of hereditary diseases exist today in America; numerous ones in the same class as Cooley's Anemia probably afflict thousands of persons. Thalassmia is a disease of several varieties; heterozygous thalassmia produces an almost unnoticeable anemia; alpha thalassmia is incompatible with life and causes fetal death after 30 days, and HB Bart disease is dangerous as well, for it produces a functionally inadequate anemia.

Cooley's Anemia is devastating in its affect on children afflicted and their parents. While no estimate of the exact number of people carrying the thalassmia trait exists, probably several hundred thousand unknowingly have the gene. An all out attack is necessary if we are to conquer this little known, but very serious killer.

BOSWELL STEVENS—THE FARMERS' FARMER

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, this coming November will mark the end of a long and distinguished career in helping better the plight of farmers in my home State of Mississippi and the Nation when Boswell Stevens retires as president of the Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation following 24 years of dedicated service. I am very proud to represent this outstanding American in the Congress and appreciate the very wise advice and counsel he has given me on farm legislation over the years. Mr. Speaker. I would like to share with my colleagues the following article which has appeared in newspapers throughout Mississippi giving details of Boswell Stevens' distinguished career.

BOSWELL STEVENS RETIRES AS FARM BUREAU PRESIDENT

The longest tenure of any state Farm Bureau president in the nation will end this November as Boswell Stevens, president of the Mississippi Farm Bureau Federation, steps aside from a post he has held continuously since July, 1950.

The Macon, Mississippi, general farmer who literally became "Mr. Farm Bureau" in Mississippi and highly influential in national agricultural affairs, will clear the way for a younger man to take the helm of the 90,000 member organization when farmer delegates from all 82 counties converge on Jackson in November for their annual meeting.

In a news conference in Jackson, Stevens age 74, recalled his first involvement in Farm Bureau affairs in 1923 through the Noxubee County Farm Bureau. As the years passed he headed his county organization and became a state director of the federation. As a vice-president in 1950 upon the sudden death of the federation president, Ransom Aldrich of Michigan City, Stevens was suddenly thrust into a new position of leadership during an interim period. In July the voting delegates convened and elected Stevens to the presidency.

Although membership was at a low of only 16,000 farm families at the time, groundwork had been completed for new membership services in the mid-forties that were to help build farmer support of the organization as Stevens began the task of developing a staff, cooperation among agricultural agencies and enthusiasm in building a strong voice for Mississippi agriculture. The federation is non-governmental and is a voluntary dues-paying organization similar to a chamber of commerce for Mississippi agriculture.

Stevens solicited and got help from the crossgrain of Mississippi's agricultural community. A significant momentum of growth set in among the Farm Bureau affiliated life and auto insurance companies. Soon a fire insurance company was organized by the state federation. Today these companies are leaders in their field in Mississippi and the South.

With the Stevens shoulder actively put to the wheel of progress, the organization meshed its efforts to help generate other agri-business organizations such as Mississippi Livestock Producers Association, and the Jackson Association which was to evolve into Dairymen, Inc. Meanwhile, with sustained support, other Farm Bureau introduced enterprises such as Mississippi Chemical Corporation at Yazoo City, Mississippi Hospital and Medical Service and community hospitals came into the mainstream of the state's economic life. The nitrogen fertilizer manufacturing corporation was conceived in a board meeting of Farm Bureau leaders and was to set a new national concept in farmer-developed manufacturing enterprises. Farm Bureau had strongly advocated passage of a Hill-Burton Act in the national congress which was to enable rural communities in Mississippi to build modern hospital facilities with federal aid. And Farm Bureau had brought into Mississippi the Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan for prepaid hospital insurance.

For over two decades Stevens gave and took for Mississippi agriculture, testifying before Congressional committees in Jackson and Washington, arguing the Mississippi viewpoint before the executive committee and voting delegates of the American Farm Bureau convention, and sparring with occasional detractors.

His scars over the years have been minimal, for his genial and diplomatic nature has softened the blows. His manner usually has carried the day.

Others call it retirement. Boswell Stevens doesn't. But he doesn't bother to correct you when you do. With membership on a staggering number of important boards, Boswell Stevens remains in service as he steps from the presidency of the federation this November. But he's going back to Macon and get closer to the acres of black prairie soil that once engaged his full attention before he realized that prosperity for agriculture lay beyond the turn row.

UNCORKING A BATCH OF SOUR GRAPES

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, while Harvard seeks "Veritas" and Yale strives for "Lux et Veritas," in Gasconade County, Mo., it is well established that "In Vino Veritas." Once again our banjo-picking, tuba-playing, sometime editor, Tom Warden, has brought us "Bacchus to the Bible."

UNCORKING A BATCH OF SOUR GRAPES

(By Tom Warden)

When Missouri Attorney General John Danforth decreed that home wine-making is against the law, he undoubtedly uncorked the spirit of a law that is not only indefensible, but is also unenforceable.

With all due respect to General Danforth being a man of the cloth (and I've known a few of them to ferment their own juice), he is behaving like a man whose Sunday socks were used to strain out a batch of grape squeezings.

Now . . . I believe in the rule of law. I also believe that a bad law is worse than no law at all.

With one fell swoop of his ecclesiastical pen, General Danforth has made criminals out of a lot of people . . . perhaps a few clergymen, mothers, grandmothers, lawyers, newspapermen . . . the list is endless.

If this is General Danforth's interpreta-

tion of the law—and I can only wonder how the jurisprudence establishment has thus far overlooked this scurrilous practice—then the law needs to be changed, along with the man who made this assinine interpretation.

Little old ladies and well-meaning grandfathers have been making wine at home for decades, and somehow they have managed to elude the clutches of depravity while taking a daily sip of fermented finery.

I hardly believe that a basket of grapes, a saccharometer, jar, yeast and a cork are the devil's tools!

The General is trying to bring back Prohibition . . . not by legislation, but by some ridiculous interpretation of a law that is bad to start out with and impossible to enforce.

It is doubly strange that General Danforth can find nothing of greater importance to rule on than his edict making lawbreakers out of many of us.

With all the open and obvious bendings of the law in Jefferson City by legislators who put themselves above the law, and with political shysterism in St. Louis that is making a mockery out of the law, it seems the attorney general could have preoccupied his mind with more important crusades than that of cutting down grape arbors.

He is trying to unravel the fabric that has held up individual freedom in this country. It really takes a great legal mind to imagine that someone making wine at home for his own consumption is breaking the law and contributing to the increasing crime rate.

And while this modern-day Elliot Ness is going around hacking holes in basement barrels of wine, crooked politicians, the Mafia and the underworld in general is thriving right under the noses of these law-and-order apostles.

It is time, I think, for John Danforth to come down out of his pulpit and be an attorney general. He's not preaching to his flock when he renders such edicts as this wine-making farce.

I mean ill to no man, John Danforth, but I hope your next batch of wine turns to vinegar! Your latest judicial edict has certainly gone sour.

ADDRESS BY MR. GEORGE MEANY

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, the Jewish Daily Forward celebrated its 75th anniversary at Philharmonic Hall in New York City. On that occasion, Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, gave an eloquent speech commending the Forward's role as the chronicle of the activities of the American labor movement.

I am sure this address will be of interest to our colleagues. The text follows:

What do you say on the occasion of the 75th anniversary of a newspaper—the Jewish Daily Forward? It's more than a newspaper. Foreign language newspaper? Yes. But more than a foreign language newspaper. Really, the 75th anniversary of a great institution, and, to be specific, an American institution.

When you look back—and we in the labor movement have a saying that we don't like to look back, certainly not with any feeling of satisfaction, and certainly not with any feeling of complacency, because it seems to be the way of life in the labor movement

that something is always going to happen tomorrow. But I think there is some satisfaction in looking back over the last 75 years—the years of this great labor newspaper.

Because, in the final analysis, it may be a foreign language newspaper; it may be a daily newspaper for the city of New York; it may even be an international paper. And it really is an institution. But to us, it is a labor paper.

From the very beginning, the Forward was truly a labor paper. Of course, it was a source of support in the struggles of the Jewish workers going back many years—the Waist-makers in 1909; the so-called Cloak and Suits Revolution of 1910.

But over the years, the Forward has given generous support—financial and moral support—to all unions engaged in the struggle for better life. Coal miners, steel workers, and others.

Sixty years ago, it may surprise you to know, the records of the American Federation of Labor show that this was the only daily labor paper in America. And, as far as I know, it is still the only daily labor paper in America.

So, we're celebrating 75 years in the life of a living, fighting institution dedicated to making life in America more rewarding to millions of new citizens and at the same time making our democratic society more vital for American citizens as well as for foreign born.

We're celebrating the anniversary of the Jewish Daily Forward at a most timely and appropriate moment in our nation's history. When I think of the devious and destructive forces now preaching hatred for America—its traditions as well as its free institutions—with the ostensible purpose of a better life for all; when I look at those who would eliminate the achievements of democracy in the name of progress, I more fully appreciate the part played by the Jewish Daily Forward in the last 75 years in helping the growth of the American free trade union movement and other democratic institutions in our nation.

Nor can we forget the tireless efforts of Abraham Cahan and his associates in helping to make good American citizens of the impoverished and persecuted, who came to our shores seeking freedom from tyranny, as well as an opportunity to live and grow as free men and women. Yes, as responsible American citizens, who could and did in turn make their contribution to a better society here in America.

The beginnings of the Jewish Daily Forward were anything but auspicious. It was established in opposition to the leadership of the Socialist Labor Party of that time to which practically all of the founders of the Forward were affiliated. The perspective clientele of the new publication was very, very unimpressive. Immigrants who had come to America from agricultural areas such as the Russian empire, where they had been denied the right to buy and own land, and had in effect been driven by adverse circumstances to emigrate. And they found themselves in a new land without resources, without homes, and in many cases without any skills by which they could earn a living. Poverty was common to all of these people.

But so was ambition. Ambition to use the opportunities that America afforded for education and improvement. A new Jewish culture came into being in those early days and the nerve center of that blossoming culture was the Jewish Daily Forward.

We in the American labor movement can not forget how much the development of the Forward was tied up with and inseparable from the struggles and successes of trade unionism—particularly, though not only, among the garment workers in our country.

Need I remind you that at one time the Jewish Daily Forward had to borrow the head of the ILG to become the business manager

of the paper. Nor can we in the trade union movement ever forget the part played by the Forward during the 20's and 30's when American labor fought for its life against the basic evil of Communism—its attempts to infiltrate, to dominate, to take over American labor. The Forward never wavered; never compromised and never ceased its struggle against the forces of evil until the Communist threat to our movement was eliminated.

It has been said—and rightly—that America is a nation of nations. Our nation has been formed by many peoples and many cultures. The men and women of various tongues, races and creeds, who came to our shores, have made distinct contributions without destroying their own cultural and traditional values. And this was a great contribution to the enrichment of the American nation. Pride in the achievement of their forefathers did not weaken their patriotism. The high faith in themselves, in their national origin, in each particular institution they respected, actually provided a strong foundation for their new allegiance to the country to which they emigrated. That is why some people say that they were Americans before they got to America.

I think this is well to keep in mind today when we see some self-styled ideologists insisting on splintering and dividing our nation.

We of the trade union movement are practical people. And we see the benefits of a unified American citizen. The columns of the Jewish Daily Forward recount the days when winning a \$1 increase a week or shortening the week from 60 to 54 hours was considered a great victory.

We see a different picture today and we've learned from experience how to stave off disastrous defeat and to insure continuing progress. Even the moments of darkest despair are fleeting when one has dedication to an ideal, devotion to a good cause and determination to translate aspirations into achievements.

We in the American trade union movement have not surrendered our hopes or our ideals for a society without determination just because progress is not as rapid as we would like it to be.

Those who preach separatism and division in our land, those who talk of white power, black power, pink power, or red power are not serving or promoting the cause of justice or equality. In reality, they are undermining the fight for a better and fuller life for all.

Some of these dividers and separators call themselves the "new left," but, in reality, they are neither new or left. There is nothing new in that old poisoned weed of anti-semitism which they peddle in the name of so-called Arab liberation, or push in the name of black power. Anti-semitism is contemptible and reactionary, no matter who preaches it or when or where it is pushed or peddled.

The politics of hate and hypocrisy do at times make strange bedfellows. I say to the angry and mostly disturbed they could benefit much from the wisdom of Abraham Cahan who once said: "One should learn to shake off European prejudices towards the idea of being an American."

And in the columns of the Forward 50 years ago Abraham Cahan said: "We have to be Americans. We shall help to build America. We shall accomplish in the new world more than we could in the old world."

Well, we in the AFL-CIO are working today and we'll continue to work for a better America and a better world—an America and a world free from poverty, ignorance, racial discrimination and prejudice of all kind, free from dictatorship and war.

In the spirit of the highest aspirations and tireless activities of those who founded this great institution, I say to the Forward on this occasion:

We in the trade union movement appreciate to the fullest the contribution you have made to the American worker and to the welfare of all Americans. This is a better nation today because of the splendid work on behalf of a better America performed over the years by Abraham Cahan and those of his fellows who were associated with him in the early days of this great institution.

We welcome our continued services in the present and we wish you many happy returns in the service of human decency, freedom, social justice and peace in the years to come.

Thank you.

EDNA B. HILL

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on May 21 a remarkable life ended in Phoenix, Ariz.—that of Edna B. Hill, 84, a retired U.S. Public Health Service nurse who spent her life carrying comfort and hope to Indian people. Mr. Ben Vance of the Arizona Republic in Phoenix, told the story of this well-spent life in an interesting and tastefully written article which follows:

EDNA B. HILL, 84, NURSE TO ILL INDIANS

The life of a lady who spent most of it nursing and caring for others inside and outside of Arizona Indian hospitals ended Sunday after eight years of near-abandonment in Valley welfare facilities.

Edna B. Hill, 84, a retired U.S. Public Health Service nurse who was given scrolls for outstanding service during her decades with the Indian Service, died Sunday in a Phoenix nursing home. She was a ward of the county. Her retirement pay couldn't match nursing home prices.

Miss Hill retired in 1951 and came to Phoenix after serving in various parts of the state including the Whiteriver-Cibecue agency in Navajo County.

She was known throughout her long Arizona career and earlier in Missouri for spending most of her free time and salary with impoverished patients, buying hand-crafted articles and aiding in the education of their families.

It was Miss Hill's hope to retire to Carmel, Calif., until she found there was not enough to build a house after paying \$6,000 for a lot.

About 1952 her retirement home was a wood and canvas structure at 4946 E. Sheridan. Here she cared for an elderly nurse friend through the throes of death and devotedly selected a grave for her under a solitary shade tree in a Tempe cemetery.

In 1964 Miss Hill became tangled in a leash on one of the stray dogs she adopted and snapped her leg in a fall. Mercifully the memory of her recent past also snapped in her mind and made it easier for her few friends to sell her home, get her out of debt and find homes for her dogs.

When a newspaper ad offered a free registered German Shepherd, dawn found the lawn of Miss Hill's guardian full of people exclaiming how friendly they could be to dogs. More persons showed up that one day than the total number of visitors Miss Hill had while she was in hospitals. She would have been proud to know her dog, an offspring of Rin Tin Tin, was wanted by so many people.

Miss Hill vividly remembered incidents 20 years ago or longer. The staff of Maricopa County Hospital were instructed to get appointments when attending to her in the

multi-bed ward. She said that the doctors over at Whiteriver would read her X-rays when they visited Ribecue. She recalled Middlesboro, Ky., as her birthplace near the historic Cumberland Gap.

When her guardian first visited, Miss Hill said, "You look like a sensible person and I'm sure I have met you somewhere before." After the county hospital stay, Miss Hill was placed in various nursing homes as her meager funds declined.

A Catholic priest will conduct a service for Miss Hill at 9 a.m. tomorrow in Whitney and Murphy Arcadia Chapel, 4800 E. Indian School. Burial will follow beneath that shade tree in Double Butte Cemetery, Tempe.

JAMES HOFFA LISTS 26 PRISON REFORMS NECESSARY TO HELP REHABILITATE PRISONERS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James Hoffa, former president of the Teamsters Union, has made a most significant contribution to prison reform when he testified before the other body and listed 26 specific recommendations to help rehabilitate the Nation's prisoners. The Washington Star carried an extensive report of Mr. Hoffa's testimony and I recommend it to my colleagues.

Mr. Hoffa is spearheading the drive for prison reform. There are a number of proposals now pending before Congress and more will follow. But, it is my belief that most of the recommendations proposed by Mr. Hoffa can be effectuated without additional legislation.

Authorities now have sufficient latitude to carry out these reforms. I wish to commend Mr. Hoffa for the leadership and initiative he is providing to this serious problem facing our prisons. Jimmy Hoffa has always been a leader and he is again demonstrating this leadership in the fight for prison reform. This Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for taking on this thankless job. The Washington Star article follows:

HOFFA LISTS 26 PRISON REFORMS

After four years and nine months in a federal prison, former Teamsters President Jimmy Hoffa has told Congress 26 ways he believes federal penitentiaries should be improved.

Without elaborating in his testimony prepared for delivery today to the Senate Judiciary subcommittee, Hoffa said:

"I have seen useless destruction of property, maiming of human beings, loss of self-respect, and inhumane treatment.

"The causes are not one-sided, but much of this can be cured by proper planning and education on the part of the prisoners and the officials of the institution."

Prisons are overcrowded and have an average age of 75 years, he said, and the antiquated ones should be torn down and new ones built that are smaller and more comfortable.

Job training is out of line with reality, he added, with "license plate and mop-bucket manufacturing" two examples "that bear little relation to potential jobs in private industry."

"It is not for humanitarian reasons alone that we must reform our corrections system,"

he said. "It is for our own safety. We have never faced up to the facts that most convicts will someday be released from the hell-holes we call correctional institutions.

"They come out, as we have seen, more bitter, more disturbed, more antisocial, and more skilled in crime than when they went in."

Hoffa said he realized that budget money for prisons did not enjoy the highest priority, but he called for:

New prisons holding no more than 350 persons each, with individual cells "to retain some sort of dignity."

Adequate, comprehensive medical and dental care, libraries and recreational space.

Movies with more general appeal "rather than . . . sex movies, and crime movies, which create nothing but problems for a majority of the prisoners."

Better guard training, sufficient counseling and case workers, and prisoner grievance boards.

Visiting hours that are not restricted by number of visits per week, with a proper place, with seats, for a prisoner's visiting family.

Unrestricted mail and telephone privileges, providing the prisoners pay for their calls.

Hoffa said prisoners also should have the freedom to wear their hair the way they want, within limits, and be able to buy and wear clothes they choose after prison authorities put identifying tags on the clothing.

Prisoners should receive a minimum wage for prison work, with an active job procurement program to secure work for them when they get out, he said.

Hoffa served at Lewisburg, for mail fraud and jury tampering was commuted by President Nixon Dec. 23.

COMMIES STILL BREAK PROMISES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, while I respect the very profound approach to foreign affairs which has marked the President's trip to Peking and Moscow, I still believe that, in the light of history, we should be very careful of agreements reached with Communist governments.

This point is very well made in a column by Dumitru Danielopol, the distinguished international correspondent for the Copley Press, which appeared in the San Diego Union of May 5.

As the major power of the free world, we have a special responsibility to ourselves and our allies to maintain vigilance, keep our defenses strong, and provide the leadership the free world needs in the face of whatever moves the Communist powers might make in violation of their commitments.

The article follows:

COMMIES STILL BREAK PROMISES

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

WASHINGTON.—After a half a century we still are shocked when Communists break their "commitments."

Why?

We've just witnessed official indignation again over Hanoi's invasion of South Vietnam in violation of an understanding with President Johnson five days before the 1968 elections.

The deal, a desperate attempt to put Hubert Humphrey in the White House, involved a U.S. promise not to bomb North Vietnam.

Many observers at the time, including this correspondent, raised eyebrows.

Now the air raids ordered by President Nixon have reopened the issue.

The Nixon administration accuses Hanoi of violating the 1968 commitment with its invasion. Hanoi rejects the existence of any commitment.

Clarification is in order even if only for the sake of historic truth.

Let's look back four years.

Soon after the Republican Miami Beach convention the British press said Mr. Nixon appeared unbeatable. The only chance for Hubert Humphrey was "a spectacular success at the Paris talks . . ."

The Humphrey campaign sputtered into October and it was evident that something drastic was in order. In some states Humphrey was not only far behind Richard Nixon, but George Wallace, too.

Hints began to drift from the White House of a possible "breakthrough" in Paris.

Sen. Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., warned that the administration "may try to 'mislead' the American people."

"Any peace move so late in the campaign must be suspect," said Sen. George Murphy, R-Calif. Sen. Everett Dirksen, R-Ill., warned about "a gimmick." South Vietnam Vice President Nguyen Cao Ky said Johnson "would stop the bombing to insure Humphrey's success."

In an article on 28 Oct. 1968 this correspondent warned that "a smoke screen of optimism" could be used by the Johnson administration to justify a bombing halt that would help Humphrey.

The order came five days before elections. Was there a real "break through" or was it a "gimmick" to help Humphrey?

We still don't know.

Humphrey got the predictable boost but it wasn't good enough to put him in the White House.

What went wrong?

One of the people most involved in the "breakthrough," Ambassador W. Averell Harriman, then U.S. negotiator in Paris, blames the Saigon regime for dragging its feet. Had they rushed to Paris, he says, things would be different.

"Some believe," Harriman wrote later, "that if we had started actual negotiations during the week before election day, it might have made a small but vital difference in the elections."

Obviously, election day was on the minds of the men in Paris.

Russia, it is said, played a big role in the bid to defeat Nixon. Moscow pushed the North Vietnamese towards an imagined "settlement."

Today that issue is academic. What we face now has nothing to do with events in 1968. South Vietnam has been invaded by organized North Vietnamese divisions. The "civil war" masquerade has ended. This is no longer a "people's war," by even the most twisted logic. It is a typical Communist grab for power, made easier because the west continues to delude itself that agreements are possible with such an enemy.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN— HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 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 sadis-

tically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,600 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

A DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS VERSUS A REPUBLICAN PRESIDENT

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the present Congress is in the control of the Democratic Party by a margin of nearly 2 to 1 in the Senate and better than 5 to 4 in the House.

This means the Speaker of the House and every single chairman of every single standing and special committee, and every subcommittee, is a Democrat. This, in turn, means that no bill can come to a hearing in committee, or to the floor for a vote unless the Democrats decide it shall.

The result in this Congress is darn little action for America. Why? Because President Nixon has proposed about 90 different programs to the Congress for action—most of them constructive, yet apparently this Democratically controlled Congress is darned if it is going to approve anything President Nixon originates in a national election year whether it is good for the country or not.

This is unfortunate for the people of the United States as able Columnist David Broder points out so well in this morning's Washington Post. It is also very likely, as Mr. Broder concludes, that the American voting public will remember this obstructionism and procrastination by the Democrats in this Congress, in choosing a new Congress this fall.

A FALLOW CONGRESS

(By David S. Broder)

To return from the Democratic presidential primary trial to Washington and the Democratic-controlled Congress is to move from a world of glittering rhetoric to one of petty, paralyzed reality.

While George McGovern, Hubert Humphrey and the rest have been out on the road promising wondrous changes in the offing, their colleagues have been back here—doing what?

Well, the scorecard of major legislation passed by this second session of the 92nd Congress includes two laws that will affect people's lives directly and two other reform measures that may have considerable indirect effect.

Last week, Congress sent the President a massive program of aid to higher education, with a provision included to slow school bus-ing orders. Earlier, it added enforcement powers to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Both those laws will be felt in people's lives.

There's also a public benefit in the stricter campaign financing law, which Congress finally passed last January, a carryover from the previous year, though not many voters will see the advantage in concrete terms. And there may be benefits down the road, if the Equal Rights Amendment for women, which Congress approved, is ratified by the states.

But that about exhausts the lists of significant legislation passed this year. It's a meager catalogue, compared to the needs of the country or the promises Democratic presi-

dential contenders have been making on behalf of their party.

It may be that Richard M. Nixon will overlook this Democratic "credibility gap," but don't bet on it.

For three years, the President has had before the Congress serious proposals on revenue-sharing with states and cities, and reform of the welfare system. For two years, he has had equally significant proposals on reorganization of the federal executive branch and expansion of health insurance protection.

All of these are matters of urgent national priority. They have been acknowledged as matters of major concern by the Democratic presidential candidates, who—in all the areas except federal reorganization—have offered counter-proposals of their own going well beyond what the President has suggested.

Yet in all these areas, the Democrats will go into convention, less than a month from now, with a record of congressional inaction. To date, the Democratic Congress has neither given the President a final up-or-down vote on his own proposals in these four vital areas nor developed and passed alternative programs of its own.

If there is a justification for this abdication of political responsibility, it does not come readily to mind. And the Democratic convention orators and platform writers will have to be more devious than usual to divert the public's attention from the yawning chasm between their promises and their party's poor record of performance.

It is true, of course, that divided government—with responsibility for the executive branch in the hands of one party and legislative branch in control of the other—is an open invitation to paralysis and irresponsibility. But the Democrats cannot avoid blame by claiming negligence on the part of the President in meeting his domestic responsibilities.

The President has made serious proposals in all these areas. He has not threatened to veto the Democratic alternatives, for, indeed, no alternatives have come close to passage.

In any fair accounting for the paralysis on the domestic front, the Democrats who control the Congress must take the lion's share of the blame.

The truth is that while the Democrats have talked change in this campaign to the point that their likely nominee, McGovern, is accused by some of his fellow-partisans of being "too radical," the reality of the party's legislative record is one of pitifully little progress.

Contrasted with the openings Mr. Nixon has made in the areas of foreign policy where he does not have to wait for Congress to come plodding along, there is real question as to which party can honestly claim to be the party of change.

Where is the Democrats' domestic equivalent of the Nixon "Open Door" China policy? Where is there a law passed by the Democratic Congress in the past four years that rivals in significance the Strategic Arms Treaty Mr. Nixon negotiated in Moscow?

These are questions the voters will be asking, when the rhetoric of the presidential campaign is measured against the record.

"CHET" ASHCRAFT, A DISTINGUISHED CITIZEN

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, C. P. "Chet" Ashcraft, of Hillsboro, Kans., a loyal friend and outstanding citizen, re-

cently passed away in the town he loved. He will be sorely missed because he was so much involved in many aspects of community life for so many years. He had distinguished himself as civil defense director of Marion County, Kans. Mrs. Shriver and I join in extending our heartfelt sympathy to Mrs. Ashcraft and her family upon their great loss.

Kenneth Bruce, editor of the Hillsboro, Kans., Star-Journal, who succeeded "Chet" Ashcraft as editor of the community newspaper, has written an excellent editorial eulogizing Mr. Ashcraft. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the editorial:

[From the Hillsboro Star-Journal, June 1, 1972]

WE WILL MISS CHET

It's always difficult to write appropriately adequate words when the community loses an outstanding citizen, and even harder when he is also a dear friend.

It has been almost 18 years ago that we purchased the Star-Journal from Mr. and Mrs. C. P. Ashcraft. During the years since then we have been associated with them in many ways and have always considered them very special people.

Not many weeks have gone by that Chet hasn't dropped into our office just to say "hello" or visit. We always enjoyed having a cup with the former editor who usually had a yarn or two to spin. And, if it got to be about noon, his "well, I'd better go home to mama and see what the neighbors brought in for dinner" always brought a smile.

Chet was a good community worker. He served many years as president and manager of the Marion County Fair, an event he sincerely promoted. He was also active in the Chamber of Commerce and in other civic affairs. He could tell about his experiences in helping form a German smoked sausage company; about his various political experiences in the city, county and state; about the great livestock and dairy industry of this area; or about the best places to fish . . . and made it all interesting . . . and often humorous.

A firm believer in the basic principles of life, Chet devoted many hours to his church and to the Masonic Lodge and he was a great family man.

Chet usually spoke his mind and it didn't take long to find out how he felt on a given subject . . . you always knew where he stood. Agreed or not, we knew he loved this community and his contributions to its betterment were many.

We, and so many others, will miss Chet Ashcraft.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS CONGRESSMAN WYDLER'S 1972

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, it has become a tradition in my congressional district to send reports of my activities to constituents and to ask each year for their views on important current national issues, by means of a questionnaire. The questionnaire is now in its 9th consecutive year.

I send the questionnaire to every household in my congressional district, regardless of the occupants' political affiliation. In this way, I can truly test the prevailing opinions on the great national issues.

Once again, thousands and thousands of people of the congressional district have answered the questionnaire. The results have been carefully tabulated, and I am still busy answering the many special comments that have been made on the questionnaire returns. The enthusiastic response proves that people do care about their Government and want to be part of it.

I am now sending a copy of the questionnaire results to each home in my congressional district.

There is no better measure of the real feelings in my district than these questionnaire results. They are the voice of the people.

The following comments are my personal interpretation on these results:

The people in my district believe that network television does not fairly present both sides of most issues.

Then, these same people agreed most strongly—89.24 percent—that Congress should have a standard procedure for Federal intervention in prolonged strikes which damage the public's interest.

There are 86.94 percent who oppose school busing; and 80.85 percent favored President Nixon's visit to mainland China.

The closest issue was over legislation to promote day care centers and nursery schools: 43.53 percent favored it, but 46.20 percent opposed and 10.27 percent were undecided.

One item that I have proposed for years, tax relief for parents supporting college students, received a strong vote of approval—68.57 percent, with 26.27 percent opposed and 5.16 percent undecided.

The complete results are as follows:

1972 QUESTIONNAIRE AND OPINION POLL

	Yes	No	Undecided
1. Broadcasting—Do you feel that network television fairly presents both sides of most issues?	33.21	54.81	11.98
2. China—Do you favor President Nixon's visit to mainland China?	80.85	11.67	7.48
3. Crime—Do you favor stricter gun controls at the Federal level?	74.40	21.05	4.55
4. Economy—Do you favor increasing the minimum wage to \$2 per hour?	66.88	26.70	6.42
5. Do you favor a lower minimum wage for teenagers who work?	42.42	50.10	7.48
6. Education—Do you favor legislation to promote the establishment of daycare centers and nursery schools?	43.53	46.20	10.27
7. Do you favor allowing college students to register and vote in the towns where they attend school, including local elections?	29.61	65.06	5.33
8. Granting that busing is inconvenient for everyone, do you see busing as a legitimate means to achieve quality education for all?	9.44	86.94	3.62
9. Do you favor tax relief for parents supporting college students?	68.57	26.27	5.16
10. Environmental protection—Would you favor Federal programs to curb pollution even if it meant higher taxes?	65.63	24.26	10.11
11. Health—Do you favor a national health insurance program to cover catastrophic or prolonged illnesses?	77.24	15.46	7.30
12. Insurance—Would you favor a program of no fault automobile insurance on a national level?	67.35	16.86	15.79

Yes No Undecided

13. Strikes—Do you feel that Congress should have a standard procedure for Federal intervention in prolonged strikes which damage the public's interest?	89.24	6.97	3.79
--	-------	------	------

PRESSING HEALTH PROBLEMS

HON. JOHN W. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as our society becomes more affluent, and as we strive to better the common good, foremost of our concerns is the solution of many of our pressing health problems. In the past few years, we have made some strides in combating heart disease and we have embarked on new frontiers in the battle against cancer. More recently, we have become attuned to certain health problems which afflict societal or racial groups, such as lead paint poisoning and sickle cell anemia. All of these efforts are indeed commendable and should be continued and expanded.

There is, however, one health problem which has not received the attention that its magnitude demands.

I am speaking of kidney disease which claims some 58,000 lives each year, and afflicts over 8 million American men, women and children. In fact, the highly touted fatality figures for automobile accidents are less each year than those for sufferers of terminal kidney ailments. Kidney disease is now the fourth major health problem in the United States, according to the National Kidney Foundation, but it is a problem which has fallen behind some less pervasive afflictions in appealing to the public conscience and the national pocketbook.

Not only is kidney disease a very serious threat to those who are unfortunate enough to be gravely ill, it also poses an economic hardship upon those who are stricken, their families and their employers. Among women, kidney disease is the No. 1 cause of absenteeism from the job, among men under 25, the second leading cause, and among men over 25, the fourth cause. Additionally, every year some 4,000 little children between the ages of 1 and 6, are stricken with childhood nephrosis.

As with all disease, we will never lay kidney disease to rest until we have committed ourselves to a total approach—of prevention, treatment, and cure. Much of the success of this total approach will lie with the conscience of the American people. Money for research is, of course, vitally important. This year, research fellowship grants for kidney studies totaled over a half a million dollars—a considerable sum except when compared to the scope of the problem. It is clear that additional monetary commitments will have to be made, both in the public and the private sectors.

Professional education is also of key importance. The National Kidney Foun-

dation presently performs the service of providing doctors, medical societies, and social work personnel with up-to-date information on the latest advances in kidney research. Additionally, the Foundation provides information for television, radio, newspaper, and other public service formats so that the individual citizen may also keep apprised of the many facets of kidney disease and the progress in its prevention, treatment, and cure.

I briefly mentioned the public commitment which must be made if we are to stop the ravages of kidney afflictions. For just a moment, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell my colleagues of an achievement of a number of citizens in my district and in the State of Georgia toward this end. The members of the Marietta Council of the Dixie Chapter of the Telephone Pioneers, a voluntary organization of the Southern Bell Telephone System, began a campaign nearly 1 year ago to collect enough trading stamps and cash to have an at-home artificial kidney machine contributed for present use in Cobb County. This is the first machine of its type to be based in Cobb County, which has a population of over 200,000 persons. As a part of the Atlanta metropolitan area, Cobb County citizens were able to utilize the artificial kidney machines available at Grady Memorial Hospital in Atlanta. But this hospital is the only facility in the Atlanta area which has such machines, and it must serve an extremely large metro population. Clearly, this was a big triumph for Cobb County citizens to receive a kidney machine for use in the county. It was a big triumph for those who worked so long and so hard to make their success a reality. It is obviously a big triumph for those who will now have the benefits of this machine in the privacy of their own homes.

But, in another light, Mr. Speaker, Cobb County's individual triumph points up the insufficiency of our commitment to this Nation's health and welfare. These dedicated people were able to procure one artificial kidney machine to serve a population of over 200,000 people, and throughout the State of Georgia, other chapters procured three more machines to serve their populations. But, with one out of every 25 Cobb Countians conceivably being kidney victims, some of them seriously, one machine is lamentable indeed. We simply cannot afford to rely upon the generous and unselfish efforts of groups like the Pioneers to provide all the necessary equipment for those who are afflicted with kidney disease. These persons are purely a volunteer group. It is wrong to expect that they should provide a major part of our first line of defense against kidney fatalities, when they have other responsibilities, which must come first. And, it is naive to expect that they will be able to meet the rising demand for such equipment without the Government and other institutions making commensurate contributions. What the Pioneers have done, more than anything, is to point up the grave need for strong commitments on the parts of Government, business, and academia toward ending kidney disease. The

Pioneers have done much more than to donate a kidney machine. They have donated their time, effort, and money where we have not, and they have shown us the fallacy of our supposed national commitment to this Nation's health and well-being. I take great pride in their contribution of themselves, and I hope that other groups throughout the country will learn from their example. But, I also hope that those of us who are in a position to do much more, and have not, will also take a lesson. In the future, I hope that the Pioneers will no longer retain their distinction of being the only group to have provided an artificial kidney machine for use in Cobb County, and I hope that the Congress will soon concern itself with this important matter.

SHOULD WE TRY HEROIN MAINTENANCE?

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of June 5, 1972, there appeared an article by John A. Hamilton entitled "Free Fix for Addicts?" This article sets forth the concern of narcotics treatment professionals over recent proposals to introduce heroin maintenance as an acceptable method for the treatment of heroin addiction in the United States.

The advisability of heroin maintenance is a subject which demands close scrutiny and informed debate. Too often in the past has the public dialog on narcotics addiction and the treatment of addiction been tinged with emotion. The Hamilton article makes a significant contribution to the debate on heroin maintenance and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

FREE FIX FOR ADDICTS?

(By John A. Hamilton)

A free fix for junkies? An experimental program that gives heroin to heroin addicts under the label of "research"?

Community leaders in New York City, where a scaled-down proposal along this line is receiving renewed interest from the Lindsay administration, have denounced the idea as "a cruel hoax" and as "colonialist-type thinking." The nation's leading drug experts are also strongly opposed to the whole concept.

Dr. Vincent Dole of Rockefeller University, who developed the use of methadone in the treatment of heroin addiction, calls the thought of dispensing heroin itself "insanity." Dr. Jerome Jaffe, head of President Nixon's Special Action Office for Drug Abuse Prevention, notes the need to supply addicts with as many as five shots of heroin daily and concludes that any heroin-dispensing program would prove "a logistical nightmare."

One of the founders of the British system for treating narcotics addicts, Dr. Richard Phillipson, shares these views. The British system rests on the treatment of addiction as an illness rather than as a crime and, for a while, this treatment consisted mostly of dispensing heroin to heroin addicts. Dr. Phillipson, who is now with the National Insti-

tute of Mental Health in Washington, warns against this nation's trying slavishly to follow his original model. He points out that while some heroin is still dispensed in Britain, the British system recently has been moving toward an increased use of methadone.

Nonetheless, despite all this, there are those who persist in advocating a heroin-dispensing program for New York City. The Vera Institute of Justice has presented a formal proposal to Mayor Lindsay's Narcotics Control Council and some members of this council are urging its implementation, linking the drug problem with the crime problem and arguing that if addicts received free heroin they would no longer rob to maintain their habits.

Such an argument may now have special appeal to Mayor Lindsay. Out flat emotionally after his futile Presidential foray, badly bruised in budgetary scuffles with both the City Council and the Board of Estimate, the Mayor is reported interested in launching new programs in problem areas that would at least give the appearance of innovation and activity.

But the fear of crime, as real as it is, and the need for a mayoral initiative are hardly persuasive reasons for launching a heroin program in the face of community and medical opposition. The proposal has serious flaws. It is said that heroin is essential to "lure" street addicts into treatment programs, but the truth of the situation in New York City is more the reverse. There are long waiting lists of addicts unable to gain entrance into existing treatment programs, especially the more successful methadone programs. There is less a need for a "lure" than for expansion of these programs. At Rikers Island and at the Tombs, the Manhattan House of Detention, men behind bars plead with medical visitors.

"Hey, man," one said to Dr. Dole recently, "I'm in here now. I've been in here before. I'll be in here again. I need to get into a drug program."

Dr. Dole told him that most programs were now full.

The methadone programs that Dr. Dole runs require funds. Any experimental heroin program would drain away funds. Where methadone can be administered once a day and addicts can be stabilized to hold jobs, heroin would have to be administered more often and addicts would continue to suffer the "highs" and "lows" that go with such addiction. The staffing of a heroin program would have to be double or triple or more that of a methadone program. Again, a drain on scarce funds.

Dr. Phillipson's "grave reservations" about giving addicts a free heroin fix find support in the most recent figures made available by the British Home Office. As of the end of 1970, these figures show that Britain had only 1,430 narcotics addicts, compared to the estimated 150,000 now in New York City. Of these addicts, the Home Office figures show that only 183 were being maintained on heroin. Another 254 were receiving a combination of heroin and methadone, while the bulk some 738, were receiving methadone alone. A remaining group of 255 were listed as "therapeutic" addicts, having acquired their addictions from drugs taken during illnesses or operations; these were receiving a variety of other drugs.

Thus, the free fix that the British now give addicts is not usually a free heroin fix, as some advocates of a heroin program here seem to imply; on the contrary, the British are moving away from the use of heroin and toward the use of methadone. The Vera Institute's proposal for a heroin experiment has a section devoted to a discussion of the British system, but it somehow neglects to mention either Dr. Phillipson or the figures from the Home Office.

MAN WITH A MISSION

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months, I have had the privilege to serve on the Republican Task Force on National Health. Under the fine leadership of Chairman TIM LEE CARTER, the task force has been attempting to determine how to provide quality medical care to all citizens at a cost they can afford.

Recently an article about Congressman CARTER appeared in the Review, the official publication of the Federation of American Hospitals. This is a well-deserved tribute to an able and dedicated man, and I commend it to all my colleagues:

MAN WITH A MISSION

Congressman Tim Lee Carter (R-Ky) is a man with a mission.

He is chairman of a Republican Task Force on National Health.

The mission, he says, is to find the ingredients to incorporate into a health care program that will provide "adequate health services to all people at the lowest possible cost and, at the same time, preserve the principle of private enterprise."

The 16-member Task Force is investigating the status of health care services and exploring the feasibility of several proposed legislative courses of action in the health field.

Special attention is being given to: comprehensive National Health Insurance; catastrophic health insurance; creation of Health Maintenance Organizations (HMO's); development of medical services in rural areas; medical manpower problems and the use of para-medics; health education and the prevention of illness.

CONCERN OVER COSTS

Congressman Carter, who is a physician, said: "We are endeavoring to study all the major health problems which control persons in America today. Of primary concern, of course, is the mounting cost of health care in our hospitals, clinics and physicians' offices. It is important, therefore, that we search for a means by which proper medical care can best be provided to all groups and all levels of our society without working an undue hardship on any group."

Other members of the Republican Task Force include: Congressmen Donald G. Brozman (Colo.), Clarence Brown (Ohio), Pierre duPont (Del.), Edwin B. Forsythe (N.J.), Durward G. Hall (Mo.); William J. Keating (Ohio), Manuel Lujan, Jr. (NM), Joseph M. McDade (Pa.), Stewart B. McKinney (Conn.), Jerry L. Pettis (Calif.), Tom Railsback (Ill.), J. William Stanton (Ohio), Fred Schwengel (Ia.), John Ware (Pa.), and H. John Heinz III (Pa.).

Congressman Carter said members of the Task Force had been interviewing representatives of all interested groups—including hospital personnel, physicians and consumers—in an effort to try to find solutions "to our health problems."

The 61-year-old congressman from Tompkinsville, Kentucky, was elected to Congress in 1964 and re-elected three times. He is a graduate of Western Kentucky State College and the University of Tennessee School of Medicine where he obtained his medical degree in 1937. He was an Army combat medic during World War II. Until his election to Congress, he practiced medicine at Tompkinsville.

In addition to his Task Force and committee assignments, he is a member of the President's Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse.

Congressman Carter made these comments in a recent interview with the FAH Review Magazine:

Question. What have been some of the findings of the Republican Task Force on National Health to date?

Congressman CARTER. We, of course, have learned many things about our health problems. One of the most striking conditions is the escalating cost of health services, particularly in hospitals. Also, we have noticed that there is an increase particularly in hospitals associated with educational institutions—medical schools.

Question. In your opinion, what can be done to slow these escalating costs?

Congressman CARTER. We must streamline our medical practice in some way in order to cut out unnecessary tests and reduce the time of stay in hospitals, for example. There are many factors which enter into this.

Question. Will the findings of the Health Task Force be presented to the National Republican Party's Platform Committee?

Congressman CARTER. Yes. In fact, we expect to formulate legislation to implement our findings.

Question. What will be some of your major recommendations?

Congressman CARTER. It is a little early to say just what our recommendations will be. We have some experienced medical people who are assisting us. I think that HMO's—Health Maintenance Organizations—will be included. However, we want to preserve the right of private physicians to build HMO's if they so desire. There would be, of course, federal financing—loans to groups that wanted to establish HMO's and perhaps grants in the ghetto areas and areas where there is an inadequate supply of medical services, particularly isolated rural areas.

Question. Do you believe that for-profit HMO's should be provided guaranteed federal loans?

Congressman CARTER. If they are for-profit HMO's, I think it should be possible for them to get fair bank loans. But I wouldn't think they should be guaranteed. I believe that grants and guaranteed loans should go to the non-profit organizations.

Question. What type of loans do you feel for-profit HMO's should receive?

Congressman CARTER. Well, they should be provided such loans as they could get from private institutions and perhaps from the federal government, as Hill-Burton gives loans at the present time. Actually, in Hill-Burton hospitals, the hospitals themselves are usually non-profit institutions but the physicians work for profit. I think that this idea can be carried over to the HMO's—that is, loans can be made to an HMO but the physicians would work there, obtaining money for each patient which they have on a fee basis, as they do at the present time.

Question. Do you foresee passage of any HMO legislation this year?

Congressman CARTER. It is possible. But I am not sure legislation will be passed. We have an HMO bill before us at the present time. It was introduced by Congressman Roy of Kansas.

Question. What role do you foresee for HMO's in the future of health care delivery?

Congressman CARTER. I think that HMO's will have a large role. We have had several HMO's throughout the country which have proved to be successful, it seems. HMO's will be able to provide a broad coverage of services—from birth throughout life. Of course, we envision an HMO as being capable of performing all complicated laboratory tests and having within it all types of specialties so that people can get a thorough physical evaluation—diagnosis can be made—and then the patients can receive adequate treatment.

Question. In your opinion, what role will the health care issue have in the 1972 election campaigns?

Congressman CARTER. I believe it will play a part. However, it won't be as decisive a part as other problems because everyone is for health, and each candidate for the presidency, for example, has his own health legislative proposals.

Question. Do you foresee approval of a National Health Insurance bill this year?

Congressman CARTER. No, sir. I do not. I haven't talked with any leader in the House or Senate who thinks that a comprehensive health insurance bill will be passed this year.

Question. Do you favor any particular National Health Insurance proposal that has been introduced thus far?

Congressman CARTER. Many of them have good features. The Republican Task Force on Health will take the better parts of each bill and develop legislation which will be helpful to the American people and, at the same time, cost them as little as possible.

Question. How do you feel about President Nixon's National Health Insurance Plan?

Congressman CARTER. I have been a sponsor of President Nixon's bill, but there are parts of it that I don't agree with. For instance, there is a slight limitation on private enterprise to which I object. While I am for loans and grants to non-profit institutions in certain instances, I want to point out that we have private physicians who want to form their groups, their clinics, their HMO's. I am all for them having the right to do so. I think the more competition we have in the health field, the better our people will be served.

Question. How do you feel about the profit motive in the health care field?

Congressman CARTER. It is just as simple as this. In any profession, you find some dedicated individuals who will work without thought of profit. But a profession such as medicine is different. It is often necessary for a physician to work night after night and on Sundays. The extra pay is an incentive. Sickness doesn't take a holiday.

A physician's work is not like that of a man on an assembly line who works eight hours and goes home. Because of the nature of sickness, a physician cannot be limited to eight hours day. Therefore, he must be paid for the increased amount of work he does.

Anyone who thinks that there should not be a profit motive in health—or in medicine and delivery of health services—would have to feel, then, that a man who works overtime on the assembly line should not receive overtime pay. Many people just haven't rationalized their thinking on this matter. Many are moved by altruistic ideals that would be good if no one would work for money or fame, but each would work for the joy of working—as Kipling has said. But, actually, in real life, it just doesn't work that way. We must have added incentive for extra work whether it is on the assembly line—on the farm—or in the duties of a nurse or a physician.

Question. In your opinion, what is the general attitude of the people toward health care delivery at this point in time?

Congressman CARTER. Well, our country wants adequate health care at a reasonable price. I don't feel the pressure at the present time to be nearly as great for a health bill as it was in 1965 when Medicare was approved. The people do, of course, want adequate health care, and they are certainly willing to pay for it. But, here again, they want it at as reasonable a price as they can get.

Question. As a physician and as a congressman, how do you feel about Medicare and Medicaid?

Congressman CARTER. I feel that Medicare has been a great help to people throughout the country. I think Medicaid serves a useful purpose. One thing I do want people to realize is that we are going to pay for what we

get. So many people feel that when they receive health services from the federal government, they're not paying for them. But, they are paying for these services—they will pay for them in increased taxes. There is no other way.

Comprehensive health insurance might be written up or publicized as not costing the people anything. Well, this is the farthest thing from the truth. They are going to pay for it. It is going to come out of their payrolls. It is going to be reflected in the added cost of manufactured articles.

Under the administration's NHI bill, the manufacturer, for example, would pay 65 per cent of the cost of medical care for his employees for the first two and a half years, and after that he would pay 75 per cent of the cost. All of these things would be reflected in higher cost of goods. Then, there is the worker himself who would pay 35 per cent and then 25 per cent.

So, we have to pay for all of these things, either through increased taxes or through the increased cost of consumer goods. It is really a matter of where we want the cost to be borne.

Another big problem, of course, is to see that everyone receives adequate care.

Question. What do you think can be done to alleviate the health manpower shortage?

Congressman CARTER. We are trying to do something about it in Congress by increasing the number of scholarships and loans for medical institutions and institutions for allied health professions. We have passed a bill that will increase the amount of money authorized for medical schools, nursing institutions, pharmacy, dentistry, podiatry and veterinary medicine. These bills—the Comprehensive Health Training Act and the Comprehensive Nurse Training Act—will provide more funds for the schools and more grants and scholarships for people who want to go to school. I feel that we will have adequate health personnel within the next few years.

NAVY COVERUP

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Navy is covering up more than \$100 million in cost overruns for sophisticated electronic equipment on 30 new DD-963 destroyers.

The cost of providing the DD-963 with complex electronic decoys and radar equipment has skyrocketed from \$75 million to nearly \$200 million, according to Adm. I. C. Kidd in response to my questioning before a recent hearing of the House Armed Services Committee.

Rather than calculate the real cost, the Navy continues to stick to its original estimate of \$75 million for radars and decoys known as the electronic warfare suit. The real cost of the DD-963 with all its needed electronic equipment will be approximately \$95 million per ship, not the Navy's current estimate of \$90.5 million per ship.

It is also my belief, Mr. Speaker, that before the first DD-963 joins our fleet, the price tag will be in excess of \$100 million for one destroyer.

This latest development is just one more sign that the Navy's massive ship-building program with Litton Industries is in deep trouble.

As many of my colleagues may know,

Litton currently holds Navy contracts to build five LHA amphibious assault ships and 30 DD-963 destroyers. According to official Navy estimates the destroyers are expected to cost \$2.7 billion, or approximately \$90.5 million per ship.

In addition, reports in the press have indicated that Litton is seeking an additional \$400 million in bailout money on the five LHA amphibious assault ships in addition to the current estimated price tag for the five ships of \$960 million.

Between the DD-963 and the LHA program, the Navy is well on its way to producing its own version of the C-5A.

It is my hope that the House Armed Services Committee will give serious consideration to making changes in the Navy's request for \$610 million for seven new DD-963's in the 1973 fiscal year budget.

U.N. LAW OF SEA REPORT: SECTION II

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as part of my report to the Congress on the U.N. Law of the Sea Conference, I yesterday submitted for the RECORD remarks by the Honorable John R. Stevenson, legal adviser to the U.N. Seabed Committee, concerning the background on the crisis we face in the Law of the Sea. The second section, concerning the current U.S. Oceans Policy, follows:

U.N. LAW OF SEA REPORT: SECTION II

U.S. OCEANS POLICY

What emerged from the President's statement, was a new United States oceans policy designed to accommodate a wide variety of domestic and international interests. Particularly with respect to maritime limits questions—which are among the most controversial—we sought to understand the major broad limits and of narrow limits. It is our conviction that these interests can be harmonized or accommodated to a large degree in a general international settlement, if they are addressed by dealing with the real problems involved. Such an accommodation should be of greater value and duration than an arbitrary compromise.

The territorial sea and straits

The United States has recognized that the only practical possibility for agreement on the breadth of the territorial sea lies in acceptance of a 12-mile maximum limit. After careful study of our own reasons for adhering to the 3-mile limit, we decided that it would be possible to accept a 12-mile limit if it were broadly agreed, rather than unilaterally asserted, and if it were accompanied by agreement on free transit through and over international straits, that is straits used for international navigation.

The reason why the United States is insisting on this guarantee of free transit through and over straits used for international navigation is that with the move from a three to a twelve mile territorial sea, international straits between six and twenty-four miles would become overlapped by territorial seas. While the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea in straits may not be suspended, innocent passage does not include submerged transit or overflight. Moreover, some coastal States have interpreted

innocent passage subjectively, arguing for example that the flag, cargo, or destination of a vessel is a relevant consideration. The absence of clear guarantees of free transit through international straits would create a number of critical pressure points around the world where the potential for conflict could dramatically increase. We saw one such situation develop prior to the 1967 war in the Middle East.

Just as the question of navigation and overflight in straits within 12-miles of the coast is one key aspect of the territorial sea issue, the rights of coastal States over resources beyond a 12-mile territorial sea are another vital aspect of this issue.

Fisheries

With respect to fisheries, there is no doubt that a settlement cannot be reached that does not protect the regulatory interests of coastal States in fisheries well beyond 12-miles. The economic and social problems caused by highly mobile distant water fishing fleets using advanced methods are not unique to developing countries; our own coastal fishermen have the same problems. In order to resolve this problem, we have proposed delegating regulatory authority to coastal States with respect to two types of fish that comprise over 75% of the world's fish catch: coastal species, that is species that normally reside off the coast, and anadromous species, that is species such as salmon that spawn in fresh water, then migrate far out to sea, and finally return to their streams of origin. The authority delegated to the coastal State would be subject to international standards, such as those designed to assure conservation and maximum utilization of fisheries and an agreed formula for historic fishing rights. We regard compulsory settlement of disputes as an essential aspect of any such settlement.

On the other hand, we do not believe there can be effective coastal State management of highly migratory oceanic species such as tuna, which appear off the coast of any one nation for only a short period of time. Accordingly, we propose that such species be managed by international and regional organizations.

SEABEDS

With respect to seabed resources beyond the territorial sea, coastal States already enjoy sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring the continental shelf and exploiting its natural resources. As I indicated earlier, a precise limit for the exercise of such rights was not agreed in 1958, although it is clear that such rights extend at least to where the water reaches a depth of 200 meters (about 600 feet).

This limit would determine not only the extent of the seabed area subject to coastal State sovereign rights over resources, but also the size of the international seabed area that would be subject to a new international regime to be established by the Law of the Sea Conference pursuant to the Declaration of Principles adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1970. With respect to the international area, the United States has proposed a new international organization to regulate and license exploration and exploitation and to collect revenues from such activities primarily for the benefit of developing countries.

In the context of considering alternative seabed limits, the narrowest limit on which agreement could conceivably be reached would be 200 meters depth. Although the distance from shore of the 200 meter depth varies from several miles to several hundred miles, an average would be less than 50 miles. Many developing coastal States have urged much broader limits for coastal State jurisdiction, such as 200 miles or the entire continental margin.

We have proposed an intermediate zone as a means of resolving this problem. The inter-

mediate zone would begin at the 200-meter depth. We proposed that it continue seaward to embrace the continental margin, but have also indicated our willingness to consider several criteria, including a mileage distance from shore, for the outer limit of the intermediate zone. Within the intermediate zone, coastal States would regulate exploration and exploitation, but there would also be international standards and compulsory dispute settlement designed, for example, to assure protection of other uses of the area, global protection of the marine environment from seabed pollution, and some sharing of revenues with the international community.

Scientific research

In our view, scientific research in the oceans is, and should be, beneficial to all. The United States supports both maximum freedom of scientific research and maximum efforts to ensure dissemination of the results of such research. There is no inherent contradiction between the exercise of resource jurisdiction by coastal States and the protection of free and open scientific research. On the contrary, such research can enhance the ability of coastal States to derive maximum benefits from resources under their jurisdiction. Thus, one important aspect of the intermediate zone proposal for the seabeds is that coastal State control over exploration and exploitation of resources would not restrict other uses of the area such as scientific research.

Pollution

The United States is vigorously seeking to bring ocean pollution under effective international regulation in a number of different forums. IMCO has produced several Conventions on pollution from ships, and is continuing this work. Also significant are IMCO's attempts to lessen the chances of collisions at sea through such measures as traffic separation. The U.S. has worked for a Convention on ocean dumping, an environmental monitoring system, an international fund for research, as well as other measures in the context of the 1972 Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. The U.S. draft seabed treaty proposes that the international seabed organization to be established by the Law of the Sea Conference be given broad regulatory and emergency powers in order to prevent pollution arising from exploration and exploitation, and all deep drilling, in the international seabed area. Also, one essential advantage of an intermediate zone on the seabeds is that minimum environmental standards can be fixed internationally, thus better assuring protection of the ocean environment as a whole, assuring coastal States that they will not suffer competitive economic disadvantage by applying such standards, and assuring coastal States not only the right to apply higher standards if they choose, but the right to seek technical assistance from the international authority in doing so.

A SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, with the education amendments passed last week and the Labor-HEW appropriations scheduled for action in the House tomorrow, it is appropriate that we recognize the vital role of education in our society and pay tribute to those who have made America's educational system what it is today.

With our understandable preoccupa-

tion over events on the battlefields of Vietnam we may have a tendency to overlook the battles being waged within our own society—the battle for understanding and tolerance, the battle for equal opportunity, the battle for the right to share in America's affluence.

In the front lines of those battles are the more than 2 million classroom teachers in our elementary and secondary schools. Particularly in the disadvantaged communities of our central cities, these men and women are waging a valiant struggle to provide hope and opportunity to children whose lives have been devoid of both.

The internal strength of our Nation is dependent on the products of our schools. The seeds of whatever greatness lies ahead for this country are being sown today in the classroom. To those who bear that responsibility, we must say, "Thank you, keep up the good work."

ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL DYSAUTONOMIA INSTITUTE

HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

STATEMENT BY LOUISE DAY HICKS INTRODUCING LEGISLATION FOR NATIONAL DYSAUTONOMIA INSTITUTE

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to bring to the attention of this House the existence of a little-known yet devastating disease; a disease which not only kills its young victims, but first leads them through a life of tragic and bizarre symptoms.

It is called "dysautonomia," meaning disturbance of the autonomic nervous system. This familial disease of childhood occurs almost exclusively in descendants of Ashkenazic Jews, from which more than 98 percent of the American Jews are descended.

Dysautonomic children are usually undersized, and have a special facial appearance marked by pallor, a rather fixed stare, unusually high forehead, and an apprehensive, somewhat frozen expression. Characteristic symptoms of dysautonomia include vomiting, poor motor coordination, and difficulty in feeding and swallowing. But the tragically distinctive and identifying feature of dysautonomic children is that they can cry, but are unable to shed tears. A major problem associated with this defect is that any foreign object in the eye, because there are no tears to wash it out, can often cause corneal ulcers. These ulcers may become so severe that the child's eyelids must be sewn together to heal the damage.

Characteristically, a dysautonomic child is also unable to feel pain or to distinguish between hot and cold. This dangerous insensitivity to pain can make the child oblivious to burns and broken bones, leaving many children scarred and crippled for life.

Scoliosis, the bending of the spine to one side, is another symptom which worsens as the child grows older. Also, vomiting is chronic sometimes going on for days at a time.

About 25 percent of all dysautonomic children die by the age of 10. After that the death rate mounts steadily; about 50 percent have died by the age of 20, usually from pulmonary infections.

The disease is inherited through an autosomal recessive gene. This means that when the diseased gene is paired with a normal gene, its harmful action is blocked, but the person becomes a "carrier" of dysautonomia. The disease, which may skip several generations, occurs when two people who are carriers marry and have children. In such a case, the chances are one out of four that the child will be born with dysautonomia. Today it is estimated that one out of every 100 American Jews is a carrier of dysautonomia.

What can be done for these victims today? Although the disorder was discovered in 1948 by Drs. Riley and Day (and therefore frequently termed the Riley-Day syndrome) today there is only palliative treatment for the disease consisting of using tranquilizers to help control the intense vomiting that occurs. There is no cure for the disorder itself.

Research holds the only hope for these victims. And so I am here today to introduce a bill to establish in the Public Health Service an institute for research on dysautonomia.

The establishment of a National Dysautonomia Institute would enable our country to wage an effective battle against this terrible disease. Through such an institute research programs could be conducted and fostered relating to the cause, prevention, and treatment of dysautonomia. Through this institute, our country would be able to search out undiagnosed victims who can be helped, would be able to find ways to identify carriers and prevent the disease in unborn children, and would be able to find a way of reversing the disease in its present victims.

Moreover, an understanding of dysautonomia would provide not only a better understanding of the workings of the normal nervous system, but would also provide a key to a further understanding of multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, high blood pressure, heart problems, and diseases connected with all the body system affected by the autonomic nervous system.

I urge your support and approval of this bill so that we may begin to make a concentrated and an effective attack on these diseases which threaten our nation.

MAJORITY OF PEOPLE CANNOT HANDLE EFFECTS OF MARIHUANA

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in the current debate over marihuana, the point is often made by those supporting its legalization, that the use of marihuana does not lead to experimentation with more dangerous drugs. Police and narcotics officials with whom I have discussed this question disagree strongly. I recently received a very moving letter from a concerned mother whose daughter progressed to addictive use of amphetamines from initial contact with marihuana. This mother, understandably, is deeply concerned over any effort to legalize the use of marihuana and I ask my congressional colleagues to reflect carefully on her experiences.

The letter follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WILSON: I am accepting your invitation to write you concerning my views. I received your pamphlet in the mail yesterday and it was the answer I

had been looking for. Where to begin in my own small way to do what I could to prevent the legalization of marijuana.

I have just gone through the horrendous experience of having my 15 year old daughter placed under arrest at her High School for the possession of drugs (including a marijuana cigarette) and possession for sale. She was detained in juvenile hall for her own protection. My daughter had become addicted to amphetamines. Fortunately the suppliers were apprehended at the same time. She is now safe and getting the help she needs.

I am adamant about the marijuana, because I know this is where it started for her. Four years ago when she passed through the gates of Junior High School, she found the pressures too much and turned to marijuana for escape. She has told me that it was readily available then and of course it still is. From there it was easy to pop (as she puts it) a few pills now and then.

This is of course not all the story, but it is the basis. I have read all the articles pro and con on this legalizing, and have discussed it with Juvenile Detectives. I just cannot for one minute believe that anything that affects the mind as this drug does, can be beneficial to our society. Many people may be able to handle the effects and walk away, but I truly believe that the majority cannot. I am particularly concerned about our young people. Growing up has always been problematic but it is even more so today. The availability of the various drugs is bad enough in itself, legalizing any one of them is terrifying.

I would very much appreciate your advice as to who else I can write to about this issue.

I appreciate your pamphlet and commend you on the fine job you are doing as our representative.

Yours sincerely,

TRIBUTE TO MR. FARMER PASCHAL

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Farmer Paschal, a close personal friend of mine, whom I deeply admire and respect, of Ripley, Tenn., is retiring after 44 years in the agricultural extension farm program, 33 of these spent as Lauderdale County extension agent. Mr. Paschal has distinguished himself as an outstanding agent and has always been a friend of the farmers in this area. His presence will be sorely missed. The Lauderdale Enterprise, a weekly newspaper, has printed an article on Mr. Paschal which I would like to have inserted at this point:

FARMER PASCHAL

Farmer Paschal, Lauderdale County Extension Agent since 1939, is retiring at the end of this month, to be succeeded by his assistant county agent, Charles Peal, who in turn will be replaced by Dan T. Brown, of Cookeville, a Viet Nam veteran who has previously done Extension work in Selmer.

Friends are invited to greet Mr. Paschal in a reception being arranged by his colleagues from 2:30 to 4 p.m. Sunday, June 25th, in Ripley High School.

Mr. Paschal, oldest of five sons and three daughters of his parents, grew up on a tobacco, wheat, and hay farm in the Cottage Grove community of Henry County.

"My father wanted me to be a lawyer," he says, "and my pastor wanted me to be a preacher. I didn't think I was good enough to be a preacher nor smart enough to be a lawyer, but it took me two years to decide to become a county agent."

"We got a good county agent in Henry County in 1918, and I began to see as a 4-H boy how a county agent could help farm families. Farmers then had no impartial sources of information, and they needed them so much."

"I taught school from 1920 until 1923, spent two years in college, taught school another year, and finished college. On March 16, 1928, I took my last college exams, bought a new car, married Laura Davis, and was hired as a county agent, all in one day."

"I worked as county agent in Decatur County until 1934 and in Chester County until 1939, when I came to Ripley. (J. L. Burns and E. L. Vaughan were on the committee that recommended me to the Lauderdale County Court.)"

"I worked with 4-H clubs for almost 18 years, until Lauderdale County acquired an assistant county agent to take over this work."

"In 1939, I began taking 4-Hers to the Mid-South Fair in Memphis, and this grew until we couldn't get enough busses. The school board then agreed to provide busses if we would pay the drivers and provide adult supervisors. We used as many as 21 busses to transport 950 4-Hers to the fair."

"Rat control campaigns we began in Ripley spread to Halls, Gates, and Henning and have been conducted annually for 23 years."

"In Decatur County, in 1931, I helped farmers incorporate a cooperative marketing association for green-wrap tomatoes. Lauderdale Countians have applied this co-operative idea to many projects during my years here."

"Our Soil Conservation District was organized the year I came here, and the Forked Deer Electric Co-operative, serving 6,000 families with 1,000 miles of line, was begun with 171 miles and a loan of \$335,000."

"From 1939 to 1942, we supervised a Farm Program to inform farmers about ways to increase efficiency. P. M. Parker, W. C. Viar, Jim Jaynes, and William Hall were committee members."

"In 1941-42, we carried out a mattress project, making 8,200 double 50-lb. cotton mattresses to use surplus cotton."

"In 1944, the Lauderdale Farmers Co-Operative was organized, after the Farm Bureau had shown the way with co-operative sales of \$50,000 to \$90,000 a year from 1940 to 1944. The Co-Op sold \$135,000 worth of supplies the first year, rose rapidly to half a million dollars annually, and served as a model for other counties."

"In 1948, we formed the Lauderdale Truck Growers to market strawberries. It operated successfully for 13 years."

"In 1951, we began chemical weed control work, which was being used on 600 acres by 1960 and today is used on 150,000."

"We worked out procedures for distributing surplus commodities under the County Court's direction in 1957 and 1958."

"We began work in 1958 to rid this area of brucellosis, and the county was declared brucellosis-free a year later."

"We began a farm management school in 1962, meeting with 45 farmers two hours weekly for ten weeks."

"I was called upon to work closely with the Cane Creek Watershed program, which received \$3,000,000 in federal money to greatly benefit parts of the country."

"Just last year, Lauderdale County set the pace again with the state's first cotton scouting program, on 1,550 acres—a program being expanded this year and copied elsewhere."

"My 44 years in this work have seen enormous changes, but all of our Extension work boils down to one thing—getting information out to farmers; when they understand, they will respond, and all of us benefit—farm

people or otherwise—when we have a strong farm economy."

Paschal won the Distinguished Service Award of the National Association of County Agricultural Agents in 1944.

Through careful planning, preparation, organization, patience, and perseverance, he made the county agent's work look easy to those not familiar with the many demands upon his office and the long hours, including night meetings, often involved.

Records show that for the last 26 years, he made an average of 235 farm visits, talked to 1,350 farmers in his office and 1,573 by phone, made 275 5-minute radio broadcasts, held 102 meetings of 8,305 farmers, distributed 1,924 bulletins, and prepared 150 news articles each year.

Mr. Paschal has used newspapers and radio extensively to inform farmers. He wrote for the Herald and the Parsons News Leader in Decatur County and the Chester County Independent in Henderson. The Halls Graphic and The Enterprise have carried a regular weekly column by Paschal, much of which has been used also in The Jackson Sun, with Memphis and Nashville papers carrying many items. He has had a regular farm broadcast on WTRB in Ripley.

After the death of Mrs. Laura Paschal, Mr. Paschal married the former Mrs. Emma Lou Roberts, of Double Bridges. They will continue to reside in Ripley as the veteran Extension agent "takes on a few projects I haven't had time for up to now."

ECONOMY CONTINUES TO PLAGUE OUR NATION

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, problems with the economy continue to plague our Nation, and citizens from throughout the country are concerned with it. Of special note is a letter I received from Mr. John R. Montgomery III, president of the Lakeside Bank of Chicago. I insert his remarks along with remarks that I made recently in my weekly newspaper column for my constituents. I ask my colleagues in the House to take heed of these evaluations:

MAY 1, 1972.

Hon. EARL F. LANDGREBE,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANDGREBE: The Federal Reserve Board in its annual report for the year 1971 stated that economic recovery "will depend importantly on a strengthening in consumer demands". We are told that personal income is at an all time high and yet consumer savings continues at an historically high rate. How likely is it that the consumer will spend more money and incur more debt in 1972 to spur an economic recovery?

I thought you might be interested in the results of a study we initiated recently in our bank. We have 47 employees. Except for promotional raises (2), no officer or employee received more than a 5% increase in pay in 1972. After adjustment for these promotional raises and terminated employees, our average raise from December 1971 to January 1972 was 4.14% on a comparable basis, well within the Federal guidelines. With the expiration of the surtax, 1972 federal income tax rates are less than the 1971 rates. There has also been an increase in the personal exemption. These will have an impact on taxes payable in 1973. However, as a result of insufficient withholding last year, many people have an

unusually large out-of-pocket liability to meet by April 15 this year. To prevent a recurrence of this situation, tax withholding rates were increased in 1972. In our bank, without considering F.I.C.A. taxes, federal income tax withholding increased from December 1971 to January 1972 by 17%. Thus, not only do many people have significant cash tax liabilities to meet this April, but the effect of increased withholding is to limit the raise for my average employee to only 0.8%.

Now we are told by leading economists across the country that inflation is to abate in 1972 and the rate of inflation will approximate 2½% to 3½%. Well, the employee whose average salary increase was 0.8%, if the rate of inflation is 3%, will actually be making 2.2% less this year than he did last year.

Our bank hosted its Sixth Annual Business Forecast Luncheon in February. At that time we distributed questionnaires to our guests so they could prognosticate what sales, profits, demand for loans, etc. might be during the coming year. We had about 100 local businessmen in attendance. The composite guess on the rate of inflation for 1972 was 5.3%! This, of course, seems high until we read that in February the wholesale price index went up (adjusted for seasonal variations) 0.7%. Should this monthly increase in prices continue at the same rate during 1972, the annual rate would be 8.4%! Naturally, we hope this will not happen, but it does seem apparent that the annual rate of inflation in 1972 will exceed the 2½% to 3½% forecast earlier. If the increase is 5.3%, which does not now seem at all unrealistic, my average employee will face a loss of spending power of 4½% in 1972! Facing the prospect of higher Federal income taxes (or a value added tax) in 1973, increased Social Security taxes, higher real estate taxes, probable further devaluation of the dollar which will have the effect of increasing domestic prices, together with continued and possibly more pervasive economic controls, can the consumer be expected to trigger an economic recovery? Or, given the uncertainty the future holds, is he likely to continue his high rate of savings and shy away from increased debt?

With this continued increase in prices, it is apparent that controls are "not working". Since Congress has shown no historic propensity for self-incrimination I am sure it will feel that the obvious answer is to make controls more pervasive and more mandatory. But how can controls possibly work when it is Congressional spending itself which continues to create these gigantic inflationary pressures?

We ran a \$25 billion deficit on top of a full employment economy in 1968. In 1971, we ran a \$23 billion deficit. In 1972, it looks like \$40 billion. Budgeted for 1973 already is \$25.5 billion!! We are being asked to pay the price for government excess. Who is controlling the government?

If, in fact, we have a concern for minorities, for the poor, the aged or persons otherwise handicapped, we must stop this excessive government spending. No amount of government spending for the very groups we say we care most about can replace the purchasing power lost through deficit-created inflation.

Is there some way we, as bankers, while still remaining responsible to our stockholders can help you return a measure of sanity to our monetary affairs? I am concerned for the welfare of my family, my employees, my customers and my country.

Cordially yours,

JOHN MONTGOMERY,
President.

THIS WEEK IN WASHINGTON
(By Congressman EARL F. LANDGREBE)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Chase Manhattan Bank reports, "If inflation is not effectively

restrained over the next few years, periods of interrupted growth and high unemployment will be inevitable—and probably frequent. Future inflation would also pose persistent questions about the position of the American dollar, with consequent disruption of international trade and monetary relationships."

Inflation must be controlled over the long run. Wage-Price freezes and other such controls are merely stop-gap measures. They retard inflation for a short time, while attempting to maintain an acceptable rate of growth. However, they are not effective in slowing down the combined effect of inflation over the period of several years.

However, the Congress constantly faces increasing pressure to spend federal money to solve social problems. I agree with the report that "control will indeed be lost if the future implications of all Federal spending programs are not fully understood." Programs are enacted which cost little at the start, but whose cost rapidly escalate as time goes by. It would be simple to raise taxes, but also stupid to do so. I think insufficient effort is made to keep spending at a level that matches incomes.

I have refused to vote for proposals that continue to represent this ridiculous system. On March 15, I voted against infusing another \$170 million into Amtrak. In 1970, it was sold to the Congress as an experiment. In 1972, it comes back to the Congress requesting more money to operate. Unfortunately, the bill was approved in the House 312 to 63.

On March 15, I also voted against an additional \$911.6 million for federal unemployment compensation in excess of originally anticipated levels. However, this measure passed the House also.

I have opposed a college subsidy that would guarantee a flat sum to each full-time student in attendance at every institution. To expect the federal government to pick up the tab for everyone's college education is foolhardy and costly.

Too many of these have already been approved by our liberal-controlled Congress. Thus, as federal expenditures have soared to new heights, so also has the federal debt. As a result, another increase in the debt limit, in the amount of 30 billion dollars, was approved this week, bringing our National Debt Limit up to a startling 450 billion. Of course I opposed this increase. Remember, the interest on our debt is now costing the taxpayers of this country \$43,000 per minute.

Statistics indicate that unemployment is dropping. As the country heads toward full employment, economists warn that the increases in federal spending will make longer inflationary deficits inevitable. Such things as these attack the fiscal sanity of this great nation.

Should the President establish more rigid controls? I say "No!" Not only can controls be counterproductive to normal adjustment of the economy, but more important, they violate our free enterprise system!

We must take a long range look at the country's spending and budgetary process. We must combat deficits and inflation by examining the total picture, not only isolated parts. Government common sense should diminish, rather than increase, interference in this free enterprise system.

THE STARS IN OUR EYES

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in 1777, the Continental Congress

declared the Stars and Stripes to be our country's national flag. There have been many stars added to our flag over the years, and, I am proud that I can join with my colleagues and those in our country who recognize the many great things that our Nation's flag stands for, in this tribute on Flag Day.

There are many in our country, however, who would not only destroy our flag but the Nation which it symbolizes as well. Unfortunately these few who have burned and desecrated our flag, and those who teach and practice revolution for destruction's sake, know little by personal experience of conditions in other countries. Those who have suffered as citizens of other countries less free than ours know the greatness of our country. To them the stars in our flag are symbolic of a heaven-sent blessing.

The price of freedom is vigilance and the willingness of our people to make sacrifices for God and country. We could lose our freedoms by taking them too much for granted. We should take time to remind ourselves that ours is a nation under God despite the propaganda by the desecrators of our flag who would like to make us believe otherwise.

Recently, on June 2, 1972, Yolanda Maurer, a reporter for the Fort Lauderdale News, one of the newspapers in my congressional district, wrote a very thought provoking article which reveals her feelings as one who immigrated to our country and became a citizen with respect to her anger at the recent desecration of the American flag by some last Memorial Day. I commend this article to all patriots and nonpatriots because it is worth thinking about.

TORTURE OFFENDERS: FLARE UP OVER FLAGS
(By Yolanda Maurer)

I'm angry.

In fact, I'm boiling mad.

I've been mad and shaken with helpless anger ever since the news of the desecration of the flags on Memorial Day by local vandals came out in the paper.

Normally, I don't take too kindly to flag-wavers and patriotic speech makers.

I figure that love for your country is as natural as love for your family: you don't have to talk about it all the time to convince yourself or others of it.

Besides, I've seen too many dictators in my days use narrow nationalism in guise of patriotism not to be afraid by certain ways of waving the flag...

But for anyone to abuse the American flag—and on the graves of soldiers besides is too much.

If whoever did it is found, I think that fines or even prison would be ridiculous.

I think we should re-instate the good old torture system of the medieval days—and let them have a little of it at a time... for each soldier who died for that flag.

This may seem like a pretty violent reaction to you.

So maybe it is.

Maybe it is because I remember how I saw the American flag close-up for the first time.

It was through the bars of a military prison in North Africa, where the Germans had imprisoned a group of hostages. I was one of them.

We had been there for a few weeks, and we knew that our only chance of not being shot was if the Americans made it on time.

There had been the sound of battle raging outside all that night, and, at dawn, from inside the jail, we didn't know who had finally won...

Suddenly, there were shouts outside, trucks driving up, men getting off . . . men running through the corridors, doors banging open all the way down the halls . . . and suddenly, they were there!

The Americans were there . . . tall, handsome, dirty, smiling, grinning, kissing, looking to us like the Angels from Heaven themselves . . .

And behind them, in the bright sunlight of the courtyard, a sun we hadn't seen for many a day, there was a beautiful flag waving gently in the sun, a flag full of stars and stripes, the flag of America.

We had waited four long years of shame, frustration and anger to see this flag fly freely—with all that stands behind it.

Nothing since, except the sight of a loved face—has ever looked as beautiful to me.

This is perhaps why I take the desecration of the flag as a personal injury.

I am not American-born.

America is my country by adoption, by choice, so to speak.

Sometimes, people love their adopted children even more than their natural ones.

Because they didn't just happen to be born.

They were chosen, selected, desired, and wanted eagerly.

You have some of these same feelings when you "choose" a country and renounce the one of your birth.

You can't stand to see it abused, debased or vilified.

This doesn't mean that you are blind and deaf to its shortcomings and its failures.

Which would be a form of stupidity.

Its just that, with all the things wrong with America—and believe me, I know them all—I still can see all the things right with it.

America—and the flag for which it stands—has fed half the earth in times of need, has spanned the cosmos to walk on the Moon, has built more courtrooms to keep its people free, and more classrooms to educate them than any one else, has made the world safe from disease, and continues to do so, has been the first to come to the rescue of every country in the world struck by a natural calamity.

America, rebuffed by other ideologies, forgetting that it is the mightiest of them all, still tries with good faith and humility to build a bridge to live with others in understanding and peace.

Its President, putting pride aside, takes the first steps and covers the world in search of that peace and understanding.

What other country could you pick to "adopt" that would make you prouder?

And, when hippie-like, I say: "Keep the faith, baby", the kind of faith I mean is in America—and the flag which stands for it.

Those who have forsaken even this faith must know inside, the darkness of Hell.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

HON. WILLIAM J. KEATING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 the House-passed legislation expanding the Nation's public television program. In light of this action and expected Senate consideration of the House-passed bill, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention a project that my office participated in with the cooperation of educational television in Cincinnati.

My office, in conjunction with the Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce, and Con-

gressman DONALD CLANCY sponsored a congressional intern program which made it possible for select Cincinnati area high school students to visit Washington. The program was recorded by Cincinnati educational television, WCET.

Two WCET staff members accompanied the students on their trip to Washington. Gene Walz, manager of special projects, filmed and directed the program; and Thomas Brumley, coordinator of school services, produced "The First Congressional Scholarship Tour." The script for the program was written by A. James McAdams III, who was one of the student participants in the program. The program, which has been shown in several classrooms, is a two-part series documenting the congressional tour. On Sunday, June 18, the two programs will be shown together from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. Marjorie McKinney, director, Department of Instruction, at WCET, said that:

The programs demonstrate the tremendous creative potential that can be used in educational television.

The program shows the activities of the 50 students as they heard speakers that ranged from Congressman ROBERT DRINAN, Democrat of Massachusetts, to Special Assistant to the President Clark McGregory.

Justice Potter Stewart of the U.S. Supreme Court discussed the role of the judiciary.

The students had discussions on the role of the House with Speaker CARL ALBERT and Minority Leader GERALD FORD. They also heard from Congressman JOHN ANDERSON, Republican of Illinois. Both Congressmen ANDERSON and DRINAN discussed the need for congressional reform and the role played by the House Rules Committee.

Two national reporters from Scripps-Howard discussed the role of the press in Washington.

Ohio Senators TAFT and SAXBE talked to the students about the role of the Senate in the legislative process. Senator TAFT discussed his work on the Senate Labor Committee and Senator SAXBE spoke of the confusion that often arises in the legislative process and appropriations.

To study the role of the committee in the legislative process the students sat in on a hearing on the rights of Spanish-speaking peoples before the Judiciary Subcommittee on civil rights oversight. They were addressed by committee Chairman DON EDWARDS and ranking Republican CHARLES WIGGINS. Then Mr. Jerold Zeifman, counsel for the committee, talked to the students on the history of the equal rights amendment which had gone through this subcommittee.

The program shows the students participating in a panel discussion with congressional staff members from both Republican and Democratic offices.

Tom Brumley, who produced the two programs, stated that the goal was to allow students who did not travel to Washington to share some of the insights into how Government operates. He added:

This program demonstrates the potential of education/public television to make the learning process more interesting.

THE CIVILIZING ROLE OF OUR NATIONAL PARKS

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, in honor of the hundredth anniversary of the signing of the act creating Yellowstone National Park, the first national park, President Nixon has proclaimed 1972 the National Parks Centennial Year. The celebration of this centennial has been marked by an outpouring of affection and concern for the parks on the part of press and public.

On May 28 the Sunday Star published a thoughtful contribution to the national dialog. Titled, "The Civilizing Role of Our National Parks," the article presents in graphic terms the significance of the National Park System and the challenges to it posed by the Nation's expanding need for recreation resources.

The Congress bears primary responsibility for establishment of the policies and provision of the funds which will define and sustain the development of the system during the coming decades. Believing my colleagues will find the Star article most informative, I present it for inclusion in the RECORD:

THE CIVILIZING ROLE OF OUR NATIONAL PARKS

Every weekend from now until late summer that string of camper pickups headed out of the city, to the mountain parks and national seashores, will be getting thicker and thicker. There will be thousands more than there were at the same time last year. For disillusioned though they may be with many visions and enterprises, Americans are enjoying a resurgent love affair with the dream of the American wilderness.

The intensity of that seizure is indicated in a recent study report for which the government contracted. In this 100th year of the national parks system, an independent survey group proposed that a cool \$100 billion be spent in the years ahead on the purchase and development of parklands. That would add 52 million acres of parks of all kinds, and a national bond issue is the recommended financing device.

Preposterous? So it seems at first glance, and the idea probably is much larger than anyone's hope of attainment. The country is, after all, caught in a painful squeeze of priorities, and cannot possibly afford the ideal solutions to all its problems. But the reports which the National Park Service recently received from several study task forces afford some valuable views of what ought to evolve in the American outdoors. They raise provocative questions about alternatives in the uses of the remaining open spaces, urge the creation of national parks within urban areas and warn of the penalties of failure to enlarge the public preserves. Some of those penalties are becoming clearer all along in the explosion of outdoor recreation.

No one expects that boom to abate. Perhaps more than ever before Americans have come to realize that the parklands and other unspoiled retreats are vital, beyond calculation, as civilizers of a people whose nerves are becoming ever more frazzled. Urbanization and industrial civilization, which were to give security through the conquest of nature, have produced their own shattering insecurities. This was foreseen long ago by the naturalist John Muir, who helped create Yosemite National Park. "Thousands of tired, nerve-shaken, over-civilized people," he

wrote, "are beginning to find that going to the mountains is going home, that wilderness is a necessity, that mountain parks and reservations are . . . fountains of life."

The problem today is that the fountains are clogging up, because Muir's thousands have turned into surging millions. More than 200 million individual visits were recorded at the national parks last year, and the estimate for this year is 212 million. City-dwellers are streaming out in ever-increasing numbers to seek the therapy of nature, and will continue to, as urbanization continues. But what they're finding, all too often, is the same congestion they left behind—bumper-to-bumper traffic, overflowing campgrounds, noise and air pollution.

All recent studies on the subject come to the same conclusion: The national parks system is seriously underfinanced, and a good many of the parks are overrun by hordes of people and their vehicles. As the crush has intensified, one would suppose that the Park Service has been enlarged, at least moderately, to face the challenge. But no, its personnel actually have been cut by 5 percent, and it operates under a reduced and severe manpower ceiling. This austerity prevails while park rangers take on extra duties of traffic-policing, and chasing vandals who now inflict upwards of \$1 million a year in damage on the parks. Though the rangers work countless hours of overtime, out of dedication to their jobs, they never catch up.

If Congress wants the parks to serve the public adequately, and not be trampled by under-regulated crowds, it must come up with considerably more money. While President Nixon has proposed the largest increase in history for parks management and operations, his budget request still leaves a gap of \$18 million below the estimated needs for the next fiscal year. The lawmakers would do well to increase the funding so the Park Service can do more than desperately hold its own.

If it does only that, the pressures for expansion will keep building up and ultimately, we suppose, something will have to give. And there are many well-conceived plans for relief when the administration and Congress decide to embark on larger designs. Many older parks need to be made much larger, and new ones should be created, especially in the more populous sections. Park Service Director George B. Hartzog Jr. has some exciting ideas for bringing parks to the urban areas, where they are needed more than anywhere else.

He envisions, for example, the "recycling" of large acreages that have been blighted or neglected in the industrial onrush. Lands ravaged by strip mining and assorted industrial pollutions could be included in such a program, and eventually turned into models of natural beauty. They would be cheap to acquire and generally close to large cities, and Hartzog suggests the purchase of large chunks as "national park reserves." It is a most appealing conception, now under study by an Interior Department committee.

But the pressing need, right now, is for the purchase of much parkland of both high and low quality. This is far more important than park developments because, as the wiseacre realtors say, nobody is making any more land these days. What's left is being consumed at a phenomenal rate, and much of it is property that should be in the parks of the future. Congress has been too parsimonious in funding land purchases for new parks and additions to the older ones. As it hesitates, the real estate prices keep rising and hence the task of acquisition becomes ever more difficult.

By far the most critical aspect is the matter of privately owned lands within national park areas, which should be purchased to prevent commercial degradation of the parks. These add up to almost a quarter of a million acres and could be bought for about

\$300 million—certainly not an exorbitant amount. Hartzog regularly has sought \$25 million a year for such purchases, but never has gotten much more than \$10 million. So business ventures—even new towns—may be springing up on lands in park areas that the government should have owned a long time ago.

Beyond this lies the primary problem: The better national parks are too far apart and too far from the main concentrations of people—the city folk most in need of escapes to nature. Some major new parks, and smaller ones too, should be developed in the Boston-to-Richmond urban corridor, and in several other rapid-growth strips.

This year, though, the parks people are just hoping to cope with the vehicular onslaught. And in some places they're using transmitters that broadcast to the radios of visitors' cars, even as helicopters are used to advise rush-hour commuters in the cities.

Further, the Park Service is threshing about in a role conflict. Many environmentalists contend that its dual functions of preservation and recreation are incompatible—that mass recreation is inherently offensive. It seems to us, however, that the country is fully capable of preserving larger and larger natural areas, and at the same time providing more public recreation in high-density sectors. There is still enough land for full, parallel accommodation of both of these values, if the government will only acquire it. Until that acquisition begins on a much larger scale, however, preservation must be given top priority, even if that finally means setting entrance quotas at some parks.

Just to bring the existing park system up to standard, Hartzog says, more than \$2 billion should be spent for land and development. A lot of money, but Congress should begin thinking in terms of some large instalments. For the parks, we can see now, are literally springs of life, and Americans will be needing them more in the years ahead.

NEED TO REFORM EDUCATION

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, we have made a tremendous investment in the youth of this Nation through our support and passage of the conference report of the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1972.

For the first time, every high school graduate may pursue a college or related higher education, with no requirement that he or his family be wealthy.

Though not entirely perfect, there are many good features in this legislation, especially the amount of per student grants, the fact that veterans may benefit greatly from the program, and that the student is given freedom of choice as to his school of higher learning, since the grant is made directly to the recipient. I am particularly pleased that for the first time, the amount of any grant is based on the need of the student, taking into account factors other than just income.

I would add that although I am encouraged by this badly needed step forward, and recognize the potential impact of this major national investment, I would urge my colleagues to work to guarantee that we get our money's worth.

There are far too many high school students today who are turned off by the education we afford them before any opportunity to pursue higher education is theirs. Even as early as elementary school, the system beyond their control has made these young men and women a poor educational investment risk. I believe, therefore, that we must pursue the reform of our elementary and secondary education to better prepare our young people for both the challenges and satisfaction of a post secondary or higher education. In fact, I am convinced that in many cases, it would be valuable to begin earlier and with a more thoughtful approach, as proposed at various times to this Congress within the last 6 months, by means of child development services not just restricted to compulsory education, but also to meet minimum health care and nutrition requirements as well.

These are vitally needed by many disadvantaged children so often found today in our urban school systems. Indeed, if we are to maintain the health and viability of public education for one and all, we must bring about meaningful change in our ability to deliver on the promise of equal educational opportunities.

We must work to create an educational system, both in the city and suburbs, that helps students more, rather than hinders them, that provides better trained educators and administrators, and that develops better teaching methods.

Only then will we realize a genuine return from the investment we have made, through our recent vote, in the Higher Education Act Amendments of 1972.

FARM PRICES AND FOOD PRICES

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, water lays on the land in much of our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District. One of the wettest springs in history has kept our producers out of the fields; so much of our corn is still unplanted. What is now planted may never mature, because of our short growing season.

This is an added burden in addition to those the producer already carries.

There was an interesting column in the West Central Daily Tribune at Willmar by Ann Bosch, Kandiyohi County extension home economist which I would like to share with my colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD.

She relates some facts and figures in regard to farm and food prices which all of us could well bear in mind:

FARM PRICES AND FOOD PRICES

Some interesting facts and figures about the American farmer, the food he produces for the American consumer, and why they cost what they do:

In the last 20 years—

Wholesale food prices have gone up 20 percent.

Retail food prices have gone up 43 percent.

Farm prices for food products have gone up only 6 percent.

Retail food prices have not advanced as much as other main categories in the cost-of-living index.

Twenty years ago people paid 23 percent of their take-home pay for food.

Last year they spent 16 percent of their take-home pay for food.

This year they are expected to spend less than 16 percent.

Twenty years ago the farmer received 49 cents of the dollar spent by consumers for farm-raised food. Farmers are now receiving only about 38 cents of that dollar.

In the last 20 years, while output per man hour in the manufacturing industries has multiplied by 1.6, output per man hour on farms is up by 3.3 times, or more than twice as much as in industry.

Twenty years ago one farm worker supplied 16 people with food. Now he produces enough for 51 people, an increase of more than three times.

While the American consumer was spending a decreasing amount of his take-home pay for food, that food was increasing in quality and quantity:

Farmers produced and marketed 21.9 billion pounds of beef in 1971.

Twenty years ago, they produced and marketed only 8.8 billion pounds.

Last year beef consumption per person averaged 114.3 pounds.

Twenty years ago the average consumption per person was 56.1 pounds.

Twenty years ago, only a third of the beef produced was of Choice grade.

Now 60 percent of beef production is graded Choice.

Beef and veal imported from other countries to help feed the American consumer have increased 3.7 times in the last 20 years.

The increase in food prices is primarily because of higher wages:

Average wage rates per hour of production workers in manufacturing are 2.3 times higher than 20 years ago. They were \$1.56 per hour in 1951 and \$3.57 in 1971.

The average hourly earnings of food marketing employees is 2.5 times higher than 20 years ago. They were \$1.31 in 1951 and \$3.24 in 1971.

The largest increases in the cost of food are for food eaten away from home, where labor and services are the main ingredients of food cost. Total food expenditures away from home have risen 79 percent in the last 10 years and the price index for food eaten away from home has increased more than 50 percent in the last 10 years.

CORRECTIONAL SYSTEMS

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, rehabilitation and the preparation of the offender for resumption of normal social and occupational activity should be the major purpose of the correctional institution. Recent turmoil at prisons, reformatories, and jails, as well as high recidivism rates, provide a basis for questioning our current system of criminal confinement and rehabilitation. My own conclusions, based on study and investigations as a member of the Judiciary Subcommittee charged with inquiry into our correctional systems, are that rehabilitation of the incarcerated is in most instances a theory rather than a practice. Correc-

tions rarely correct; the system does not prepare the offender for his return to society—and 19 of every 20 incarcerated do return.

One of the most concerned and knowledgeable individuals in this area is my distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable ABNER J. MIKVA. The following remarks by Congressman MIKVA were made at a public hearing in connection with the plans of the State of Illinois to construct four new, small, community-based adult correctional facilities in or near major metropolitan areas. As an alternative to traditional confinement, such facilities offer a bold, imaginative step in the direction of reducing the high crime rate. I am pleased to insert my colleague's remarks and to share them with the membership:

TESTIMONY OF CONGRESSMAN ABNER J. MIKVA

Mr. Chairman, it is a privilege to be here this morning to testify in support of the plans for a community-based correctional center in Cook County. Under the direction of Peter Bensinger, Illinois' Department of Corrections has established itself as a leader in prison reform. It is one of the most progressive states in the country in this area, and these hearings today represent another example of that leadership. The hearings are especially important because, right now, the state and the Department of Corrections are at a critical point in their efforts to reform the prison system. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the rest of the country is watching to see what happens.

It is fashionable now to talk about prison reform. Most public officials and political candidates all have positions on it and, like the flag, they are all in favor of it. Doing something about the problem—really reforming the correctional system—takes more than rhetoric. It demands courage and vision and diligence. The Department of Corrections has those qualities and, for once, the state legislature has given the Department some of the money to put the courage and vision into practice. But one more ingredient is necessary, and that is why the Department is holding these hearings. The ingredient is public support, and without it, there won't be any prison reform.

The state in effect has left the matter in our hands now, the hands of the people who live in Cook County. We are being asked to put up or shut up, to support prison reform or stop making hypocritical statements about it. We are being asked to support the Department's plan for a community-based correctional center in Cook County. More is at stake than just that though. The rising crime rate in this country is a national crisis. It is not an "urban" problem or a "black" problem or a problem just for poor people. My neighbors in Evanston are concerned about it, just as Director Bensinger's neighbors in Chicago are concerned about it. Most people recognize the urgency of the crisis, and there are constant demands on government and law enforcement to "get tough" with the crime problem. By proposing a community-based correctional center, the Department of Corrections is attacking the crime problem head on, and it is asking us to help by supporting the plan.

THE NEED FOR COMMUNITY-BASED CORRECTIONAL CENTERS

For the last 150 years, the prison system in this country has been a dismal failure. It just has not worked, and the steadily rising crime rate is evidence enough of that failure. The crime rate will not go down as long as most of the people we send to jail return to crime when they are released. It is a particularly vicious circle. The present system almost encourages men and women

with a "record" to return to crime, and the police end up catching the same criminals over and over again.

A good part of the problem lies with the very philosophy behind prisons in this country. Traditionally, society has responded to crime with punishment—vengeance and retribution. People convicted of a crime are taken away from their families, their jobs, and their communities and they are locked up. They are kept behind high walls and barred windows and, sometimes, they are thrown into pits and denied meals or showers as additional punishment. The theory is that this will teach them a lesson. It is supposed to be such an awful experience that no one would ever take the risk of committing another crime.

That is the theory. And, for the last 150 years, we have been learning that the theory did not work well in practice. Even with the intolerable conditions that exist in many jails and prisons today, that threat simply does not prevent people from committing crimes. It is not a deterrent. Some criminals think they will not be caught and, unfortunately, many of them are not. Even more important though, many people today live with such desperation and futility that the risk of imprisonment is not much worse than the prospect of continuing their day-to-day existence.

We have a difficult time understanding how they think and react, but it must be a terrible feeling to be shut out by society. It must be a desperate feeling to know you are undereducated, unemployed and unemployable—to know that you have virtually no chance of sharing the American dream. With that feeling, a person is likely to strike out in desperation. Punishment will not prevent it, nor will it correct that feeling.

There is another theory of penology—rehabilitation. It is nothing new, but we have been having trouble making it work. One reason is that, as a nation, we have been unwilling to commit enough resources to do the job. After all, it is easier to lock people up than to try to correct them. That unwillingness surfaced again in Congress recently when several of my colleagues suggested that we cut the appropriations for prison teachers and psychiatrists and counselors. It is a curious attitude for an enlightened nation, because rehabilitation can work and does work. We have had enough success with it to know that—so have other countries, especially in Scandinavia. When it comes to "correcting" a criminal offender—job training, education, personal counseling works a thousand times better than throwing the man into the "hole."

Rehabilitation has not worked well because our prisons often try to rehabilitate and punish at the same time. Rehabilitation won't work in a setting characterized by force and violence and intolerance—or an atmosphere of coercion. If rehabilitation is forced, if it is used as a ritual or a ticket to release, it will not work. A man must want help before he can be given help. Now, no one is talking about "coddling" prisoners or giving them "country club living," but one thing is certain we can never rehabilitate men and women if we try to do it in the fortresses and dungeons that we call "prisons." There is a need for a dual correctional system—one kind of place to send people to punish them and keep them away from the rest of society (some people may never be able to be rehabilitated)—and another kind of place where people can get help after they have been punished or instead of being punished.

THE VIENNA EXPERIENCE

There are a great many places in Illinois where we can send people to punish them. But there is only one place in the state that is designed for rehabilitation. It may be unique in this country, and it certainly is the most progressive correctional institution we have.

That place is in Vienna, Illinois; the Vienna Correctional Center. It is a community-based correctional institution, and it works.

Unlike our prisons, Vienna is not a human warehouse. There are no stone walls, or guard towers bristling with rifles and machineguns. The prisoners there have rooms, not cells, and they wear name tags instead of numbers. A man who goes to Vienna comes out with a skill that he can use to get a decent job. He comes out with some hope, and an attitude that will lead him away from, not towards, a life of crime. He has a chance to make it on the outside and make it on society's terms. It is community-based despite the fact most inmates do not come from the Vienna area. It is community-based because of the facilities in the community—from the junior college to the employers.

The Department of Corrections wants to build another Vienna in Cook County. After visiting Vienna earlier this year as chairman of a House Subcommittee on prison reform, I find the Department's proposal refreshing and encouraging. It is a major step in the right direction.

SOME QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

No one expects the idea of a community-based correctional center to be without opposition. Some people will ask why we should provide all this "special" help for criminals when there are many, many other people, just as impoverished or uneducated but who are law-abiding citizens. The answer is that we must somehow help both. We have an obligation to the "law-abiding" citizens because it is the right thing to do. We have an obligation to rehabilitate criminals in society, not just because it is right, but because it is practical. We need prison reform, not just for the prisoners' sake, but for the sake of our society. The crime rate is not going anywhere but up unless we stop making our prisons graduate schools for crime.

Other people will be concerned about the "threat of crime" raised by housing several hundred convicted criminals in Cook County with nothing between them and the people but an open door.

This is an understandable fear—given the image that the mass media and movies have given us of escaped convicts—but I think that it is an unfounded fear. Vienna has not been terrorized by criminals. A few men have escaped, but men escape from Cook County Jail and Stateville as well. Most importantly, the furlough program at Vienna, which lets men visit their families and look for jobs, has been 100 per cent successful. Every man who has walked out of Vienna on furlough has walked back in again.

NOT A PERFECT SOLUTION

A community based correctional center in Cook County will not solve all of our crime problems. It will not be a perfect solution, but such a center will provide the right circumstances for rehabilitation. The correction of criminals should take place in the community because that is the only way they will be able to learn a skill and learn to readjust their lives. In some cases, there will be disadvantages involved in placing a man or woman near the community where they first became involved in crime. It may be necessary to consider restricting an offenders "furlough" to keep him from his old associates and his old neighborhood. There is a good example of the problem on Chicago's west side. A half-way house there, St. Leonard's, is trying to help ex-offenders succeed, and they are doing an excellent job. But they have to work under the handicap of being in what may be the geographical drug center of the city. St. Leonard's would have greater success if it were located in a place with fewer temptations. When I visited St. Leonard's one man told me, "If a guy can make it here, he can make it anywhere." That probably is true, but we shouldn't make the

challenge so great. The important thing is that a community-based correctional center will provide an alternative to that old atmosphere—a source of a new job and new friends. The Department of Corrections might also want to consider exchanges of prisoners between community-based correctional centers. In any event, the theme is the same: put the offender in a place where he wants to be rehabilitated and can be rehabilitated.

A community-based correctional center for Cook County has my support, and it should have the support of everyone in this area who really wants to do something about stopping crime. This kind of "prison reform" works, and that is the best reason for expanding its use. By proposing such correctional centers, the Department of Corrections is offering to live up to its responsibility. It is our job as citizens to support the idea and live up to our responsibility as well.

FEDERAL ROLE IN SCHOOL FINANCE

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, today at my invitation Father John Brennan delivered the invocation before the Members of the House of Representatives. He is the president of the Council of Religious Teachers and an instructor at Father Judge High School in Philadelphia.

Because of his experiences as a teacher and with the council, he knows that large urban private school systems must have massive Federal aid if they are to continue providing children with an excellent education.

Recently Msgr. Francis B. Schulte, the superintendent of schools for the Philadelphia Archdiocese, testified before the U.S. Office of Education Public Forum on the Federal role in school finance. It is my pleasure to introduce his insight on this matter into the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF MSGR. FRANCIS B. SCHULTE

My name is Monsignor Francis B. Schulte, and I am the Superintendent of Schools for the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. Under the general supervision of this office are 279 parish elementary schools, plus 5 special schools, and 31 diocesan high schools, educating altogether 223,000 students. The territory of the Archdiocese includes the City of Philadelphia and the four surrounding counties—Bucks, Chester, Montgomery, and Delaware. Almost 60% of these students are in Philadelphia schools. About 15% of the city students are from minority groups, and more than 20% of these are non-Catholics.

We recognize that the special concern of this panel is the urban problem, but we observe a relationship of cities with their surrounding suburbs which suggests the value of some attention to this larger context. My remarks, therefore, will be directed to a brief description of the impact of present legislation on the schools in all five counties, and to certain legislative possibilities which are important to parents both in the city and in the suburbs.

I do want to make it clear, however, that our most pressing financial strains are in the city, and it is there that our impact on the vitality of the community is most critical.

In our experience, the most significant federal impact, at least in the cities, has resulted from the Elementary and Secondary

Education Act of 1965. General speaking, we would suggest that guidelines and directives issued by the Office of Education should reflect Commissioner Marland's public commitment to fair non-public school participation. Thus the greatest liberty consistent with the law should be fostered to achieve creative cooperation.

Our observation has been that Title II has been rather uniformly beneficial to non-public schools. However, it has suffered from inadequate funding and the absence of provisions for supplementary personnel adequate to insure the most effective use of the materials made available under this Title.

Title I and the more limited Title III provisions have probably been a greater catalyst for change in Philadelphia than almost anywhere in the nation. Our judgment is that such success depends upon the commitment of public and non-public schools to cooperation—cooperation in every area that affects children. Such a commitment exists in Philadelphia. At the national level, the Airline House Conference was a serious Office of Education initiative to achieve such understanding and cooperation. The initiative must be pursued. Realistically, however, such conferences are more likely to be effective when attendance is limited to superintendents from school districts with significant numbers of non-public school students.

In general, until non-public schools sit at the table when the question "What needs to be done?" is being asked, they will always be instead the object of another question: "How do we fit the non-public schools into this finished program?" Again, Philadelphia has done more than any school district in our experience to achieve such a partnership from the beginning of the planning process.

The needs of urban children are manifold, but we would like to note in particular one serious concern. In cities like this, a growing number of Spanish-speaking people are settling. Tied with this urban growth is an influx in rural areas of migrant workers with similar needs. Catholic schools are natural allies for any governmental agency intent on meeting this important priority. But again, there is a need for adequately financed programs in which non-public schools can function effectively. Title VII is simply not funded sufficiently.

Valuable as ESEA and other laws have been, they do not address the basic survival questions of urban schools. In this regard, we plead not only for ourselves, but for our public school children as well. It is all very well to say that none of us are sailing the urban education ship as well as we might. But so long as so much of our energy is devoted to plugging leaks and bailing out the boat, America Cup performance will be difficult to attain. For our part, we are determined to remain in the core of the city so long as we have money and personnel to continue. But we need help. A citizens' committee of 31 members, chaired by Mr. John T. Gurash, Chairman of INA Corporation, is presently at work on an independent, intensive study of our financial records and prospects. While this report will not be completed for a few weeks, preliminary indications are that we may anticipate the need for more than 50 million dollars of new money in the next three years. At the same time, the staggering impact of immediate or even gradual closing of these schools on the public area will be delineated in the report.

Faced with this crisis, we specifically endorse the proposals of the President's Panel on Non-public Education. Several of these are particularly crucial to the urban poor. Singly or in combination, vouchers, supplemental income allowances for tuitions for welfare recipients and the working poor must become available. The concept of urban renewal must be extended in some effective fashion to include antiquated schools, both

public and non-public, whether through matching grants or low-interest loans.

And of course, there must be a sensitivity to the needs of middleclass citizens who have remained in the cities, at least in part because of an allegiance to a non-public school now available to their children, but increasingly threatened by rising costs which lead to rising tuitions. We need stability in our cities. The demise of non-public schools would be one more reason for people to leave. To meet this cost squeeze, a tax credit on tuition would enable them to continue to send their children to the non-public school of their choice.

The signs of the times are clear: financial pressures are pricing parents of non-public schools out of any real ability to choose the school they prefer. Where poverty is greatest, the threat of such a loss of freedom is most immediate. In the cities, perhaps more than anywhere else, the disappearance of non-public schools would be a catastrophe. We urge that administrators and legislators not tarry in finding answers, for the best solution will be useless if we have dissipated another of our national resources—the non-public school.

Let me add a postscript in closing. It has come to my attention that there is increasing pressure in some federal programs to limit the number of children served and to increase the amount of service being provided to the individual child. Let me hasten to assure you that I accept the notion that there must be a concentration of service to have a significant effect on the child who is seriously disadvantaged educationally. I would hope, though, that there will be sufficient flexibility to accept the notion that success for some children may mean extra help at critical points in his educational life. Thus, a well-designed readiness program can limit the likelihood that compensatory programs will later be needed by certain children. The same reasoning would apply to the child who has special difficulty in an area like speech and who can function quite well if he or she gets help in this one area. The fact is that children seldom fit totally into set categories or rigid generalizations.

In essence, I am agreeing with the general notion of concentrated service, but asking that this approach be reasonably flexible in application.

JOB PROBLEMS THREATEN SUCCESSFUL ADDICT REHABILITATION

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, there is an active debate underway over the best means of treating narcotics addiction. As chairman of Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction over the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act, I have heard much testimony over the past year and a half from adherents of many different types of treatment methods and philosophies. I have also, in the course of the subcommittee's work, visited many treatment programs both here and abroad and observed the application of numerous treatment modalities to heroin addiction.

I have no firm conclusions regarding which particular form of treatment is best. In fact, I am increasingly convinced that no one form of treatment can be

defined as being best for all addicts. Heroin addicts are people, and differ from each other as much as any other group of people differ with regard to their needs. It therefore seems clear that different types of treatment modalities should coexist and that additional treatment methods should be developed to reach the addicts not now being served successfully by existing treatment programs.

There are, however, standards which should be applied to judge the effectiveness of heroin addiction treatment programs. The primary standard for judgment should be the success of the program in returning the addict to full, self-fulfilling participation in society. Thus almost all treatment programs that I have observed measure their success in terms of the turning away by their clients from the addict lifestyle toward a functioning in an employment or educational setting. When the way to employment is blocked for addicts in treatment, the chances are that the likelihood of success for rehabilitation are diminished. Those of us concerned with the development of more successful treatment and rehabilitation programs for narcotics addicts must also concern ourselves with the receptivity of the larger society to those addicts who need a job to support their efforts to rehabilitate themselves.

An article by James M. Markham which appeared in the New York Times on Monday, June 5, 1972, highlights the problems encountered by addicts who seek employment. It deserves the attention of all Members of this body.

The article follows:

EX-DRUG ABUSERS ARE PLAGUED BY JOB PROBLEMS

(By James M. Markham)

A youthful drug abuser sees he is getting into trouble, voluntarily joins a rehabilitation program, completes the program, rejoins society and gets a job he likes. His problems are over, right?

Wrong, if you ask Stan Oppenheim, Tom Major and many others who have been tangled in one of the toughest links of the rehabilitation chain: getting and holding a job in the straight world.

Stan Oppenheim is a husky, 28-year-old, decorated Vietnam veteran who runs a small, but prospering burglar alarm company in Brooklyn. Tom Major is a 21-year-old former "garbage head"—a street expression for someone who will try any drug.

After spending half a year in an upstate treatment program, Mr. Major went to Mr. Oppenheim 14 months ago and asked him for a job with his company, Griffin Security Services, Inc.

"All my life I spewed liberal thinking," Mr. Oppenheim recalled the other day. "But this put me on the spot."

"He told me that before speaking to me he wanted to inform me of his past," Mr. Oppenheim said, referring to the bearded youth's deep experimentation with many drugs, excluding heroin. "He was very straight-forward about it."

Mr. Major got the job, as an installer of alarm systems. "It was the best thing I ever did," Mr. Oppenheim said. "He's trustworthy, dependable. The customers love him."

The State Department of Motor Vehicles was somewhat less compassionate about Mr. Major's bootstrapping efforts. The young man had lost his driver's license for driving under the influence of drugs, and in his new job he had to drive a minitruck.

It took Mr. Oppenheim from March, 1971, to November, 1971, to obtain a driver's license for his new employee. During that period, another employee drove Mr. Major on his rounds—"and needless to say, during that period, we lost money on him," Mr. Oppheimer said.

Mr. Oppenheim cajoled officials in New York and Albany, hired a lawyer, waited, obtained with some difficulty an "obligatory" certificate that turned out to be unnecessary and, finally, got the license for Mr. Major.

"The thought that was going through my mind was not Tom, but other people like him—there must be thousands of them—and how difficult it must be for them, how hopeless if they tried to do it alone," Mr. Oppenheim said. "One state agency will spend millions to reform them, and then another will go out of its way to hinder them."

Mr. Major drove faultlessly on his new job for 14 months. Then a few weeks ago, Mr. Oppenheim's insurance company, the Fireman's Fund, which in February had renewed the Griffin automobile insurance policy, announced that it was canceling it.

PREMIUM IS DOUBLED

A routine insurance check on the seven Griffin drivers had turned up Mr. Major's cluttered record from his period of drug abuse, including an entry for driving under the influence of "alcohol"—kindly judge's euphemism—and another for driving under the influence of drugs. The last entry was from November, 1970—just before Mr. Major's entry into the treatment program.

Mr. Oppenheim appealed the cancellation, stressing that Mr. Major's personal rehabilitation was well under way—and at stake. The Fireman's Fund refused to alter its decision.

Mr. Oppenheim's automobile policy will now be thrown into a high-risk pool, resulting in a doubling of his premium to \$3,000. The Fireman's Fund also has informed him that it is canceling his workmen's compensation policy as well.

"This particular case was not passed off lightly," said Richard Griebel, public relations manager for the Fireman's Fund. He said the cancellation of the policies had "nothing whatsoever to do with Mr. Major's use of drugs" and resulted solely from his driving record.

Mr. Oppenheim says he will continue to keep Mr. Major on the payroll, even though it will cost him a good deal of money.

Mr. Major's story is not unusual. Almost any drug treatment program can produce a handful of similar cases.

The following are examples:

Russ McGrotty worked for an insurance company in Queens as a claims adjuster for five years—three while he was on heroin and two while on methadone maintenance. When the company learned he was on methadone, it dismissed him.

A former addict was trained as a butcher while imprisoned on Rikers Island. Released, he got a job in a supermarket, where he worked two years. When the supermarket obtained a license to sell beer in six packs, the youth was dismissed, since the market was not permitted by state law to employ a former convict if it sold alcohol.

TRAPPED IN WELFARE

In another case, Allan, a 24-year-old former heroin addict, has been participating in a state-run methadone program for two years. Last winter he was offered a job as a tow-truck driver. He applied for a tow-truck driver's license from the New York City Police License Division.

Although Allan has a hard-to-come-by "certificate of relief from disability" to cover a drug-related misdemeanor conviction, he has not been issued his license. The licensing regulations bar anyone who is addicted to alcohol or drugs, and Allan's request is with the chief surgeon's office.

Allan's widowed mother wrote Mayor Lindsay last year, appealing for a reconsideration of her son's license application. "How long can a 24-year-old man live on welfare at \$17 a week?" she asked. "How long before someone really cares about my son and others like him?"

Although the Mayor's office never answered Allan's mother's letter, it was reproduced, passed among city officials and contributed to a city personnel policy statement that was released on March 22.

POLICY AGAINST BIAS

"The human suffering and social and economic loss caused by rising drug addiction are matters of deep concern to the Mayor," the statement said, spelling out that henceforth there should be no discrimination against hiring former addicts for city jobs, excluding the uniformed services.

It is too early to measure the impact of the decision, but an initial survey of city agencies that might hire former addicts turned up 58 possible openings.

Polly Feingold, director of the Coalition Action Council of the New York Urban League, has been lobbying in Albany for legislation that would lift the many restrictions on employment opportunities for ex-convicts, many of them former addicts.

State licensing practices, Miss Feingold points out, often prevent former addicts with prison records from getting jobs in establishments that sell liquor, private detective agencies, billiard parlors, banks, insurance adjuster's offices or agencies connected with boxing, wrestling or horse racing.

FORD COSPONSORS LEGISLATION TO AID LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult and oftentimes thankless jobs in today's society is that performed by our law enforcement officers. Police officers normally work extra long hours for relatively low salaries and often work under dangerous conditions. Yet many of us take their services for granted, and we very rarely express our appreciation to these public servants for the essential services they perform.

For this reason I would like to express my personal appreciation today to the law enforcement officers throughout our Nation, and I would especially like to commend the officers of the following departments in my own State of Michigan:

Allen Park, Ash Township, Belleville, Brownstown Township, Canton Township, Carleton, Dearborn Heights, Flat Rock.

Garden City, Gibraltar, Huron Township, Inkster, Lincoln Park, Livonia, Melvindale, Rockwood, Romulus.

Southgate, Sumpter Township, Taylor, Van Buren Township, Wayne, Westland, Woodhaven, Wayne County Sheriff's Office, Michigan State Police.

Mr. Speaker, as a legislator both in the Michigan State Senate and here in the U.S. Congress I have consistently supported legislation designed to assist law enforcement officers in performing their

difficult and often dangerous jobs more effectively.

There are presently two proposals of special significance to law enforcement officers pending before Congress, which I am proud to say that I sponsored. One bill which I drafted would authorize the Attorney General of the United States to reimburse any law enforcement official, who is a defendant in a civil action arising out of the performance of his official duties, for the costs of defending himself if he prevails in that action.

The other legislation of particular significance is the Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights which I have joined in cosponsoring with my friend and colleague, the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. BIAGGI), himself a former police officer, and over 100 of my colleagues here in the House.

Both of these bills are now pending before the House Judiciary Committee and it is my hope that they will soon receive the prompt and favorable consideration which they deserve. At this point I would like to insert the text of my bill and a summary of provisions of the Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights in the RECORD.

H.R. 15463

A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to certain law enforcement officers in reimbursement for costs incurred by such officers in certain legal actions arising out of the performance of official duties

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Attorney General is authorized to make grants to each law enforcement officer who is a defendant in any civil action arising out of the performance by such officer of his official duties, if such law enforcement officer should prevail in that civil action, to reimburse such officer for the reasonable costs of investigation and legal fees incident to such civil action.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act, the term "law enforcement officer" includes attorneys general, prosecuting attorneys, chiefs of police, sheriffs, constables, and their subordinates.

SUMMARY OF "LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS' BILL OF RIGHTS" LEGISLATION

The bill would amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 by requiring, beginning one year after enactment, two additional provisions to be incorporated by States in their Comprehensive Plans before the plans are approved for grants. These are:

1. Provide a system for the receipt, investigation and determination of complaints and grievances submitted by law enforcement officers of the State, units of general local govt. and public agencies;

2. Provide for the formulation of a "Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights" which, if enacted into law, would provide statutory protection for the constitutional rights and privileges of all local law enforcement officers of the State, units of general local govt. and public agencies operating in the State.

I. The Bill of Rights shall provide, but shall not be limited to

a. Law Enforcement officers shall not be prohibited from engaging in or refusing to engage in political activity while off duty.

b. Rights of law enforcement officers under investigation are specified, such as: time and place of interrogation; nature of complaint and names of complainants; complaints sworn to; interrogations of reasonable dura-

tion; no intimidations or threats; interrogations to be recorded; officers to be informed of legal rights; at officer's request, he shall be represented by counsel or other representative of his choosing during interrogation.

c. Whenever complaint review boards are established containing other than police officers in their membership, a proportionate number of police representatives shall be included in the membership.

d. Officers' right to bring civil suit against others for damages or abridgement of civil rights arising out of official duties, and shall be given assistance when requested to bring such suits.

e. Disclosures of officers' personal finances not required for purposes of assignment or other personnel actions, unless conflict of interest is indicated or for tax collecting purposes and then only under proper legal procedures.

f. Officers to be notified and given reasons for personnel actions considered to be punitive prior to effective date of action.

g. No adverse action to be taken against a police officer for exercising rights under Law Enforcement Officers' Bill of Rights.

II. A Law Enforcement Officers' Grievance Commission to be established in each State or unit of general local government composed of a tripartite representation of police, government and the public. Shall have the authority and duty to receive, investigate and determine complaints and grievances submitted by police officers arising out of claimed infringements of rights. Certified police representational organizations may represent officers or may initiate complaints on behalf of members. Complaints filed by officers may be against any person, group of persons organizations or their heads; officials of his department, or other local, state or federal unit operating in the State. The Commission shall be empowered to hold hearings, take testimony under oath, issue subpoenas, issue cease and desist orders and institute actions in State courts in cases of noncompliance.

MAN DONATES 96TH PINT OF BLOOD; WIFE ONE BEHIND

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, those who donate blood perform an invaluable service which is often a gift of life to people in need.

Special tribute should be paid to Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Sagendorf of Thomaston, Conn., the reigning U.S. Championship donor team. Mr. Sagendorf recently gave his 96th pint of blood and is now one pint ahead of his wife. The Sagen-dorfs, who have been donating blood since World War II, are just shy of the celebrated 24 gallon mark. Last year in New York, they were deservedly honored as the Nation's top donor couple.

Generosity of people like the Sagen-dorfs is a splendid example of how each of us—in our own way—can serve our fellowman. For the interest of my colleagues, articles which recently appeared in the Thomaston Express and the Waterbury Republican regarding the Sagen-dorfs' feat follow:

WIFE ONE BEHIND—MAN DONATES 96TH PINT

THOMASTON.—Pulses pounded and cor-puscles raced at the Red Cross Bloodmobile here Tuesday as onlookers awaited for one-

half of the U.S. Championship donor team to come and shed his 96th pint.

Everything was set at Congregational Church Hall as the time approached for Thomaston's own 60-year-old Herbert Sagendorf to pump out the liquid that would make him a Blood Bank Immortal.

A cake had been just baked for him and a banner citing his expected accomplishment was furled and ready. Mrs. Sagendorf, whose total donations dating back to World War II also come to 95 pints, was standing by as Bloodmobile Captain-of-the-Day.

One question was uppermost in every mind: Would Sagendorf pass the physical all donors must undergo?

Finally, he arrived, in the van of several young donor-recruits led by Sagendorf's nephew, Harry Waterhouse, 18.

The medics did their thing. Temperature? O.K. Pulse? Check. Blood pressure? Good!

They unfurled the banner. And for the 96th time, Harry Sagendorf entered the lonely world where man meets needle—eye to eye.

The Sagendorfs, now just a pint shy of a connubial 24 gallons, were honored by the American Association of Blood Banks in New York last year as the nation's top donor couple. Mrs. Sagendorf, now a pint behind her spouse, says she plans to catch up next time around.

Mrs. Winfield Wight, Thomaston blood chairman, said Sagendorf and his recruits helped the unit exceed its 200-pint quota for the visit by 11 pints.

A number of aspirants to duplicate the Sagendorf saga got special recognition after Tuesday's donations. They were led by Robert Henderson, who gave his fifth gallon; Ralph Humphrey, William Gill Jr. and Harold Morton, who reached the four-gallon level.

BLOOD DONORS GIVE OVER 200 PINTS

THOMASTON.—Over 200 pints of blood were collected at a very successful Bloodmobile visit in Thomaston April 25. Some 218 people were registered, but 7 were rejected for health reasons, and 24 non-scheduled donors, many in the teen age group, showed the spirit of the community.

The excitement of the afternoon came when Herbert Sagendorf was awarded his 12-gallon pin for the 96 pints he had donated from Sept. 1950 to the present. After he passed the medical history requirements, a banner created by Mrs. Daniel Samson, was unfurled showing the 12 gallon in the can-teen, he was presented a specially decorated cake by Nancy Scott, Harry Waterhouse of Northfield, an 18-year-old, accompanied his Uncle, Herbert Sagendorf, and brought four additional friends with him as first-time donors.

A Five Gallon Award was given to Robert Henderson, four gallon Awards went to William Gill, Jr., and Ralph Humphrey, three gallon Awards to Harold Morton, Joseph B. Kelley and Donald Yurtin, two gallon Awards to Raymond Baldwin, Stacia Cocco, Rickard Darm, Horst Gelschmann, John Reardon and Muriel Rowland.

The Future Nurses of Thomaston High School wore Red Cross arm bands made by Girl Scouts of Cadets Troop 4050, under the supervision of Mrs. John Cianciolo. General Time led the industries with 37 employees recruited by Lucille DeCastro, R.N.

Sincere appreciation is extended by Mrs. Winfield E. Wight, Thomaston Red Cross Blood Donor Chairman, to the management of local industries for the 94 persons who were scheduled on factory time, to the donors and the dedicated workers who served during the afternoon, for their cooperation and assistance. Appreciation for a successful visit is also extended to the Senior Citizens for directing traffic, and to Chester Dusak for the use of his parking facilities which adjoin the Auditorium.

MARINE SCIENCES

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Biaggi) has been a leading supporter of this Nation's State maritime academies. In recent years, he has fought for increased support for these vital institutions in the face of administration pressure to deemphasize the Merchant Marine training program.

Last week, he was the principal commencement speaker at the New York State Maritime College at Fort Schuyler, the oldest academy of its kind in the United States. In his address, the gentleman from New York points out a new and serious threat to the international leadership of this country—what he terms the sea gap. He points out the urgent need to expand this country's support of research and development in the marine sciences. He sees the State maritime academies as the institutions best designed to fulfill this role.

Mr. Speaker, so that my colleagues will have the benefit of the gentleman's views, I am including the full text of his remarks at this point in the RECORD:

BIAGGI WARNS OF U.S. LAG IN MARINE SCIENCES TECHNOLOGY

Men . . . the country doesn't need you anymore. I don't know what you plan to do when you leave here, but we have enough merchant marine officers; the Navy is over-staffed; and frankly, we ought to close down Fort Schuyler and the other state maritime schools.

How many times have you heard those words? How many times has this institution been threatened with extinction? In recent years, the voices of opposition to the state maritime academies have grown in strength. Last year, the administration drastically reduced its support for the state schools arguing that Kings Point alone could take care of the need for merchant marine officers in the Seventies.

Again, last year, opposition came from yet another quarter. The Selective Service System took exception to deferring cadets at the state schools. Despite wide support for a 1-D deferment and despite strong congressional interest and despite the pleadings of the Navy and Commerce Departments, the Selective Service System still said NO.

I then introduced legislation that would mandate equal recognition with Kings Point for the state academies.

I pledge to you today that I will continue my efforts to get this bill to the floor of the House before the end of this Congress—despite the Selective Service System's opposition.

What does all this trouble and heartache mean? Why must the state maritime schools fight a continual uphill battle for survival?

The state schools have long been the bastard children of the federal maritime establishment. Born of the States these schools were taken under the wing of the Maritime Administration which provides student and operating subsidies. While their existence is recognized, many in the federal government would prefer not being reminded annually of their presence.

But what many in the federal government have lost sight of is the potential those schools offer in other areas of the maritime

field. Our Nation committed billions of dollars to explore the outer reaches of space—yet we have spent virtually nothing to explore the unknown reaches of the oceans which cover three-quarters of the world's surface.

The vast resources of the ocean are just beginning to be exploited. Government control and international cooperation on the exploration and exploitation will be necessary and manpower trained in these sciences will be needed.

Our sources of food and water—which are now found primarily on the land—are being rapidly exhausted. As population grows in the third world countries new approaches to feeding the masses will be sought. The ocean and its wealth of food must be harvested in the future. Manpower skilled in the yet unsolved mysteries of the ocean will be needed.

Pollution of the ocean poses a serious threat to its potential. While we are beginning to realize the vast resources of the seas and the need to utilize them, we are destroying them by using the oceans as a dumping ground for the wastes of mankind.

Men capable of saving the seas by applying oceanographic skills will be needed in increasing numbers.

More importantly, men skilled not only in the marine sciences, but men instilled with a love of the ocean and an ability to master its mysteries will be needed.

I say to you today, it is here that the new mission of the state maritime academies lies and men like you will be the leaders of this mission.

True, the vast majority of you will not find yourselves at the helm of a merchant ship or a Navy vessel. But you will find yourself applying the skills learned here, and your knowledge of the seas, in maritime-related fields. A great many of you will be working with the Federal Government in such agencies as the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration and the Maritime Administration.

Many more of you will be working for the ports and harbors of this country. For the exporters of the produce of this land. For the shippers. For the middlemen and merchants whose living is derived from trade on the seas. The communion with the sea you have enjoyed all your life will stay with you in your future professions. And as we expand our reliance on the ocean for survival, more and more doors will be opened to you.

What form will this new mission take. The old mission was one of primarily commanding ships. Of being ready to serve this Nation in time of war as members of the merchant marine. That aspect of your mission will still be there—in fact, it is the heart of your future—always ready to serve this country in time of national emergency.

But as peace returns to the world, we must broaden the scope of this mission to include the peacetime activities in the maritime field. We must train men skilled to operate in war and peace.

Later this summer I will introduce another bill expanding the scope at the state academies and providing the additional funds necessary to encourage the states to develop the New Mission at these schools.

You may ask why I am talking about a new role for the state schools to you who are leaving—who will not be around to participate in any expanded role at the academies.

I am sure, however, as you join the ranks of the alumni you realize the need to foster the growth and the development of the merchant marine and the maritime industry of this Nation. If you have looked for jobs, you have found them scarce. Other nations—particularly the Soviet Union—have surpassed us in the exploration and the use of the ocean.

In recent weeks we have heard a great deal of talk about the missile gap and the submarine gap and the defense gaps. I would like

to see more concern from the present administration for what I call the Sea Gap.

While Nixon's summit and the SALT talks received the headlines, a small newspaper article in the back pages of the Times described this Sea Gap.

Oh, the Times didn't call it that, but there it was. A startling oceanographic breakthrough was discovered by a Soviet Union ocean research team. Over the last few years, breakthrough after breakthrough in the exploration of the ocean's mysteries have been accredited to the Soviets.

This Nation has turned its back on the horizons just off our shores.

We have turned our back on our oceans. I call on you today to join with me in fighting for a new mission for the state maritime academies—a new mission to explore the depths of the seas and the breadth of the oceans.

A new mission to close the sea gap.

Fort Schuyler and those who will follow you here will benefit. The other state academies and their cadets will benefit. The Nation will benefit. And you will benefit. Thousands of jobs will be created and many of the needs of this Nation will be met by a look toward the new horizons across our shores.

If we fall in this effort to develop new strength in the maritime industry of this country, we will fail ourselves as a Nation. We will have turned our backs on the last frontier on Earth. We will have abandoned our tradition of leaving no task undone—no challenge unmet.

I want you men to leave this academy with the commitment to meet this challenge. To get the job done, Fort Schuyler has instilled in you the ability to do it. Don't fail her and don't fail yourselves. America does need you—now more than ever.

REVENUE SHARING: "AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS GONE"

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal this morning contained an editorial on revenue sharing which I think would be of great interest to my colleagues:

AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS GONE

After three years of discussion, President Nixon's proposal for general revenue sharing will soon be debated, possibly next week, on the floor of the House of Representatives. All signs point to House adoption of some form of the measure. But we're still hoping that Congress will find a way to deny Mr. Nixon a victory he would come to regret. The justifications for this legislation may have been barely plausible when it was conceived, but they have now dwindled to the vanishing point.

The idea of sharing the federal bonanza with the states and cities, you may recall, was conceived eight years ago at a time when the notion of a "fiscal dividend" was in vogue. We were told that the economy, and with it federal tax revenues, would be expanding so rapidly in forthcoming years that Washington would have an annual, delightful problem of what to do with the cash.

The 89th Congress, 1965-66, was thrilled with the theory, and not only enacted a host of Great Society programs, but also structured them so their costs would expand to annually chew up the fiscal dividend. At the same time, President Johnson decided to fight a war without raising taxes. The fiscal dividend would take care of everything.

When Mr. Nixon took office, state and local

governments were slipping into a "fiscal crisis." Much of it was brought on by expansion of services to match the pace of the federal effort. Much, by wage demands of municipal employees and teachers, scrambling to catch up with the inflation-swollen pay increases in private industry.

Mr. Nixon embarked on a plan to cool the economy and inflation, a plan that halfway worked, i.e., the economy cooled, but inflation didn't. State and local government costs continued to rise while the onset of recession bit into their revenue sources. By the end of Mr. Nixon's first year, the notion had taken hold that local governments had exhausted revenue sources and only the federal government had the means to pay for rising costs. This was referred to as "the fiscal imbalance."

Thus, Mr. Nixon's proposal to correct the imbalance by sharing federal revenues with local governments. What money? The "peace dividend," of course. By winding down the war in Vietnam, billions would be freed for revenue sharing. As fast as Vietnam savings showed up, though, Congress dealt them out in tax cuts (1969 and 1971) and in continued expansion of domestic programs. Concurrently, the recession took enormous chunks out of federal revenues.

Throughout this period, mayors and governors lusted for the promised federal cash, but meanwhile had to meet the bills by raising state and local taxes. Last year alone, states put more than \$5 billion in new or higher taxes on the books, a 10% increase in collections.

Then, the recession ends. The economy begins expanding, and with it, state and local revenues. The cost of unemployment benefits and welfare payments levels off. Wage demands by municipal employees and teachers, having reached a parity with private workers, become more reasonable. Except for a few selected cities with special problems, New York, Newark, E. St. Louis, Detroit, the nationwide "fiscal crisis" in local and state government abates.

Disappearing altogether is the "fiscal dividend" and the "peace dividend." The "fiscal imbalance" is still with us, but it has flipped. As a result of the higher tax rates enacted at local levels in the past three years, the Tax Foundation now projects that state and local governments, which in 1970 raised \$130.76 billion in taxes, by 1980 will raise \$323.55 billion. That will be more than enough, says the Tax Foundation to meet spending needs.

But, on the other hand, the federal government now faces a dismal horizon. According to the recent Brookings Institution report, even if the economy is at full employment by 1975, federal revenues will fall \$17 billion short of balancing the budget.

It would seem, then, that the idea of general sharing of federal revenues is an idea whose time has come, and gone. When the House of Representatives begins its debate, it might consider the witlessness of pursuing the matter. Suddenly, it makes more sense for the state and local governments to be sharing their revenues, their "fiscal dividends," with Uncle Sam.

EDUCATION IN BEST VALUES

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, in the June 3 edition of the New York Times, I read with great interest the following excellent article by Prof. Reo M. Christenson of Miami University, Oxford, Ohio. He is professor of political science there.

But first, I would like to set out here the provisions of a bill which I have introduced as follows:

H.R. 11956

A Bill to provide Federal grants to assist elementary and secondary schools to carry on programs to teach moral and ethical principles

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1970 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"GRANTS FOR TEACHING MORAL AND ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

"SEC. 807. (a) The Commissioner shall make grants to State educational agencies to assist them in establishing and carrying out programs under which students attending public elementary and secondary schools will be provided instruction in moral and ethical principles. The content and nature of such instruction shall conform to general standards prescribed by such State agencies.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years."

Sec. 2. Section 422 of the General Education Provisions Act is amended by inserting after "the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1970" the following: "(other than section 810)".

The article by Professor Christenson reads as follows:

May I offer a suggestion that will horrify many of your readers? This is it: One of the greatest needs of American education is a commitment and a program to develop character.

Every healthy society needs a common core of accepted values to give it cohesion and minimal stability. Unless such a core exists and a society is prepared to indoctrinate its children with them, that society is headed for trouble. While such a body of values does exist in America—values that have solid validity despite the giddy pace of change—millions of our young people are not exposed to them (in church, school or home) in any systematic or effective way. Meanwhile, a growing harvest of public and private crime, irresponsibility, incivility, vandalism, shoddy work and lack of personal discipline is at least partly attributable to our failure in this field.

What values do I have in mind? Here are some:

Honesty and truthfulness. What could be more important? No principles are very meaningful unless illustrated, and students should read about persons returning accidental overpayments at the cashier's counter, rejecting the urge to shoplift, resisting the temptation to cheat on exams, and so forth. They should learn that it is as wrong to steal from corporations or the government as from individuals.

Trustworthiness. The longer we live, the more we appreciate those who live up to their word and carry out their responsibilities despite distractions and difficulties.

Work well done. We have seen the spread of careless workmanship in recent years and been victimized by its prevalence. Students should be taught that it is a matter of self-respect, of pride, of personal satisfaction to do a job well.

Kindness and compassion. The importance of kindness not only to friends but to all whom we meet—the humble, the poor, the aged—yes, even those whom we do not like very well.

The courage to admit mistakes. Children should be taught to express regret when they have wronged another. They should learn that it is a mark of courage, honesty, emo-

tional health and grownupness to acknowledge mistakes and ask forgiveness.

Racial tolerance.

Respect for law. Children should learn that obedience to law in a democratic state is an obligation of citizenship. They should learn that respect for law-enforcement officers, when the latter are doing their duty, is one of the indispensable prerequisites for living together peaceably, without fear.

Nonviolence in pursuit of one's goals. Youngsters should recognize that violence begets violence; that its fruits are hatred, fear and the desire for revenge; that the employment of violence degrades its practitioners; that it takes more maturity and courage to seek redress of grievances by peaceable persistence than by throwing rocks or bricks or pulling a trigger.

Respect for democratic rights. They should learn to respect the right of all to freedom of speech—including those whose views they detest—to freedom of assembly and religion, equality before the law and the right of every man to a fair trial.

How should these values be taught? Primarily by textbooks and other readings which, by story and by historical example, illustrate the moral lessons all children should learn. These materials can be written with skill, judgment and taste—and prove absorbing, too. Children hunger to know right from wrong and thirst for models who personify those qualities which appeal to the best within us. The dramatic possibilities for conveying these qualities and personalities are limitless. There are writers on hand if the schools show an interest in this work.

Of course, there will be strenuous objections, from certain quarters, to the "indocination of middle-class values" into students. But many middle-class values (often shared by lower-class persons moving up the ladder) are sound and wholesome: in addition to those cited above, we might add cleanliness, courtesy, punctuality, good work, an emphasis upon education and self-improvement, paying bills on time, keeping the house painted and the yard free from debris, working with local volunteer agencies, and so forth.

As for those who deplore teaching black children "white middle-class values," they should be reminded that these are not "white" values—they are simply "middle-class values."

It would be naive to think that the schools can work miracles in arresting the degeneration of values in America. But major effort by the schools would bring the problem conspicuously before our people, direct our attention and energies upon it in a purposeful way and indirectly lead homes, churches, and other groups to help the cause along.

This proposal does not imply that character training should substitute for other public or private attempts to make ours a more just and humane society. It is a supplement, not a substitute.

Any society which does not have enough self-confidence in its fundamental values to instruct the young in them or enough common sense to do so is courting disaster.

ARMY AVIATION HAS BIRTHDAY PARTY TUESDAY; 30 YEARS OLD

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, June 6, 1972, was an important date for the U.S. Army, for it marked the 30th anniversary of Army aviation.

June 6, 1942, was the beginning of light aviation as an organic part of the Army field artillery fire direction center.

Today aviation is an integral part of the Army's mission. Without organic air support, our Army could not have done the fine job it has done in South Vietnam. Those who doubt the value of such air support only need talk with the infantry soldier who has been in combat in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, Fort Rucker, Ala., is the home of Army aviation—in truth, it is the "West Point of the Air" for the U.S. Army. Fort Rucker celebrated the 30th anniversary of Army aviation appropriately, and I would like to insert in today's RECORD an article from the Daily Ledger, Enterprise, Ala., describing the events at Fort Rucker. I join in saluting Army aviation, Mr. Speaker, on its 30th birthday. As long as I remain in the Congress, and as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I intend to do everything in my power to see that Army aviation continues to flourish.

The article follows:

ARMY AVIATION HAS BIRTHDAY PARTY TUESDAY; 30 YEARS OLD

FORT RUCKER, ALA.—On Tuesday, June 6, Army Aviation will be 30 years old. And at Ft. Rucker, the birthday will be observed with a cake-cutting, two fly-bys and a performance by the Silver Eagles.

The public is invited to join the celebration which begins at 3 p.m. at Guthrie Field.

Major General Allen M. Burdett, Jr., Ft. Rucker's commanding general, will cut the anniversary cake, followed by a fly-by of students who graduate from the Army Aviation School on June 13.

Next will be the Silver Eagles, the Army Aviation Precision Demonstration Team, with their intricate maneuvers in OH-6 and OH-58 helicopters.

The 45 minute program is scheduled to end with another fly-by, which will include 15 aircraft, two types of airplanes and three types of helicopters.

June 6, 1942 marked the beginning of light aviation as an organic part of the Army field artillery fire direction center. Organic Army light aviation consisted of "Piper Cub" type airplanes. Each artillery battalion was usually authorized two airplanes, two pilots and one mechanic to be used as an aerial observation post for adjustment of artillery fire.

In the fall of 1942 three L-4 (Piper Cubs) aircraft took off from the deck of the aircraft carrier "USS Ranger" 40 miles from the North African coast to provide aerial observation for the direction of artillery fire support of the North African invasion.

The Army quickly discovered that not only could the little airplanes provide an unequaled observation post, but that, due to their high maneuverability, losses were almost nonexistent. By the end of the war they were being used in all theaters of operations and were performing several other missions in addition to their original mission of directing artillery fire. The light aircraft were used to evacuate wounded, for courier service, for radio relay stations, and as command liaison vehicles. Thus Army Aviation became a part of the ground forces, but not yet a necessity.

Interest in the Army Aviation program decreased following World War II. The absolute necessity of having airborne observers directing artillery fire were not fully realized until the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950. The jagged, hilly terrain of Korea made ground observation almost impossible and presented numerous other problems.

Army aircraft were immediately sent into

the front line area of Korea to adjust artillery fire. Within a matter of days it was obvious that the Army aircraft, with their ability to operate from small dirt strips, rice paddies which had been bulldozed flat, and other relatively flat ground, provided the only sure means of transportation. The few Army aviators in Korea during the first months were logging excessive amounts of flying time in performing missions of observation, wire laying, evacuation, radio relay, courier service, and movement of personnel and light equipment.

As the war in Korea progressed, Army aircraft were called upon for additional missions such as battlefield illumination and aerial photography. There were never enough Army aircraft or aviation personnel available for the rapidly expanding requirements. In many instances, even the Army airplanes were not able to evacuate wounded or move personnel since the terrain was too rugged to construct a short, 1,000 foot, rocky airstrip. However, a new type of aircraft, the helicopter, had reached a new technical stage of development which made its use by the field forces practical. The requirement for helicopters in Army had been established in 1947, and the Korean War provided the impetus needed to shift the helicopter program into high gear.

The rotary wing aircraft had the capability of an airplane, that is relatively high speed and the ability to pass over obstacles encountered by surface vehicles. But most important, it also had the capability to land in an area not much larger than its own dimensions. As quickly as the helicopters could be manufactured and personnel trained, they were sent to Army units in Korea. The first helicopters sent to Korea were the small two-and-three place craft, H-13 and H-23. They were immediately put into service evacuating wounded and providing transportation for division commanders. For the first time in history, a division commander could inspect his division in one day and direct combat engagements from the air.

As soon as they were available in 1952, larger, cargo-type helicopters, such as the H-19, were sent into Korea. While they did not carry guns, they were a formidable weapon. They provided means of saving thousands of lives in the fast evacuation of wounded from front line positions to rear area hospitals.

The helicopter, and with it Army Aviation, came of age in the Korean War. The 30th Medical Group alone, with 18 two-place helicopters, evacuated over 20,000 casualties during the war. There were only two cargo helicopter companies available in Korea, the 6th and 13th, with 21 cargo helicopters each, and they proved themselves invaluable in evacuating wounded and supplying units in the front lines.

The Army emerged from the Korean War with the realization that Army Aviation possessed the capability of revolutionizing the techniques of employment of ground forces. In 1953, the 506th Transportation Company, later redesignated the 4th was assigned to the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga., to be used by the Infantry to develop techniques and doctrine for the tactical employment of transport helicopters. A year or so later the Army Aviation School at Ft. Rucker started conducting tests on helicopter armament, and the Artillery School at Ft. Sill, Okla., conducted tests on helicopter-borne artillery.

The period from 1955-1960 did not see a large expansion in Army Aviation, but it was a time for maturing and growing, and preparing for the future. In early 1961, the United States Army committed the first helicopter companies to the Republic of Vietnam as a means to improve the mobility of the RVN Army. The increased effectiveness of ground troops was so dramatic that plans for increases in aircraft and aviation organi-

zations were integrated into all levels of U.S. Army planning.

The 11th Air Assault Division (Test) was born at Ft. Benning in 1962 to test these revolutionary ideas for the next two years. Not since Hannibal's historic use of elephants, or Hitler's blitzkrieg in Europe has such a concept so captured the imagination of the military or the general public.

As the conflict in South Vietnam began to escalate, it became more and more evident that sizeable U.S. units must be committed. The 11th Air Assault Division, organized as a provisional unit, became a permanent U.S. Army division and was redesignated the 1st Cavalry Division (Air Mobile) and deployed to Vietnam. There it compiled an enviable record which has been branded into the pages of history.

During the period 1962-1967, the United States Army deployed to South Vietnam the 1st Cavalry Division; the 1st, 4th, 9th, and 25th Infantry Divisions; the 101st Airborne Division, and several separate brigades. All but the separate brigades had organic aircraft and aviation personnel assigned. Even so, to satisfy the air mobile requirements in country of exceedingly hostile terrain, additional Army aviation assets were needed. In June 1968 there was one Aviation brigade composed of four combat aviation groups, totaling more than 2,400 Army aircraft of all types and an excess of 20,000 personnel. They were involved in combat operations from the mountains and jungles near the demilitarized zone to the swamps and marshes of the Delta, an area over 450 miles long by 150 miles wide.

Even with the deescalation of American involvement in the Vietnam conflict, Army Aviation is still rapidly moving forward. The TRICAP Division located at Ft. Hood, Tex., is now undergoing tests which will last for the next several years. This Triple Capability Division consists of an armor brigade, an airmobile brigade and an air cavalry combat brigade. This unit will be assessing the combat lessons of Vietnam and the latest technological advances to develop fresh tactics to ensure the effectiveness of the Army ground team.

Army Aviation, with its rapidly developing heritage, will continue to provide Army commanders the best possible support. This assures the United States Army that it will continue to be the world's best.

WHITE MOTOR CO. DUCKS RESPONSIBILITY TO EMPLOYEES AND COMMUNITY—PENSION LAW NEEDED

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a distressing example of corporate neglect of its responsibilities has occurred in my State. It clearly requires action by Congress.

The White Motor Co., Inc., headed by S. E. Knudsen, chairman and chief executive officer since May 1971, has decided to abandon its Minneapolis-Moline plant in my district, leaving hundreds of workers out of jobs and terminating or drastically cutting pension benefits earned by the employees—many of whom have been with Minneapolis-Moline most of their working lives.

On June 3, Senator WALTER F. MONDALE conducted hearings which uncovered the plans of White Motor Co. to terminate its pension plan and reduce benefit checks far below what had been promised to the employees. Retirees receiving from \$200 to \$400 in monthly pension checks will be cut to \$90 a month.

Senator MONDALE's hearings spotlighted weaknesses which no doubt exist in many other company pension plans in the Minneapolis area and throughout the country. Thousands of workers are in danger of losing their pension rights—even after they have retired.

To prevent other workers from suffering the fate of the Minneapolis-Moline workers, I have introduced H.R. 15367, a bill to safeguard employee pensions. When it is law, employees will be insured against loss of the benefits they have earned under their company retirement plan. After 8 years with one company a person would have a vested right to a pension. The law would permit transfer of pension rights from one company to another if a worker changed jobs.

Congress must take action to see that employees who are covered by private retirement plans actually get the pension benefits that are coming to them.

The bill I have introduced is the Senate Williams-Javits bill. One summary of the provisions of this bill follows. Another more detailed summary appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 11, 1972, at page S7605:

OUTLINE OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF WILLIAMS-JAVITS PENSION REFORM BILL—RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY FOR EMPLOYEES ACT

The following are the major provisions of the Williams-Javits Pension Reform Bill:

1. Establishes within the Department of Labor, under the supervision and responsibility of the Secretary of Labor, an Office of Pension and Welfare Plan Administration, to be headed by an Assistant Secretary of Labor appointed by the President, with Senate advice and consent, which will be responsible for promotion, establishment, and administration and operation of employee benefit plans and enforcement of Act.

2. Prescribes minimum vesting requirements whereby an employee, after eight years of service, will acquire a vested non-forfeitable right to 30% of pension benefits, and, thereafter, each year will vest an additional 10% until, at the end of 15 years, he will have vested rights of 100%. Each existing pension plan would be given the option to elect to divide itself into a "new plan" and an "old plan." New employees would be covered only under the "new plan" and old employees would be permitted to elect coverage under either plan. The "old plan" would not be required to comply with the Act's vesting standards but would be required to comply with all other provisions of the Act. The "new plan" would be required to comply with all provisions of the Act.

3. Establishes minimum funding standards of pension plans which will insure that all pension liabilities incurred by the plan after the effective date of the Act will be funded over 40-year period.

4. Authorizes the Secretary to grant variances from funding requirements for qualifying plans under certain circumstances.

5. Establishes voluntary program for portability through a central fund, whereby employees of participating employers may transfer vested credits from one employer to another.

A VOICE OF EXPERIENCE

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, all America recalls that Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, a distinguished cabinet leader in other years, has many times demonstrated his wisdom in statecraft.

Particularly he has been one of the American leaders who has not hesitated to condemn the grievous mistake we have made in Vietnam.

We have again from Mr. Eccles a word of admonition, indicating that it would be an illusion to suppose that the mining of the Haiphong Harbor and the bombing of railroads have achieved success for us. Mr. Eccles is particularly concerned about the escalating war and expenses, and the alarming balance of payments. I detect, too, that he is aware of the mounting deficit in our Federal budget, going on to many millions of dollars in the last 3 years.

Mr. Eccles puts it in a nutshell when he states:

The war is destroying the American system.

His remarks are appended below:

AN ADDRESS BY MARRINER S. ECCLES

We all recognize that these are unusual and tragic times for anyone to be accepting an award for furthering the cause of world peace and world trade, since we have very little of either. I assure you, I would be much less hesitant about accepting an award if I could feel that I had accomplished something toward these ends. For most of my life, I have been working for those issues which seem to me basic for a stable and prosperous society at home and a respected position abroad. Whether it was the population dilemma, fiscal and monetary matters, or world affairs, a lifetime of pressing for change is actually all I can claim credit for.

The dilemmas we find ourselves in today were quite apparent on the horizon as long as ten years ago. And through two administrations, we have taken the wrong road every time we had a chance to alter our course. Through these years, our record for unwise and reckless action is bad. We are now—in the present world crisis—confronted with the sum total of our mistakes.

We have completely ignored our domestic needs so that we have a frustrated and angry society. Explosive and dangerous rebellion simmers just below the surface.

We have overestimated our wealth and our power and spread ourselves too thin around the world. We are just now realizing that we cannot dominate the world militarily and take care of our domestic needs as well.

We took no steps to reverse the balance of payments deficiency—but just watched the dollar depreciate. Now it is a floating currency of indeterminate value.

We have never faced up to the monopoly of labor, the favoritism toward big business, and the inequities in the tax structure. These and other developments have made the control of inflation impossible.

We have allowed the military to become blown up into such a force that it is now our master instead of our servant. Far from being a department of defense—which we do need—it has become a political arm of the President and the delineator of our foreign policy. As a result, we have wrecked our credi-

bility in the world to such an extent that we are neither believed nor trusted. The sleight-of-hand and secret conduct of our foreign affairs has cost us our friends and made us new enemies. The Vietnamese debacle is the best "proof of that pudding."

Nearly seven years ago, I said in a widely publicized statement, "Under no circumstances should we escalate the war in Vietnam; our position there is indefensible. Contrary to our government's propaganda, we were not invited by, and we have no commitment to, any representative or responsible government in South Vietnam. We are there as an aggressor in violation of our treaty obligations under the U.N. Charter." Under our Constitution, Congress alone has the power to declare war. Johnson ignored this fact when we invaded Vietnam, and Nixon supported that invasion and expanded it by invading Cambodia and Laos. We have been in a fighting war in Asia for nearly eight years. We are now deeply involved there, and I believe will find it more difficult to sever our connection with Southeast Asia than at any other time.

The war is destroying the American system. It is drawing upon resources which need to be put to work solving increasingly critical social and economic problems facing the nation. Crime, delinquency, drug addiction, poverty, alcoholism, mental illness, war and defense have drawn an estimated \$314 billion from our economy the past year. These problems are all increasing faster than our population. Crime in our country has increased 148% in ten years, while the population has increased only 13%. The number of homicides in the U.S. is five times as great as in any other country. Violence has become an accepted way of life in the United States. The sights and sounds of war have become familiar, and our people are hardened to brutality and violent death. According to the President's Commission on Violence: "The American is four times more likely to be a victim of violence than the European."

Our annual defense budget has increased from \$49 billion in 1965 to approximately \$80 billion at the present time. This is almost entirely due to the war in Southeast Asia which has cost about \$150 billion. The federal deficit during the period was approximately \$90 billion. Without Vietnam there would be a budgetary surplus of around \$60 billion. The U.S. has already spent well over a trillion dollars on the military since 1946. The accumulated deficiency in our international balance of payments through 1972 was approximately \$73 billion. We had a deficiency last year in our trade balance for the first time in 77 years of more than \$2 billion, with an increasing deficiency this year. Previously, for a number of years this country had a trade balance surplus averaging about \$5 billion.

Adding to the inflationary effects of the heavy deficit financing (approximately \$30 billion this year) and the deficiency in our international balance of payments, are the exorbitant demands made by, and the settlements given to, organized labor. The unions represent only 25% of the labor force. Their wages and fringe benefits are from two to four times that of other industrial countries. Thus, organized labor not only draws from the economy benefits in excess of inflation and increased productivity, but undermines our ability to compete in world as well as domestic markets.

Reduced individual and corporate taxes, investment credit, accelerated depreciation, and the elimination of the auto sales tax, all contribute to the federal deficit. This, in turn, adds to the inflationary pressures and further weakens the dollar. It is important that tax loopholes be closed, as a matter of equity.

If we expect to strengthen the dollar, we must correct the causes of its weakness.

The problems of deficiencies in our inter-

national balance of payments and in our trade balance, as well as the increasingly large federal debt and the increasing cost of labor, have brought about a growing inflation in our country and made our dollar increasingly less desirable as a world currency. Since the International Monetary Fund was created at Bretton Woods after the war, the dollar based on gold at \$35.00 an ounce has been the world currency. All other currencies were related to it. In the summer of '71, it was inevitable that the 27-year-old Bretton Woods system of fixed international exchange rates, all pegged to the U.S. dollar, would collapse. On August 15, when Nixon was forced to cut the dollar loose from gold, the old currency system died, and the dollar was left to float. Some of the other countries acted previously and others followed the dollar in letting their currencies float. Since that time, there has been no stability in the world currencies.

The important currencies have increased in value in relation to the dollar on the basis of the exchange market. The dollar, on the other hand, has become the least desirable currency, piling up in foreign central banks and other financial institutions much faster than foreign currencies in the U.S. This results in a continuing decline of confidence in the U.S. dollar, and a rush by foreigners to turn dollars into other currencies or American securities. It is undergoing a staggering decline in the black markets of the Communist world—from 30% to 60%—where it once was treasured and hoarded. To meet the crisis, Nixon imposed a 90-day 10% import tax and froze wages and prices. At the end of this Phase I period, Phase II went into effect permitting some adjustments. There is no indication when Phase II, which has not been successful, will be discontinued. Until the U.S. gets its monetary house in order and a new reserve currency can be established, we will continue to lose prestige and power, and it will be increasingly difficult for the U.S. to develop and maintain foreign trade.

In a financial sense, a war is never over since the cost of war does not end with the cessation of hostilities. During the war period since '65, there have been over 50,000 boys killed, and more than 250,000 wounded or missing. We are spending approximately \$11 billion a year for veterans' benefits, and nearly \$2½ billion for veterans' hospitals and medical expenses. The annual interest on the public debt is about \$20 billion. This debt and high taxes are entirely due to the present and past wars. These problems cannot be brought under control until our national defense expenditures are reduced by at least \$20 billion to the pre-Vietnam war level of \$50 billion. This makes the ending of our stupid involvement in Southeast Asia imperative.

We have become great in world affairs because of economic strength, and not because of military strength; but we have allowed the defense establishment to overwhelm with military might. By mid '72, the U.S. will have more than 5,000 long-range nuclear weapons; the Soviet Union 2,500. Each one can destroy a city, and yet the U.S. is now proposing to substantially increase its nuclear arsenal. When is enough enough? American bombs since 1965 have produced 21 million craters in South Vietnam. In this period, we used 26 billion pounds of explosives; that is twice what the United States used in all of World War II. Of this 26 billion pounds, 21 billion were exploded in South Vietnam. In that small country—one we are supposedly to save—we have employed explosives with the energy of 36 Hiroshima nuclear bombs—all of these rained down on a country the size of Missouri.

Military muscle has never been able to preserve any world power, and it never will. If we have to depend on the military/in-

dustrial complex for our prosperity, it is a profound indictment of our capitalistic democracy.

A World War II general observes that, "We are turning into a military state, and the demoralization will eat up this country's abundance as surely and irrevocably as silkworms eat mulberry leaves."

President Eisenhower, in his farewell address in 1961, said, "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence whether sought or unsought by the military/industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or our democratic processes."

No matter how much we spend for armaments, there is no safety in arms. Our security is wholly the product of economic, intellectual, and moral strength. Our national policy of relying on military power primarily, as in Vietnam, to solve the political problems, breeds violence everywhere and ultimately destroys the foundations of our Republic. We must leave the politics of Asia to the Asians.

I don't think we can win the war in the classic sense. Russia and China have publicly announced that they would continue to give the military and economic aid necessary to North Vietnam in order to defeat the U.S. aggressors. This, however, is all the help the North Vietnamese have received from Russia and China. We, on the other hand, have not only provided all military equipment and other supplies, but have taken charge of the war. We have sent in our Army, Navy, and Air Force, done the bombing, and most of the fighting. We have made a civil war between the Communists and the non-Communists, our war. As a result, we have aligned against us these two powerful countries, as well as the rest of the Communist world, with practically no support from any other country. Win or lose, I doubt if we will ever be free of Indochina. If we win, we will have to rehabilitate the country which will cost us billions of dollars. If we lose, we are still morally responsible to make amends as best we can.

Look at us in Korea. As reward for victory, consider the billions we have sunk in South Korea and our situation there after twenty years. Also, consider the 250,000 troops in West Germany after twenty-five years. Germany and Japan, who were almost destroyed during the war, today are the two most prosperous countries in the world, and their currencies are the strongest. They have kept out of military commitments and have spent practically nothing for arms. This should be a lesson to us in economics.

To have world trade, you have to have a climate of peace. You have to have a stable currency—and perform responsibly on the world scene. You can't have 2,300 military bases around the world. You can't ring China and Russia with nuclear installations as we have done. World trade and world friendship go hand in hand. Neither self-isolation nor aggression can solve the acute problems that each nation shares with the rest of the world. It is one world—or no world. The raw materials of the world belong to the people of the world and must be shared through international trade and finance.

Mr. Nixon was elected in 1968 on the strength of his claim that he had a plan to get us out of Vietnam. After more than three years in office, we are still heavily involved there with intensification of the fighting on many fronts. We hear much about the troop withdrawals but nothing about the heavy escalation of the air war, and now the huge addition of Naval power.

In looking at Mr. Nixon's record, I find it hard to believe that he is willing to get out short of victory. In 1968, a national magazine

quoted Mr. Nixon as follows: "There is no alternative to the war's going on. We have to stop it with victory, or it will start all over again in a few years."

The President has also said repeatedly, "I will not be the first President to lose a war."

Based on everything Nixon says, in my opinion he has never had, and has not now, any intention of giving up the idea of a non-Communist Saigon government. And just a few weeks ago, in his statement to the nation, he again reaffirmed support of the Saigon government. Except for this issue (the political future of Saigon), this war could have been settled years ago.

We want our prisoners back and our troops returned, but the fact is—the Saigon government and victory seem to have first priority with the President, despite his protestations to the contrary. What is more, as long as the war continues, we are adding to the prisoners and more of our boys are being killed.

We are told we have to have a victory in Vietnam or there will be a "blood bath." What do you consider over 700,000 Vietnamese troops killed by us and our ally—not to mention the appalling civilian toll? Isn't that a "blood bath?" A parallel situation in the U.S. would figure out to about 6½ million young men dead. What do you think that would be in the U.S.?

So—we have to face it! There already is a "blood bath"—and it is our doing. We are guilty. And no amount of rhetoric about a "generation of peace" will make it go away. It will never be forgotten—or forgiven. Nor should it be.

What we have now actually done in our mining of the Haiphong harbor and bombing of the railroads is to tell Russia and China and the rest of the world that they cannot send anything to Vietnam, but we can. Win or lose this immediate challenge, we have demonstrated to the Communist World, Russia and China, with whom we are hoping to trade and establish good relations, that we are dictatorial and inflexible, and that we must win at all costs. What permanent confidence and trust can we expect to establish in our future relations with them by this recent action?

I am sure the irony of the situation is lost on no one—when it is to Russia we must turn for restraint, cool-headedness, and responsibility in world affairs. If this confrontation with Russia, which we have precipitated, does not result in a global conflict, it will be because of the wisdom, judgment, and restraint of the Communists whom we hold in such scorn. If a settlement of some sort in Vietnam results from the President's trip to Moscow, it will be because Russia, in its own interest, saw fit to "pull our chestnuts out of the fire." They can demand concessions for this as they hold the cards. We have been out-manuevered, as we have had to ask for their help. It could very well be a Cuba in reverse.

One thing is certain, we have learned some important truths about ourselves in these difficult years. We have learned that we can be influenced erroneously; that our judgment and fairness can be overwhelmed. We can be fooled and confused and made uncertain.

It looks as though there never would come a time when the country could not be whipped into a frenzy of fear over Communists even though they are 10,000 miles away.

We are pathetically at the mercy of our political leadership—which determines the image we project in the world. No king or dictator in modern times has anything remotely like the power of an American President.

Deep down in our hearts we know we have strayed far afield from the ideals on which this country was founded. We know that killing and carnage do not bring us honor. We know the quiet of a shattered country is not peace. We know that the prestige of this

Presidency and the honor of our country are enhanced in the world by integrity and stability, and we are appalled at the savagery we have unleashed on a small Asian country which has in no way offended us.

Oddly enough, it was a military man who has most tellingly put into words the folly and tragedy of war. It was General Eisenhower who said: "This world in arms is not spending money alone; it is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children. The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: A modern brick school in more than 30 cities; it is two electrical power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population; it is two fine, fully-equipped hospitals. We pay for a single fighter plane with ½ million bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people."

And, finally, from my beloved countryman, Robert Burns, a closing thought that seems to me to fit our moment in history:

"Oh wad some Power the giftie gie us
To see oursels as others see us!
It wad frae monie a blunder free us,
An' foolish notion."

ADAM CLAYTON POWELL—"HE KEPT THE FAITH"

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, April 4, 1972, marked the close of an era for black people in this Nation. Adam Clayton Powell—Congressman, Minister, civil rights leader—was dead. The people came 100,000 strong to say goodbye and to reminisce about the man, and his life.

A St. Louis policeman, Lt. Frederick Grimes, in a letter to Congressman Powell's son, Adam Clayton Powell III, expressed eloquently the sense of the man and the meaning of his life to black Americans. With your permission, I would like to share this letter with my colleagues:

METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
CITY OF ST. LOUIS,

St. Louis, Mo., April 24, 1972.

Mr. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, III,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SKIPPER: This letter is to belatedly express the deep anguish that I too, feel in the loss of your dear Father. Please accept this message of sympathy with the genuine words of sympathy that you may cherish in the times ahead for you.

Uncle Jerome drove through St. Louis last week enroute to New York for the final rites and I wanted to accompany him on the trip, but unfortunately I was unable to be granted leave of absence for trip, therefore, I must offer my tribute in writing.

The volumes of rhetoric written and spoken on the life of Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., cannot adequately describe him as you knew him, nor as each of us knew him and the effects that he had on the lives of those whom he chose to love or befriend. Adam, truly wrote his own epitaph each day of his active life.

During the 1956 and 1960 Presidential Campaigns, your Father worked the St. Louis area and I was his police escort and we shared a mutual admiration and respect. At the Kennedy Inaugural in January 1961, I was one of only two black police officers from the entire nation assigned to Washington. This was solely by the insistent efforts of Con-

gressman Powell, who demanded my presence—this is the man Powell that I knew.

Although the human image of Adam Powell is no longer with us, his contributions and memories are immortal and will live with pride in the soul of every black American yet unborn because he truly "kept the faith"—his inspirational teachings will most certainly create other black leaders. It was best expressed by President Kennedy, in his inaugural speech—"the torch has passed" which implies that you or someone like you must continue what was started by Adam C. Powell, Jr.

In the future should you have the need of my services and friendship, please be assured that you have a friend here in St. Louis.

With every good wish for your future,

Until we overcome,

Lt. FREDERICK J. GRIMES.

JOHN PAUL VANN

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation, and the district which I represent in Congress, lost an outstanding citizen last weekend. He was John Paul Vann, the senior U.S. adviser in the Central Highlands sector of South Vietnam.

John Vann was a resident of Jefferson County, Colo., but had spent 9 out of the past 11 years in a series of sensitive assignments for the United States in Vietnam.

During 1963 and 1964 he was an executive with the Martin Marietta Corp., Littleton, Colo., and it was during this period that I first met him.

He was an unusually intense person, one who characteristically applied himself night and day to the problem at hand. His intensity made him controversial, both in civilian and military life, but it was a quality which enabled him to get things done under the most trying of circumstances.

John Vann served this Nation's interests in Vietnam with the same intensity, and last Friday night it cost him his life. His hard-driving, take-charge attitude caused him, again and again, to expose himself to the greatest of risks. John Vann, I am told, never asked another man to face the hazards that he, himself, had not faced. During the current North Vietnamese offensive he was a pillar of strength for the remaining American forces and the military commanders of South Vietnam.

Many tributes are being paid John Paul Vann by the leaders of this Nation and the free peoples of Southeast Asia. His name already has become legendary in a part of the world which so much needed his strength and personal testament to democracy and the high price which sometimes must be paid to achieve and sustain it.

In my opinion, the finest tribute which can be paid John Paul Vann is to remember that he, perhaps more than any other American, has made the withdrawal of our forces feasible. When he came to Vietnam he worked with a people whose leadership had been methodi-

cally destroyed and whose ability to defend themselves had all but vanished. Today, it appears just possible that South Vietnam is developing a viable self-defense force.

This was the cause for which John Paul Vann fought for 9 years—and one for which he sacrificed his life.

WAGE-HOUR VIOLATIONS

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following radio interview with Mr. Rudy Oswald, an economist with the AFL-CIO Department of Research. The subject matter discussed is the widespread violation of the Federal wage and hour law.

As the subcommittee chairman whose panel has jurisdiction over this law, I hope to schedule oversight hearings soon after the Senate completes action on the pending amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. Oswald's interview follows:

LABOR NEWS CONFERENCE, MUTUAL BROADCASTING SYSTEM

Subject: Wage-Hour Violations.

Guest: Rudolph Oswald, an economist in the AFL-CIO's Department of Research.

Reporters: Robert Levey, staff writer for the Washington Post and Tom Joyce, labor correspondent for Newsweek magazine.

Moderator: Frank Harden.

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The following time is presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System.

HARDEN. Labor News Conference. Welcome to another edition of Labor News Conference, a public affairs program brought to you by the AFL-CIO. Labor News Conference brings together leading AFL-CIO representatives and ranking members of the press. Today's guest is Rudolph Oswald, an economist in the AFL-CIO's Department of Research.

Since 1938, federal law has set a floor under the wages employers must pay their workers and a ceiling on the number of hours worked, after which a penalty rate, or overtime, must be paid. Yet year after year, hundreds of thousands of some of the nation's lowest-paid workers are shortchanged wages their employers are required by federal law to pay them. Worse yet, less than one-third of those underpayments are ever recovered. Here to question Mr. Oswald about continuing violations of the federal wage and hour law, why those violations persist and prospects that they will ever be ended, are Robert Levey, staff writer for the Washington Post, and Tom Joyce, labor correspondent for Newsweek magazine. Your moderator, Frank Harden.

And now, Mr. Joyce, I believe you have the first question?

JOYCE. Mr. Oswald, the AFL-CIO claims that hundreds of thousands of workers are being shortchanged under the minimum wage law. What solid evidence do you have that is occurring?

OSWALD. Mr. Joyce, the Labor Department makes inspections of various places of work to determine whether or not they are complying with the minimum wage requirements.

So far this year—in the first nine months of fiscal '72—they have found that some 370,000 workers have been underpaid nearly \$75 million. At that rate, that's about half-

a-million workers underpaid \$100 million over the full year. We know from the past Labor Department studies of compliance levels that their inspection find only one-third of the violations.

So, we could say that about 1.5 million workers today are not being paid the appropriate minimum wage or overtime rates, as required by the Fair Labor Standards Act—with some \$300 million of underpayments.

JOYCE. Who are these workers, and why don't we hear more about them?

OSWALD. Mr. Joyce, they are a variety of workers, and many of them are afraid to bring to the government's attention the fact that they are being underpaid.

With high unemployment, they are fearful that their employer will fire them because they have complained to the government about the underpayments, even though the law prohibits employers from taking any sort of repressive action against such employees.

In most cases, they are fearful.

In some cases, they are people who don't speak English—they're Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans and others—often they are not familiar with the laws and requirements of this country, and they are taken advantage of.

LEVEY. Mr. Oswald, isn't a large part of the problem part-time workers and teenagers entering the labor force for the first time?

OSWALD. No, Mr. Levey—that's the impression that many people have, but in many cases, they are adult workers—often heads of families—they are victimized by employers—sometimes large employers, sometimes small employers.

We find that violations exist where children are underpaid.

But, most of the violations involve underpayments to adult workers.

LEVEY. Are there any seasonal variations of this phenomenon, or variations according to the section of the country?

OSWALD. There are variations—by industry, by area of the country, and, on occasion, seasonal variations, because of the type of industry.

There are very high violations in agriculture, which, of course, is seasonal.

There are more violations in the South, where wages tend, as a whole, to be lower.

And there are more violations involving minorities—and in some of the ghettos of the large cities—where these workers are taken advantage of.

JOYCE. Mr. Oswald, what kind of industries are we talking about? Are we talking about mostly "Mom and Pop" operations? Are we talking about things a lot bigger than that?

OSWALD. It sometimes involves chain operations—sometimes very large establishments—and in other cases, fairly small establishments.

Small "Mom and Pop" operations are not covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act. It covers industries that are interstate commerce—most manufacturing and larger retail and service establishments—as well as schools, hospitals and other major industries in this country.

JOYCE. Would it be correct to assume that more young people are likely to be underpaid than adults?

OSWALD. No, Mr. Joyce, we find that more adults are underpaid than young people—most of the violations do involve adults.

What we do find, in terms of young people, though, is other types of violations. The Fair Labor Standards Act, when it was first written in 1938, also tried to do away with what is called "abusive child labor." It prohibited employment of children under the age of 16 during school hours, or working—when school is in session—more than three hours a day or 18 hours a week.

We find that there are many violations of these child labor regulations.

We find, for example, children under the age of 9 employed.

Some 19,000 children under age 15 were employed last year during school hours, or in industries that are hazardous according to the investigations of the Labor Department.

Obviously, that is only a small part of the total number of such violations.

LEVEY. Mr. Oswald, we've had a minimum wage law now since 1938, and, of course, during that time, we've had national administrations of both parties. Do things seem better now—under the Nixon Administration—than before, in terms of numbers?

OSWALD. Mr. Levey, the number of violations are as high as it has been for the past decade.

However, it seems that the current Administration's emphasis is no longer on discovering violations. It has de-emphasized completely the enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment Standards has indicated that the priority should be on voluntary compliance, rather than on enforcement and uncovering underpayments.

As a result, the emphasis is no longer to make sure that employers abide by the minimum wage and child labor requirements, but rather that, in a vague sense, employers should abide by the standards as enunciated in the Act—as people said, in 1900 before passage of the Act.

But, we saw all the abuses that occurred under that attitude—and they led to enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938.

LEVEY. Let me ask about the AFL-CIO's role in this. There's now pending on Capitol Hill a bill that would increase the minimum wage. The AFL-CIO has favored that. But, why would the AFL-CIO favor it, if people are having a tough time collecting minimum wage as it is now?

OSWALD. Yes, we favor the increase of the minimum wage—we feel that an increase is absolutely necessary for workers who are at the mercy of their employers—whose wages are so very low that they can not provide for their families.

At \$1.60 an hour—which is the current minimum wage—a worker with a full-time, year-round job would only earn \$3,200 a year. That's below the \$4,000 poverty standard.

Yet the Nixon Administration isn't even supporting the immediate increase of the minimum wage to \$2.

We feel that is the very least that is necessary—make the improvement in the minimum wage effective immediately.

The AFL-CIO, at its last convention called for an increase in the minimum wage to \$2.50 an hour. We say that \$2.50 is absolutely necessary, because if a worker doesn't receive more for working full-time, year-round than the minimum poverty level, you must say that our system doesn't really allow a worker to escape from poverty.

We believe that if the American industrial system is to function properly, someone who works full-time, year-round, should at least be able to support the typical family of four at a modest standard in our society—by working full-time, year-round.

The only way to accomplish that is by increasing the minimum wage.

JOYCE. Mr. Oswald, in line with what you just said—that the AFL-CIO is advocating \$2.50 an hour—the AFL-CIO, if I am correct, is supporting the bill that would only increase it to \$2.00 an hour, which brings the weekly wage just up to about the poverty line. How do you explain this?

OSWALD. Mr. Joyce, the AFL-CIO supported, in the House of Representatives, the Dent bill (D-Pa.) which would have raised the minimum wage—immediately—to \$2 an hour.

We supported the Dent bill in the face of onslaughts by the Administration to delay

even that modest increase of the minimum wage.

The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee has reported out a bill, which will come before the full Senate shortly, which would raise the minimum wage to \$2 immediately, and a year thereafter, to \$2.20.

We believe that bill would be an important step in the right direction. Our position, however, remains that a \$2.50 an hour minimum wage is necessary for the country today. It is the only means to assure that workers will have enough to support a family.

JOYCE. Well, you still seem to be saying that the \$2.20, or whatever, is only perpetuating a group of working poor.

OSWALD. We do not believe that the \$2.20 provision, a year after the increase to \$2 an hour, is sufficient to provide for the needs of our country, so that workers who are so employed will be able to have enough income to escape from poverty.

LEVY. Mr. Oswald, of course, it's not simply a matter of getting the poor caught up a little bit—it's also a matter, isn't it, of establishing a floor for the AFL-CIO to negotiate its contracts above? Is this in any way part of the AFL-CIO's backing of the \$2.50 minimum?

OSWALD. Well, Mr. Levy, most of the contracts negotiated by AFL-CIO unions—and, as you know, there are 120 unions affiliated with the AFL-CIO—most of those contracts provide wages far in excess of \$2.50 an hour.

So, for most of these unions, an improved minimum wage—whether it is \$2, or \$2.20 or \$2.50—will not have any impact on their negotiations.

We feel that the improvement is an absolute necessity, in terms of basic justice—that someone who is working earns enough to be able to support his family. Look at the record—at the expenses of working. The government's own defined poverty line—\$4,500 a year—at \$2.50, working full-time, year-round, he would earn just \$5,000 a year.

That's barely enough to pay for his working expenses—and still have slightly more than the basic poverty-level existence.

LEVY. Talking again about the bill that would raise the minimum to \$2.00—as I make it, that's a 25% increase in the minimum. Has any thought been given—or any flap raised—concerning the fact that that's far and away above the 5.5% guideline that the Pay Board has established?

OSWALD. Mr. Levy, Mr. Rumsfeld has indicated that this is above the 5.5%.

However, the last time Congress acted to raise the minimum wage was in 1966. At that time, they raised the minimum wage to \$1.60 an hour.

In the period since 1966, prices have gone up 25%—as much as the immediate increase of \$2.

So, all that would happen is that these workers would be made whole today—catch up for the deterioration of their conditions over the last five years. Unless they're raised immediately to \$2 an hour, they would be forced to bear fully the burdens of the current inflation.

A management consultant firm that recently studied the salaries of top officials of large corporations found that the salaries of presidents of these large corporations increased an average of 15% last year.

We're talking about an increase of the minimum wage for the first time since 1966—a period in which inflation has eroded completely the buying power.

We found during World War II, for example, when there were step-ups in the minimum wage, that even in that very tight period of wartime wage controls, the War Labor Board allowed the full minimum wage increase of 33% that had been legislated.

JOYCE. Mr. Oswald, a few minutes ago, you were talking about the child labor. If I'm correct, there are a number of advocates—both in Congress and in the business com-

munity—who are advocating a sub-standard minimum wage rate for teenagers, on the theory that this would not take jobs away from adults. Can you address yourself to that proposal for a moment?

OSWALD. The AFL-CIO is adamantly opposed to any sub-minimum wages paid to anyone, Mr. Joyce.

We believe that the Fair Labor Standards Act is a basic floor under wages—under all wages.

If two people are doing the same work, they should be paid the same wage—not a different or lesser wage that is based on the worker's age, or the color of his skin, or on sex, or on the language that he speaks. Workers should be paid a minimum wage based on a national floor that is a floor under all wages.

JOYCE. What about the argument that a uniform minimum wage—one that made no provisions for teenagers—would deprive adults of jobs?

OSWALD. If there is a sub-minimum wage established for youth—as the Administration proposes—there's no reason why any employer should increase the wage that he's now paying an employee—from \$1.60 an hour, for example, to \$2 an hour.

He might just as well substitute a teenager for that adult.

The whole purpose of the minimum wage law is to provide a floor under wages—and the purpose of the increase in the minimum is to raise the floor, not to pave the way for substitution of teenager workers for adult workers.

LEVY. Mr. Oswald, a double-barreled question, if I may. How much of the underpaid wages is ever actually paid at a later time to the people who are cheated—number one. And number two—what are the mechanisms for these people to collect?

OSWALD. Mr. Levy, there are really two ways that the workers can collect back wages, but currently, only about one-third of the wrongfully withheld wages is actually ever paid to the workers.

One way the worker can collect is to bring suit himself for the wages due him, plus an equal amount in damages, in a federal district court.

Or, he can ask the Secretary of Labor to take his case, and recover the amount due.

Under the bill that is currently being considered by the Senate, there would also be a provision that some penalty be allowed in those cases where the Secretary himself brings the court suit. Otherwise, all that the employer is required to pay is the amount he should have paid in the first place. Basically, that means that no penalty is imposed for violating the law.

JOYCE. Mr. Oswald, another two-part question, if you will. One, what do you think are the chances on the Hill for this legislation? And two, why isn't there more interest in the proposal? We hear very little about it.

OSWALD. The House, Mr. Joyce, passed the Fair Labor Standards Act amendments in early May, and the Senate will be taking up the amendments, most likely, in mid-June.

A report of the Senate committee will be ready for the Senate floor very shortly, and the Senate might be able to take up legislation any time thereafter.

I think the reason that we're not hearing more about it is because the Nixon Administration is not particularly interested in publicizing the plight of people whose wages are below \$2 an hour—people who work full-time, year-round—or part-time—and still don't have enough to even modestly support their families.

LEVY. Mr. Oswald, of course it's not just a matter of interest on the Hill, it's a matter of interest also among the aggrieved people. Is the lack of interest among them that we seem to see here—they aren't collecting their money—do you think that's related to the fact that they are among our less-vocal citizens?

OSWALD. Precisely, Mr. Levy, these are the people who don't write letters—who don't have secretaries to whom they can dictate a letter to their Congressman or Senator—who do not have access to the mass media.

They are the quiet people—the down-trodden. Many have difficulty composing a letter.

Their dismal conditions, as voiced a year ago, are “forgotten Americans”—those who are working full-time and are still in poverty. They're not heard in the streets.

They put in a full day's work, without a minimum wage, or at a wage that doesn't allow them to escape from poverty.

HARDEN. Thank you, gentlemen. Today's Labor News Conference guest was Rudolph Oswald, an economist in the AFL-CIO's Department of Research. Representing the press were Tom Joyce, labor correspondent for Newsweek magazine, and Robert Levey, staff writer for the Washington Post. This is your moderator, Frank Harden, inviting you to listen again next week. Labor News Conference is a public affairs production of the AFL-CIO, produced in cooperation with the Mutual Broadcasting System.

MUTUAL ANNOUNCER. The preceding program time was presented as a public service by this station and the Mutual Broadcasting System. The opinions expressed are solely those of the participants.

NEITHER WOULD GUN LAWS

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, since the assassination attempt last month upon Gov. George Wallace, there have been renewed appeals for gun control legislation.

The Wichita, Kans., Eagle recently published an editorial which refers to a discussion by Dr. John Burton of Pontiac, Mich., concerning the folly of attempts to ban the sale of firearms by legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the Eagle editorial:

NEITHER WOULD GUN LAWS

Whenever there's a tragic incident in the country—such as the shooting of Governor Wallace—there is an emotional reaction against guns, and a renewal of the effort either to ban their sale or attempt to recall those already in the hands of the citizenry.

A man who is something of an expert on the subject, a forensic pathologist by the name of Dr. John Burton of Pontiac, Mich., explained the folly of such attempts to a Wichita audience the other day.

The American public feels a need to keep guns for protection and “the good guys” simply would not turn in their guns because they know there are “bad guys” out there who would refuse, said Dr. Burton.

He's right. And it is also true that making guns harder to get would handicap only the man who wanted a gun for legal uses. A criminal or a lunatic who wanted a gun would find one by illegal methods. If he couldn't, he might resort to a homemade bomb, which might kill not only his intended victim but a lot of other people as well.

As Dr. Burton pointed out, violence is nothing new. Before guns were as available as they are today, people still were killing other people. But in those days they used knives or hammers or something else. Laws already exist, of course, against committing acts of violence, but these do not deter the deranged or the impassioned.

Neither would gun laws.

DOUBLE STANDARD ON RHODESIA

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the double standard urged by many opponents of trade with Rhodesia is an interesting one. Such trade, these critics declare, assists a regime which does not share our own views concerning human dignity and the rights of the individual.

These same observers, however, are in the forefront of urging increased trade with Communist China and the Soviet Union. In those instances where they are willing to agree that these Communist governments are in fact dictatorships which deprive their people of elementary rights, they argue that trade will help to open these closed societies.

Thus given two forms of government different from our own, Rhodesia, on the one hand, and Communist governments, on the other, they urge a boycott of Rhodesia and an end to all restrictions with regard to Communist states.

What they forget, of course, is that the two cases are not comparable. The Soviet Union, for example, is challenging us in the Middle East, in the Indian Ocean, and in the North Atlantic. Trade with a government whose goal is world domination affects our own interests in a far different way from trade with a self-contained government such as that of Rhodesia.

Discussing this double standard, editor Robert Bleiberg of Barron's notes that:

While boycotting Rhodesia . . . the U.S. is briskly extending the hand of friendship, not to mention offers of tangible financial aid, to two of the bloodiest tyrannies in the history of mankind. You can't do business with Smith but you can subsidize Kosygin, Brezhnev and Mao.

By boycotting Rhodesian chrome in the past, the United States has been forced to pay exorbitant prices to the only other major producer, the Soviet Union. Mr. Bleiberg points out that:

After the imposition of U.N. sanctions, the price of imported chromite soared from \$33 a ton to \$72, to the pleasure and profit of the Kremlin . . . sanctions cost U.S. consumers of stainless steel an estimated \$100 million per annum.

The Department of State argues that sanctions were imposed upon Rhodesia because:

American policy rests on the basic principles of self-determination and majority rule.

Mr. Bleiberg responds that:

The explanation must have impressed billions of disenfranchised, hopeless people throughout Latin America, Asia, and Africa, not to mention the Soviet Union . . . What a shame!

I wish to share this editorial, which appeared in Barron's of May 29, 1972, with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

DOUBLE STANDARD—FOGGY BOTTOM IS ACTING SHAMEFULLY TOWARD RHODESIA

(By Robert M. Bleiberg)

Annual meeting time has come and nearly gone, bringing its customary quota of criti-

cism from the floor and leaving its fair share of bruised executive egos. In sharp contrast to last year or the one before, this season in the main has been a relatively tranquil affair, with confrontations few and far between, riot and civil commotion conspicuously absent. Here and there, however, estimates of sales and earnings, no matter how rosy, have taken second place to angry protests. Thus, at the annual meeting of Union Carbide Corp., Chairman F. Perry Wilson disclosed that profits in the first quarter had increased 14%, and voiced confidence that the company "will make solid progress in 1972." Nonetheless, dissident stockholders took management to task for "corporate offenses ranging from its activities in southern Africa to executive campaign contributions," while "a group of about 30 chanting demonstrators marched in front of company headquarters, protesting Union Carbide's recent importation of 26,000 tons of Rhodesian chrome." Mr. Wilson got off easier than his opposite number at Foote Mineral Co., whose annual meeting at the Barclay Hotel in Philadelphia drew a contingent of 50 pickets, which, in between denunciations of the company for dealing with white supremacists, "danced and sang to the sound of African bongo drums."

On Capitol Hill, which usually marches to a different drum, both Congressmen and Senators lately have taken up the beat. Negro members of the House of Representatives, organized into a so-called Black Caucus, have publicly called for the destruction of American property in Rhodesia and South Africa and the violent overthrow of their racist regimes. Pending that happy outcome, Reps. Shirley Chisholm (D., N.Y.), John Conyers Jr. (D., Mich.), Ronald Dellums (D., Calif.), Charles Diggs (D., Mich.), Charles Rangel (D., N.Y.) and Louis Stokes (D., Ohio)—together with various church groups and the outlawed Zimbabwe African National Union—have brought suit in U.S. District Court seeking an injunction against the use of chrome ore shipped from Rhodesia to these shores by Foote Mineral and Union Carbide. Meanwhile, in the upper chamber, Senators Gale McGee (D., Wyo.) and Edward Kennedy (D., Mass.), with the blessings of the State Department, are pushing the repeal of last year's Byrd Amendment, which made such imports legal.

Fanaticism, said George Santayana, is redoubling one's effort while losing sight of one's aim, but the radical left is something else. For nearly half a century, despite compelling evidence to the contrary, it has proclaimed the innocence of Sacco and Vanzetti, anarchists and convicted killers, and, with equally ruthless disregard of proven fact, has launched a campaign to whitewash the Rosenbergs and Alger Hiss. By the same token, the fanatical war on Rhodesia is longer on ideology than on respect for truth. By trading with Rhodesia, charged the leader of the demonstration against Foote Mineral, the U.S. "has saved Ian Smith's government from economic disaster." In truth, thanks to the widespread flouting of United Nations' sanctions, notably by neighboring Zambia and other black African states, Rhodesia for the past half-decade has flourished. More to the point, by repealing the Byrd Amendment, Congress would deliberately reimpose a financial burden on both producers and consumers of stainless steel (which requires chrome) and once again make this country heavily dependent upon the Soviet Union for a vital raw material. Finally, while boycotting Rhodesia—only strategic products are free of the general ban—for its repugnant form of government (which, in U.N. eyes, at any rate, constitutes a "threat to peace"), the U.S. is briskly extending the hand of friendship, not to mention offers of tangible financial aid, to two of the bloodiest tyrannies in the history of mankind. You can't do business with Smith, but you can subsidize Kosygin, Brezhnev and Mao.

Armed with this double standard, the U.S. for years has been waging economic warfare on Rhodesia. Pursuant to a resolution of the U.N. Security Council in December 1966 (reaffirmed and strengthened in May 1968), President Lyndon Johnson by Executive Order imposed sanctions on that country, violations of which are punishable by fines of \$10,000 and prison sentences up to ten years. (In the first case of the kind, five defendants recently pleaded guilty to violating the embargo by supplying ammonia to a Rhodesian fertilizer plant—some crime against humanity!) Under the Nixon Administration, things continued in the same ugly vein until last fall, when Senator Harry F. Byrd Jr. (D. Va.) succeeded in amending the military procurement authorization bill, to permit, in effect, the importation of Rhodesian chrome and other "strategic and critical raw materials." Since then, to the outrage of the Black Caucus and corporate pickets, shipments totaling fifty thousand tons have landed in the U.S., and efforts to repeal the Byrd Amendment have redoubled. Last week's collapse of the tentative agreement between Her Majesty's Government and Salisbury, based on findings that the black majority disapproved of its terms, doubtless will intensify the drive.

As an economic weapon—here Santayana's definition applies—the international embargo has been a joke. Since Rhodesia's Declaration of Independence in 1965, production and trade have risen by 10% per year. This is how Salisbury looked a few months ago to Ray Vicker, chief European correspondent of The Wall Street Journal: "Japanese, French, German and Italian businessmen are encountered in hotel lobbies here. Hertz' Rhodesian outlets offer Japanese-made Toyotas for rent, while Avis competes with German-made BMWs. Liquor stores carry stocks of British gin and choice Scotch. Italian shoes are popular with Rhodesian women, while French wines are found at top hostels. . . . Rhodesia's manufacturing industries have expanded to provide many products that were formerly imported. Manufacturing expanded 12.5% in 1970 from 1969, and probably will show an increase of around 8% this year. 'We can continue to get by indefinitely, if we have to,' says one Rhodesian sanctions buster, who travels the world negotiating agreements for Rhodesian exports and imports."

Until last fall, moreover, the joke was on this country, which wound up paying an exorbitant price for chrome mined in the Soviet Union (or, there is reason to suspect, merely transshipped via Moscow from Rhodesian mines). After the imposition of U.N. sanctions, the price of imported chromite soared from \$33 a ton to \$72, to the pleasure and profit of the Kremlin, which, like the most rapacious capitalist, charged whatever the traffic would bear. Hence according to the American Iron and Steel Institute, sanctions cost U.S. consumers of stainless steel an estimated \$100 million per annum and domestic producers, faced with mounting competition from foreign industry which enjoyed access to cheaper raw materials, a large chunk of their market. (Since the embargo was lifted, by the way, Russian ore prices have dropped sharply.) To add insult to injury, some of the "legal" Russian chrome—to judge by results of sophisticated chemical analysis performed by Crucible Steel, which found that the titanium content of ore from the Soviet Union differed markedly from that of Rhodesia—probably had its origins in racist mines. According to one State Department spokesman: "Occasionally we have heard of Russian ships docked in Africa to pick up Rhodesian chromite, but verification has proved this not to be the case." Trust Foggy Bottom to try to prove a negative.

So much for the dollars and sense. As to the legality of the Byrd Amendment, the controversy, as noted, has landed in the courts,

where a U.S. District Court judge has refused to issue a preliminary injunction against Foote Mineral and Union Carbide. Plaintiffs doubtless will appeal to higher authority. However, at least one eminent lawyer, the late Dean Acheson, had no doubts as to the illegality of the embargo. In a memorable address before the American Bar Association in 1968, he stated: "It would surprise some of our fellow citizens, though hardly anyone here, to learn that the United States is engaged in an international conspiracy, instigated by Britain and blessed by the United Nations, to overthrow the government of a country that has done us no harm and threatens no one . . . (this is) barefaced aggression, unprovoked and unjustified, by a single legal or moral principle." Why was Rhodesia, alone among nations, singled out as a threat to world peace? The State Department in 1969 offered a reason: "American policy on Rhodesia rests on the basic principles of self-determination and majority rule." The explanation must have impressed billions of disenfranchised, hopeless people throughout Latin America, Asia and Africa, not to mention the Soviet Union, upon which the Nixon Administration is eagerly preparing to lavish most-favored-nation treatment and subsidized credits. What a shame!

WEST POINT DURING THE ERA OF LINCOLN

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual that I get invited to places where we talk about Abraham Lincoln and I did get invited to hear Maj. Gen. Roland Gleszer who spoke to the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia on May 18.

His remarks are informative and worthwhile for all who are interested in Lincoln and especially for those who are interested in American history and I am glad to have this opportunity to place them in the RECORD where they may be read by all who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Major General Gleszer's remarks follow:

WEST POINT DURING THE ERA OF LINCOLN

At the outset, I should admit to you my anxiety when I first began to assemble my notes for these remarks today. It is difficult to find a topic which has direct bearing on the Lincoln era, yet one which also has impact upon the affairs of today. This problem was compounded by the divergence of opinion that exists about Lincoln and the Civil War times.

After my research, I am sure that there must be more historians of the Civil War than there were generals fighting in it. And of these two groups, the historians are undoubtedly the more belligerent. In defending their favorite heroes, they occupy positions as resolutely as ever did General Grant, and in developing their cases, they fight with a gusto reminiscent of George Custer. Because of this, I feel compelled not to deal with personalities *per se*, but rather with institutions, specifically, those that were present during the time of Lincoln and have existed through the present.

There are two institutions about which I can lay some claim to expertise. The first, is the institution of marriage; but, I make it a habit to leave all comments about that in-

stitution to my wife. The second, by background and experience, is the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, an institution whose role during the Civil War and after has been an important one, both to the Army and to this country.

So both by elimination and inclination, I developed my topic for today—West Point during the era of Lincoln.

Over the years, I have seen the United States Military Academy from many perspectives . . . as a cadet, as a colonel commanding a cadet regiment and as a father of a West Pointer. From this exposure, I have drawn one vivid and significant impression, that being this: For many years, the academy has enjoyed an unparalleled respect and support from the American people. Regardless of the political climate at any given time, the grassroots popular faith in the dignity and worth of West Point has remained high, and virtually unshakable.

As a cadet, I was often told that, in terms of popular image, cadets ranked with generals. As an officer, I quickly learned the validity of this comment. Going from cadet to officer was, in a paradoxical sense, both a demotion in image and a promotion in rank.

Now . . . what is the genesis of this emotional and what might be considered an irrational popularity? What were the factors that generated such support? Exactly where did it begin?

It developed as a direct result of the American civil war experience . . .

With the aid of history and with your indulgence, it is this thesis that I will expand today.

Things had not always been good for the academy. The 1830's and 1840's, especially, were not good years.

During this period as a result of the historical American reliance upon militia forces and a corresponding traditional distrust of standing armies, West Point had come under repeated attack. The Jacksonians assaulted the academy on both philosophical and financial grounds, claiming that its very existence was contrary to democratic concepts. Within the public mind, a very real doubt existed about the wisdom of having an academy.

With the election of Van Buren, the academy enjoyed a brief respite. But, the situation still remained "touch and go" for West Point and its survival as a national institution. In fact, the academy was very nearly disestablished in 1845.

But on the horizon loomed a confrontation which would alter the nation's attitude toward the academy. After skirmishing broke out along the Rio Grande, President Polk, on 11 May 1846, demanded a declaration of war against Mexico. After 30 years of peace, years in which West Point had graduated more than 1,000 officers, the academy got its first real test—that of the battlefield.

The war and the accomplishments of its graduates brought West Point, in the 1850's, a decade of development. The faculty was excellent. The academy was the foremost engineering school in the nation. Robert E. Lee became the school's ninth superintendent. Jefferson Davis, a West Point graduate, was the secretary of war in the cabinet of President Franklin Pierce.

But still there was no great ground swell of popular grassroots enthusiasm for the Academy. It would take the Civil War to develop West Point as a living legend.

The Civil War was a West Pointer's fight. In 55 of the 60 biggest battles, West Point graduates commanded both armies, in the remaining 5, a West Pointer commanded one of the opposing armies. These men knew how to train and administer troops, and as a rule they were highly intelligent. But, most importantly, they possessed the vital strengths of leadership and integrity, strengths forged by the environment of West Point.

It should be emphasized, that before 1861

few had had any actual experience in managing large numbers of troops. Not one had controlled a unit as large as a brigade and only a few had ever handled a regiment. Except for a few men who had visited Europe, the men who would lead the opposing armies in the Civil War had never seen a force larger than the 14,000 men of Winfield Scott in the Mexican War. And, this group had been only captains and lieutenants. In the Civil War, however, they were called upon to serve in the highest positions of command. In fact, Sherman confessed that his first studies of large unit tactics were made for the first time in the days prior to Bull Run.

Yet, learn they did. They proved their ability to both apply their lessons and extrapolate from their knowledge. And, as in many other wars that have been fought, the battlefield proved to be a demanding school.

The war, in addition to placing the Academy's graduates in difficult situations, also, forced the Academy as an institution into an awkward and precarious position.

As a result of the secession, a total of 286 West Pointers, including 65 cadets, had opted for the Confederacy. Although the total was by no means overwhelming, Southerners had long dominated the critical posts within the army and a loss of so many key officers panicked the civilian leaders in Washington.

This anxiety developed into an attack upon the Academy itself. In a report that was issued the first of January 1861, Secretary of War Cameron, stated "the large disaffection has excited the most profound astonishment and naturally provokes inquiry as to its cause."

President Lincoln himself, echoed similar sentiments in a message given on the 4th of July 1861: "It is worthy of note that in this Government's hour of trial, large numbers of those in the Army and Navy who have been favored as officers have resigned and proved false to the hand which had pampered them."

These early comments of the President have been attributed by many to his personal experience as a Militia captain during the Blackhawk War. But regardless of origin, the impact of his comments was felt. The dismay of many West Pointers was compounded by the fact that the critics seemed ignorant of the fact that many southern born graduates had remained loyal to the Union.

But . . . as the war progressed, Lincoln's respect for the Academy and for the quality of the men it produced grew. As Commander in Chief, he could see the necessity and worth of having a corps of trained professionals upon whom the burden of the war could be placed. To Lincoln the politician, the value of having a professional and fundamentally nonpolitical military during a time of crisis was also evident.

Another factor that Lincoln admired in the men of West Point, both of the North and the South . . . was, their inherent sense of brotherhood, a feeling that Lincoln himself hoped to maintain within the Nation as a whole, despite the divisions of war.

I would like to recount a few incidents, drawn from Fleming's "The Men and Times of West Point," that are indicative of the spirit that existed between men of both sides, especially those entrusted with responsibilities of high level command. They are symbolic of the sense of humanity and the recognition of common ties that existed.

One such story concerns General Custer and his old friend Col. Tom Rosser. In his reckless daring, Custer found himself charging the Confederate cavalry commanded by Rosser. One day in the full view of the northern sharpshooters, Rosser threw back his red lined cape and boldly reconnoitered the enemy lines. Custer, riding up and down his line, hastily ordered everyone to hold their fire. The next day, under a flag of truce, Custer sent Rosser this message: "Tom, do

not expose yourself so. Yesterday I could have killed you."

Even Grant, the relentless pursuer, never forgot that he was fighting men who had been his classmates and friends. The story is recounted of the evening when Grant sent scouts forward to determine why the men of George Pickett's division were burning so many campfires. When the scouts returned and informed Grant that the fires were in honor of Pickett's newborn son, Grant ordered answering bonfires to be made. A few days later under a flag of truce, a baby's silver service was delivered to Gen. Pickett, engraved: "To George Pickett, Jr., from his father's friend, Ulysses S. Grant."

The ultimate example of this appreciation of comradeship is engrained in the humanitarian terms of surrender dictated at Appomattox. When Walt Whitman heard the conditions of this surrender he declared: "Affection shall solve the problems of freedom yet." Without a doubt, his tribute had been earned in part by West Pointers, both of the North and the South.

In some respects, this spirit of Appomattox died with Lincoln. The Nation began the long and bitter road of reconstruction—a time in which wounds did not heal, and a time in which bitterness remained. But among West Pointers, reconciliation remained not only a hope but a reality. Grant entertained Longstreet in his home, and in one of his first official acts as President, granted Longstreet a position as surveyor of customs in New Orleans. It was this desire for reconciliation that prompted several West Pointers to form an association of graduates, an organization which launched an all out effort to recruit southerners back into the Armed Forces of the Nation. As early as 1868, young men from the Southern States were once again admitted to the Military Academy.

IF ALIVE LINCOLN WOULD HAVE APPROVED

In summary, the Lincoln era was a time of challenge and testing for West Point. The academy had survived the attacks of the Jacksonian years. It had shown itself equal to the tasks of the Mexican War, and it had emerged as a corps of young and professional officers upon whom the Nation could count. The Academy had been a place where men could grow and dream, but when the dreams were shattered by the advent of war, the sense of brotherhood remained, adding humanity to the conflict and a hope of reconciliation in the years that followed.

But more important than any other factor, the Academy had come of age and had proved itself in the eyes of the Nation. By their accomplishments, its graduates had forged a tradition of sacrifice, and a reputation for integrity upon which the Academy draws to this day. It found a lasting place in the hearts and minds of the American people.

Thank you.

DEATH OF JOHN PAUL VANN

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the death of John Paul Vann is a tragic loss for the United States and Vietnam. No one could have been more dedicated to the program with which he was charged than Mr. Vann—he devoted his every effort and hour to providing all possible avenues for the security and self-determination of the Vietnamese people, for whom he had deep affection. However, his chief motivation came from the fact

that he was a deeply patriotic American who was convinced of the importance of us and to the world of the great effort we were making in Southeast Asia.

I will always be glad that I had the privilege of knowing John Paul Vann—when I was in Vietnam in 1970, he was working primarily in the Delta area. Nothing was too difficult or too dangerous for him to undertake, and at that time that particular area was the "hot spot" of the country. The success of the Vietnamization program there now is notable, and it is largely due to his tireless and fearless efforts.

He believed utterly and completely in the importance and necessity of his job, which he did with a single-minded purpose which resulted in concrete achievements. Certainly, the phrase, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant" could not be more deserved by or better fitted to any man than to John Paul Vann.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT SHOWS SOVIET UNION SYSTEMATICALLY VIOLATED 45 PRIOR AGREEMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL TREATIES

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, certainly we are all hopeful that the recent disarmament treaty signed by the United States and Russia will mark a real beginning of disarmament. However, a review of various international agreements and treaties with the Communist Government of the Soviet Union points to a history of flagrant violations and breaches of faith.

A report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee dated September 27, 1961, is one of the most startling documents citing the "grim record of the Soviet Union" in international relations. The report cites 45 specific Soviet violations of international treaties and agreements.

This study is very timely in the light of the recent negotiations and agreements between the United States and U.S.S.R. While we all support the efforts of the President in this area, it is our earnest prayer that history does not again repeat itself. But, upon the record, one's faith is shattered.

Because of the interest of the Congress and the American people in this subject, I insert this report in the RECORD:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE SOVIET UNION IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

I. SOVIET VIOLATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS

In war never tie your hands with considerations of formality. It is ridiculous not to know the history of war, not to know that a treaty is the means of gaining strength. . . . The history of war shows as clearly as clear can be that the signing of a treaty after defeat is a means of gaining strength. . . . Yes, of course, we are violating the [Brest-Litovsk] treaty; we have violated it thirty or forty times.—Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, pp. 301, 309.

A diplomat's words must have no relation to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy

is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood.—Stalin, *Works*, Vol. II, p. 277.

A. Germany

The Soviet Union has systematically and flagrantly violated the wartime and postwar agreements concluded by the Allies to govern the administration of the occupation and rehabilitation of Germany. In addition to violating those parts of the agreements which were designed to ensure the peaceful, democratic, and balanced economic development of all Germany, the USSR has persistently sought to terminate unilaterally the rights of the Western Allies which resulted from the victory over Nazi Germany and which were formalized in numerous agreements concluded with the Soviet Government.

1. Democracy

The Potsdam Protocol of August 1, 1945 and subsequent decisions by the Allied Control Council guaranteed certain fundamental personal and political freedoms to the German people.

a. "The judicial system will be reorganized in accordance with the principles of democracy, of justice under law, and of equal rights for all citizens without distinction of race, nationality or religion." (Potsdam Protocol, II, 8)

b. "Subject to the necessity for maintaining military security, freedom of speech, press and religion shall be permitted, and religious institutions shall be respected. Subject likewise to the maintenance of military security, the formation of free trade unions shall be permitted." (Potsdam Protocol, II, 10)

These basic human freedoms have been consistently and flagrantly violated by the Soviet Union. The legal system was put on a political basis and thousands of people in the Soviet Zone were arrested and deported to the USSR or sent to concentration camps.

There is no freedom of speech or of the press in the Soviet Zone, and freedom of religion has been greatly limited, as in the USSR. Education has been subordinated to communist aims and principles. Soviet military forces cooperated with the East German regime in putting down the uprisings and strikes which occurred in June 1953. Until it was stopped by force, the flow of refugees escaping from the Eastern Zone gave evidence of the continuing denial of basic human freedoms to the people of East Germany.

c. "So far as is practicable, there shall be uniformity of treatment of the German population throughout Germany." (Potsdam Protocol, II, 2)

The Soviet-controlled East German authorities in June 1952 began an extensive program aimed at the complete isolation of the East German population from contact with the West and particularly with the population of West Germany. Soviet actions included closure of the interzonal frontier and prohibitions of visits of West Germans to the Soviet Zone except by special permits. The USSR created a 5-kilometer blocked zone along the frontier from which a substantial portion of the population, including entire villages, was forcibly evacuated. In Berlin carefully controlled traffic from the Soviet sector to the Western sectors continued until August, 1961, when the East German regime closed the Berlin sector border as tightly as the interzonal frontier.

d. Free exchange of printed matter and films was authorized in all occupation zones of Germany and Berlin. (Control Council Directive No. 55, June 25, 1947)

Soviet authorities have repeatedly barred from the Soviet Zone or Soviet sector of Berlin such materials originating in other zones.

e. "Local self-government shall be restored throughout Germany on democratic principles. . . ." (Potsdam Protocol, II, 9, 1)

f. "All democratic political parties with rights of assembly and of public discussion shall be allowed and encouraged throughout Germany." (Potsdam Protocol, II, 9, ii)

g. "The purposes of the occupation of Germany . . . are to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of German political life on a democratic basis and for eventual peaceful cooperation in international life by Germany." (Potsdam Protocol, II, 3, iv)

In April 1946 the Soviet authorities forced the merger of the Socialist Party of Germany with the Communist Party of Germany, forming the SED or Socialist Unity Party, with the aim of "capturing" the Socialist voters of Berlin and the East Zone. In June 1947 the Soviets "vetoed" the election of Ernst Reuter as Governing Mayor of Berlin and installed their representatives in the police who, operating under Soviet orders, openly defied the legally-elected Berlin government. On June 23, 1948, the Soviets ordered the SED to carry out riots around the City Hall of Berlin and brought the demonstrators to the scene in Russian Army trucks.

In East Germany the so-called German Democratic Republic was established in October 1949 by Soviet order, without prior discussion or free elections. The regime's first elections were held in 1950 under the "bloc-party" system and the National Front, a communist cover organization. In 1952, the USSR refused to grant entry into East Berlin and East Germany of a UN commission to investigate whether there were conditions conducive to free elections.

2. Economic Question

The Potsdam Protocol of August 1, 1945 provided for the treatment of Germany as a single economic unit, envisaged the equitable distribution of essential commodities between the various zones and limited excessive reparations.

a. "During the period of occupation Germany shall be treated as a single economic unit." (Potsdam Protocol, II, 14)

b. "To this end common policies shall be established in regard to . . . import and export programs for Germany as a whole . . . reparation and removal of industrial war potential, transportation and communications." (Potsdam Protocol, II, 14)

c. "Allied controls shall be imposed upon the German economy but only to the extent necessary . . . to ensure in the manner determined by the Control Council equitable distribution of essential commodities between the several zones so as to produce a balanced economy throughout Germany and reduce the need for imports." (Potsdam Protocol, II, 15)

On April 5, 1946, in the Allied Control Council's Economic Directorate, the Soviet Union stated that each zone should be responsible for its own trade. The USSR thereafter consistently refused to make a common import-export plan workable by submitting a plan for its own zone, even though the Control Council, on September 20, 1945, had approved the establishment of a common program.

d. "Payment of reparations should leave enough resources to enable the German people to subsist without external assistance." (Potsdam Protocol, II, 19)

e. ". . . industrial capital equipment . . . should be removed from the Western Zones of Germany in exchange for an equivalent value of food, coal, potash, zinc, timber, clay products, petroleum products, and such other commodities as may be agreed upon." (Potsdam Protocol, III, 4, a)

The USSR exploited and drained German resources in a manner not authorized by the Potsdam Protocol, took large amounts of reparations from current production, and absorbed a substantial part of German industry in the Soviet Zone into Soviet state-owned concerns. Although the United States had made 11,100 tons of reparations equip-

ment available to the USSR by August 1, 1946, the Soviet Union did not live up to its agreement to ship goods in return to the Western zones of Germany.

The result of the Soviet violations of the agreement on reparations and the USSR's refusal to treat Germany as an economic unit was that the United States and the United Kingdom were obliged to give financial support to their zones in Germany to maintain a minimum economy. In effect, the United States, in shipping reparations to the Soviet Union while supporting its own zone to make up deficiencies caused by Soviet violations of the Potsdam Protocol, was permitting the USSR to collect reparations from the United States itself, rather than from Germany.

f. German external assets in Finland, Eastern Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria and Rumania were to be vested in the German External Property Commission. (Control Council Law No. 5, October 30, 1945)

The USSR directly appropriated German external assets in these countries without unvesting and assignment by the German External Property Commission.

g. In conformity with Paragraph 14 of the Potsdam Protocol, quadripartite legislation was enacted to provide tax uniformity and stabilization of wages in all zones. (Control Council Laws Nos. 12, February 11, 1946, and 61, December 19, 1947; Control Council Directive No. 14, October 12, 1945)

Soviet authorities permitted the *Land* governments of Brandenburg and Saxony-Anhalt to grant partial tax exemptions to large groups of wage and salary earners in violation of this legislation. This move was intended to stop the exodus of skilled workers to the western zones, to encourage qualified workers to take jobs in Soviet-owned factories, and to make propaganda claims about improved living standards of Soviet Zone workers.

3. Demilitarization

On repeated occasions during and after the war, the USSR agreed the demilitarization of Germany should be one of the cardinal aims of the occupation.

a. "The purposes of the occupation of Germany . . . are the complete disarmament and demilitarization of Germany . . ." (Potsdam Protocol, II, 3)

b. "All armed forces of Germany or under German control . . . shall be completely disarmed. . . . Detachments of civil police to be armed with small arms only, for the maintenance of order and for guard duties, will be designated by the Allied Representatives." (Declaration Regarding Defeat of Germany, June 5, 1945, Art. 2)

c. "All forms of military training, military propaganda and military activities of whatever nature, on the part of the German people are prohibited, as well as the formation of any organization initiated to further any aspect of military training and the formation of war veterans' organizations or other groups which might develop military characteristic or which are designed to carry on the German military tradition, whether such organizations or groups purport to be political, educational, religious, social, athletic or recreational or of any other nature." (Four Power Agreement on Additional Requirements to be Imposed on Germany, September 20, 1945, Section I, Paragraph 2)

In 1948 Soviet authorities began building up a sizable "police force" in the Soviet Zone. On May 23, 1950, the United States protested to the USSR against the remilitarization of the Soviet Zone, calling attention to the fact that some 40,000 to 50,000 men in so-called "Police Alert Units" were receiving basic infantry, artillery and armored training, and were equipped with Soviet military weapons.

By the end of 1953 the Soviet Zone had a "police force" of 100,000 men, supplemented by an additional 140,200 military personnel, including three mechanized divisions and an

air force. By June 1959 East German military and paramilitary forces totaled more than 700,000 men.

In violation of the four-power occupation status of Berlin the USSR has allowed the presence of East German paramilitary units and armament factories in East Berlin. Military parades have taken place annually on May Day in East Berlin. These violations were carried out during a period when the USSR itself still acknowledged the continuation of the four-power occupation status of Berlin. Until August 1961, the USSR had denied the existence of the four-power status of Berlin only during three brief periods in 1948, 1952, and 1958. Each time it reversed its position in response to strong western objections. Finally on August 13, 1961, East German armed forces, in flagrant violation of the quadripartite status of Berlin, entered Berlin and participated in the illegal closing of the border between the Soviet and Western sectors of the city.

4. Allied Occupation of Germany

In violation of wartime and postwar agreements, the Soviet Union has sought to destroy the organs established for the occupation of Germany and to deny to the Western Allies their rights stemming from the military conquest of Germany.

a. ". . . supreme authority in Germany will be exercised, on instructions from their Governments, by the Soviet, British, United States, and French Commanders-in-Chief, each in his own zone of occupation, and also jointly in matters affecting Germany as a whole. The four Commanders-in-Chief will together constitute the Control Council." (Four Power statement on control machinery in Germany, June 5, 1945, Paragraph 1)

On March 20, 1948, the Soviet commander unilaterally adjourned a meeting of the Council and abruptly walked out, thereby precipitating a rupture of its operations.

b. "The administration of the 'Greater Berlin' area will be directed by an Inter-Allied Governing Authority, which will operate under the general direction of the Control Council and will consist of four Commandants, each of whom will serve in rotation as Chief Commandant." (Four Power Statement on Control Machinery in Germany, June 5, 1945, Paragraph 7)

On June 16, 1948, the Soviet representative walked out of a meeting of the Inter-Allied Governing Authority (*Kommandatura*). On July 1, 1948, Soviet authorities announced that they would no longer participate in any meetings. These acts finally destroyed the quadripartite control machinery of Berlin.

c. [Occupation of Berlin will be carried out] . . . in accordance with arrangements between the respective commanders, including in these arrangements simultaneous movement of the national garrisons into Greater Berlin and provision of free access by air, road, and rail from Frankfurt and Bremen to Berlin for United States forces." (Letter of the President of the United States to Soviet Premier Stalin of June 14, 1945, to which Stalin replied on June 18, 1945: "On our part all necessary measures will be taken in Germany and Austria in accordance with the above stated plan.")

The Soviets imposed rail and road restrictions on Allied traffic to Berlin from the Western zones on April 1, 1948. The Allies inaugurated a "little airlift" which was expanded to a full airlift on June 26, 1948, two days after the Soviets imposed a total blockade. On July 1, 1948, the Soviet Chief of Staff of the USSR delegation to the Inter-Allied Governing Authority told his British, French, and American counterparts that four-power administration of Berlin no longer existed.

d. "All the restrictions imposed since March 1, 1948, by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on communications, transportation, and trade between Berlin and the Western zones of Germany

and between the Eastern zone and the Western zones will be removed on May 12, 1949." (Quadrupartite Agreement, New York, May 4, 1949, Paragraph 1)

e. "... in order to improve and supplement this and other arrangements and agreements as regards the movement of persons and goods and communications between the Eastern zone and the Western zone and between the zones and Berlin and also in regard to transit, the occupation authorities, each in his own zone, will have an obligation to take the measures necessary to insure the normal functioning and utilization of rail, water, and road transport for such movement of persons and goods and such communications by post, telephone, and telegraph." (Council of Foreign Ministers Communiqué, Paris, June 20, 1949, Paragraph 5)

On September 20, 1955, the USSR transferred to the East German regime control over road, railroad and air traffic in and out of Berlin in violation of the 1949 agreement. In December 1955, the Soviets threatened to interrupt the Berlin barge service, and higher tolls were levied on barges bound for Berlin in May 1958. Since January 13, 1950, the Soviet authorities have intermittently interfered with traffic between Berlin and Western Germany. On August 13, 1961 East German authorities put into effect several measures which had the effect of limiting, to a degree approaching complete prohibition, passage from the Soviet sector to the Western sectors of the city. These measures accompanied the closing of the sector boundary by a sizable deployment of police forces and by military detachments brought into Berlin for this purpose. This was a flagrant, and particularly serious, violation of the quadrupartite status of Berlin and freedom of movement within that city guaranteed by the Quadrupartite Agreement of New York of May 4, 1949 and by the decisions taken at Paris on June 20, 1949 by the Foreign Ministers of the Four Powers.

5. Prisoners of War

a. "German prisoners of war located in the territory of the Allied Powers and in all other territories will be returned to Germany on December 31, 1947." (Report of the Council of Foreign Ministers, April 23, 1947)

The Soviet Union reaffirmed this obligation in submitting its plan for repatriation on June 30, 1947. On January 3, 1949, the United States protested to the Soviet Union for its failure to furnish information on repatriation of war prisoners, noting that only 447,367 prisoners were known to have been repatriated out of the 890,532 war prisoners which Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov announced on March 12, 1947 were still in Soviet custody.

b. "... repatriation of war prisoners will be completed during 1949." (Soviet note of January 24, 1949.)

On May 5, 1952, the Soviet news agency TASS announced that the last group of German prisoners of war, numbering 17,538, had been repatriated. It added that 9,717 prisoners were still being held because they had been convicted of grave crimes and that in addition 3,815 were still being investigated. At this time it was estimated that the Soviet Government held more than 100,000 German prisoners, most of whom had been convicted on various pretexts to hard labor and were therefore no longer considered war prisoners. During the period from May 1950 to August 1955, some 11,000 German prisoners were released by the USSR, and following a special plea by the West German Government during the negotiations leading to the exchange of diplomatic representatives in September 1955, the Soviets released 11,000 additional prisoners. The Soviet Government has also refused to repatriate more than 100,000 German civilians deported during and after the war from East Germany and Eastern Europe. The United Nations Ad Hoc Commission on Prisoners of War reported in September 1957 that the Soviet Government had not

even replied to a request to discuss further the prisoner-of-war issue.

6. Eastern Frontiers

Both the Yalta Agreement and the Potsdam Protocol stipulated that final delimitation of the German-Polish frontier should await a peace settlement with Germany.

a. "... the final delimitation of the Western frontier of Poland should thereafter await the Peace Conference." (Yalta Agreement, VII)

b. "The three Heads of Government reaffirm their opinion that the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should await the peace settlement." (Potsdam Protocol, VIII, B)

Immediately after this pledge was made, the USSR in effect recognized the Oder-Neisse line as the German-Polish frontier, allowing the Soviet-controlled Lublin Polish Government to occupy the land and evacuate the Germans who had been living there. On July 6, 1950, the Soviet-controlled governments of Poland and East Germany signed an agreement recognizing the Oder-Neisse line, in violation of the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements.

B. The Baltic States¹

In direct violation of a series of treaties stretching over the entire interwar period from 1920 to 1939, the Soviet Union seized the Baltic countries of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the summer of 1940 and annexed them to the USSR.

1. The Peace Treaties

In 1920 the RSFSR² signed peace treaties with the Baltic states, recognizing their independence and defining the joint boundaries.

a. "... Russia unreservedly recognizes the independence and autonomy of the State of Estonia, and renounces voluntarily and forever all rights of sovereignty formerly held by Russia over the Estonian people. ..." (Estonia-RSFSR Treaty of Peace, Tartu, February 2, 1920, Art. II)

b. "... Russia recognizes without reservation the sovereign rights and independence of the Lithuanian state, with all the juridical consequences arising from such recognition, and voluntarily and for all time abandons all the sovereign rights of Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory." (Lithuania-RSFSR Treaty of Peace, Moscow, July 12, 1920, Art. I)

c. "... Russia unreservedly recognizes the independence and sovereignty of the Latvian state and voluntarily and irrevocably renounces all sovereign rights over the Latvian people and territory which formerly belonged to Russia. ..." (Latvia-RSFSR Treaty of Peace, Riga, August 11, 1920, Art. II)

2. Nonaggression Pacts

All the Baltic States signed nonaggression pacts with the Soviet Union, which were renewed periodically up until 1939.

a. "The Lithuanian Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics mutually pledge themselves to respect, in all circumstances, the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other. Each of the Contracting Parties pledges itself to abstain from any aggressive actions whatsoever against the other Party." (Lithuania-USSR Treaty of Nonaggression, Moscow, September 28, 1926, Arts. II, III)

By virtue of additional protocols signed May 6, 1931 and April 4, 1934, the life of this treaty was extended until December 31, 1945. It was flagrantly violated by the secret protocol concluded by the USSR with Nazi Germany on September 28, 1939 which stipulated that the territory of Lithuania fell within the Soviet sphere of influence and allowed

the USSR to "take special measures on Lithuanian territory to protect its interests."

b. "Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to refrain from any act of aggression directed against the other and also from any acts of violence directed against the territorial integrity and inviolability or the political independence of the other Contracting Party. ... Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes not to be a party to any military or political treaties, conventions or agreements directed against the independence, territorial integrity or political security of the other Party. ..." (Latvia-USSR Treaty of Nonaggression, Riga, February 5, 1932, Arts. II, III)

An additional protocol signed in Moscow on April 4, 1934 extended the life of this treaty until December 31, 1945. A secret protocol of the Nazi-Soviet Pact of August 23, 1939 stipulated that Latvia was to be considered within the Soviet sphere of interest, in direct violation of the Soviet-Latvian non-aggression treaty.

c. "Both High Contracting Parties mutually guarantee the inviolability of the frontiers existing between them and established in the Treaty of Peace signed on February 2, 1920, and undertake to refrain from any act of aggression against each other. ... Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes not to participate in any political agreements manifestly directed against the other Party in the sense of aggression. ..." (Estonia-USSR Treaty of Nonaggression, Moscow, May 4, 1932, Arts. I, II)

An additional protocol signed in Moscow on April 4, 1934 extended the life of this treaty until December 31, 1945. A secret protocol of the Nazi-Soviet Pact of August 23, 1939 stipulated that Estonia was to be considered within the Soviet sphere of interest, in direct violation of the Soviet-Estonian nonaggression treaty.

3. Renewed Soviet guarantees

On September 28, 1939, the Soviet Union compelled Estonia to sign a Treaty of Mutual Assistance. Latvia and Lithuania signed similar treaties on October 5 and 10, respectively. By the terms of these pacts, the USSR received leases on military bases and port installations and the right to maintain armed forces on the territories of the states concerned. At the same time, the Soviet Union guaranteed in these treaties the sovereignty of the Baltic States.

a. "The entry into force of this Pact shall in no way infringe upon the sovereign rights of the Contracting Parties, particularly their economic system and political structure." (Estonia-USSR Pact of Mutual Assistance, Moscow, September 28, 1939, Art. V)

b. "The entry into force of the present Pact must in no way affect the sovereign rights of the Contracting Parties, in particular their political structure, their economic and social system, and their military measures." (Latvia-USSR Pact of Mutual Assistance, Moscow, October 5, 1939, Art. V)

c. "Entry into force of this Pact shall not affect to any extent the sovereign rights of the Contracting Parties, in particular their state organization, economic and social systems, military measures and, in general, the principle of non-intervention in internal affairs." (Lithuania-USSR Treaty of Mutual Assistance, Moscow, October 10, 1939, Art. VII)

4. The Molotov Pledge

In a speech to the USSR Supreme Soviet on October 31, 1939, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov again guaranteed the sovereignty of the Baltic countries.

"We stand for the scrupulous and punctilious observance of the pacts on the basis of complete reciprocity and we declare that all the nonsensical talk about the Sovietization of the Baltic countries is only to the interest of our common enemies." (*Pravda*, November 1, 1939)

On June 15 and 16, 1940, Soviet troops

¹ See also sec. IV, A, pt. 3, p. 84.

² The RSFSR (Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic) was superseded by the USSR on December 30, 1922.

occupied Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. On July 21, the USSR forced the resignation of the governments of the three Baltic States and incorporated their territory into the USSR.

C. Finland

In direct violation of treaty obligations, the Soviet Union invaded Finland on November 30, 1939 without a declaration of war and attempted to establish a Soviet-controlled communist government in Finland, headed by former Comintern secretary Otto Kuusinen.

1. The Peace Treaty

By the Peace Treaty concluded on October 14, 1920, the Soviet Government recognized the independence and sovereignty of Finland.

"Whereas Finland declared its independence in 1917, and Russia has recognized the independence and the sovereignty of Finland within the frontiers of the Grand Duchy of Finland . . . the two powers shall mutually undertake to maintain, for the future, an attitude of peace and goodwill towards one another." (Finland-RSFSR Treaty of Peace, Dorpat, October 14, 1920, Preamble, Art. I)

2. The Nonaggression Treaty

The Nonaggression Treaty concluded on January 21, 1932 guaranteed the inviolability of Finnish territory.

"The High Contracting Parties mutually guarantee the inviolability of the frontiers existing between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Republic of Finland . . . and reciprocally undertake to refrain from any act of aggression directed against each other. Any act of violence attacking the integrity and inviolability of the territory or the political independence of the other High Contracting Party shall be regarded as an act of aggression, even if it is committed without declaration of war and avoids warlike manifestations." (Finland-USSR Treaty of Nonaggression, Helsinki, January 21, 1932, Arts. I, II)

By the Soviet-Finnish Protocol of April 7, 1934, this treaty was renewed until December 31, 1945. In October 1939, the Soviet Government presented to Finland a series of demands, including cession of territory and disarming of zones along the Finnish-Soviet border. The Finns were disinclined to accede to the Soviet "proposals" and negotiations reached a deadlock. On November 28, 1939, the USSR unilaterally abrogated the non-aggression pact and two days later invaded Finland without a declaration of war. Thirty Red Army divisions crossed the frontier. After heroic resistance against overwhelming odds, Finland capitulated and signed the Treaty of Peace of March 12, 1940. By its terms the USSR annexed the Karelian Isthmus and other Finnish territory.

D. Poland

In violation of Soviet treaty pledges of Polish sovereignty and territorial inviolability, Soviet troops invaded Poland in September 1939 in concert with German forces. The Soviet Union, in agreement with Nazi Germany, carried out the fourth partition of Poland. The pledges contained in the Yalta and Potsdam Protocols to establish a representative and democratic government in Poland after World War II were not adhered to by the USSR, which forced the Polish population to accept without free elections the Soviet-backed Lublin government.

1. Prewar Guarantees of Polish Sovereignty

The Soviet Union guaranteed Polish sovereignty and territorial inviolability in the Peace Treaty of 1921 and the Nonaggression Pact of 1932.

a. "Russia and the Ukraine abandon all rights and claims to the territories situated to the west of the frontier laid down by Article II of the present treaty. Each of the Contracting Parties mutually undertakes to respect in every way the political sovereignty

of the other Party, to abstain from interference in its internal affairs, and particularly to refrain from all agitation, propaganda or interference of any kind, and not to encourage any such movement." (Poland-RSFSR Treaty of Peace, Riga, March 18, 1921, Arts. III, V)

b. "The two Contracting Parties . . . undertake to refrain from taking any aggressive action against or invading the territory of the other Party, either alone or in conjunction with other powers. . . . Each of the Contracting Parties undertakes not to be a party to any agreement openly hostile to the other Party from the point of view of aggression." (Poland-USSR Pact of Nonaggression, Moscow, July 25, 1932, Arts. I, III)

By virtue of an additional protocol signed on May 5, 1934, the Nonaggression Pact was extended to December 31, 1945. An additional joint statement of November 26, 1938 reaffirmed adherence to the Nonaggression Pact. Despite these assurances, on September 17, 1939, the USSR invaded Poland and on September 29, 1939 the Soviet Union concluded a treaty with Nazi Germany partitioning Poland. Polish territory was incorporated into the USSR. The Soviet Government cynically explained its aggression in the following words: "The Polish State and its Government have virtually ceased to exist. Treaties concluded between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Poland have thereby lost their validity." On October 31, 1939, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov, speaking to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, in reporting the partition of Poland, bragged that, "a quick blow against Poland, first by the German Army and then by the Red Army, sufficed to leave nothing remaining of the ugly offspring of the Versailles Treaty."

2. Wartime Agreements

In 1941 the USSR signed agreements of mutual assistance with the Polish Government-in-Exile.

a. "The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recognizes the Soviet-German Treaties of 1939 as to territorial changes in Poland as having lost their validity. The two Governments mutually agree to render one another aid and support of all kinds in the present war against Hitlerite Germany." (Poland-USSR Agreement on War Cooperation, London, July 30, 1941, Preamble, Art. III)

In December 1941 the USSR organized a Moscow-dominated Polish Government in the Soviet Union, known later as the Polish Committee of National Liberation or the Lublin Government. On April 25, 1943, the USSR severed relations with the Polish Government-in-Exile, and on July 26, 1944, the USSR established diplomatic relations with the Lublin Government.

b. "Soldiers serving in the Polish army on the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall be subject to Polish military laws and regulations."

"The armament, equipment, clothing, mechanical transport, etc. for the army shall as far as possible be furnished: (a) by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics from its own stocks, (b) by the Government of the Polish Republic from supplies borrowed on the basis of the 'Lend and Lease' Bill. In this latter case the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall afford such help as is possible in the matter of transport. (Polish-Soviet Military Agreement, London, August 14, 1941)

The Soviets refused to give the promised rations and equipment to the Polish Army in the Soviet Union. The Polish troops under General Anders were finally evacuated to Iran. One of the most serious difficulties in forming the Polish Army resulted from the disappearance of 14,000-15,000 Polish officers known to have been in Soviet prisoner of war camps during the period of the Nazi-Soviet alliance. The bodies of 4,143 were

found by the Nazis in 1943 in mass graves outside Katyn, where they had been massacred by the Soviet NKVD.

3. Agreements on Postwar Status of Poland

In complete violation of the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements, which called for the creation of a broadly-based representative government sanctioned by free elections, the USSR proceeded to force the pro-Soviet, Moscow-directed Lublin Government on the Polish people.

a. "The Provisional Government which is now functioning in Poland should therefore be reorganized as a broader democratic basis with the inclusion of democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad. The Polish Provisional Government of National Unity shall be pledged to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot. In these elections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates." (Yalta Protocol, VII)

That the Soviet Union had little intention of observing this agreement became evident almost immediately, when on April 21, 1945, it concluded a formal treaty of alliance with the Lublin Government. The USSR did everything it could to hinder the participation of non-communist Polish leaders in the discussions in Moscow which were intended to reorganize the provisional Polish government. Sixteen prominent Polish leaders were arrested and imprisoned when they attempted to attend these sessions.

b. "The Three Powers note that the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity, in accordance with the decisions of the Crimea Conference, has agreed to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot in which all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and put forward candidates. . . ." (Potsdam Protocol, VIII, A)

The Polish Provisional Government was nominally a coalition, but in fact its key positions were occupied by pro-Soviet communists, who had established themselves during the period of "liberation" by the Red Army. Elections were postponed until January 19, 1947, in order to terrorize and eliminate the opposition. Of the 444 deputies elected to the Parliament in the elections, the Polish Peasant Party, which reportedly represented a large majority of the population, received only 28 seats. On January 5, 1947, the United States and the United Kingdom Governments requested the Soviet Government to join in approaching the Polish Government concerning the pledge of free elections contained in the Yalta and Potsdam Agreements. The Soviets refused. On January 28, 1947, the Department of State issued a press release stating that reports received from our Embassy in Poland immediately before and after the elections, based upon the observations of American officials, confirmed the fears of the United States Government that the elections would not be free.

E. Hungary

In violation of the Armistice Agreement, the Yalta and Potsdam Protocols, and the Peace Treaty with Hungary, the USSR refused to cooperate with the Allies in the rehabilitation of Hungary and installed a pro-Soviet government against the will of the Hungarian people and despite the protests of the Western Allies.

1. Occupation Arrangements

The Armistice Agreement and the Yalta and Potsdam Protocols provided for Allied cooperation in the establishment of democratic government in Hungary, sanctioned by free elections.

a. "For the whole period of the armistice there will be established in Hungary an Allied Control Commission which will regulate

and supervise the execution of the armistice terms under the chairmanship of the representative of the Allied (Soviet) High Command and with the participation of representatives of the United Kingdom and the United States." (Armistice with Hungary, Moscow, January 20, 1945, Art. 18)

The Soviet representative on the ACC (Allied Control Commission) for Hungary consistently acted unilaterally in the name of the ACC without consultation or notice to his American and British colleagues, thus denying them any semblance of effective participation in the work of the ACC.

b. "The Premier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and the President of the United States of America have consulted with each other in the common interests of the peoples of their countries and those of liberated Europe. They jointly declare their mutual agreement to concert during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe the policies of their three governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems. . . . The three governments will jointly assist the people in any European liberated state . . . to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment through free elections of governments responsive to the will of the people . . ." (Declaration on Liberated Europe, Yalta Agreement, II)

In violation of the agreement, the USSR, acting through the Hungarian Communist Party and its own agencies and armed forces in Hungary, established a totalitarian regime contrary to the desires of the population. In June 1946 General Sviridov, Deputy Soviet Chairman of the ACC, without consulting the United States and United Kingdom ACC representatives, dissolved Catholic youth organizations. The Soviet Government rejected repeated United States proposals to join in tripartite examination of Hungary's economic problems and unilaterally imposed discriminatory economic agreements, including the establishment of joint Soviet-Hungarian companies. In February 1947 Soviet military police arrested Bela Kovacs, member of Parliament and former secretary general of the Smallholders Party. In May-June 1947 General Sviridov precipitated a political crisis enabling the Communist minority to force the resignation of Prime Minister Nagy.

c. "The three Governments agreed that the revision of the procedures of the Allied Control Commissions in these countries would now be undertaken, taking into account the interests and responsibilities of the three Governments which together presented the terms of armistice to the respective countries, and accepting as a basis, in respect of all three countries, the Soviet Government's proposals for Hungary as annexed hereto." (Potsdam Protocol, XI)

"During the period up to the conclusion of peace with Hungary the President (or Vice President) of the Allied Control Commission will regularly call conferences with the British and American representatives for the purpose of discussing the most important questions relating to the work of the Allied Control Commission. . . . Free movement by the American and British representatives in the country will be permitted. . . ." (Potsdam Protocol, Annex I, 1, 3)

Despite repeated requests, the USSR declined to discuss the revision of procedures for the Control Commissions as agreed at Potsdam. Instead, it continued to act unilaterally in the name of the Commissions in matters of substance without consultation

with, or notice to, the United States and United Kingdom members. For example:

(a) Instructions were issued by the Soviet High Command regarding the size of the Hungarian Army without consulting the British or United States representatives.

(b) Without the knowledge of the United States, the Soviet deputy chairman of the ACC ordered the Hungarian Government to disband certain Catholic youth organizations in June-July 1946. He also recommended dismissal of certain government officials.

(c) In the fall of 1946 and without consulting the Americans or British, the Soviet element of the ACC gave permission to form the Hungarian Freedom Party.

(d) Early in 1947 the Hungarian police were ordered by the Soviet chairman in the name of the Allied Control Commission to suppress the publication of Count Ciano's diary.

(e) In early 1947 the Soviet chairman stated he had personally given approval to the Hungarian Government to resume diplomatic relations with certain countries in the name of the Allied Control Commission and without prior discussion with the British or Americans.

(f) In May 1947 the ACC chairman refused the United States permission to visit Hungarian Army units.

(g) Soviet authorities refused to permit free movement of the American element of the Allied Control Commission (also applicable to Bulgaria).

(h) The Soviets refused to transmit to the American representative data on the arrest of Bela Kovacs by the Soviet Army.

2. The Peace Treaty

By the terms of the Hungarian Peace Treaty, disputes over the execution of the treaty not settled by diplomatic negotiations were to be referred to the heads of the United States, United Kingdom, and Soviet diplomatic missions in Budapest.

"Excepting those instances covered by a special procedure stipulated in the present Treaty, any dispute concerning the interpretation or execution of this Treaty which is not settled by diplomatic negotiations shall be referred to the Three Heads of Mission. . . ." (Hungarian Peace Treaty, February 10, 1947, Art. 40)

On May 31, 1949, the United States requested the United Kingdom and the USSR to hold a meeting of the three heads of mission in Budapest to settle the dispute over Hungarian noncompliance with article 2 of the treaty—the so-called human-rights clause. The Soviet Union, in its note of June 11, 1949, refused to participate in the meeting. A second United States note, delivered on June 30, 1949, expressed regret over the Soviet Union's disregard of the provisions of the treaty and asserted that the existence of a dispute between the United States and Hungary could not be questioned. In a memorandum dated July 19, 1949, the Soviet Union reaffirmed its contention that no basis existed for a meeting of the three heads of mission. Since that time the Soviet Union has consistently refused to participate in such a meeting.

3. The Hungarian Uprising

Proof of the anti-popular nature of the regime installed in Hungary by the USSR in violation of the Declaration on Liberated Europe (Yalta Protocol) was furnished by the anti-government revolt of October-November, 1956. The Soviet intervention and kidnapping of Hungarian Premier Imre Nagy violated the Charter of the United Nations, the Soviet Government pledge of October 30, 1956, and the assurances of safe conduct given to Nagy by the Kadar regime.

a. "We the peoples of the United Nations, determined . . . to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to

ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of economic and social advancement of all peoples, have resolved to combine our efforts to accomplish these aims." (Charter of the United Nations, Preamble, ratified by the USSR on October 24, 1945)

b. "Having in mind that the further presence of Soviet military units in Hungary could serve as an excuse for further aggravation of the situation, the Soviet Government has given its military command instructions to withdraw the Soviet military units from the city of Budapest as soon as this is considered necessary by the Hungarian Government." (*Pravda*, October 31, 1956)

On November 4, 1956, Soviet troops entered Budapest and brutally put down the rebellion of the Hungarian people against Soviet domination and Soviet communism. On September 14, 1957, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution which endorsed the report of the Special Committee on the Problem of Hungary. The report confirmed that: "(a) the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, has deprived Hungary of its liberty and political independence and the Hungarian people of the exercise of their fundamental human rights; (b) the present Hungarian regime has been imposed on the Hungarian people by the armed intervention of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; (c) the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has carried out mass deportations of Hungarian citizens to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; (d) the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has violated its obligations under the Geneva Conventions of 1949; (e) the present authorities in Hungary have violated the human rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Treaty of Peace with Hungary." The resolution then called upon "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the present authorities in Hungary, in view of evidence contained in the report, to desist from repressive measures against the Hungarian people, to respect the liberty and political independence of Hungary and the Hungarian people's enjoyment of fundamental human rights and freedoms, and to ensure the return to Hungary of those Hungarian citizens who have been deported to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. . . ."

On November 22, 1956, deposed Premier Nagy was seized by Soviet authorities after leaving the Yugoslav Embassy in Budapest. This was done in violation of an agreement concluded on November 21 between Yugoslav officials and the Soviet-sponsored Kadar regime in Hungary. The Yugoslavs protested the abduction in notes to the Kadar government and the Soviet Union on November 24. As late as December 12, 1959, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted another resolution in which it deplored the continued refusal of the USSR and the regime in Hungary to cooperate with it to achieve the objectives of the United Nations in accordance with its resolutions in regard to Hungary; deplored the continuing repression of the fundamental rights of the Hungarian people and their lack of freedom of political expression under the continuing presence of the Soviet armed forces; denounced the execution of Imre Nagy, Gen. Pal Maleter, and other Hungarian patriots; and condemned the continued defiance of the resolutions of the General Assembly of the United Nations of which the USSR and Hungary are members. It also called upon the USSR and the present Hungarian government to desist from repressive measures against the Hungarian people and to respect the liberty and political independence of Hungary and the Hungarian people's enjoyment of fundamental human rights and freedoms.

F. Rumania

During the period of the Nazi-Soviet alliance, the USSR annexed parts of Rumania. After World War II the USSR violated the Armistice Agreement, the Yalta and Potsdam Protocols, the Foreign Ministers Agreement of December, 1945, and the Peace Treaty with Rumania in refusing to cooperate with the Allies in the democratic rehabilitation of Rumania.

1. Prewar Guarantees of Sovereignty

Upon establishment of diplomatic relations, the USSR guaranteed full respect for Rumanian sovereignty.

"The Governments of our countries mutually, fully and integrally guarantee to respect the sovereignty of both countries and to abstain from any direct or indirect interference in the internal affairs and development of one another and especially from any kinds of agitation, propaganda, intervention or support of them." (Exchange of Notes, Rumania-USSR, Geneva, June 9, 1934)

In agreement with Nazi Germany, the USSR, on June 26, 1940, invaded Rumanian territory. Soviet forces occupied Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina and annexed them to the USSR.

2. Occupation Arrangements

The Armistice Agreements, the Yalta and Potsdam Protocols, and the Foreign Ministers Agreement of December 1945 provided for Allied cooperation in the establishment of democratic governments in Rumania, sanctioned by free elections.

a. "An Allied Control Commission will be established which will undertake until the conclusion of peace the regulation of and control over the execution of the present terms under the general direction and orders of the Allied (Soviet) High Command." (Armistice with Rumania, September 12, 1944, Art. 18)

The Soviet general who was Chairman of the Allied Control Commission in Bucharest failed to consult the United States and British representatives in issuing orders in the name of the ACC.

b. "The Three Powers . . . jointly declare their mutual agreement to concern during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe the policies of their three governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems." (Declaration on Liberated Europe, Yalta Agreement, II)

c. "The three Governments take note that the Rumanian Government thus reorganized should declare that free and unfettered elections will be held as soon as possible on the basis of universal and secret ballot. All democratic and anti-fascist parties should have the right to take part in these elections and to put forward candidates. The reorganized Government should give assurances concerning the grant of freedom of the press, speech, religion and association." (Foreign Ministers Agreement, December 24, 1945, V)

In February 1945 Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vyshinsky arrived in Bucharest to dictate the dismissal of the Radesco Government and the imposition of the communist-dominated Groza regime. Soviet authorities again directly interfered during the Rumanian elections of November 1946. Soviet troops were used to break up meetings of the opposition and disrupt orderly election procedures. In December 1946, the USSR refused to accept a proposal by the United States and United Kingdom to establish a joint commission to study the economic situation in Rumania. Meanwhile, the Soviets continued to treat Rumania as a colony of the USSR by use of Soviet-controlled joint companies, excessive reparations exactions and one-sided commercial agreements.

d. "The three Governments agreed that the revision of the procedures of the Allied Control Commission in these countries would now be undertaken taking into account the interests and responsibilities of the three Governments which together presented the terms of armistice to respective countries. . . ." (Potsdam Protocol, XI)

Despite repeated requests, the USSR refused to consult on the procedural revision of the ACC and continued unilaterally throughout the armistice period to refuse participation in ACC operations to the United States and the United Kingdom. The Soviet ACC representative issued directives to Rumanian authorities without the agreement of United States and United Kingdom representatives, sometimes in the face of United States and United Kingdom protests, and often without notification or discussion. The Soviets also obstructed the entrance of official United States personnel and aircraft into Rumania.

3. The Peace Treaty

By the terms of the Rumanian Peace Treaty, disputes over the execution of the treaty not settled by diplomatic negotiations were to be referred to the heads of the United States, the United Kingdom, and Soviet diplomatic missions in Bucharest. Soviet troops were allowed to remain only to safeguard communication line to occupation forces in Austria.

a. "Heads of the Diplomatic Missions in Bucharest of the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, acting in concert, will represent the Allied and Associated Powers in dealing with the Rumanian Government in all matters concerning the execution and interpretation of the present treaty. . . . Any dispute concerning the interpretation or execution of the treaty which is not settled by diplomatic negotiations shall be referred to the three heads of the mission." (Rumanian Peace Treaty, February 10, 1947, Arts. 37, 38)

Contrary to these provisions, the Soviet Government has consistently refused to cooperate with the American and British chiefs of mission in Bucharest and has in consequence reduced the treaty, repeatedly violated by the Rumanian Government, to a dead letter.

On May 4, 1948, the American Minister to Bucharest requested that an early meeting of the heads of the diplomatic missions in Bucharest be arranged to consider the implementation of the military clauses of the Treaty of Peace with Rumania. Both the Soviet and British chiefs of mission agreed to the meeting, which was scheduled for May 18, 1948. However, the Soviet Ambassador canceled the scheduled meeting, saying he was indisposed. On May 26, 1948, he informed the American Minister that there was no necessity for the proposed meeting and no grounds for putting the proposal into effect.

b. "Upon entry into force of this present Treaty all allied forces are to leave Rumania in 90 days, while the Soviet Union retains the right to keep such armed forces on Rumanian territory as are necessary to maintain lines of communication of the Soviet Army with the Soviet zone of occupation in Austria." (Rumanian Peace Treaty, February 10, 1947, Art. 21)

Soviet troops remained in Rumania after signature of the Austrian Peace Treaty and withdrawal of occupation forces from Austria. On April 15, 1957 the USSR and Rumania reached a new agreement sanctioning the stationing of Soviet troops in Rumania.

G. Bulgaria

The USSR violated the Armistice Agreement, the Yalta and Potsdam Protocols, the Foreign Ministers Agreement of December 1945, and the Peace Treaty with Bulgaria in refusing to cooperate with the Allies in the democratic rehabilitation of Bulgaria.

1. Occupation Arrangements

The Armistice Agreement, the Yalta and Potsdam Protocols, and the Foreign Ministers Agreement of December 1945 provided for Allied cooperation in the establishment of democratic government in Bulgaria, sanctioned by free elections.

a. "For the whole period of the armistice there will be established in Bulgaria an Allied Control Commission which will regulate and supervise the execution of the armistice terms under the chairmanship of the representative of the Allied (Soviet) High Command, and with the participation of representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom." (Armistice with Bulgaria, October 28, 1944, Art. 18)

The Soviet chairman of the ACC repeatedly took unilateral action in the name of the ACC and without consultation with his United States or United Kingdom colleagues, thus effectively negating United States and United Kingdom participation.

b. "The Government of Bulgaria will restore all property of the United Nations and their nationals, including Greek and Yugoslav, as may be determined later. The Government of Bulgaria will restore all rights and interests of the United Nations and their nationals in Bulgaria." (Armistice with Bulgaria, October 28, 1944, Arts. 9, 10)

The USSR has aided and abetted the Bulgarian Government's failure, in varying degrees, to fulfill these provisions of the armistice. The Soviets have refused to consider with the United States and United Kingdom Bulgaria's obligation to restore and reconstitute United Nations property and interests. While deliveries of foodstuffs were made to the Yugoslavs unilaterally, the USSR blocked three-power consideration of amounts to be shipped to Greece. None was shipped to that country.

c. "The Three Powers . . . jointly declare their mutual agreement to concert during the temporary period of instability in liberated Europe the policies of their three governments in assisting the peoples liberated from the domination of Nazi Germany and the peoples of the former Axis satellite states of Europe to solve by democratic means their pressing political and economic problems." (Declaration on Liberated Europe, Yalta Agreement, II)

d. "It is understood by the three Governments that the Soviet Government takes upon itself the mission of giving friendly advice to the Bulgarian Government with regard to the desirability of the inclusion in the Bulgarian Government of the Fatherland Front, now being formed, of an additional two representatives of other democratic groups, who (a) are truly representative of the groups of the parties which are not participating in the Government and (b) are really suitable and will work loyally with the Government." (Foreign Ministers Agreement, December 27, 1945, VI)

The Soviet Government, through the Bulgarian Communist Party, unilaterally subverted representative democratic processes in Bulgaria and assisted in denying the Bulgarian people the exercise of fundamental freedoms. In February 1945 the Soviet head of the Allied Control Commission in Sofia openly interfered in the internal affairs of Bulgaria's largest political party by demanding and obtaining the replacement of Dr. G. M. Dimitrov as Secretary General of the Agrarian Union. Soviet authorities in Bulgaria did not honor the Foreign Ministers Agreement and prevented the broadening of the Bulgarian Government.

e. "The three governments agreed that the revision of the procedures of the Allied Control Commissions in these countries would not be undertaken, taking into account the interests and responsibilities of the three governments which together presented the terms of armistice to the respective countries. . . ." (Potsdam Protocol, XI)

The Soviet Government refused repeated United States and United Kingdom requests to consult as agreed. It continued to operate the Allied Control Commissions unilaterally without effective participation of or even, on occasion, knowledge of the United States and United Kingdom members.

2. The Peace Treaty

The Bulgarian peace treaty provided that disputes on the interpretation or execution of the treaty not settled by direct diplomatic negotiations should be referred to the three heads of mission in Sofia.

"Excepting those instances covered by a special procedure stipulated in the present Treaty, any dispute concerning the interpretation or execution of this Treaty which is not settled by diplomatic negotiations shall be referred to the Three Heads of Mission. . . ." (Bulgarian Peace Treaty, February 10, 1947, Art. 36)

On May 31, 1949, the United States requested the United Kingdom and the USSR to convene a meeting of the three heads of missions in Sofia to settle the dispute over Bulgarian noncompliance with article 2 of the peace treaty. The Soviet Union, in its note of June 11, 1949, refused to convene the three heads of mission with the excuse that it "did not see any grounds for convening." The USSR in the same note declared that "not only are the measures [of the Bulgarian Government] concerning which the United States of America has expressed its dissatisfaction not a violation of the peace treaty, but on the contrary are directed toward the fulfillment of the said treaties which obligate the said countries to combat organizations of the fascist type." The United States note of June 30, 1949, confirmed the existence of a dispute between Bulgaria and the United States over the peace treaty. The Soviet memorandum of July 19, 1949, reaffirmed the Soviet contention that no basis for a meeting existed. The Soviet Union has consistently maintained its obduracy on this matter.

H. Czechoslovakia

The USSR violated the 1935 Pact of Mutual Assistance, the Atlantic Charter, and the 1943 Agreement with the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile by collaborating with the German Nazi regime during the 1939-41 period, by annexing Czechoslovak territory in 1945, and by intervening in Czechoslovak domestic politics to institute a pro-Soviet communist government in the early postwar period.

1. The 1935 Pact of Mutual Assistance

By the terms of this pact, the USSR pledged not to aid or enter agreements with countries committing aggression against Czechoslovakia.

"... it is stipulated that should either of the High Contracting Parties become the object of an aggression on the part of one or more third powers in conditions not giving ground for aid or assistance within the meaning of the present Treaty, the other High Contracting Party undertakes not to lend, for the duration of the conflict, aid or assistance, either directly or indirectly, to the aggressor or aggressors. Each High Contracting Party further declares that it is not bound by any other agreement for assistance which is incompatible with the present undertaking." (Czechoslovakia-USSR Treaty of Mutual Assistance, Moscow, June 5, 1935, Art. IV)

Subsequent to the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact on August 23, 1939, which recognized the Nazi conquest of Czechoslovakia, the USSR provided economic assistance to Nazi Germany and directed the Czechoslovak Communist Party to agitate against the legal government of Czechoslovakia.

2. The Atlantic Charter

Soviet adherence to the Atlantic Charter pledged the USSR not to seek territorial aggrandizement.

"... their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other; they desire to see not territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned." (Atlantic Charter, August 14, 1941, Soviet adherence September 24, 1941)

In the July 1945 Treaty of Moscow, the USSR forced the Czechoslovak Government to agree to the Soviet annexation of the Carpatho-Ukraine, which was then incorporated into the Ukrainian Soviet Republic.

3. Friendship Agreement

By the terms of a friendship agreement concluded with the Czechoslovak Government-in-Exile in 1943, the USSR pledged postwar collaboration, guaranteed Czechoslovak sovereignty, and promised not to intervene in Czechoslovak internal affairs.

"The High Contracting Parties, considering the interests of the security of each of them, agree to maintain close and friendly collaboration in the period after the re-establishment of peace and to act in conformity with the principles of mutual respect for their sovereignty as well as of non-intervention in internal affairs of the other state." (Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Assistance and Postwar Collaboration, December 12, 1943, Art. 4)

During the immediate postwar period the Soviet Union did intervene in Czechoslovak internal politics to secure the establishment of a pro-Soviet communist government. The USSR actively aided the communist minority and Soviet agents worked clandestinely in the Czechoslovak Ministry of Interior under the guise of Czechoslovak communists. During the February 1948 crisis, Soviet troops surrounded four-fifths of the Czechoslovak frontiers and Soviet agents participated in meetings and demonstrations and were among the armed militia in the streets of Prague. Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Zorin was in Prague to direct the communist takeover.

I. Iran

In direct violation of numerous prewar and wartime treaties, the USSR, in 1945, promoted rebellion in the northern area of Iran occupied by Soviet troops. By delaying the withdrawal of Soviet troops and by arming the rebels, the USSR attempted to establish Azerbaijan and Kurdish republics in Iran, which could be absorbed into the USSR.

1. Prewar Agreements

Treaties signed in 1921 and 1927 pledged Soviet respect for Iranian sovereignty and territorial integrity.

a. "In consideration of the fact that each nation has the right to determine freely its political destiny, each of the two contracting parties formally expresses its desire to abstain from any intervention in the internal affairs of the other." (Soviet-Iranian Treaty of Friendship, February 26, 1921, Art. IV)

b. "Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to refrain from any aggression and from any hostile acts directed against the other party, and not to introduce its military forces into the territory of the other party. . . . [They undertake] not to encourage or to allow in their respective territories the formation or activities of: (1) organizations or groups of any description whatever, whose object is to overthrow the Government of the other contracting party by means of violence, insurrection or outrage; (2) organizations or groups usurping the office of the Government of the other country or of part of its territory, also having as their object the subversion of the Government of the other contracting party by the above mentioned means, a breach of its peace and security, or an infringement of its territorial integrity." (Soviet-Iranian Treaty of Non-Aggression and Neutrality, October 1, 1927, Arts. II, IV)

2. Wartime Agreements

By the terms of the Tripartite Treaty of 1942 and the Declaration of Tehran, Soviet troops were to be withdrawn from Iran not later than six months after the defeat of Nazi Germany and the USSR guaranteed once more Iranian sovereignty and territorial integrity.

a. "The forces of the Allied Powers shall be withdrawn from Iranian territory not later than six months after all hostilities between the Allied Powers and Germany and her associates have been suspended by the conclusion of an armistice or armistices or on the conclusion of a peace treaty between them, whichever date is the earlier." (Treaty of Alliance Between the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and Iran, January 29, 1942, Art. V)

b. "The Governments of the United States, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United Kingdom are at one with the Government of Iran in their desire for the maintenance of the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of Iran." (Declaration of Tehran, December 1, 1943)

c. "As regards the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from Iran, the Soviet Government, as you are aware, takes the view that this withdrawal of troops should be effected within the period laid down in the Anglo-Soviet-Iranian Treaty." (Letters of Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov, September 20, 1945)

In direct violation of this long series of agreements, the Soviet Union began to promote a rebellion in the northern area of Iran occupied by Soviet troops in the fall of 1945. In the Iranian province of Azerbaijan rebels were equipped with Soviet arms, led by the Iranian communist Pishhevari and aided by Soviet agents who crossed into Iran. On December 12, 1945, the rebels proclaimed the Autonomous Republic of Azerbaijan. Red Army troops provided full protection and prevented Iranian troops from reaching the scene. Shortly afterwards rebels in the neighboring Kurdish province, carrying Soviet arms and wearing Soviet uniforms, proclaimed an independent Kurdish republic in Azerbaijan. Pishhevari broadcast his thanks to the Red Army for its assistance. In spite of an appeal by the Iranian Government to the United Nations, the rebels remained in control and Soviet troops failed to leave by the agreed date of March 2, 1946.

Red Army forces were withdrawn from Iran only after Iranian Premier Qavam had gone to Moscow and, under duress, had agreed to the withdrawal of the Iranian complaint before the United Nations, to the admission of three communists to his cabinet, and to the establishment of a joint Soviet-Iranian oil company (the USSR holding 51 percent of the stock) for exploitation of oil in northern Iran. Although the Iranian Premier was subsequently able to dismiss the communists from his cabinet, cancel the joint oil agreement, and send Iranian troops to put down the rebels in the North, Soviet interference in Iranian internal affairs and pressure on the government has continued. Soviet broadcasts to Iran have repeatedly attacked the Iranian Government, incited the Iranian people to violent action against it, and supported the illegal pro-Soviet Tudeh Party. The Soviet military attaché, General Rodionov, was implicated in the Tudeh conspiracy in the Iranian army and air force that was uncovered in August and September 1954.

J. Turkey

In violation of prewar agreements, the USSR attempted to obtain territorial concessions from Turkey in the early postwar period and intervened in Turkish internal affairs in efforts to intimidate and weaken the Turkish Government.

1. Treaty of Friendship

The Soviet-Turkish Treaty of Friendship of 1921 restored Turkish sovereignty over the territory of Kars and Ardahan.

"The northeast frontier of Turkey . . . follows the former northern administrative frontiers of the sanjaks of Ardahan and Kars . . ." (RSFSR-Turkey Treaty of Friendship, Kars, October 13, 1921, Art. IV).

2. Nonaggression Pact

The USSR pledged to abstain from aggression and not to participate in any hostile acts directed against Turkey.

"Each Contracting Party undertakes to abstain from any aggression against the other. . . . Furthermore, each of the two Contracting Parties undertakes not to participate in any hostile act by one or more other powers directed against the other Contracting Party." (Treaty of Friendship and Neutrality, Paris, December 17, 1925, Art. II)

This treaty was renewed on December 17, 1929 and again on November 7, 1935. It was unilaterally denounced by the USSR on March 19, 1945. In June 1945, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov demanded that Turkey cede to the Soviet Union a base on the Black Sea Straits and the districts of Kars and Ardahan. This demand was echoed by two Georgian historians in December 1945 in an open letter in which they argued that Kars, Ardahan, and other East Turkish districts had belonged to Georgia in the Middle Ages. In a vigorous note of August 8, 1946, Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov charged the Turkish Government with violations of the Montreux Convention and demanded concessions which would establish Soviet control of the Straits at the expense of the Turks. The Turkish Government was able to resist Soviet pressure only by the intervention of the Western Allies and by the declaration of the Truman Doctrine on March 12, 1947.

K. Afghanistan

In violation of prewar treaties of neutrality and nonaggression, the USSR forced Afghanistan to cede territory and intervened in the internal affairs of Afghanistan during the postwar period.

a. "Each of the Contracting Parties undertakes to abstain from all kinds of aggression against the other. . . ." (Afghanistan-USSR Treaty of Neutrality and Non aggression, August 31, 1926, Art. II)

b. "The High Contracting Parties, having recognized each other's sovereignty, undertake to abstain from any armed or unarmed intervention in the internal affairs of the other Contracting Party. . . ." (Treaty of Neutrality and Nonaggression, June 24, 1931, Art. III)

The treaty of 1931 was renewed by the Protocol of March 29, 1936. In March 1946, Afghan officials uncovered a Soviet plot led by Soviet agents to incite the Tajik minority to open rebellion and eventual union with the USSR. That the Soviet Union eventually hoped to turn Afghanistan into a protectorate was shown by its repeated violent objections to United Nations and Western aid to Afghanistan during the immediate postwar period and by its demands that Afghanistan grant the USSR a special place in economic developmental schemes and trade.

L. China

In direct violation of the 1924 Sino-Soviet Agreement on General Principles, the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the 1937 Nonaggression Pact, the USSR repeatedly intervened in Chinese affairs prior to World War II and recognized Japanese violations of Chinese sovereignty in Manchuria. The USSR also violated wartime agreements of cooperation with Nationalist China to the advantage of the Chinese Communists.

* The RSFSR (Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic) was superseded by the USSR on Dec. 30, 1922.

1. Prewar Agreements

The 1924 and 1937 Sino-Soviet Pacts provided for Soviet respect of Chinese sovereignty and territory integrity. By adhering to the Kellogg-Briand Pact, the USSR formally pledged to renounce force in the settlement of disputes.

a. "The Governments of the two Contracting Parties mutually pledge themselves not to permit, within their respective territories, the existence and/or activities of any organization or groups whose aim is to struggle by acts of violence against the Government of either Contracting Party. The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agrees to renounce the special rights and privileges relating to all concessions in any part of China acquired by the Tsarist Government. . . ." (Sino-Soviet Agreement on General Principles, May 31, 1924, Arts VI, X)

b. "War should be renounced as an instrument of national policy, and the settlement of disputes should never be sought except by peaceful means." (Kellogg-Briand Pact, August 27, 1928, adhered to by the USSR September 27, 1928)

The USSR was the first major power to break its obligations under the Kellogg-Briand Pact. In October and November 1929, Soviet troops, supported by aircraft and gunboats, invaded Manchuria in order to seize control of the Chinese Eastern Railway. The Soviet Government rebuffed all Chinese attempts to settle the dispute over the railway by diplomatic means, preferring to employ its clearly superior military power to force a settlement on its own terms. Efforts by the United States and other Western powers to invoke the Kellogg-Briand Pact and to encourage a settlement by peaceful means were brusquely rejected by the Soviet Government.

c. "In the event that either of the High Contracting Parties should be subjected to aggression on the part of one or more third powers, the other Contracting Party obligates itself . . . to refrain from taking any action or entering into any agreement which may be used by the aggressor or aggressors to the disadvantage of the Parties subjected to aggression." (Sino-Soviet Treaty of Nonaggression, August 21, 1937, Art. I)

This agreement was violated by the Soviet signature of a "neutrality pact" with Japan on April 13, 1941.

2. Wartime Agreements

The Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance of 1945 and related agreements provided for mutual political and economic cooperation and recognition of sovereignty.

a. "The High Contracting Parties, having regard to the interests and security and economic development of each of them, agree to work together in close and friendly collaboration after the coming of peace and to act according to the principles of mutual respect for their sovereignty and territorial integrity and of non-intervention in the internal affairs of the other Contracting Party. The High Contracting Parties agree to afford one another all possible economic assistance in the postwar period in order to facilitate and expedite the rehabilitation of both countries and to make their contribution to the prosperity of the world." (Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship and Alliance, August 14, 1945, Arts. V, VI)

b. ". . . the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics agrees to render to China moral support and aid in military supplies and other material resources, such support and aid to be entirely given to the National Government as the Central Government of China." (Report of Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov, August 14, 1945)

In its occupation of Manchuria, commencing in 1945, the Soviet authorities removed from Manchuria assets valued at \$858,000,000 in the form of mining equip-

ment, rolling stock, steel mills, electric power generators, and other equipment.

The Chinese Government failed to receive from the USSR the promised military supplies and other material resources called for by the treaty. When Soviet troops left Manchuria, they allowed the Chinese communists to take over substantial quantities of Japanese arms and assume control over the area. Chinese Government troops attempting to enter Manchuria subsequent to the Japanese surrender were denied the right to land at Dairen by the Soviet authorities there and were forced to use less advantageous landing points.

c. "The administration of Dairen shall belong to China." Agreement concerning Dairen, August 14, 1945).

Due in large part to Soviet obstructionism, China was unable to establish a government administration at Dairen.

M. Korea

The USSR violated the Cairo Declaration and subsequent Allied agreements on Korea by establishing a Soviet-controlled regime in North Korea, by refusing to cooperate with the Western Allies, and by supporting the North Korean invasion of South Korea in June 1950.

1. Wartime Agreements

The Cairo Declaration, reaffirmed by the Potsdam Protocol, pledged Allied cooperation for establishment of a free and independent Korea.

a. ". . . in due course Korea shall become free and independent." (Cairo Declaration, December 1, 1943, adhered to by the USSR, August 9, 1945)

b. "The terms of the Cairo Declaration shall be carried out. . . ." (Proclamation Defining Terms for Japanese Surrender, Potsdam Protocol, July 26, 1945)

2. Postwar Agreements

A series of postwar Allied agreements based on the Foreign Ministers Declaration of December 1945 sought to establish practical means for rehabilitating Korea on a democratic basis.

"In order to assist the formation of a provisional government and with a view to the preliminary elaboration of the appropriate measures, there shall be established a Joint Commission consisting of representatives of the United States command in southern Korea and the Soviet command in northern Korea. In preparing their proposals the Commission shall consult with the Korean democratic parties and social organizations. . . . It shall be the task of the Joint Commission, with the participation of the provisional Korean democratic organization, to work out measures also for helping and assisting (trusteeship) the political, economic and social progress of the Korean people, the development of democratic self-government and the establishment of the national independence of Korea." (Report of Conference of Foreign Ministers, December 27, 1945)

The Soviet Union from the start thwarted the implementation of this agreement. Its representatives on the Joint Commission refused to recognize as "democratic" any parties and organizations not under Soviet control. The USSR used its occupation of Korea north of the 38th parallel to institute there a pro-Soviet communist regime which claimed jurisdiction over the entire country.

The Joint US-USSR Commission on Korea met 62 times. The first meeting was held on March 20, 1946; the last meeting was held on October 18, 1947. The first series of 24 meetings were concluded on May 8, 1946, when the Joint Commission adjourned *sine die*. The meetings were reconvened on May 21, 1947, and were finally suspended, after 38 meetings, on October 18, 1947.

In these 62 meetings, the Joint Commission failed to resolve the one issue which divided the Soviet and American delegations at the beginning of the talks, namely the issue of

what Korean groups should be consulted concerning the formation of a provisional Korean Government. The USSR took the position that only those Korean parties and social organizations which fully supported the provisions of the Moscow agreement on Korea should be consulted. The United States held that this policy would exclude from consultation a large majority of the Korean people and would place a communist minority, which had not openly opposed the Moscow agreement, in a predominant position in the consultations. After Joint Commission negotiations had broken down on this issue in 1946, an exchange of letters between Secretary of State Marshall and Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov in April and May 1947 gave the impression that the USSR was willing to modify its position on the problem of consultation with Korean groups, and the Commission reconvened on May 21, 1947. However, the Soviet delegation in July reverted to the position it had taken during the 1946 talks, and the meetings were finally suspended on October 18.

On June 25, 1950, the pro-Soviet communist regime of North Korea, armed and encouraged by the Soviet Union, attacked the Republic of Korea.

N. Japan

The Soviet Union has violated the Potsdam Protocol by refusing to return all Japanese prisoners held in the USSR. It has also unilaterally repudiated promises contained in the Joint Declaration of 1956 which established diplomatic relations between the USSR and Japan.

1. The Prisoner Issue

The Potsdam Protocol stipulated the immediate return of Japanese prisoners of war. "The Japanese military forces, after being completely disarmed, shall be permitted to return to their homes with the opportunity to lead peaceful and productive lives." (Proclamation Defining Terms for Japanese Surrender, Potsdam Protocol, July 26, 1945, Art. IX)

On April 22, 1950, TASS announced that the Soviet Government had completed the repatriation of Japanese "prisoners of war" from its territories, except for 2,467 men charged with war crimes or under medical treatment. However, Supreme Commander Allied Powers (SCAP) and Japanese Government figures show that as of that date 369,382 Japanese prisoners of war and civilians remained under Soviet control, still unrepatriated or unaccounted for.

2. The joint declaration

By the terms of the USSR-Japanese Joint Declaration of 1956, the Soviet Union pledged to refrain from interference in Japan's internal affairs and to return the islands of Habomai and Shikotan to Japan upon conclusion of a peace treaty.

"... the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics... agrees to transfer the islands of Habomai and the island of Shikotan to Japan on the understanding, however, that the actual transfer of these islands to Japan will take place after the conclusion of a peace treaty between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Japan. ... The USSR and Japan mutually undertake to refrain from interfering, either directly or indirectly, in each other's internal affairs for any reasons of an economic, political or ideological character." (Joint Declaration of the USSR and Japan, October 19, 1956, Arts. III, IX)

The Soviet Union declared in a note of January 27, 1960, that the Habomai and Shikotan Islands would not be returned to Japan upon conclusion of a peace treaty if Western military forces remained in Japan. This was a clear repudiation of the Joint Agreement, which had placed no such conditions on the return of the islands.

The USSR has repeatedly and flagrantly interfered in Japanese internal affairs. Dur-

ing the weeks preceding the Japanese Diet elections of May 22, 1958, Soviet radio propaganda beamed at Japan violently opposed the re-election of Premier Kishi's Liberal Democratic Party. Soviet threats against the Japanese Government reached a high point during the renegotiation of the United States-Japan Security Treaty, threatening Japan with the danger of a nuclear war if the treaty were signed.

O. The United States

The USSR has frequently violated the terms of the Litvinov Agreements of 1933 and has failed to live up to its side of the wartime lend-lease agreements.

1. The Litvinov Agreements

The Litvinov Agreement stimulated that the USSR would not engage in subversive activities against the United States, that it would inform American authorities immediately of the whereabouts of American citizens held in the Soviet Union, and that it would not refuse visas to American citizens on the grounds of religion.

a. "... it will be the fixed policy of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to respect scrupulously the indisputable right of the United States to order its own life within its own jurisdiction in its own way and to refrain from interfering in any manner in the internal affairs of the United States, ... to refrain, and to restrain all persons ... from any act tending to incite or encourage armed intervention or any agitation or propaganda having as an aim the violation of the territorial integrity of the United States, its territories or possessions, or the bringing about by force of a change in the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States, ... not to permit the formation or residence on its territory of any organization or group ... which has as an aim the overthrow or the preparation for the overthrow of, or the bringing about by force of a change in, the political or social order of the whole or any part of the United States. ..." (Letter of Soviet Foreign Minister Litvinov to President Roosevelt, November 16, 1933)

The Soviet Foreign Minister's avowal produced no effect whatever on the activities of the Third International, or Comintern, which continued to carry out its role as the organizer and directing center of the world communist movement from its headquarters in Moscow. On November 21, 1933, five days after his pledge, Litvinov said that the activities of the Comintern would not be affected by the Agreement of November 16. Yet the avowed purpose of the Comintern, clearly defined in its statutes and theses, was "the struggle by all available means, including armed force, for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie and the creation of an international Soviet Republic."

Although the Comintern was formally dissolved in 1943, Soviet-inspired communist activity in the United States continued unabated. Evidence of systematic violation of the Litvinov agreements after 1945 was brought to light by convictions under the Smith Act of 1940, which made it a criminal offense "to organize or help to organize any society, group or assembly of persons who teach, advocate or encourage the overthrow or destruction of any Government in the United States by force or violence."

The trial and conviction in 1949 in a United States Federal Court in New York of eleven communist leaders revealed that the American Communist Party, acting on orders of the Soviet Union issued by Dmitri Manulsky, Comintern leader and in 1949 Foreign Minister of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, had returned to a policy of violent revolution.

b. "... the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, while reserving to itself the right of refusing visas to Americans desiring to enter the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on personal grounds, does

not intend to base such refusals on the fact of such persons having ecclesiastical status. (Letter of Soviet Foreign Minister Litvinov to President Roosevelt, November 16, 1933).

In March 1955 the Soviet Government expelled the Reverend Georges Bissonette, one of a succession of clergymen who had resided in Moscow and ministered to the spiritual needs of American nationals of the Roman Catholic faith in Moscow. The Soviet Government refused entry to Father Louis Dion as successor to Father Bissonette on the grounds that the Litvinov-Roosevelt agreement provided for reciprocity in the admission of clergymen to the respective countries. Although the 1933 agreement contained no provision to this effect—of which the Soviet Union's failure to make any such claims in the intervening years was itself tacit admission—the Soviet Government continued to bar Father Dion for nearly four years. He was finally admitted in January 1959 after repeated representations by the United States to the Soviet Government.

2. Lend-lease Agreement

The Lend-Lease Agreement provided for wartime cooperation and exchange of information and stipulated that material shipped to the USSR should be returned upon the ending of hostilities.

a. "The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will continue to contribute to the defense of the United States of America and the strengthening thereof and will provide such articles, services, facilities or information as it may be in a position to supply." (Agreement on Mutual Assistance, June 11, 1942, Art. II)

There was almost complete lack of reciprocity in exchange of information. The frustrations experienced by the United States Military Mission in Moscow in attempting to achieve a semblance of cooperation with the Soviets were portrayed by General John R. Deane, the head of the Mission, in his book, *The Strange Alliance*.

b. "The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will return to the United States of America at the end of the present emergency, as determined by the President of the United States of America, such defense articles transferred under this agreement as shall not have been destroyed, lost or consumed. ..." (Agreement on Mutual Assistance, June 11, 1942, Art. V)

In the lend-lease settlement negotiations the United States expressed willingness to settle for "fair" value of articles remaining on the basis of usefulness to the Soviet peacetime economy. In January 1951, the United States offered to let the USSR settle its lend-lease account for a payment of \$800,000—a small fraction of the value of goods retained by the Soviets. On February 4, 1960, the Soviet Embassy offered to reopen the lend-lease talks on the condition that a settlement be sought as part of a broad agreement on increased trade and long-term credit for the Soviet Union. The United States has insisted, however, that the USSR fulfill the terms of the 1942 agreement by settling its lend-lease account as a prior condition to other economic negotiations.

P. Great Britain

During the interwar period the USSR repeatedly violated pledges not to engage in subversive propaganda. In 1955, the Soviet Union unilaterally repudiated the 1942 Mutual Assistance Agreement.

1. Prewar Agreements

a. "This present Agreement is subject to the fulfillment of the following conditions, namely: (a) that each Party refrains from hostile action or undertakings against the other and from conducting outside of its own borders any official propaganda direct or indirect. ..." (RSFSR-United Kingdom Trade Agreement, March 16, 1921, Preamble)

On May 8, 1923 Great Britain delivered the "Curzon ultimatum" to the USSR, threaten-

ing to terminate the trade agreement unless impounded British fishing vessels were released and the Soviet Union disowned and recalled agents in India, Persia, and Afghanistan engaged in anti-British propaganda.

b. "... the Government of the Soviet Union declares that the abstention from interference with the internal affairs of the other country constitutes the necessary condition for mutual confidence and friendly relations between the two countries." (Soviet Note Regarding *De Jure* Recognition and Settlement of Outstanding Questions, February 8, 1924)

The British Government was forced to protest, on February 23, 1927, Soviet violations of its pledge to abstain from subversive propaganda. Evidence of hostile Soviet activities in Great Britain was published by the British Government in a White Paper and diplomatic relations were severed on May 26, 1927. Diplomatic relations were resumed on November 5, 1929.

2. The Mutual Assistance Pact

The British-Soviet Treaty of 1942 pledged mutual cooperation during the postwar period.

"The High Contracting Parties declare their desire to unite with other like-minded States in adopting proposals for common action to preserve peace and resist aggression in the postwar period." (United Kingdom-USSR Treaty of Alliance and Mutual Assistance, May 26, 1942, Art. III).

This treaty was unilaterally annulled on May 7, 1955 by the USSR. The action was one aspect of a Soviet campaign to prevent the ratification of the Paris agreements, which terminated the occupation of Western Germany and brought the newly formed Federal Republic into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Q. Other agreements

1. The Soviet-French Treaty

On December 10, 1944, the USSR concluded a treaty of alliance and mutual aid which pledged mutual cooperation during the postwar period.

This treaty was unilaterally abrogated by the USSR on May 7, 1955, at the same time that the USSR abrogated its 1942 treaty with Great Britain.

2. The Soviet-Yugoslav Credit Agreement

On January 12, 1956, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia concluded an agreement under which Yugoslavia was to receive Soviet credits for economic construction and expansion. Additional Soviet credits were offered to Yugoslavia in an agreement concluded August 3, 1956.

In the spring of 1958 the Soviet Union, which had become increasingly disgruntled with Yugoslavia's ideological independence, endeavored to use its credit agreement as a political weapon. *Pravda*, on May 9, 1958, noting that "ideological differences lead to differences on political issues," threatened in a thinly veiled fashion that economic assistance might be terminated if the Yugoslav ideological lines were not changed. On May 27, 1958, Foreign Minister Gromyko handed to the Yugoslav Ambassador a note announcing the unilateral suspension for five years of Soviet deliveries under the 1956 credit agreements.

3. The Israeli Oil Contract

On July 17, 1956, the Soviet state oil-exporting firm, *Soiuznefteksport*, concluded a contract with two Israeli companies to deliver oil to Israel.

On November 6, 1956, the Israeli companies were informed that the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade had canceled the export license under which the shipments were to be made. In announcing the unilateral cancellation of the contract, *Soiuznefteksport* justified its action by an interpretation of *force*

majeure which was not even consistent with Soviet law. Israeli claims for damages were rejected out of hand by the decision of the Soviet Foreign Trade Arbitration Commission.

4. Freedom of Navigation on the Danube

On December 4, 1946, the USSR agreed at the fourth meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers that a provision for freedom of navigation on the Danube would be included in the peace treaties with Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary.

The USSR and its supporters, the East European satellites, at the Danube Conference in Belgrade (July 30 to August 18, 1948) pushed through virtually unchanged the Soviet draft for a new Danube convention. According to an official United States statement on August 18, the Soviet bloc "brushed aside" every amendment submitted by the Western powers. The United States, the United Kingdom and France refused to sign the Belgrade Convention and declare that they considered previous agreements on the Danube still in force. The USSR which was not a party to the 1921 convention, asserted on the other hand that Western failure to accept the new Soviet-imposed convention "will in no measure influence its coming into force."

Adoption of the Belgrade Convention provided pseudo-legal trappings for already existent Soviet domination over Danube affairs. The convention eliminated all Western countries from a new Danube Commission, which was to have representatives only from the riparian powers (annexation of Bessarabia made the USSR a riparian power). It denied the rights of Western countries under past agreements such as the 1921 convention. The new convention limited the powers of the projected commission by providing for a special Soviet-Rumanian administration on the maritime Danube, thus giving the USSR a strategic position for influencing Danube affairs. The effect of the convention was to perpetuate pro-Soviet discriminatory practices along the river.

PRICE AMENDMENT WOULD FIRE ABSENTEE CONGRESSMEN

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, having read over my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 12, I have discovered that the Government Printing Office made a typographical error in transcribing the congressional attendance chart as reported in my Special Action Report soon to be distributed to my constituents.

Therefore, I am today resubmitting that portion of my Special Action Report so that the RECORD can be corrected:

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 on important legislation involving the spending of billions of taxpayers' dollars and affecting their constituents.

While there are certain time 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	69.8
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.

THE 1971 FUND ASSETS SHOW RESUMED GROWTH

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, at the end of 1971 private pension funds amounted to \$151.8 billion and public funds held \$135.5 billion in assets—a total of more than \$287 billion.

I insert here an article from the June issue of Pension & Welfare News and three accompanying tables given preliminary estimates of the assets of these funds at the end of 1971 and showing their growth since 1960:

THE 1971 FUNDS ASSETS SHOW RESUMED GROWTH

Total assets of private noninsured pension funds at the end of 1971 were \$106,400,000,000 (book value) and \$125,000,000,000 (market value) according to preliminary estimates recently by the Securities and Exchange Commission. These data on private noninsured pension funds include funds of corporations, nonprofit institutions, and union and multiemployer funds.

Also included are profit sharing plans involving retirement benefits; excluded are health, welfare, and other types of employee benefit plans.

The growth in total assets (book value) during 1971 was \$9,400,000,000, or almost 10 percent. This compares very favorably to the preceding years of 1969 and 1970, during which pension funds growth had slowed considerably.

From 1960 to 1968, assets of pension funds grew at a compounded growth rate of 12 percent; in 1969 and 1970 growth was measured at 9 percent and 7 percent respectively.

Table 1 details the book and market value of fund assets in the past decade. At year end 1971 market value of total assets was 17 percent higher than book value as compared to year end 1970 when market value was 8 percent above book value. The difference is largely attributable to the gain in stock values during 1971.

Common stock in pension fund portfolios, valued at market, amounted to \$84,800,000,000 at the end of 1971; common stock thus accounted for 68 percent of pension fund assets. At book valuation, common stock made up less than 59 percent of pension fund portfolios.

Pension funds added \$11,000,000,000 of common stock (book value) to their holdings during 1971, while total assets rose only

\$9,400,000,000. This was effected by pension funds liquidating other portfolio investments in order to purchase common stock in 1971.

Holdings of corporate bonds, mortgages, and United States government securities all decreased in 1971. In contrast, during 1970, pension funds allocated an unusually large amount of new funds to the bond market and relatively less to the stock market.

The quarterly growth and distribution of pension fund assets during 1971 is shown in Table 2. Quarterly information is also published every three months in the *SEC Statistical Bulletin*.

Over \$287,000,000,000 were held by all types of pension funds at the end of 1971. This figure includes assets of private noninsured pension funds, insured pension reserves, state and local government retirement funds, and pension plans administered by the United States government.

As Table 3 indicates, private pension funds amounted to \$151,800,000,000 and public funds held \$135,500,000,000 in assets.

In the private sector, insured pension reserves (statement value) were estimated to be \$45,400,000,000 at year end 1971; more than half the growth in insured pension funds was attributable to separate accounts set up by insurance companies to invest pension moneys. Separate accounts of insurance companies amounted to an estimated \$7,200,000,000 at the end of 1971, compared to \$4,900,000,000 in 1970.

Turning to the public sector, state and local retirement funds had \$64,700,000,000 in assets at year end 1971, according to estimates made by the Federal Reserve Board. These pension funds grew by \$6,800,000,000 or 11.7 percent during the year. Federal government pension funds held \$70,800,000,000 in assets, invested almost entirely in United States government securities.

TABLE 1.—ASSETS OF PRIVATE NONINSURED PENSION FUNDS

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
[In millions of dollars]											
Book value:											
Cash and deposits	660	710	770	890	940	900	1,320	1,590	1,620	1,800	1,640
U.S. Government securities	2,720	2,920	3,050	3,190	2,990	2,750	2,320	2,760	2,790	3,030	2,730
Corporate and other bonds	16,880	18,100	19,560	21,420	23,130	25,230	26,360	27,000	27,610	29,670	29,010
Preferred stock	760	750	710	650	750	790	980	1,330	1,760	1,740	1,770
Common stock	13,340	15,730	18,120	20,950	25,120	29,070	34,950	41,740	47,860	51,740	62,780
Mortgages	1,560	1,880	2,220	2,780	3,380	3,910	4,080	4,070	4,220	4,300	3,680
Other assets	1,590	1,800	2,120	2,540	2,870	3,520	4,230	4,580	4,720	4,730	4,800
Total assets	37,510	41,890	46,550	52,420	59,180	66,170	74,240	83,070	90,580	97,010	106,420
Market value:											
Cash and deposits	700	700	800	900	900	900	1,300	1,600	1,600	1,800	1,600
U.S. Government securities	2,700	2,900	3,000	3,200	2,900	2,700	2,200	2,600	2,600	3,000	2,800
Corporate and other bonds	15,900	17,500	18,800	20,700	21,900	22,500	22,600	22,400	21,300	24,900	26,100
Preferred stock	700	700	700	700	800	800	1,000	1,400	1,600	1,600	2,000
Common stock	22,100	21,200	27,000	33,000	40,000	38,700	50,100	60,100	59,800	65,500	84,800
Mortgages	1,600	1,900	2,200	2,800	3,400	3,800	4,000	3,600	3,500	3,600	3,200
Other assets	1,600	1,800	2,200	2,600	3,000	3,500	4,200	4,300	4,300	4,300	4,500
Total assets	45,300	46,700	54,600	63,900	72,900	72,800	85,500	96,000	94,600	104,700	125,000

Note: Figures may not add to totals because of roundings.

TABLE 2.—QUARTERLY PRIVATE NONINSURED PENSION FUND ASSETS

	1970, December	1971 March	1971 June	1971 September	1971 December
[In millions of dollars]					
Cash and deposits	1,800	1,990	1,660	1,780	1,640
U.S. Government securities	3,030	3,020	2,600	2,040	2,730
Corporate and other bonds	29,670	29,050	28,780	28,380	29,010
Preferred stock	1,740	1,740	1,720	1,730	1,770
Common stock	51,740	54,660	58,310	60,250	62,780
Mortgages	4,300	4,160	3,950	3,780	3,680
Other assets	4,730	4,940	4,800	4,880	4,800
Total assets	97,010	99,560	101,820	103,440	106,420

TABLE 3.—ASSETS OF ALL PRIVATE AND PUBLIC PENSION FUNDS

[Book value, in billions of dollars; figures may not add to totals due to rounding]

	1960	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Private	52.0	86.5	95.6	106.3	118.0	128.5	138.2	151.8
Insured pension reserves ¹	18.8	27.3	29.4	32.0	35.0	37.9	41.2	^a 45.4
(Separate accounts, included above) ²		.3	.6	1.2	2.2	3.5	4.9	^a 7.2
Noninsured pension funds ³	33.1	59.2	66.2	74.2	83.1	90.6	^a 97.0	106.4
Public	56.4	72.8	80.4	90.1	98.5	110.1	123.5	135.5
State and local	19.6	33.1	37.1	41.5	46.1	50.8	^a 57.9	64.7
Federal:								
Federal old-age and survivors insurance	20.3	18.2	20.6	24.2	25.7	30.1	32.5	33.8
Federal disability insurance	2.3	1.6	1.7	2.0	3.0	4.1	5.6	6.6
Civil Service retirement and disability program ⁴	10.4	15.9	17.0	18.1	19.4	20.8	23.1	26.1
Railroad retirement	3.7	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3
Total private and public	108.4	159.3	176.1	196.4	216.6	238.6	261.7	287.3

¹ Statement value.

² Separate accounts of life insurance companies, set up for specific pension plans, allow greater investment latitude than is permissible under State laws for general life insurance assets.

³ Includes funds of corporations, nonprofit organizations and multi-employer and uniform plans.

⁴ Includes Foreign Service retirement and disability trust fund.

^a Estimated.

^b Revised.

PITTSBURGH AREA STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN "YOU ARE THE FLAG" ESSAY CONTEST

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, there are those among older Americans who are quick to criticize the young for what the elders term a "lack of patriotism."

I do not believe that this is the case. I think that today's youth holds the interest and well-being of their country just as high as many of us do and did when we were their age.

Today's youth happens to question more than some of us did and they may be a bit more skeptical of patriotic slogans, the meaning of which seem to get trampled or distorted in everyday application. But these qualities are strengths not weaknesses. A healthy skepticism leads to intelligent decisions.

Annually the Flag Plaza Foundation of Pittsburgh, an adjunct of the Boy Scouts of America, and the Duquesne Light Co., join to sponsor a "You Are the Flag" essay contest among Pittsburgh area students. There were 30,000 entries in the contest this year.

As in past years, the winners have presented their youthful patriotism in a number of unique written forms.

I would like to share them with my colleagues at this time.

In addition, I would like to include an article from the Mount Washington News about a constituent of mine, Marty O'Malley, who has been a grand finalist in the Flag Contest for the past 2 years.

The essays and news article follow:

AN UNPOLISHED MIRROR—THAT'S ME

(By Joseph Beggs)

Who me??... The flag??... You've got to be kidding. How can I be the flag, that great symbol of our country? I'm just a normal thirteen year old boy who likes exciting mystery books, sports, girls, my dog and cat, and I dislike school. Sure, I pledge my allegiance to the flag and raise the stars and stripes at home and at scout camp. But that doesn't make me a super patriot that you could call the flag. In fact, I don't even have a shirt that's red, white, and blue.

Now people like Betsy Ross, who is said to have made the first American flag: Patrick Henry, who cried out the ringing words, "Give me liberty, or give me death"; Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, reflect the flag and all that it stands for. But, I don't reflect the rays of light that constantly penetrate... Rays come in the form of parents, teachers, Sunday School, books, and the examples of the patriots of today. Men like Armstrong and Aldron, our Presidents, and those willing to give their lives for our nation. Then there's me... that unpolished mirror.

Unpolished, yes... but at least I'm not broken. I wouldn't think of sewing the flag on my clothes or showing disrespect to the flag or mutilating it in any way. I'm proud and thankful that I'm a citizen of the United States. I want to do my part to help this country—one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. Still, I am different from the patriots... or am I? How many of them were famous at the age of thirteen? In fact, they probably were the same as me. It was when they became pol-

ished that they reflected the flag. I'm still young, but I, too, can shine. After thinking about it, maybe I was wrong! I am the flag and I'm proud that I can begin to reflect our Nation.

I AM THE FLAG!!

(By Barbara Cline)

Dear Lord, you know I'm getting old, I can't deny it. In a few years I'll be 200. Yet the flow of life runs through me still. Yes, you know me, stubborn, enduring, still tossing and frolicking in the breeze, never resting, always striving onward. Perhaps the reason I never stop is because I've lead too many brave men into battles from which they never returned, or because I've witnessed so much hatred and bloodshed and agony. When I think of these things, I'm almost ready to retire.

I think and brood for awhile until, gradually, like the dawning of a new day, a fabulous, shining, glorious realization overcomes me with a radiant clarity that I can almost touch and see and smell. I have carried these courageous men into an oncoming battle for a purpose—to improve the lives of more people, to make certain that there will be less bloodshed, and to provide a new tomorrow for all the world's children! You call me Old Glory, but I'm young yet. Please God, don't let them turn their backs on me, or 'orsake me, oh please!... don't let them give up yet. I've still a lot to give. Yes, dear Lord, thank you for helping me find the goodness in what I do. It's true, I have lead men into battles but I've also lead them in exploration and discovery, from our early settling of the West, to our latest conquest of the moon. Come men, I'm ready to do what must be done.

YOU ARE THE FLAG

(By Amy Couch)

See the flag as it waves overhead?
See the tombstones of men who are dead.
These men died for justice, meant to be had,
For peace and for purity, not all so bad.
The flag was their symbol of freedom and life,
The men who were fighting in grief and in strife.
The flag was important to the brave and the true,
Who fought in the mist and the morning dew.
They wanted their freedom these men with such love,
The flag was their goal as it waved high above.
They were loyal and loving and courageous too,
They fought to save the many and few.
The flag with its stripes and its blue starry field,
Is justice and peace that never shall yield.
They needed the flag for the hopeful and brave,
And for this flag many were driven to a grave.
I hope I shall never face such great pain,
Or hardships and poverty or such a great strain.
I would be willing to fight for this flag,
But I would not tear it or make it a rag.
This flag means so much to us now and back then,
That we should be willing to fight over again.
To fight in the morning or in the night,
To fight with our love and also our might.
The flag overhead is a symbol of love,
Won by men who earned it with help from above.

AMERICA

(By Miles Early)

I think to live in America, you should do your share.

There are very few people that help America grow. Most sit around and complain. Take for example, air pollution. Who really does

anything about it? Or water pollution? And how about that candy bar paper that you just threw anyplace outside. You don't do that in your house, do you?

When you listen to the news at night and hear about the black power and white power going against each other, it just doesn't make sense. No one is going to achieve anything except maybe kill each other. The power I think should exist is Red, White, and Blue power.

When our country began everyone worked and shared with one another. They had building power. The flag they chose for our country was not just one color, but three. It was the flag that showed red, white, and blue power. This power was for all the people of the United States. I think it is the power of peace, love and friendship. The best thing about red, white and blue power is that the more it is shared the stronger it gets.

If we can go thousands of miles to make friends with other countries like China, I think we should be able to go ten or fifteen feet to make friends with our neighbors even if they are a different color.

If I, a boy of thirteen, can see and understand why America is so great and how to make it even greater, why can't grown-ups much smarter and wiser than I understand?

YOU ARE THE FLAG

(By Beth Garrett)

It is a long day from sunrise to sunset, but that is my work day, every day, seven days a week, fifty-two weeks a year—for years stretching on for years. It is outdoor work which means I get wet when it rains, cold when it blows, and scorched by the summer sun. I'm not complaining because I love the work. It has been a steady job, and with God's help I pray that it will continue.

The job is hereditary. My father had it, and his father's, father's father had it. There have been moments of great despair and moments of glory. One of my forefathers fought with the Minute Men at Bunker Hill. Another marched to glory at Gettysburg. My own father rode with the tanks in Germany. My great, great grandfather heard the crying of a million slaves and cried too.

It is a difficult job because the world expects so much of me. I must always be honest and true. I must always be courageous and hold out a helping hand. My door must always be open, and I must bring the poor, the hopeless, and the downtrodden into my family. I must try always to act in truth and to fight for right.

I am the hope of mankind, and I sing a song of freedom. I preach equality and I shine like a great light. I am the American Flag.

WHAT THE FLAG MEANS TO ME

(By Robin Gibbons)

The Flag is a sacred symbol as it proudly waves above.
Conceived in the name of Freedom, born in a dream of love.
It flies above in time of peace; it flies in time of war;
It flies for weary wanderers that wait on a distant shore.
The right to pursue our happiness and find it if we can,
Of lofty aims, that we will find in the brotherhood of man.
It represents a land worth while, that God has surely blessed.
Symbolic of all that God made good, is imbedded in our flag;
To men who do not understand, it is just a colored rag.
They are evil men, violent men who curse and desecrate,
Who wish to overthrow this land, who tempt the hand of fate,
And yet they cry for justice when their pillaging is through,

And seek the flag's protection for the evil deeds they do.
 The Flag shall never stand for greed, for evil or for hate;
 It stands for love, and love it is that made our country great.
 There can be no greater thrill on earth, that can ever come to you,
 Than to see our flag flying in the breeze against the azure blue.
 What is the meaning of our Flag? It means a guarantee
 Of the right to love and believe in God.
 That's what it means to me.

YOU ARE THE FLAG
 (By Shawn Hetler)

You are the privilege of serving!
 You are two brothers enlisting in the Navy and Air Force so that they may serve their country and thus honor their flag.
 You are a father who left college also to enlist in World War II.
 You are a Grandfather who enlisted in World War I.
 You are a great great relative who worked to help form the Declaration of Independence.

This does not mean that any of these were war loving people, but it does mean that each one of these people felt that they shouldn't wait for the "other guy" to do the job but that they should pitch in and do it now and do it right.

You are the haven to the Irish, German, English, Scotch, Polish or Korean relatives who have fled their native lands to benefit and prosper under the shelter of your bright stars and broad stripes.

You are the Protestant, Catholic, or Jewish relative who have enjoyed your unquestioned freedom to enter the church of their choice and bend their knees, heart, and head in the prayer of their choice whether it be silent or aloud.

You are the glory floating over the school I take for granted I will be attending free for thirteen years.

You are the banner I carry dressed in my blue cub scout uniform or my green boy scout uniform.

You are my right to watch T.V., see a movie, play a record, listen to my radio, watch a ball game or play a ball game in any free time I may have and without dictation from a leader or a state.

You are my Red White and Blue security blanket that I can curl under as I say my goodnight prayer knowing that I sleep in safety and peace.

OUR COUNTRY—OUR FLAG
 (By Susan Lower)

There's a flag rippling softly in the breeze. The red, white, and blue folds make it look as if it was especially made to lie against the soft clouds, surrounded by a clear, blue sky. The red, white, and blue exterior is what makes our flag a sight to behold. But to find its beautiful, hidden meaning, you must delve deep into the folds of its stars and stripes. Its meaning is there, and everybody, someday will discover just what that meaning is.

Perhaps its significance to me is that our flag stands for the big, important things in our country as well as the smaller things. The flag is all the different things that our land and our people are.

It signifies death as it's draped over a casket, but it means life as it honors a mother's new child.

It's the beautiful, green countryside, the fresh air, and a clear sky, yet it's also the crowded city, the big factories, and the dirty air.

It's the footsteps left by treading soldiers in 1775, and today it's new footsteps left on the moon.

It's a bright, sunny day dawning just over the eastern horizon, but it's that day's end as the sun lowers behind the mountains in the west.

Our flag is the rich man and the poor man; the loved and the hated. It's a smiling face and a tear-streaked face. It's the saint and the sinner; the good and the bad. It can be 20 million bright shining lights, or maybe just the flame of a single candle. Our flag is our land. It's our people. It's our past. It's our present. It's our country. But most important to me is that I'm part of all this; because I'm the flag.

YOU ARE THE FLAG
 (By Scott Mehno)

The American flag is a symbol which we all cherish, but my deep and abiding love is not for the flag itself but for what it represents, the American people. Not only the great Americans who built our country into the strong nation it is today; not only the soldier at Bunker Hill or Viet Nam, there is another type in America that has contributed just as much but has received less recognition. They are the common people, the working forces who keep America moving. In a sense we are all common people striving for one goal in life, a freedom for all the people of our Nation. The flag represents this goal for all races of our country.

It also represents a dream, the American dream. It's a dream that people from all walks of life may live in freedom, and that there may be a world peace among men. Unlike other nations' great Americans have fulfilled some of these dreams. Others are still to be realized.

The flag represents our heritage also. It is a story in itself of every American and our struggle for liberty and justice. It portrays courage of people like Helen Keller who overcame her handicap and taught many other Americans to accept themselves for what they are. It is an emblem which depicts the power of the American people and our sacred freedom. Wherever it is flown today, on mountaintops, across American plains, on battlefields torn with bitterness, or waving freely before the White House, it commands respect from all of its observers. And though there will always be problems facing our flag and our great Nation, we will go on as the standard of liberty for the world.

MARTY O'MALLEY WINS IN FLAG ESSAY

A salute to a Mount youth for his inspiring essay on our Flag!

Marty O'Malley of 258 Republic St. is one of the grand prize winners in Duquesne Light Co.'s "You Are the Flag" essay contest.

Marty is the son of Marty and Gladys O'Malley and is an eighth grader at St. Mary of the Mount. An avid student of history, Marty's ambition is to become a lawyer.

The winners will be recognized at Flag Plaza on Flag Day, June 14. Following the award presentation they will leave on a three-day historical tour of Williamsburg, Jamestown and Yorktown, Va.—the "cradle of the colonies." Each of the winners also will receive a flag that has flown over the nation's capital for presentation to the winner's school.

Marty's essay "You Are the Flag" follows:
 Who is the flag? Is it you, or me, or an idea? Please allow me, a piece of cloth with red and white stripes and 50 stars on a field of blue, to speak. Let me talk about how the flag was launched from a sewing room in Philadelphia all the way to the moon. Allow me to say some of the things I have seen along the way.

My colors were a symbol against tyranny and gave heart to those early Americans who wanted freedom and the right to pursue happiness. When I came on the scene I stirred those hearts to endure whatever was necessary to achieve our final goal. It took many

years but I finally flew as the symbol of a new nation.

So many times I have flown with pride and glory. There were also times when my color seemed to fade. Not from the sun and rain but from my own tears. These tears were shed during our own Civil War when this nation was threatened to be torn apart from within. Tears were shed again when the red, white and blue was flown at half-mast due to the sudden and tragic loss of such men Abraham... Martin... and John.

Those colors blossomed again, as I think they always will, because of the desire of the people they represent. They shine bright with joy when they are aboard a ship loaded with food for the people of an underdeveloped nation. They glisten brightly on the side of an airplane carrying doctors, nurses and medical supplies to victims of an earthquake or some other disaster.

Who is the flag? Is it I or is it you? I think it's both of us. I am the symbol, but you are the people and the purpose!

**ECONOMIC DATA AS A TOOL
 FOR POLICYMAKING**

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, James Knowles, who served with the Joint Economic Committee for 22½ years made an important speech entitled "Economic Data as a Tool for Policymaking" shortly before his retirement as Director of Research of the JEC on May 17. The speech was delivered at the Federal Statistics Users' Conference at which time the Board of Trustees honored Mr. Knowles with a resolution expressing "its grateful appreciation to James W. Knowles for his many years of service and outstanding contributions to the development and improvement of Federal statistics."

Following is the text of Mr. Knowles' speech:

ECONOMIC DATA AS A TOOL FOR POLICYMAKING

On January 16, 1950, I joined the staff of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, with one of my prime duties to assist the Committee in applying quantitative economic data to policymaking. It seems entirely appropriate, therefore, that as I approach the end of my service with the Committee, after 22½ years, I should spend part of this, my last day of active duty, with members of the Federal Statistics Users' Conference to discuss, in the light of experience, some conclusions and recommendations concerning the use of economic data as a tool for policymaking. This is also appropriate because for years I performed the same function for private business before I came to Government, and I expect to continue to do so in the future.

Experience brings me to three conclusions. First, a society can achieve and maintain a high degree of individual freedom only if it insures widespread opportunity for informed, independent decision-making. As a society grows more complex, individual and collective decisions can be intelligently made only if information, especially quantitative data, is made available on an increasingly large scale and measures up to rising standards of accuracy, timeliness, and consistency. Though such information flows will not

insure wise solutions to our problems, it is a necessary pre-condition.

Second, enormous strides have been made in the collection, processing, analysis and publication of economic data over the last several decades. The policymakers on the Joint Economic Committee, together with their staff have been regular contributors to the improvement of statistical programs to enable them to better meet the needs of policymakers. Indeed, one of the first assignments the Committee gave the Committee staff was to produce a report on some current gaps in our statistical knowledge. The resulting report, published in 1948, became widely known under the title, "Statistical Gaps." It became the first in a long series. Nor have we seen the end of the Committee's interest in this subject.

But, after all of these years of experience, I have a most uneasy feeling that all is not well. Indeed, I confess that my impression is that there is too much heated emotionalism, bad data, and improper use of data to make one comfortable about the correctness of our decisionmaking—public or private. One might even speculate that some future historian of this period might borrow a phrase from William Jennings Bryan to accuse the public and private leaders of this era of having crucified mankind on a cross of ignorance.

Third, the data needs of policymakers are identical, whether they operate in the public or in the private sector. The distinctions sometimes drawn between the kind of issues facing each class of officials were never very significant and in recent decades have entirely disappeared. The nation needs a unified data system capable of serving these common requirements of the public and private sectors.

The cardinal requirement that data must meet for policymaking purposes is that it flow in a timely manner from a data system capable of producing not merely accurate and comprehensive data, but data that is internally consistent. Series must be consistent, not merely within themselves over time, but with each other. What do we have? Not a system, but a loose conglomeration of vaguely-related series, incomplete and with interfaces with each other that are somewhat hazy to producers and users, alike. For example, financial data comes from the Internal Revenue Service and via a quite different sample operated by the Federal Trade Commission. Related money and credit data flow through a variety of channels operated by different agencies. Orders, sales and inventories come from another sample run by still another agency. Capital expenditures come from two other sources with different samples from all the rest. Employment figures come from still other sources with still other sampling frames. One could go on at length. How much of what is reported about economic relationships really happened? How much is simply inconsistency or statistical noise? Who knows?

For decades we have known how to design a statistical system. Why don't we have one? Why is it still so difficult to use data from different agencies measuring different but related economic variables? We have for many years had the capability of making the accumulated statistical data instantly available by wire from a central computer library. I am not talking about what is sometimes called a "data bank" with its original records, but a machine-based library of readily available published data. Why isn't this service available?

Think of the great benefit to policymaking that would arise from adequate price statistics that were carefully coordinated with data about employment, output, productivity, costs, profits, etc. The Consumer Price Index is confined to one segment of consumers. Compilation of a complete system of industry-segmented price indexes remains for fu-

ture accomplishment. We have long known how to compute weighted indexes and of their advantages over unweighted indexes, yet in the field of financial statistics, particularly the measurement of the money supply, the series are almost entirely of a primitive unweighted variety.

In view of the many explosions that have occurred in the political life of this nation over conflicts of interest, why are there no headlines about statistical programs? Almost all of what we know about the distribution of income is derived from data drawn from the records of tax returns filed with the IRS. This agency has a staff of great probity and ability, but it still remains true that taxes are collected so far as an average taxpayer is concerned, largely in total disregard of legal due process or the equal application of the law, as required by the Constitution. Indeed, this—so far as I know—is the only branch of law in which the citizen is considered guilty until he proves his innocence at his own expense! Here is an area of law in which the errors of a calculator enshrined in a print-out becomes *prima facie* evidence against a citizen, and the citizen is reduced to proving that the computer is in error, rather than having the Government prove that the computer was right.

Another major source of our financial and income data is the quarterly financial report which happens to be compiled by a regulatory agency which acts simultaneously as collector of statistics, investigator of economic wrongdoing, prosecutor, judge, jury and executioner. If this same condition was true in any other aspect of social life, wouldn't we be hearing an outcry about conflict of interest? Can we really rely on the integrity and professional skills of the staffs of these agencies as adequate protectors when we would not accept this condition elsewhere in society? Should not we remember that ancient prayer "lead us not into temptation?"

There are those who may take offense at my questioning of the status quo. But to those I reply simply with one question: How can we replace the heat of emotion with the cool and sane light of reasoned analysis of quantitative fact if statistical programming is not like Cesar's wife, above reproach or, more important, about the suspicion of reproach. We must not only assure the professional caliber and ethical standards of statistical staffs, we must also build an impenetrable barrier that assures the public that statistical data is isolated from any possible, even potential misuse or the improper revelation of individual records.

Again, though we have known for a long time most of the requirements for a complete system of economic reporting, there still are many gaps—some of which are listed in that early publication of the Joint Economic Committee back in 1948. What excuse can we offer for the fact that we have no independent check on the quality of available distribution of income information? We know how to remedy these shortcomings. What is required is a regular quarterly survey of income, expenditures and savings. This need has long been recognized. Yet it does not exist.

The shortcomings that I have once more referred to in these remarks are not reviewed here to make my colleagues feel bad about our lack of progress, for indeed we have made progress. Rather, it is to emphasize the challenge—these opportunities which lie ahead of us—to organize our mutual efforts so as to drag this nation into the second half of the 20th century so far as the collection and use of quantitative data is concerned.

If you have followed current policy debate very closely, you will notice that economic data are at the heart of many debates. There is almost as much debate about the facts of productivity, wages, profits and prices as there are over current stabilization policies. I wonder how many of those decisions by the regulatory agencies—now matters of

current regret—would have occurred if our statistical system had been designed to provide ready and adequate tools for such program design and operation.

Although my experience indicates that failures of political calculations and forecasts have been far more important as causes for erroneous policies than errors of economic analysis and forecasting, yet I still maintain that there have been many important occasions when the outcome could have been significantly different if the contending parties in a decision-making situation had truly been enlightened by statistical data generally accepted as valid. We need not look further for proof than at the record of the monetary authorities whose mistakes and misdirected decision-making for over a half a century show how to be uncanny in almost never coming up with the right answers. I do not attribute this to the mere foibles of banker mentality or a lack of devotion to the doctrines of Milton Friedman. Nor can the fault be attributed to short-comings of personnel, for some of the outstanding talent of this century have served with great devotion and integrity in the monetary agencies. The dominant source of error is simply the deficiencies of our economic, and more particularly our monetary data, as guides to decision-making in the monetary policy field.

So far I have raised questions about the failure to raise the data system to the heights of our knowledge and of the dangers this is creating that policies may go astray. On the other hand, although it may be insulting to us as technicians, the fact is that the use of quantitative information as a tool in policymaking is still very rudimentary. As I have commented earlier, there is too much emotional heat and too little reasoned analysis of data. In addition, I might now add, there is too much abuse of statistical data.

We have much criticism these days of the tax system and demands for its reform. To what extent is this really based on analysis of objective data? How much of the argument is based on administrative data derived from the very tax system we criticize? Indeed, how much is based on myth or guesswork? If such analysis of impartial independent statistical information existed, would we have been engaged in one decade in twice enacting an investment tax credit? Would we now be engaged in a debate over the adoption of an excise tax, otherwise now known as the value-added tax? I wonder how many businessmen would support either of these two tax devices if there was an impartial analysis of their impact on rates of return on capital over a period of years. Do you really believe that businessmen are prepared to advocate increased instability for the economy as a whole and lower rates of return on capital?

Many a critic of the corporate income tax would be taking a different position if he had an impartial quantitative appraisal of the most probable outcome of the various alternatives. I wonder, too, what would be the stance of many of the present critics of the property tax, including some judges, if the difficulties of the property tax were made obvious?

I wonder what would happen under the present stabilization program if the regulators of prices and wages really had measurements showing what happens in businesses of different asset size. You will pardon me for suggesting that the popularity of Professor Galbraith's recommendation to concentrate on big firms might disappear with the speed of the Titanic going down?

Over these 22 years I have become increasingly aware that liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, businessmen and labor leaders might all be interchanging positions on important issues if the use of economic data in policymaking had reached the heights that our present knowledge and equipment makes possible.

I have asked a number of questions about

why we are not making as much progress as we need to, and before I close these valedictory remarks, I would like to partially answer them. In brief, the answer can be seen from looking around this room at the people present. Here are many of the world's best experts in economic data collection and analysis. How many chief executives represent their organizations here today? Are there any? How many departments of the Government are represented by a cabinet officer? When hearings are held by Congressional Committees to consider statistical programs and their fundings, how many of the nation's leaders appear to testify in favor of an adequate organization and funding of an integrated statistical system?

We have allowed the pressures of daily decisionmaking to distract us from the vital task of creating data tools to make wise decisions possible. It is not enough for us, the technicians to be convinced of the need for an improved and integrated data system. The chief policymakers, public and private, must be convinced enough to change national priorities so as to make available the resources such a system requires. If the grand objectives set forth in Section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 are to be realized, if we, as a nation, are to contribute to a prosperous, just and peaceful world, then all of us must re-dedicate ourselves to achievement of a truly modern and effective data system. We have the knowledge. We can eliminate the remaining pockets of ignorance and mythology that still produce mistaken economic and social decisions. I am confident that the Federal Statistics Users' Conference can and will play an outstanding role in the continuing crusade to create a just, prosperous and free society through advances in knowledge and in the application of data to policymaking, public and private.

RISE IN FOOD COSTS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of rising food costs has been a matter of great concern in recent months. The consumer is faced with continually rising prices on meat, vegetables, and many other products. In an economy the size of ours, it is often difficult to isolate the cause or source of such rampant inflation.

Accusations have been made that the retail food chains are responsible for spiralling food prices. I am submitting for the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Avram Goldberg, president of Stop and Shop Companies, which I hope will help balance the scales on this issue. I recommend this statement to every Member concerned about the cost of food, and the economic mechanisms behind those increases:

STATEMENT BY MR. AVRAM J. GOLDBERG

Dr. Grayson and ladies and gentlemen: First may I introduce myself. My name is Avram Goldberg. I am president of the Stop & Shop Companies and we are headquartered here in Boston. We have been in business for 57 years starting as a small group of grocery stores. At the present time we operate 158 Stop & Shop supermarkets, 56 Bradlees self-service department stores, 19 Medi Mart super drug stores, 35 Perkins tobacco shops and 3 Funstop Toy and Leisure Time stores. We have stores in all of the New England

States (except Vermont), in northern New Jersey, and a few stores in New York State, although none in the city of New York. Our individual divisions have a great degree of autonomy, but they are all part of the Stop & Shop Companies and under our total sales umbrella—thus, all are being controlled as a Tier I Company.

I appreciate very much the opportunity, as a retailer, within the time allotted to me, to present a few comments to you. It may be presumptuous of me, but I would like to compliment you for taking the time to travel around the country, and particularly to come here to Boston to listen to us. Frankly, when we first heard of this public meeting, coming so soon after the recent intensive press coverage given to the problem of food prices, we had mixed emotions about appearing. There is always the problem of words being misconstrued in what is an anxious and sometimes angry world. The open forum, however, is not only an American tradition, but particularly a New England one, and I am happy to be able to be part of it. Of course, I can in no way speak for the entire food industry or even for the New England sector of it. I am speaking only as an individual and on behalf of our own company.

I must admit that it is rather uncomfortable to be a retailer these days. For the first time, we have even been called "The Middleman". As Mr. James Cooke, president of the Super Market Institute and chairman of Penn Fruit Company of Philadelphia said in his remarks just recently at the Super Market Institute convention in Houston, "in reality, we are the endmen. We are the ones closest to the consumer, the ones who bring the bad news of rising prices. It is the retailer who receives the brunt of consumer resentment. Yet, to blame the retailer for rising prices is like blaming the thermometer for the temperature."

I thought it would be best to talk specifically about the food business because, frankly, today that seems to be the hot issue. Our position is an ironic one. There is no question that food prices have been rising. It is perfectly understandable that our customers are not happy and our role, which is both challenging and frustrating, is to be the point of communication for the customer. Yet the reality of the supermarket economic picture certainly cannot be classified as being "profitable". I know that you undoubtedly have been deluged with statistics and I am not going to weigh you down with very many. But the figure of one cent of profit on a dollar's worth of sales has long been used as the classic symbol of our industry. Less well known is the trend, which, on a national basis, has been steadily downward for over five years. Consider these figures from a study published by the Cornell University Department of Agricultural Economics just this spring, for food chains which do one hundred million dollars per year or more. In 1964-65, those companies made an average of 1.25% net profit on sales. The next year, that figure dropped to .97%, then to .91%, and then to .45%. It rose slightly to .60% in 1968-69, declined to .45% in 1969-70 and in the 1970-71 year, it was down to .14%. So it is obvious that the runaway inflation, which we all experienced, was hurting us dramatically from a profit point of view at the same time it was hurting the consumer's pocketbook.

Now the picture in New England and particularly in Boston was even more dramatic. At the risk of being somewhat personal, it might be interesting to look at the March 27, 1972 issue of Supermarket News, admittedly a trade publication. On the front page there is a mock-up picture of two of our local retailers (one of whom happens to be myself) and the headline reads, "Boston's 'blood bath'". I would like to read to you only the first paragraph as follows:

"In Boston, the words 'exhausting,' 'frus-

trating,' and 'impossible' don't call to mind consumerist demands or union bargaining. They seem to be reserved for the dizzying low priced competition that has dominated the field here off and on for years." Stop & Shop is part of that competitive picture. In 1965, we dropped trading stamps in all of our operating territories and introduced our concept of discount food merchandising, which we call "mini pricing." Since then we have done our best to maintain the lowest possible prices "across the board" in our stores. Almost exactly one year ago, in April 1971, due to an intensifying competitive picture, we actually reduced 3,500 grocery prices in all of our greater Boston stores. We took this step even though we were confronted with what we all now know was a constantly increasing number of rising wholesale prices, as well as operating costs.

Putting this entire picture together, the result was that when Phase I commenced in August of 1971, thousands of grocery items in our stores in the Boston area were priced well below their level on May 25, 1970.

Now, what has been our position in Phase II? As each regulation was issued, we did our best to insure quick and full compliance, as soon as humanly possible. All of our stores (Bradlees, Medi Mart and Stop & Shop) placed the base price list out where the customers could look at it. Despite the fact that Phase II commenced on November 14, and we began receiving wholesale price increases, we were not allowed to raise any retail price above that list until we had completed and filed all the new forms. We were instructed by the Government that we were to be controlled on the basis of our historical gross margins, broken down by our standard categories. So we filed the PC-1R form for our supermarkets, by geographical area—and by department; in other words, our grocery, meat, produce and florist departments—the way we have always historically measured our performance and the only way we can capture our true gross margin percentage through our cash registers. (We understand the difference between the food and department store industries, and for our Bradlees stores, for example, we filed gross margins for 67 departments).

At the time that we filed the PC-1R forms on December 9, 1971, we were then operating at margins well below our base periods. The regulations and the interpretation we received from Washington indicated it was up to us to run our business subject to two limitations. First, we could not exceed those base period gross margins. Secondly, we were limited to a maximum percent net profit to sales, based upon our own record of the previous three years. It might be of interest for you to know that we have recently completed our 1971 fiscal year. The pretax earnings of our company, unfortunately, were down from 1970. In 1970, we earned before taxes approximately ten million dollars, and in 1971, only 4½ million dollars. After Federal income taxes in 1971, we earned 3.561 million dollars, or .39% of sales. I would have been delighted with our so-called base period net to sales which, on a post tax basis, would have enabled us to earn over 10 million dollars.

Since the beginning of Phase II, we have received over 1,400 price increases from our grocery suppliers, while at the same time, the now well known dramatic increase in the wholesale cost of meat took place. As a result, when we filed our first quarterly report at the end of March, in each one of our departments our gross margins turned out to be below the maximums set by the regulations. I should also like to point out, of course, that those margins, stemming from the performance of the previous year, are much lower than they were back in 1967 and 1968. If we are frozen at this level for a prolonged period of time, we will be hard pressed to absorb rising operating costs, such

as labor, state and local taxes, insurance, utilities, maintenance costs and, incidentally, the costs of the administration of the Federal control system itself.

On March 9, 1972, the Price Commission published in the Federal Register a definition of a "low profit company", based upon return on capital. We unfortunately fall into that category, as well. Although we requested the appropriate relief under that regulation the same week, it has still not been granted.

There is another point of view being expressed by some of the governmental people with whom we deal. That is the current pressure for so-called item control rather than category control. The quandary in which we find ourselves, Dr. Grayson, is that we have, from the very beginning, made a great effort to comply promptly with the regulations, not only as we have received them in writing, but as they have been interpreted to us from Washington. We believe we are in complete compliance and, as a matter of fact, our gross margins and our net profit all fall below the standards that have been set. Merely to hold our own and to attempt to come close to our historic low gross margins, we have had to raise a number of prices. Carrying some 9,000 items in our supermarkets, some go up and some go down. On some that we have raised, we may be making a slightly higher percentage than we were a year ago. On others, due to the competitive nature of the food business, our margins have not improved, and in many cases have shrunk.

Pricing in the food business is simply not done on an item by item basis. The overall market is influenced by the particular mix of pressures of cost, and of competition. No simple formula can be used to price any item and what we in Stop & Shop, and indeed all food retailers are dealing with, is not the return or markup of any individual item, but the return on the market basket of goods that is rung up on our cash registers. Therefore, individual item prices do not have a constant relation to cost. Neither our system nor competition allows it and the controls set up under Phase II reflect the realities of the food business. In fact, in the meat department, an item by item control would be simply impossible. Shifting to an item by item basis might place an overpowering and costly burden on the supermarket industry; and thus not only is it inconsistent with the historic practice of food pricing, and the regulations as issued, but might well be a cause of additional costs to the consumer.

The problem is that our understanding is often not the same as the hard-pressed people who locally attempt to enforce the regulations, despite the fact that we have been told that our understanding is the same as that of the Price Commission.

I know that the Price Commission must be very concerned with the recent apparent surge of food prices, as reflected by the Consumer Price Index of February 1972. As we all know, the major spiraling factor was meat prices, and we were one of the 12 companies invited to Washington to the now famous meeting with Secretary Connally. I certainly don't want to get into a debate as to whether the ranchers simply "caught up" or whether the price of beef on the hoof rose too high. But I think everyone, including both Secretary Connally and Secretary Butz, agreed on the simple fact that the increase in the wholesale price of beef, which peaked in the middle of February, was a direct reflection of shortage of supply and the increasing beef demand in our country. Beef prices to us simply took off on a dramatic upwards spiral approximately the middle of November and from that time until March, our margins on beef shrank until at one point they were down approximately 25% (or 5 points) from their previous level. This was despite the fact that we were forced to raise the cost of meat at the retail case.

In periods of rising wholesale cost, retail price increases lag behind. When costs decline there is also a lag in retail reductions. First, there is the mechanical lag. It takes time to get product into and through our distribution system and into the case. Also, frankly, we try to recoup *some* of the losses we experience during the time of increasing wholesale costs, as well as to determine whether the cost reduction is apt to persist. All of this makes the consumer price index, which is six weeks behind in its reflection of the retail picture when it is announced, a rather unfair measuring stick. Incidentally, it is unfair for many other reasons with which I am sure this Commission is familiar. An example of the problem of timing and lag is that we had, in the Boston area, a major beef sale scheduled for the Monday following the meeting with Secretary Connally. Obviously, for a company of our size, that sale had to be planned weeks in advance, when there was the first indication that the wholesale market had peaked. In our smaller group of New Jersey stores (where reaction time can be shorter), beef was actually being promoted at the time of the meeting.

In summary, our position can be stated as follows:

1. We in the retail business, specifically in the retail food business, are the end men in a long chain of links in a distribution process. As each one of those links has its own cost increases, we finally receive them all, and are their point of communication to the consumer. As Mr. William Mitchell, president of Safeway Stores, said at a press conference on March 29th, "If we took all the net profit of all of the retail food chains, cooperatives and voluntary groups for a year, and distributed them back to the customers on a per capita basis, the average per capita distribution would be less than one cent per day. If we cut this industry so that it made no money at all, an average family of four would get back 28¢ at the end of the week."

2. As an industry we have an identity of interest with the consumer in arresting our national inflation. As I have tried to show, the impact of the inflationary process over the past decade has served only to weaken our low margin industry and to reduce our percentage of profit. A continuation of this trend would cripple our ability to introduce improvements, attract capital, and perhaps even to survive.

3. We have supported the control system from the beginning. We have been in compliance with both Phase I and Phase II, but our ability to comply is severely hampered by conflicting interpretations between the regulations issued by the Price Commission, and the efforts at lower levels, however well intentioned, to reinterpret and enforce them. This is particularly true in the specific areas of item vs. category control, and relief to the low profit companies.

4. A policy of either freezing retail food prices at the present level, or rolling them back and freezing them at the point they were at in August of 1971, would place an unfair burden on the retail end of the food distribution chain. It would merely perpetuate the squeeze in which we had been caught on an increasingly tight basis for several years, and make it impossible for us to absorb increasing operating costs. This would be particularly true in the competitive New England area.

5. Many union contracts negotiated during Phase II must be approved by the Pay Board. In these cases, agreed-upon increases have exceeded the guidelines set forth at the beginning of the control program. But union representatives, in their understandable zeal to protect their members, who are also our employees, have negotiated frequently as if there were no controls. The procedures of the Pay Board are so complex that it takes literally months of computer time to put together the material it re-

quires before ruling. It would be most helpful if these procedures were simplified, for as yet we, for example, have been unable even to complete the material required for a contract negotiated in February. We will not know the total impact of the control systems upon us—and upon similar companies—until the Pay Board decisions issue. And if they are not consistent with the regulations of the Price Commission, then the cost-push squeeze will be even more intense than I have described.

I would like to thank you for the opportunity to present a point of view. We share with you the anxiety that destructive inflation must be curbed. We ask that present regulations be interpreted consistently and quickly. We strongly believe that the intensive competitiveness of the retail food business, as well as our own philosophy of maintaining high volume, low margin supermarkets will keep food prices as low as humanly possible.

I will be happy to answer to the best of my ability any questions you may have.

THE CASE FOR ECONOMIC CONVERSION

HON. JOHN F. SEIBERLING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. SEIBERLING. Mr. Speaker, the problem of economic conversion has received an enormous amount of verbal attention in recent years.

Unfortunately, that is just about the only kind of attention it has received.

The principle behind economic conversion is startlingly simple: By redirecting a substantial portion of Federal spending away from military spending and toward long-range civilian needs, we can strengthen the economy, put the unemployed back to work, and meet our commitment to make this country a better place for all its people.

The implementation is, of course, not so easy.

Until recently, it has been possible to ignore the economically disruptive aspects of massive defense spending. But in recent years, the sight of engineers and scientists in the queues at the welfare offices has caused widespread shock. I hope it will at long last stimulate Government action.

In an article in the June issue of the *Akron Business and Economic Review*, I have discussed how we can move from dominance by the "military-industrial" complex to what I call the "peace-industrial" complex by changing the pattern of Government spending. I include the article in the Record at this point:

THE CASE FOR ECONOMIC CONVERSION

(By Congressman JOHN F. SEIBERLING)

In the volumes of words, written and spoken, devoted to the nation's unemployment crisis over the last several years, frequent mention has been made of the plight of unemployed scientists and engineers. Though relatively small in numbers (it was estimated in 1971 that engineers and scientists accounted for 65,000 to 100,000 of the country's 5 million unemployed), this group has been more visible to the general public and has had more impact on many public officials than the millions out of work in the nation's inner cities. Many people have come to view

the high unemployment rate of the urban poor as endemic, but the sight of formerly prosperous aerospace workers standing in unemployment lines and applying for food stamps has come as a distinct shock to the general public.

The cut-back in government aerospace spending over the past several years is often cited as the cause of growing unemployment among white-collar technical workers. But it is only a part of the cause. Scientists and engineers are on the streets today because when they are dropped from aerospace work, there is nowhere else for them to go. To put it another way, the reduction of the demand for their skills in the fields of space and defense technology has not been offset by increased demand for them in other sectors of the economy.

Some of us have been talking for years about the need for "economic conversion" planning, without any tangible response on the part of the government in Washington. There is some indication, however, that the widespread concern evoked by the sight of middle-class queues at the welfare offices will bring about some governmental program for economic conversion. So far, much of the discussion has focused on the current surplus of Ph.D's and skilled technicians and on ways of finding them jobs in fields other than aerospace. But the case for economics conversion extends much farther than the need to put this relatively small group of people back to work.

Our heavy rate of military and aerospace spending over the last decade has distorted our entire economy and led to neglect of our most pressing social problems. It is not only the unemployed aerospace engineer in Seattle or Long Beach who stands to benefit from conversion. The unemployed resident of the inner city, the harried urban planner trying to cope with crowding and pollution, the outdoorsman who finds his favorite stream choked with effluents, and the businessman who faces declining exports and growing competition from imports all have a vested interest in economic conversion.

Our annual military expenditures swelled from \$44 billion at the beginning of the Sixties to nearly \$80 billion at the start of the Seventies. The expansion of public outlays for military purposes has come at the expense of other social goals. A study conducted by the Library of Congress indicating that 61% of the Administration's fiscal '72 budget (excluding trust funds such as Social Security, over which Congress has no control) was allocated to military and related expenditures.¹ Of the remaining 39%, 17% was earmarked for human resources (education, manpower, health, and income security for the poor, 11% was channeled to physical resources (agriculture, rural development, environment, commerce, transportation, community development, and housing), and 11% went to cover all other government expenditures (including space, general government, and non-military pay increases).

Part of the impact of our massive military economic investment is obvious to all who care to look. The decline in the quality of our public services, the deterioration of our health care system, the precarious financial straits of our educational institutions, the decay of our major cities, the growing pollution of our environment—all of these problems have been to large extent exacerbated by the lack of public funds to deal with them. Money which could have been spent to cure these ills has for years been siphoned off to the military.

But the trillion dollars we have spent for military purposes since 1946 has had a more subtle, less visible, impact on our economy. Not only have relatively few government dollars been available for non-military social

commercial industry to government-supported needs, but a large part of our scientific and technical talent has been diverted from commerce to defense projects.

There is a lot of talk about the need to increase U.S. productivity today. Public officials concerned about the sagging state of the economy and economic analysts noting our first trade deficit in postwar history point to our slow rate of productivity growth as one of the main villains in the story of our economic decline. In recent years, U.S. industrial productivity has been increasing at a slower rate than that of Japan and Western Europe.² This has in no small part contributed to the erosion of our international trade position. The failure of productivity to keep pace with rising wages has been a part of the cause of inflation at home and our weakened competitive position abroad.³

Productivity increase is both a function of capital investment and technological advance. Improved industrial technology is dependent on scientific research and development (R&D). The rapid growth of federally financed defense and space research in the postwar period has had serious implications for civilian R&D efforts, and, in turn, for the productivity of U.S. industry.

The large federal R&D effort fostered a rise in the overall cost of research and development, both to the government itself and to private industry. Government-generated demand created a "seller's market" for scientific and technical personnel, bidding the cost of their services upward.⁴ The rising cost of research personnel has been a major factor in growing expense of research and development.

Investment in research is always a gamble, and as research costs have risen, it is one which private industry—seeking to minimize risk—has, in many cases, been unable and unwilling to take. This, coupled with the fact that the "cream" of our scientific and technical talent has been attracted by lucrative salaries to defense and aerospace work, has meant that the growth of civilian research and development has been retarded in the U.S. in the postwar era.⁵ The application of the fruits of civilian R&D to industrial production has been further retarded in this period by steadily rising interest rates, which have discouraged the capital investment needed to infuse new technology into the economy.

The situations in Western Europe and Japan, where government investment in defense has been a much smaller portion of GNP than in the United States, are a marked contrast. In eight European countries with a combined population comparable to ours, 30% to 35% more scientists, engineers, and technicians were engaged in civilian oriented research and development between 1959 and 1965 than in the United States. The Japanese as well as the eight European countries, spent a much larger portion of GNP for civilian R&D in the same period than we did.

The correlation between large defense spending, reduced civilian research and development, and a slower rate of increase in productivity in the United States and more limited defense expenditures, greater civilian R&D, and a faster productivity rise in Japan and Western Europe is hard to ignore. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion—particularly in view of our current trade deficit—that our tremendous national investment in weaponry and weapons research has been harmful to our civilian economy.

The freeing of funds to meet domestic social needs, and the revitalization of American industry depend on the successful conversion of a substantial portion of our scientific and technical resources from military to civilian pursuits. Aerospace workers in unemployment lines are just the tip of an ice-

berg which has been growing for a quarter of a century and which runs very, very deep. But policy-makers in Washington have concentrated their attention on the iceberg's tip, treating the symptoms rather than the causes of our economic malaise.⁶

The Department of Labor has established a series of job information, relocation, and training programs intended to help unemployed aerospace workers. These may help a limited number of persons find new jobs, but they will not redress the imbalance between civilian and military research. In fact, the Administration's budget for fiscal '73 would actually increase the imbalance in favor of military R&D.⁷ If it is approved, many currently unemployed aerospace workers may be able to return to their jobs. This is no doubt politically expedient, but in view of recent history it is also economically unsound.

Congress' record on the question of conversion has not been much better than the Administration's. The Congress too has focused on job training and assistance to individuals and firms who want to transfer their skills to the civilian economy. There is nothing wrong with assisting aerospace workers and firms in this manner. I co-sponsored legislation last year to provide this kind of assistance. However, aid of this kind cannot be given in a vacuum. There must be jobs for "retrained" workers and new civilian markets for retooled firms. At present they barely exist, and we are doing little to create them.

Logically, it would seem that the opportunities for aerospace firms in the field of civilian technology are unlimited—if they can just take advantage of them. Today there is no end to the need for such things as improved mass-transit, better low-cost housing, pollution controls, improved health care delivery systems, and more efficient urban traffic control, to name a few items on the civilian shopping list. The question has been raised as to why the aerospace companies, with their experience with systems planning and their proven ability to marshal scientific technical talent to attack and solve complex problems, don't apply themselves to these needs. Why don't airframe manufacturers, for example, adapt their skills to the housing market? Why don't the communications firms which designed our space satellites and guided our astronauts to the moon develop computer systems to rationalize the traffic flow in downtown areas? The answer lies in the fact that these items are not things which can be demanded by individual consumers in the private market-place, any more than an Apollo space ship or a minute-man missile could be.

Without any indication that an effective demand exists, it is unreasonable to expect the aerospace industry to take the initiative in applying its technology to such social needs as mass-transit, low-cost housing, and pollution controls. Investment in research and development and the application of new technology to these fields will be made when the industry has assurance that there will be a return on it. Only the government can give that assurance, because only the government can create the market for these firms' products.

In weapons and space hardware, industry has shown that it can respond to government demand and move effectively into government-created markets. But there is no reason why the demand and the markets must always be for ABM's and lunar landers. If Congress appropriates funds, the government can also demand and create markets for such things as advanced pollution control technology and high speed surface transport.

It has become fashionable in recent years to speak disparagingly of the government-created "military-industrial complex". Yet there is no reason why the alliance between government and industry must be an unholy

¹ Footnotes at end of table.

one, destructive of our national well-being. By redressing the present imbalance between large military outlays and relatively small civilian expenditures, the government can create a new kind of alliance for public good—a "peace-industrial complex."

The creation of a new peace-industrial complex would have tremendous social and economic benefits. It would focus our extensive technological resources and talents on our most pressing social problems. It could mean a significant upgrading of civilian industrial technology and an improved competitive position for U.S. industry at home and abroad.¹ Finally, it would mean the creation of hundreds of thousands of new, socially productive jobs.

The new peace-industrial complex would have another, less direct, but no less beneficial effect. It would enable us to rationalize our defense policies.

As of 1969 7.5 million people were directly employed by the military or military industries. It was estimated that another 11 million persons were indirectly dependent on military, or military-related activities for their livelihoods. Taken together, this amounted to 20% and 25% of the country's total labor force. This is a large group of people and a potent voting bloc. Its presence does much to explain the pressure for constantly increased military spending which is so much a part of our system today.

The creation of new civilian jobs through the peace-industrial complex would mean reduced dependency on military and military-related activities for millions of Americans. Political pressure for increased weapons spending would be eased, and Congress could begin to consider our military spending policies in terms of our real defense needs and priorities. In an atmosphere less emotionally charged with the issue of jobs—in an economy where there are civilian alternatives for aerospace workers and management—we might avoid embarking on such questionable programs as the B-1 bomber and the Cheyenne helicopter.

It will be most unfortunate if "economic conversion" becomes a code-phrase for short-run re-employment of scientists and engineers. It is much more than that. It involves more than job retraining programs and special assistance to individual firms—although these must be a part of any detailed national conversion plan. Economic conversion involves nothing less than changing the course of government spending. It means the redirection of a substantial portion of our considerable public energies and public financial resources from military to civilian pursuits. In the end, it means committing ourselves to making this country into something better than it is today—something we can be proud to pass on to our children.

While the reader may concede in principle the necessity for economic conversion, he may also wonder how it is to be implemented. In the past several years there has been a great deal of study, and a great deal written on the most effective means of carrying out a true economic conversion program. Informed counsel and imaginative answers to this complex question are in abundance; what has been lacking is the will to act.

Successive Congresses and administrations in the post-war era have failed to grasp the extent of the damage wreaked on our national economy by the over-concentration of government resources in space and defense. But the situation is changing; awareness of the economically disruptive aspects of massive defense spending is growing. When that awareness becomes widespread in Congress, and when the public comes to share it, the creation and implementation of a national economic conversion program will be relatively easy.

FOOTNOTES

¹Of this, 44% was earmarked for current military expenditures, 6% for veterans'

benefits, and 11% for interest on the national debt (most of it war-incurred).

²In the period 1965-70, U.S. productivity increased at the annual rate of 2.1%. In the same period productivity gains for Japan, France, Germany, Italy and Britain were 14.2%, 6.6%, 5.3%, 5.1% and 3.6% respectively.

³Between 1957 and 1970 output per man-hour increased at an overall annual rate of 3.2%. Compensation per manhour increased in this period at the annual rate of 5.1%. Unit labor costs thus increased at a yearly rate of 1.9%. (This does not, however, account for all of our inflation. Pre-freeze prices were increasing between 4% and 5% per annum.)

⁴During the period of rapid expansion of governmentally supported R&D between 1950 and 1960, for example, the starting salaries for engineers with bachelor degrees rose from the 77th percentile in the rank of income of all people in the U.S. to about the 86th percentile.

⁵In spite of the fact that company-financed R&D expenditures have been steadily rising, the number of scientists and engineers per 1,000 employees in companies reporting R&D activity has remained fairly constant since the early Sixties.

⁶In all fairness, it should be noted that some of the most advanced military thinkers (still a minority, unfortunately) recognize that the weakening of our economy from a continued high level of military expenditures will inevitably have a disastrous effect on the nation's military posture. They make the point that not only is a nation's military strength a function of its economic strength but, as a result of the nuclear stalemate, the strategic competition between great powers is increasingly economic competition rather than military.

⁷For fiscal 1973, the Administration has proposed a record \$83.5 billion defense budget. \$8.5 billion of this is earmarked for weapons research and development, an increase of \$837.8 million over last year. In contrast, government spending for civilian R&D will be increased by less than \$100 million.

⁸There has been much talk of the economic "spin-off" of space and defense research, but government economists estimate that between only 5% and 10% of such R&D has a direct effect on the economy. 20% of all government R&D funds in Europe and Japan are expended for civilian purposes, as opposed to less than 6% in the United States. The higher rates of productivity increase in these countries and the rapidly improving competitive position of their goods on the world market strongly suggest that the "spin-off" from government supported civilian R&D is greater.

SENATOR BUCKLEY SPEAKS UP FOR THE PRESIDENT

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from the State of New York, the Honorable JAMES L. BUCKLEY, has distinguished himself in 2 short years as a man of courage and independence, a pragmatic and objective statesman who has contributed much to the people of New York and to the Nation. His independence and pragmatism have found him at times in honest disagreement with the administration. However, it is that same independence and same practical wisdom which have, after careful consideration

of the Nixon record, found Senator BUCKLEY, on June 7 before the Republican Luncheon Forum of Greater New York, endorsing, without hesitation and without misgivings, President Richard M. Nixon for reelection.

It is no small measure of the broad respect and eminent stature with which Richard Nixon is held, that the two distinguished Senators from New York, Senator JAVITS and Senator BUCKLEY, have concluded the reelection of Richard Nixon will best serve the people of New York and the Nation. To that goal, they have agreed to serve as cochairmen of the New York State Committee for the Re-election of the President. I join them in that goal and it is my distinct pleasure and personal honor to place in the RECORD, Senator BUCKLEY's eloquent speech endorsing the President's reelection:

SPEECH BY SENATOR JAMES L. BUCKLEY

Over one hundred years ago, in his first inaugural address, President Abraham Lincoln said: "Why should there not be patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

Lincoln's confidence in the ultimate justice of the American people was based on his understanding of their political maturity. He knew that the democratic process involves more than the right to choose among political alternatives; it involves the reasoned and thoughtful exercise of that right of choice. It is this which lies at the heart of responsible self-government.

Between now and November seventh, each American voter will be called upon to make such a choice in the Presidential election. It is a choice which I hope and pray will be made with the most thoughtful care because I believe that questions of fundamental importance to the future of our nation may hang in the balance.

Today I want to speak to you about my own choice. I know it is early in the political season to be doing so, but it is by no means premature. Thanks to the primary campaigns, the issues which will dominate the election and the thrust of the democratic argument can be clearly seen. There is little ambiguity, in short, as to the alternatives which will be presented to the American people on Election Day.

But I also want to speak out at this time because as one of the spokesmen for the conservative wing of the Republican Party, and as one who from time to time has taken issue with the administration on important points of difference, I feel a special responsibility to dispel any ambiguity as to where I stand.

Simply stated, I stand for the re-election of Richard Nixon. I intend to work as effectively as I can for his re-election and for the election of a Congress which will work with him to enact essential reforms in the years ahead. I state my support without hesitation and without misgivings. By the same token, I see no need to minimize those differences which I have had in the past or may have in the future with specific administration policies. But to acknowledge these differences in no way diminishes my personal commitment to his re-election.

My support is based on the following:

First, an assessment of the Nixon administration.

Second, the political situation in the United States as we approach the election.

Let us first look at the record, keeping in mind that political records are not made in a vacuum. What occurred before President Nixon took office and the problems he inherited must be included in any fair evaluation of his administration, for these

provided the context within which so many of his decisions had to be made.

Nor can we ignore the fact that he has had to work with a Congress both Houses of which are controlled by the opposition party, for this has dictated the limits of his legislative options.

It has been said of Attila the Hun that where his horse once trod no grass would ever grow. It can be said, with only slight exaggeration, of the political philosophy that dominated the Kennedy-Johnson years, that where its touch was felt the only things that grew were taxes and inflation and discord and bureaucracy and an endless war.

Events have a way of moving so swiftly that we tend to forget precisely what the decisions and the indecisions of those years had done to our nation. But President Nixon was not given a chance to forget. From the moment he assumed office he was faced with the legacy of the errors of the Sixties. And what was that legacy?

Violence and vandalism had been allowed to become a way of life on our campuses and in our streets. Great universities and cities were paralyzed by rampaging mobs while those in authority either looked the other way or actively condoned the lawlessness of our new barbarians.

In cities and towns across the country, the rate of crime had risen to such heights that the average person no longer felt free to walk about his neighborhood at night.

The Supreme Court had spun out a series of decisions which have erected unprecedented roadblocks in the path of those charged with bringing criminals to justice.

Public frustrations had been brought to a new high, and public confidence in government to a new low, by the unredeemed promises of "Eden Now" which had been made so freely by the high priests of the New Frontier and the Great Society. Although their programs had been enacted and billions upon billions spent, there was little they could show for all this effort but a huge bureaucracy and inflationary forces which we have yet to bring under full control.

And then there was the war. The Kennedy and Johnson administrations had wandered, willy-nilly, into a land war in Asia without any clear idea as to how to bring it to a speedy and successful conclusion. It was a war whose very real justifications were never adequately explained to the American people. It was a "No Win" war fought in a manner designed to stiffen the determination of the enemy while undermining that of the American people. It was a war which was handed over to President Nixon under conditions which precluded the military options which might have brought it to a quick and successful end.

This, then, was the legacy of chaos which was inherited by Richard Nixon as he took the oath of office in January of 1969. It was a legacy of problems and dilemmas which resulted not in spite of what the Democrats had sought to accomplish, but because of what they had been able to accomplish.

It must be remembered that all the follies and miscalculation that marked the Kennedy and Johnson years grew out of the very best that the Democrats could offer. The New Frontier and the Great Society were not just slogans. They represented the incarnation of what the Democratic theologians had told us would bring us the good, the true and the beautiful. Their every program had been enacted and they were given free reign to do as they would with almost unlimited funds. Their tragedy was not that they failed to do their best but that they succeeded; and Richard Nixon was left to pick up the pieces as best he could.

His first and most urgent task was to formulate a policy for Viet Nam which would make the most of his limited options. The demonstrators were soon in action to try to

force a precipitous retreat which would have brought disaster to the people of South Viet Nam, and which would have destroyed the credibility of American alliances around the globe. He stood his ground firmly against these and other pressures. At the same time he began to plan and execute a program for the methodical phasing out of American forces as fast as the South Vietnamese could be trained to take their place. This program is all but completed. While there were more than 550,000 Americans in South Viet Nam when he took office, fewer than 60,000 are stationed there today, almost none of them in the combat arms. It is one of the ironies of these topsy-turvy times that some of those who were most responsible for the build-up of our forces in Viet Nam are today among those who have been most abusive of the President for having failed to bring them home even faster. It is as if especially diligent termites were to scold the master carpenter.

But President Nixon has done far more than just plan our disengagement from the current conflict in Southeast Asia. In formulating the Nixon Doctrine, he has restructured our security arrangements in the Western Pacific.

This doctrine takes into account the growing political and economic capabilities of our allies as well as a realistic view of our own limitations. It will meet the future needs for regional security while avoiding the risk that we will again become engaged on the ground in local conflicts in Asia. It will do all this provided that the Congress will stop slashing the President's requests for the funds required to enable us to train and equip our allies so that they may assume the full responsibility for their own defense.

With respect to the Middle East, the President has done a superb job in his handling of one of the most volatile, dangerous situations in the world today. His quiet diplomacy and his steady pursuit of consistent policies have served to discourage a major confrontation and to keep an uneasy truce alive.

On the home front, President Nixon has achieved some impressive results despite the fact that a number of his most constructive proposals have been bottled up in Congressional Committees.

His most striking contribution has been the appointment to the Supreme Court of four highly able men who share the revolutionary view that their job is to apply the law, and not to formulate it. They have already changed the character of the Court in the most fundamental way, and they are beginning to minimize the damage which has been done by some of the more surrealistic decisions of the Warren Court. I believe we are well on our way to seeing a rebirth of public confidence in the Court as it once again exercises that judicial restraint on which the rule of law depends.

The Nixon Administration has moved vigorously to combat crime in our nation. In the field of crime prevention, \$312 million will be spent, a ten-fold increase in federal funding since 1968. The Justice Department criminal division returned over two thousand indictments in organized crime cases in 1971, mainly through the use of strike forces in seventeen cities. In Washington, D.C., the only urban area under federal jurisdiction, there was an absolute drop of 13.3 per cent in the crime rate in 1971.

President Nixon has launched a comprehensive, well-coordinated national attack on the problem of drug abuse. Since he took office, the budget of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs has been increased five-fold and the seizure of dangerous drugs and narcotics has been increased by four hundred per cent. Abroad, he has utilized our diplomatic muscle to help dry up important sources of the heroin which is smuggled into the United States. At the same time, com-

plementary efforts are being made in the fields of education and rehabilitation and research which will help those already caught up in the curse of drug addiction and save others from the dangers of experimentation.

The administration has also set an example as to how not to be coerced or stampeded by the arrogance of organized mobs. Nowhere was the example better set than in Washington in May of 1971 with the tough, efficient, no-nonsense handling of the "Mayday" hordes who had threatened to shut down the city of Washington, to shut down the government itself.

Richard Nixon has brought to the job of handling complex problems an extraordinary capacity for comprehensive planning and analysis. I can think of no better example of this than his wide-ranging program for the protection of the environment. In the field of the environment, for the first time in our history, a President has committed his administration to a policy of ecological responsibility. He has created the machinery required to implement and enforce it. It is a policy which will prove its effectiveness not by turning its back on our technology, but by utilizing it to achieve our necessary environmental goals. The President has also demonstrated his understanding that there is a limit to what the federal government can do, his understanding that it has already grown too large, too powerful. In last year's State of the Union message, he declared that we must reverse the flow of power to Washington. To my mind, this was one of the most important, most refreshing statements to be made by any President since World War II.

He followed up his address with six Special Revenue Sharing Proposals. They would have the unprecedented effect of dismantling more than one hundred existing federal bureaucracies while transferring their responsibilities to state and local levels of government which are far better equipped to handle them. This is a bold, workable blueprint for cutting back the size and influence of the federal government. Yet, because the proposals do not bear the Democratic stamp, it is less than certain that they will be enacted by the present Congress.

In economic affairs he has achieved a realistic revaluation of the dollar, and has negotiated other adjustments in the international monetary field which will improve our competitive position in world markets and reduce our unfavorable balance of trade.

I would be less than candid, at this point, if I didn't touch on those areas in which I have been in disagreement with the Nixon administration.

While I believe it is necessary and desirable to establish effective channels of communication with any government which has effective control over significant populations or resources, I have had serious misgivings over some of the results of the President's recent summitry.

I refer, for example, to the ambiguity in the Shanghai Communiqué about the status of our commitment to the security of Taiwan. If it should be widely believed that we have undertaken to scuttle an old friend and ally in the interests of major power politics, then it is understandable that other old friends and allies around the globe will begin to question the reliability of our commitment to their security. And so we have unnecessarily jeopardized confidence in our alliances at a time when too many fear that America is withdrawing from her international responsibilities.

As I have recently indicated, I am also deeply concerned about some implications of the SALT agreements. There are a number of questions which I will need to have answered before I can make a final decision as to whether or not I will vote for their ratification.

On the domestic front, I believe that the administration's Family Assistance Program will not achieve welfare reform, but will

only serve to make a bad situation worse in every significant respect at an enormous cost to the American public.

In the economic sphere, I have found myself at odds with the President on the matter of wage and price controls. I believe that the monetary measures which we had taken during the first two and a half years of his term in office were those best designed to control inflation and check unemployment, and that these measures were beginning to have their effect. If experience elsewhere on the globe is any guide, these controls will not work in the longer run; and, in the meantime, our excessive spending threatens to produce a new round of inflationary pressures.

This then is the broad outline of the Nixon record as I see it—a record which warrants my support.

I stated earlier that there was another factor on which I based my endorsement of Richard Nixon's bid for re-election. I speak of the political situation in the United States as we approach Election Day.

If it is suspected that there is any appreciable difference among the probable nominees of the Democratic Party, consider for a moment the records of Senators Humphrey, McGovern and Kennedy:

On the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment to cut off all funds for American operations in Indochina by December 31, 1971, they all voted "Aye." Had they had their way, South Viet Nam would have collapsed this spring under the weight of Hanoi's massive offensive and the Communist execution squads would now be going about their grisly business of liquidating hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese, who had shown the courage to resist, just as they had liquidated more than 5,000 civilians in Hue during their ten-week occupation of the city in 1968.

On the McGovern Amendment to the Military Procurement Authorization, which would have cut defense expenditures by twenty per cent by imposing an arbitrary \$60 billion ceiling, they all voted "Aye."

On the Rehnquist nomination to the Supreme Court, they all voted "Nay."

On the two bills which President Nixon had to veto last year because of their extravagance and unwarranted expansion of federal authority, they all voted to override the veto.

We as a nation simply cannot afford to go much further down the road which any probable Democratic candidate would want to take us.

This brings me, finally, to the responsibilities which I feel as one of the spokesmen for the conservative wing of the Republican Party. The fact of conservative dissent has weighed heavily on my mind, and I have shared most if not all of the concerns to which it has given voice.

However, if we conservatives fail to choose, if we decide to "sit this one out," we will in effect be helping those whose programs would lead the United States into disaster. But if we will take charge of events, there is very much that we can do.

Consider for a moment that both in 1960 and 1968, Richard Nixon failed to carry New York State as the Presidential nominee of the Republican Party. But on the basis of my own election; on the basis of what I have learned since then during my extensive travels throughout New York State; on the basis of all this experience, I can say categorically that with the support of those who supported me in 1970, Richard Nixon can and will carry New York State in 1972.

The fate that will fall on America unless we act has been spelled out quite clearly in the programs offered by the candidates of the Democratic Party. However, if we will work together, we will avert that fate by re-electing a President and in the process bringing into the Congress more men and women who reflect our views. If we will do

this, we will help to build a team in Washington which will work with greatest effort to preserve and protect an America which is prosperous, strong and free.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee, I am cognizant of the fact that air pollution remains a persistent problem which threatens not only the ecology, but the lives and lungs of many Americans. To remedy this situation, the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee under the very able leadership of PAUL ROGERS developed the 1970 Clean Air Act Amendments, Public Law 91-604.

Despite that law, many cities including the St. Louis area have continued to have serious air pollution problems, in part because surrounding areas continue to pollute.

Fortunately, the Environmental Protection Agency is moving to check the sources of air pollution; for example, St. Louis was recently chosen by EPA as the site of a massive, 5-year multimillion study of air pollution. When the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee holds additional oversight hearings on EPA's efforts against air pollution, EPA's study of air pollution in the St. Louis area would be an excellent topic of discussion.

At this point I insert in the RECORD, material from EPA detailing the study and three articles from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on the problem. Three articles were written by E. F. Porter, Jr., and appeared this April.

The articles follow:

SUMMARY: EPA REGIONAL AIR POLLUTION STUDY

In his January 1972 Statement on 1973 Budget, Mr. William D. Ruckelshaus indicated an increase in research funds, stating that "Air pollution regional studies to develop analytical models which will enable the States and metropolitan areas to select more effective and less costly standards—compliance abatement strategies—will be initiated at a level of \$5 million."

To provide the information that will be needed for such model development, a regional air pollution study (RAPS) has been proposed and initial FY 1973 funding totaling \$5 million has been approved by OMB and allocated from EPA resources. The initial project in St. Louis, is expected to take approximately five years to complete, and cost between \$20 and \$30 million overall. Responsibility for study management has been given to the National Environmental Research Triangle Park, N.C.

St. Louis was chosen as the initial study site, from some 33 metropolitan areas having populations over 400,000. Selection criteria included (1) isolation of the air pollution environment from that of other urban areas, (2) the presence of a variety of pollutants in a suitable "mix", (3) available land area on which to conduct studies, (4) the presence of a well-developed control program and background information, (5) the availability of historical meteorological and pollution in-

formation, and (6) relatively uncomplicated meteorology and a mild climate. Similar studies will be conducted in other urban areas following the St. Louis study.

The research plan includes studies of pollutant sources, meteorological factors affecting its transport, chemical and physical changes in pollutants as a result of atmospheric processes, exposure to sunlight, and mixing, biological processes, and human social, health, and economic factors. The information resulting from the study will be made available to state and local agencies nationwide as well as being available within EPA.

Most of the funds for RAPS will go into in-house EPA work on plans, experimental programs, studies of project data, and research grants. A major expenditure of nearly \$4 million is anticipated for an air pollution measurement network extending over the St. Louis urban area and out to 60 miles or more in all directions. Some 40 stations will telemeter air quality and meteorological information to a central computer for storage and display. 20 to 30 additional stations will record selected parameters on site. The network will be designed and managed by a prime contractor, to be selected through the normal advertising and qualification process for a service-type contract. The network hardware will be purchased by EPA through a separate normal bidding and procurement action, according to current plans. Neither procurement has been advertised as of May 5, 1972.

CLEAN AIR

(By E. F. Porter, Jr.)

The St. Louis area is not going to meet the federal deadline of 1975 for cleaning its dirty air.

Nor, for that matter, are most of the nation's heavily populated, heavily industrialized urban centers.

In fact, some states, such as Arizona, Montana and Nebraska, are not even going to try. Nor are some industrial firms, such as Anaconda Copper Co., and the major automobile producers. These conclusions are drawn from interviews with air pollution authorities and an examination of the most recent literature on the subject.

The prospect facing the St. Louis area and much of the rest of the nation is that the noble design of an impatient Congress—to require the states and industries to clean the air by 1975—is doomed to failure.

Congress set the deadline in 1970 after previous attempts in 1963 and 1967, both undertaken without specific deadlines, had failed to produce appreciable results. The deadline was established in the form of amendments to the 1970 Clean Air Act.

Missouri and 18 other states already have conceded defeat on automotive pollutants, those that originate in the internal combustion engine. Eleven states have notified the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington that they will not be able to meet the deadlines for sulfur dioxide and particulates. These pollutants account for most of the dirt in the air over urban centers.

New York has told the agency it cannot possibly attain the air quality standards for sulfur dioxide in the New York City area until the Federal Power Commission allows Consolidated Edison, the city's electric utility, to bring in more natural gas to replace dirtier fuels such as coal and oil. Because of a nationwide gas shortage, the commission has so far been unwilling to grant pipeline permits for the sake of clean air.

Pennsylvania, Maryland, Ohio and New Jersey have admitted that they cannot meet the deadline in the areas around Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Cleveland and Washington.

Hawaii has asked for at least two additional years to stop sugar growers from burning their fields after harvesting. Colorado has ad-

mitted it does not know how to control wind-blown dust in some of its arid regions.

Alaska has had a problem with smog ever since motorists discovered that the best antifreeze is an engine left running. The state has not even filed the pollution-control plan required by the law. Arizona submitted a plan. But at the last minute, the state deleted all rules applicable to copper smelters, the state's biggest polluters.

The Illinois plan is even more optimistic. It includes no demerits for automotive pollutants, even though Illinois is no better equipped than Missouri to cut tailpipe emissions.

Moreover, Missouri adopted emission restrictions for industrial sources in 1967, putting itself four years ahead of Illinois.

Illinois admits that it has inadequate restrictions on particulates—dust, soot, flyash and the like—and none at all on sulfur dioxide, a contaminant resulting principally from the burning of sulfur-bearing coal.

New Illinois standards are in the formulaic stage. They were scheduled for adoption this spring, but the entire rule-making process was halted two weeks ago when a group of Chicago coal dealers went to court to block the new rules.

Even if Illinois wins a quick court decision over the coal dealers and puts its rules into effect, it may be unrealistic to assume that the rules will achieve clean air by 1975, federal officials said. Air pollution control regulations are difficult to implement; they often require that an industry spend millions of dollars for equipment that may take years to design and install.

Actually, the air in the St. Louis area has gotten cleaner since 1967, despite the inaction of Illinois. The credit, according to Pecsok, belongs largely to the Missouri Air Conservation Commission and particularly to its former chairman, Lewis C. Green, Kirkwood, who fought successfully for comprehensive emission restrictions. Such restrictions subsequently were adopted by St. Louis and St. Louis County.

Sulfur dioxide levels in downtown St. Louis dropped from an annual average of 0.031 parts per million for every 1,000,000 parts of air (ppm) in 1968 to approximately 0.021 ppm in the first six months of last year. This drop brings sulfur dioxide levels within a whisker of the federal primary standard that Congress wants in effect by 1975.

(The so-called federal standard is defined as the maximum level of a pollutant before it becomes hazardous to health.)

(The secondary standard, which is stricter, is the maximum level of pollution that is safe for plants, animals and materials. Federal law requires the primary standards to be reached by 1975 but specifies only that the secondary levels must be reached within a reasonable period.)

Missouri officials believe they have a good chance of achieving both the primary and the secondary standards for sulfur dioxide by 1975, if Illinois enforces its proposed rules. But they are less confident about particulates.

Like sulfur dioxide, particulate levels have been inching down through the years. But unlike sulfur dioxide, particulate standards remain substantially above the federal primary standards, which call for an annual average of no more than 75 micrograms of dirt for every cubic meter of air. The secondary standard is 60.

At South Broadway and Huerck Street, for example, the average level last year was 122, about the same as it was at the Municipal Courts Building at 1320 Market Street.

Even in relatively clean places such as the City Art Museum in Forest Park or the St. Louis County Hospital in Clayton, particulate levels are in the high 80s.

Pecsok and Harvey D. Shell, the acting executive secretary of the State Air Conserva-

tion Commission, said airborne particles were going to be hard to control.

"We may never get there," Pecsok said. "There are just too many small sources of particulates and too much dirt moving around in the area."

Michael A. D'Onofrio, an engineer from the Environmental Protection Agency who has been assigned to scrutinize the Missouri plan, and Charles M. Copley Jr., the St. Louis air pollution control commissioner, insist that it will be possible to achieve the particulate and sulfur dioxide standards in St. Louis by the deadline. But they acknowledged that doing so would depend on two factors:

- (1) A crash program on the East Side.
- (2) Rigorous enforcement of pollution restrictions on hitherto neglected small sources, such as small industries and commercial establishments in St. Louis, especially along the riverfront on the city's south side. "The city's approach has been to attack the big boys first," D'Onofrio said. "They're going to have to go after some of the foundries and warehouses."

If Illinois is still bogged down by July 31 D'Onofrio noted, federal law requires Ruckelshaus to step in and issue the rules himself. There is no question that Ruckelshaus will do so, D'Onofrio said. In fact, he added, the rules are already being drafted.

WE NEED CLEAN AIR

(By E. F. Porter, Jr.)

The fact that the air in St. Louis—and in most of the rest of the nation's urban centers—is a little cleaner than it was several years ago does not mean there is less air pollution. It means only that it has been spread around more.

This is the criticism most often made of the current official federal and state air pollution control policy. It is policy that emphasizes making the outdoor—or "ambient"—air fit to breathe. It is not one of reducing or halting the total discharge of contaminants into the national, or global, envelope of air. It is a policy that at best postpones an inevitable day of reckoning, critics say.

A recent issue of *Environment*, the usually authoritative monthly publication of the Committee for Environmental Information, warned that the total burden of pollutants pumped into the air in the United States can be expected to increase, despite control efforts.

In the case of automobiles, for example, *Environment* said that even if emission controls were effective, the growth in the number of cars on the road would begin to cancel out the controls beginning in 1990. By the year 2000, the same will be true of sulfur dioxide emissions from electric power generating plants.

A close look at the St. Louis area situation tends to confirm this. In 1963, industries in the Missouri part of the metropolitan area pumped a total of about 250,000 tons of sulfur dioxide into the air. Last year, despite the ban on high sulfur fuel and other control efforts, the total amount of sulfur dioxide emitted was 339,000 tons, an increase of nearly 90,000 tons a year.

Particulate emissions showed a slight improvement over the same span: 65,061 tons poured into the sky in 1963, 57,813 tons last year.

The official federal philosophy, built into federal air pollution laws since 1963, has been that it does not really matter how much pollution goes into the air so long as it does not accumulate in one place. This view may have to be revised in the light of some recent incidents, such as acid rains in Sweden, reportedly resulting from sulfur dioxide emissions from coal burning on the British Isles, and pollution in Chicago traceable to industrial activity in Oklahoma.

The problem and the outlook for solution varies from pollutant to pollutant, all officials agree. Some are more difficult to control than others; for some control may be impossible. The situation at present:

AIRBORNE PARTICULATE MATTER

The term is generic, including smoke, dust, fly ash and all other forms of small particles light enough to stay suspended in the atmosphere. Because particulate matter has so long been recognized as a pollutant, the technology of control is better developed than for any other type. And because almost every human activity kicks up some dust or produces some smoke, particulates are one of the hardest pollutants to control on an area wide basis.

Moreover, *Environment* noted, the current official practice of measuring particulate pollution, in terms of weight—micrograms, or pounds or tons—can be deceptive. The most dangerous of all particles, the ones that can invade the human system and lodge there, are those so small they weigh almost nothing. These tiny submicron particles are also the most effective in reducing visibility; they travel the greatest distance on the currents of the air and they defy most attempts to filter them out.

Thus, it has been estimated, strict control could reduce the total particulate emissions of all sources in the United States from the present 20,800,000 tons a year to 13,000,000 tons per year by 1980; but that industrial growth will nearly double the numbers of the submicron particles going into the air over the same period.

SULFUR DIOXIDE

Sulfur dioxide levels in the air in St. Louis have fallen in the last five years almost to the point where they rest within federally prescribed limits. But this is not because of air cleaning gadgetry.

Some improvement was brought about by a controversial Missouri rule (not yet adopted by Illinois) limiting the sulfur content of coal. Lacking technical know-how on scrubbing the sulfur dioxide out of exit gases, many small and medium-sized industries simply switched to natural gas, which is almost entirely sulfur-free.

But Union Electric Co., whose huge coal-fired power plant boilers discharge most of the area's sulfur dioxide, said it could not afford natural gas—and probably could not obtain enough, anyway.

Within the last few months, Union Electric abandoned, after three years of tinkering and outlays of at least \$3,000,000, a system designed to take the sulfur dioxide out of emissions from one of the boilers at the company's Meramec plant in south St. Louis County. The system involved injection of pulverized limestone into the furnace, along with the fuel.

The Meramec plant experiment was the first of its kind in the world and drew international attention to both UE and UE's pollution control chief, John F. McLaughlin Jr. No pollution control official has expressed any doubts that McLaughlin made a conscientious effort to get the limestone process to work before tossing in sponge.

But the event comes as a blow, nevertheless, to federal and state pollution control engineers who claimed that the limestone process would prove feasible for all power plants.

It has been McLaughlin's contention for nine years that the solution to the sulfur dioxide problem could be achieved only by relocating generating capacity to outlying areas, and building tall smokestacks for dispersion.

Ironically, that is just about what has happened. Union Electric converted its older plants at Cahokia and Venice on the East Side and at Ashley Street in St. Louis to low sulfur fuel and threw the weight of its generating load on its new plants at Portage

des Sioux in St. Charles County and at Labadie in Franklin County.

A still newer plant is now being built at Rush Island in extreme southern Jefferson County. None of these plants has sulfur dioxide removal systems and there are no plans to install any.

Yet between them, the Labadie and Sioux power plants discharge far more sulfur than the older facilities ever did.

As matters now stand, there is no well-tested way to control sulfur oxide emissions from fuel burning. Regions that cannot obtain supplies of sulfur-free fuels must either scatter their power plants or live with sulfur dioxide.

CARBON MONOXIDE

This odorless, colorless and highly toxic gas, which kills by supplanting oxygen in the blood stream, is a product of the automobile. Missouri officials say the air quality standards can be attained by 1977 if the auto manufacturers comply with federal emission standards beginning with 1975. The Big Three auto makers have asked for an additional year, as provided in the federal law, but insist, nonetheless, that they cannot meet even a later deadline.

HYDROCARBONS AND PHOTOCHEMICAL OXIDANTS

These smog-causing components of auto exhaust will be rolled back to acceptable levels by 1974, Missouri officials estimated, even without proposed further exhaust control.

OXIDES OF NITROGEN

Nitrogen oxides, a poisonous component of smog, result from high temperature combustion, both in gasoline engines and in power plants. Auto makers say they cannot meet federal requirements for cars and power companies and pollution control officials agree that there is no known way to eliminate oxides of nitrogen from smokestack emissions, other than rebuilding boilers at astronomical cost.

Even the Environmental Protection Agency is about to capitulate on nitrogen oxides, a federal official admitted. "It's the pollutant we know the least about. I'm sure we're going to get sued by industry over it."

The experience of Los Angeles in trying to control nitrogen oxides may have been prophetic. After controlling particulates by forcing the power companies to install air cleaning systems, and controlling sulfur dioxide by forcing them to shift to low sulfur fuel, the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District found it still had a nitrogen oxides problem.

Because there was no feasible alternative, the agency banned all further power plant construction in the Los Angeles area.

But demand for electric power in Southern California continued to rise so the Western Energy Supply and Transmission Associates, a consortium of 23 power companies, put up a generating station in the Four Corners region of northwest New Mexico, convenient to vast deposits of coal on the Navajo Indian Reservation.

The Four Corners plant today is believed to be the largest single source of air pollution in the world with emissions roughly equal to those of the entire city of New York.

Its plume of fine particulates hazes the horizon for hundreds of miles. It is clearly visible from a space capsule in orbit.

UGLY AIR

(By E. F. Porter, Jr.)

The smoky heavy industries bordering the Mississippi River's edge on the East Side are out of sight and out of mind to many St. Louisans much of the time, but they are among the chief reasons pollutant levels throughout much of the region are still well above the level the Federal Government considers safe for human health.

The metropolitan atmosphere has been

gradually getting cleaner since Missouri adopted tough rules in 1967, but even on a clear day, as air travelers can attest, St. Louis is often distinguishable at a distance only as a brownish purple blister of smog, swelling a thousand feet or more above the surrounding countryside.

Federal requirements now call for a rollback of pollution so that by 1975 they will be at a level where breathing would be no longer hazardous to your health.

For at least one contaminant, sulfur dioxide, that goal would already have been attained were it not for the heavy discharges of the East Side industries, Missouri officials maintain.

Now under the Federal gun, Illinois is hastening to catch up. The Illinois Pollution Control Board, which two years ago replaced the unaggressive Air Pollution Control Board, has adopted emission regulations, in some respects more restrictive than Missouri's. But many experts, including some Federal clean-air officials, harbor private doubts as to whether Illinois can move fast enough to meet the Federal deadline.

According to estimates calculated by a computer of the Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago, total daily discharges of flyash, soot and dust in Madison and St. Clair counties, which total 317 tons, must be cut 57 per cent.

Aggregate sulfur dioxide emissions now amounting to 659 tons a day, must be reduced to 412 tons a day.

Three years may not be enough time, the skeptics say, to design and install the costly equipment necessary to do the job. Furthermore, if industries resist and avail themselves of the law's delays with courtroom challenges and requests for variances, the attainment of the clean air goal will be harder still to attain.

Some experts seriously question whether acceptable air quality ever will be achieved, or whether, in fact, industrial growth will add new pollutants to the air faster than remedial measures can take them out.

For some pollutants the solution may be palliative and temporary; relocating industrial sources so as to spread out the problem or flushing captured pollutants into the sewer system, where they become water pollutants.

COMMEMORATIVE MEDAL FOR THE 500TH ANNIVERSARY MARKING THE BIRTH OF THE POLISH ASTRONOMER, NICHOLAS COPERNICUS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which would authorize the Treasury Department to strike a commemorative medal honoring the 500th anniversary of the birth of the Polish astronomer, Nicholas Copernicus.

I urge my colleagues to join in co-sponsoring this legislation, which has been suggested by Mr. Aloysius Mazewski, president of the Polish National Alliance and the Polish American Congress.

Mr. Mazewski and his organizations are spearheading a worldwide observance in honor of this 500th anniversary marking the birth of Copernicus.

Mr. Mazewski and his fellow Americans of Polish descent are to be congratulated for this initiative.

Nicholas Copernicus is the father of modern science. His brilliant discoveries developed the theory of the solar system and provided the world with the first knowledge of the relationship between planets in the universe.

It was this brilliant research by Copernicus that has made it possible for the United States to develop theories and techniques leading to our successful placement of man on the moon.

This Polish astronomer has made an enormous contribution, and it is my hope the entire scientific community will join in honoring Copernicus during 1973.

I am pleased that in Chicago, Mr. Mitchell Kobelinski, president of the Illinois division of the Polish-American Congress, is spearheading the effort to honor Copernicus in Illinois during the 500th anniversary of his birth.

Included in Mr. Kobelinski's plans is the groundbreaking for a multimillion dollar Polish-American civic and cultural center to be named in honor of Nicholas Copernicus.

It is my hope that the appropriate committee will move expeditiously on my proposal for the minting of a special commemorative medal honoring Copernicus.

This will be a fitting addition to the many tributes being planned for the commemorative year.

Mr. Speaker, a copy of my bill appears at the conclusion of my remarks.

I am also including in the RECORD today a resolution adopted by the City Council of Chicago calling for a commemorative stamp to be issued in honor of Copernicus.

This action is being headed by Alderman Edwin P. Ffifelski, a resident of my congressional district and a brilliant leader in his community.

I do hope that the proper authorities will take the necessary steps to issue a commemorative stamp in honor of Copernicus, as suggested by Alderman Ffifelski.

H.R. 15483

A bill to provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 500th anniversary of the birth of the Polish astronomer, Nicholas Copernicus

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") shall strike and furnish for the Polish American Congress, Inc. (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation"), a not-for-profit organization observing the 500th anniversary of the birth of the Polish astronomer, Nicholas Copernicus, the father of modern science whose brilliant discoveries developed the theory of the solar system as we know it today and whose profound research of the universe gave civilization its first knowledge of the relationship between planets in the universe and this knowledge laid the foundation for America's ultimate success in placing man on the moon, national medals in communication of such anniversary.

SEC. 2. Such medals shall be of such sizes, materials, and designs, and shall be so inscribed, as the corporation may determine with the approval of the Secretary.

SEC. 3. Not more than one million of such medals may be produced. Production shall be in such quantities, not less than two thousand, as may be ordered by the corporation, but no work may be commenced on any order unless the Secretary has received security

satisfactory to him for the payment of the cost of the production of such order. Such cost shall include labor, material, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, as determined by the Secretary. No medals may be produced pursuant to this Act after December 1973.

Sec. 4. Upon receipt of payment for such medals in the amount of the cost thereof as determined pursuant to section 3, the Secretary shall deliver the medals as the corporation may request.

**RESOLUTION TO HONOR POLISH GENIUS
NICHOLAS COPERNICUS, "THE FATHER OF
MODERN SCIENCE"**

Adopted by the City Council of Chicago.

Whereas, we are approaching the 500th birthday anniversary of the great Polish scientist, Mikolaj Kopernik, known the world over as Nicholas Copernicus, the Father of Modern Science; and

Whereas, this extraordinary man of the world of enormous vision, Nicholas Copernicus developed the theory of the solar system as we know it today. Without benefit of the telescope, which he preceded by an entire century, and without the use of photography, which was not developed until 400 years after his death, Nicholas Copernicus conceived and proved that the earth and other planets revolve around the sun and that the theory of the earth's position as the center of this system, held to be true up to Copernicus' time, was definitely wrong; and

Whereas, Nicholas Copernicus was born in Torun, Poland, on February 19, 1473, and received the majority of his formal education at the University of Krakow, Poland, where he studied canon law; and

Whereas, Nicholas Copernicus reached adulthood at the time of the emergence from the so called "Dark Ages" and the development of the great Renaissance in Italy. He was a contemporary of Columbus, Michelangelo and da Vinci, among other great men, and so Nicholas Copernicus, always attracted to scientific concepts, was drawn to Italy, where he furthered his studies at the Universities of Bologna and Padua; and

Whereas, Copernicus undertook most of his studious accomplishments in the atmosphere of a world which had changed from flat to round, a world in which aesthetic values of art and beauty reigned supreme, a world in which science and other fields gained from revolutionary new thoughts and ideas, a world which saw the advent of the printed page to immortalize these new ideas; and

Whereas, Copernicus eventually concentrated all his thoughts and efforts on the design of our universe, and gathered data to support his revolutionary theory into a book which has become one of the most famous and far-reaching books ever printed: Concerning the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres; and

Whereas, Copernicus' book eventually revolutionized the world of science and formed a basis for all scientific thought during the ensuing four centuries, so that Nicholas Co-

pernicus has justifiably received world recognition as "The Father of Modern Science"; and

Whereas, Mankind's ever-increasing knowledge of the moon, made a reality by the daring and resoundingly acclaimed explorations of the astronauts of these United States of America abetted by our valued scientists, would not have been possible without the foundations of these basic discoveries and theories of Nicholas Copernicus;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the City Council of the City of Chicago that the Mayor and Members of the City Council do hereby acknowledge the approaching 500th birthday anniversary of Mikolaj Kopernik, the great Polish genius known as Nicholas Copernicus, "The Father of Modern Science," by setting aside February 19, 1973, as NICHOLAS COPERNICUS DAY in the City of Chicago.

Be it further resolved that the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Post Office Department be and are hereby memorialized to take whatever action is necessary to issue a Nicholas Copernicus commemorative stamp to honor the unique and undying contributions of this great Polish scientist.

**LEGISLATION ON BEHALF OF
POW'S/MIA'S**

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 1972

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, legislation which I introduced to enable the sons of POW's/MIA's to compete for additional presidential appointments to the service academies has been reported out of an Armed Services Subcommittee. Identical legislation sponsored by Senator JAMES BUCKLEY and cosponsored by 56 of his colleagues passed the Senate on December 10 on a voice vote. I wish to respectfully remind the Armed Services Committee of the widespread interest and support for this measure in both bodies and urge that it be given full committee approval in the very near future.

I insert in the RECORD at this point, Mr. Speaker, the full text of the testimony I presented to the Armed Services Subcommittee when hearings were held on this legislation:

TESTIMONY OF HON. JACK KEMP

Mr. Chairman: I am very pleased to appear here today to testify on behalf of legislation which I introduced to enable the sons of POWs and MIAs in the Vietnam conflict to compete for additional presidential ap-

pointments to the service academies. I want to thank the members of this committee for the speed with which this measure was brought up for consideration, and in addition, I would like to thank the 32 members of the House who joined me in cosponsoring the legislation and those who introduced similar bills.

Present law makes the sons of the members of the Armed Services who were totally disabled or killed in action eligible for one of 40 vacancies set aside for Presidential appointment. My bill would expand eligibility for Presidential appointments to include the sons of prisoners of war and others listed as missing in action and increase the number of these special appointments from 40 to 65.

This proposal, I feel, will in a small way show this Nation's gratitude for the sacrifice that these men and their families have been called upon to make. It will express our concern publicly for the agony and anguish which has resulted from the knowledge that the prisoners are being held as pawns in a political game being played by calculating men who have proven themselves to be impervious to the most elemental considerations of decency and humanity. By passing this measure we will acknowledge our appreciation for the courage and spirit shown by these wives and children, mothers and fathers, under the burden of exceptional hardships.

Whatever the divisions we may have over the origins of the Vietnam war, the desire for peace is unanimous as is our concern about the plight of our 1,600 brave countrymen who are missing or held prisoner by the enemy in Southeast Asia.

These men and their families have been denied the elemental rights and decencies which are the basic terms of the Geneva Convention. The enemy has not given us a complete listing of the men they hold prisoner. The North Vietnamese Communists have not allowed Red Cross teams to visit the internment camps to see that these prisoners are receiving humane treatment. They have not permitted release of the sick and injured. And they have not even exhibited a minimum of human decency and compassion.

We all pray that these brave men will soon be returned to their families; but even then, their lot will be quite different from that of prisoners taken in World War II and in the Korean War. As Senator James Buckley, who originated this legislation in the Senate, so eloquently commented:

"These men will be returning as the victims of a war which has lost that home base of public support which would make the memory of their sufferings easier to bear. This has become a war in which there are no heroes, no victory parades, no open-hearted expressions of public gratitude to those who have borne the brunt of battle."

I beseech this committee to pass this legislation quickly as a demonstration to our POWs/MIAs and their families that their sacrifices have not been forgotten by a grateful people.

SENATE—Wednesday, June 14, 1972

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. ERNEST F. HOLINGS, a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, who redeemeth our life from destruction and crowneth our life with loving kindness and tender mercies,

may our service to the Nation and to the world be given in response to Thy love. Cover our mistakes with Thy forgiveness. Confirm us in every righteous endeavor and when evening comes grant us the peace of those whose hearts are in tune with Thee.

Guide this Nation in times of peril and adversity as well as in times of peace and prosperity. May the flag we honor today be a symbol of hope and peace in a Nation under God.

In Thy holy name we pray. 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 14, 1972.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate