

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SUMMARY OF THE FIFTH WORLD CONFERENCE OF THE WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW CENTER, BY JUDGE RAYMOND PACE ALEXANDER

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, less than 1 year ago, July 21 to 25, 1971, an important conference was held in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. The results of this Fifth World Conference of the World Peace Through Law Center should not be taken lightly or forgotten. For these reasons I ask unanimous consent that an excellent and informative summary of the proceedings written by Judge Raymond Pace Alexander, of the Court of Common Pleas in Philadelphia, be printed in the RECORD.

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

A BRIEF SUMMARY ON THE FIFTH WORLD CONFERENCE OF THE WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW CENTER AND THE WORLD ASSEMBLY OF JUDGES

(By Judge Raymond Pace Alexander)

From July 21-25, 1971, over 4,000 jurists, lawyers, law teachers, scientists and legal scholars from 114 nations attended the Fifth World Conference on World Peace Through Law in Belgrade, Yugoslavia.

This Belgrade World Conference was sponsored by the World Peace Through Law Center—created in 1958 by Charles S. Rhyne, former President of the American Bar Association as a Special Committee. The Center has grown into an international association of the legal profession with members in 130 nations.

The Belgrade World Conference was the largest international law conference ever held. Following the highly successful previous World Conferences in Athens (1963), Washington (1965), Geneva (1967) and Bangkok (1969), it was also the first ever held in a Socialist Country.

While the major theme of the Conference was "Law and the Environment," delegates participated in a number of topics whose relevance to today's world is urgent. The Honorable Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States (Retired) enunciated one of the topics considered most urgent by the assembled lawyers: the enlargement of the powers and jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

"There is no more flagrant example of the disregard to nation-states for world order than the chronic under employment of the International Court of Justice. Secretary of State Rogers recently advanced suggestions that could mark a new start toward the use of the Court. They include . . . the convening (of the Court) outside the Hague to make the Court more visible in other areas, establishment of regional chambers to make the Court more attractive to Latin-American, Asian and African States in disputes . . . and more frequent use of summary proceedings. These suggestions merit prompt response.

Chief Justice Warren recommended the following in order to increase the effectiveness

of the United Nations, which he described as ". . . the only institution in the history of man that has become indispensable before it had become possible."

1. The early admission of mainland China;
2. Also the two Germanys;
3. The two Koreas, and
4. Both Vietnams.
5. Re-assessing the United Nations concentration on passing resolutions by formal votes;
6. Re-appraise priorities with respect to the United Nations contribution to Economic and Social Programs. As an illustration, in 1970-71 the United Nations is directing less than seven billion dollars to development assistance and over two billions to armaments!

The Conference adopted a strong commitment to the further development of international law and legal institutions—a work program to build a world rule of law to structure change and channel international disputes systematically and effectively. The assembled lawyers called for observance of the humanitarian principles regarding the treatment of war prisoners of the 1949 Geneva Conventions; the creation of an international authority to control and prevent environmental pollution; the creation of an International Development Charter to aid the developing nations; the creation of an International Investment Insurance Agency; the development of uniform rules of international arbitration; and study of the untold effects of overpopulation on the World's environment; a study of the control of narcotics; the creation of a vast program of uniform model laws for Nations on such subjects as aircraft hijacking, trade, travel, air and water pollution and weather control; and the creation of a Draft Treaty on an International Criminal Court.

In the important field of Human Rights, the lawyers at the Belgrade Conference reaffirmed their dedication to the principles upholding the dignity of man as expressed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and other international conventions; called for the ratification and implementation of the U.N. Declaration on the elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination; and strongly objected to the following violations of human rights:

1. Holding secret trials;
2. Denying an individual his right to counsel of his choice;
3. Permitting censorship of the press;
4. Refusing admission to the legitimate international press and to members of all legal professions of all nations to observe trials; and
5. Allowing persons to be committed to mental institutions without a fair trial or as a substitute for a fair trial.

Perhaps the most important topic considered by the Conference was the revision of the United Nations Charter. A Special Committee with a world-wide membership of 100 distinguished jurists, under the direction of Dr. Max Habicht of Switzerland, prepared and presented a Special Report on United Nations Charter Revision. The Report studied and suggested those improvements in the United Nations system that the participating legal scholars felt were most necessary. Some of the suggested revisions included making the United Nations responsible for the economic development of developing nations, implementation of Security Council, direct popular election of some UN delegates, criminal jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and the compulsory adjudication of international disputes by that Court.

In the opinion of this writer, this Conference has stimulated a considerable grass roots movement from coast-to-coast to encourage citizen participation to raise the level of awareness of the average American in the policy making of the United Nations.

THE NATION SALUTES REV. DR. JERRY D. VAN DER VEEN, M.A., B.D., S.T.M., D.D., CHURCH OF THE COVENANT, PATERSON, N.J.

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, the eloquence and richness of the wisdom of the members of the clergy throughout the breadth and scope of our Nation has been an inspiration and haven of solace to all of our people throughout history. Their thought-provoking expressions of understanding and good will are cherished and stored away in one's mind to be recalled by each of us on many occasions and particularly during a time of need.

I recently had the good fortune and honor to receive in my offices here in Washington the Reverend Dr. Jerry D. Van Der Veen, minister of the Church of the Covenant—Reformed Church of America—Paterson of my congressional district of New Jersey. I was especially moved by his prayer of thanksgiving with which he opened the May 24, 1972, session of the House of Representatives as visiting chaplain on that date and would like to share it again with you and the constituents of my congressional district, as follows:

Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.—Psalm 33: 12.

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we bow in Thy presence humbly and gratefully, acknowledging that all our blessings come from Thee.

We praise Thee for Thy greatness, Thy righteousness, Thy loving-kindness, and for Thy guidance throughout our life.

We thank Thee for our great country and for all those leaders who have guided her through difficult times.

Grant wisdom and guidance to our President. May his present journey prepare the way for peace across this turbulent world.

Bless and guide our Vice President, the Speaker of the House, and every Member of Congress along with all those who endeavor to lead us in a path of righteousness and peace.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord, we pray. Amen.

Dr. Van Der Veen is a most distinguished outstanding citizen of the State of New Jersey. The quality of his leadership in religious and civic affairs in the cities of Paterson and Hawthorne, his hometown for the past 20 years where he presently resides with his wife Grace, has truly enriched our community, State, and Nation. He has been elected to the Hawthorne Board of Education and has

served as its president. A member of the Religious Counseling Association, he has been active in the New Jersey Council of Churches and the Gospel Magazine Association of America. His hobby—the art of magic—has delighted young and adults alike.

Through this historic journal of Congress, I respectfully request my colleagues here in the House to join with me in applauding Dr. Van Der Veen in national recognition of all of his good works in his ecclesiastical pursuits redounding to the spiritual and moral integrity of those of his religious belief and materially contributing to the ecumenical spirit of brotherhood, good will, and understanding among all men.

FINDING AMERICA

HON. SAM STEIGER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, my State of Arizona is fortunate to have 22 of its most precious natural and historical areas included in the national park system. This heritage of America is enjoyed by millions of visitors each year. Recently, the man who directs the operations of the National Park Service, Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr., was recognized by the University of Arizona for the high quality of his leadership by the awarding of the honorary degree of doctor of laws at commencement exercises on May 27. I note that this is the third honorary degree that Mr. Hartzog received in the month of May for his devotion to the never-ending job of preserving and protecting our national heritage. He received similar degrees from Wofford College, Spartanburg, S.C., and Lincoln University, Lincoln, Ill.

At the University of Arizona exercises Mr. Hartzog made a very moving speech to the graduates, in which he effectively noted that the greatness of America is based on its ability to assimilate many points of view and opinions and to effectively use mileposts from the past in charting our course into the future.

I believe many Americans would find Mr. Hartzog's address pertinent, and I am including it in the RECORD.

FINDING AMERICA

(Address by George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director, National Park Service)

A well-known journalist recently returned from a journey across the country and published an account of his search for America. His report seemed to give evidence that he was not entirely sure that he had really found America. But he is not the only one having difficulty in finding America today.

Down through our history Americans have consistently sought to "find" themselves—from Huckleberry Finn to the Easy Rider. And finding one's own identity may not be far different from finding America.

Each generation looks at the world through the prism of its own experiences, and the present always is in some conflict with the past. My own generation came to maturity at a time of great trouble. Our economic system had collapsed; totalitarian dictatorship ruled vast lands and ancient peoples; ruthless ag-

gression destroyed hope for peace; and, we went to war.

Today, a new generation has grown up in a world of similar anxieties and profound social discontent.

Vocal members of this generation have framed a troubled indictment, that the American social and political system has lost its relevance in the face of rapid and pervasive changes.

They say there are two Americas in our midst: the one, affluent and indifferent—able to spend billions of dollars in order that men might walk on the moon and wage tragic war here on earth; the other, marked by inequality of opportunity, of hunger, unemployment and educational deprivations, particularly, among the submerged one-fourth of our population.

They seek to humanize our institutions, to broaden the base of participation and to open to all the avenues of opportunity. Filled with impatience and indignation over the failure of America to be what it is capable of being, their harsh rhetoric is often characterized as the Generation Gap.

Generations, I suggest, have rarely understood each other. Why else should Moses have said: "Honor thy father and mother"? I am sure that it was not because fathers and mothers were being honored consistently in Biblical times!

Gibran's widely read book "The Prophet" treats of the so-called "generation gap" by suggesting:

"Your children are not your children. They are the sons and daughters of life's longing for itself.

"They come through you but not from you. And though they are with you they belong not to you.

"You may give them your love but not your thoughts, for they have their own thoughts.

"You may house their bodies but not their souls, for their souls dwell in the house of tomorrow which you cannot visit."

Surely Gibran is correct in suggesting that each of us is unique. Each must build his own house—and live in it!

History mocks those who suggest, however, that the past is wholly dreadful and ignoble.

It is from beachheads secured at great personal sacrifice by individuals and generations gone before that society has been able to find the higher ground. Each of our lives has been enriched by the works of a Gandhi, a Rembrandt and a Woody Guthrie.

We must preserve the independence of the youthful spirit and the continuing values of the past. For every future is shaped by the past. Only in knowing the past may we judge wisely what is obsolete and what is not, what to discard and what to preserve.

In planning for a celebration of the Bicentennial of our Republic, all are agreed on one thing—the American Revolution is not yet over! Americans have always had a dream of the better life. Both the young and the old share the burden of transferring that dream and the vitality of civilization from one generation to another.

As Aristotle observed: "Youth has a long time before it and a short past behind: on the first day of one's life one has nothing at all to remember and can only look forward." By contrast, the elderly "live by memory rather than hope; for what is left to them of life is little compared with the long past."

The capacity to love and to cherish ideals with intransigent commitment is a marvelous trait of youth. On the other hand, the wisdom and earthbound experience that come with age, are necessary balance wheels on the soaring fantasy, the untested ideas and the despair of youth.

Surely, we are in the midst of a revolutionary period that is literally a watershed of history. Isolated from our natural and cul-

tural inheritance by a brutal network of concrete and asphalt, dehumanized by a heartless technology that has robbed us of personal identification, we are asking anew the questions: "Who am I?" "Where have I come from?" "Where am I going?" "What am I contributing?" and "Where shall I find America?"

One of our great novelists, a genius constantly in search of America, Thomas Wolfe, spoke for all generations when he said: "Out of the billion forms of America, out of the savage violence and the dense complexity of all its swarming life; from the unique and single substance of this land and this life of ours, must we draw the power and energy of our own life, the articulation of our speech, the substance of our art."

Ours is a society in which scientific knowledge is a chief source of wealth and power. But what the environmental crisis tells us is that this Nation's future, as President Nixon has emphasized, rests upon new and profoundly fundamental judgments of how this knowledge, and the power that it creates, shall be used.

In our searching inquiry into the causes of a deteriorating environment, we must seek to articulate an environmental ethic to guide personal and corporate conduct.

We must come to believe that the just use of science is not to conquer nature, but to live in harmony with it. We may yet learn that to save ourselves we must save the world, which is our habitat.

Recently, William Fennel Rock, a descendant of Francis Scott Key who had determined to be an alien for the rest of his life, returned to America after a voluntary exile of seven years. He observed:

"What is utterly unique about America is that dissent—the challenge to moral values, the modification of alternatives, the criticism of cultural standards—is taking place within the context of the American situation as a whole.

"It is a fact that only America has the basic elasticity to change its cultural structure at this incredible pace because the margin of revolutionary action, cultural, social and institutional—that is freedom—is greater in America than in any other country.

"America," he concluded, "is proving its greatness by exercising the capacity to call itself into question."

As you set out to revise and rebuild the Establishment into which you are about to enter, I suggest that you do not deny your birthright, nor reject the proud heritage which is rightfully yours.

This land of ours is a noble land. It is rich not only in its natural inheritance, but in the stories and legends which are its history. Here and there, scattered across the country, are the milestones left behind by men and women seeking to "Find America."

These pioneer Americans hammered out a way of life which continues to provide hope to a troubled world.

Henceforth, from this joyous occasion you join the continuing search to "Find America."

Today is your opportunity for greatness! Go, then. Build your houses of tomorrow. In them may you experience a new quality in life.

May you, through your example, establish a new ethic, by which we may live in harmony with our world and with each other.

UPSIDE-DOWN POLITICS

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Christian Science

Monitor by Roscoe Drummond points up an excellent analysis of the reasons for shortcomings of the Federal Government in the past four decades:

UPSIDE-DOWN POLITICS
(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—We are witnessing some of the most upside-down politics the nation has ever experienced.

The theme of the opposition party has invariably been: "throw the rascals out"; the theme of the opposition candidates this year is: "put the rascals back in."

In the primary melee, which is now beginning to thin out, the leading candidates Senators George McGovern and Hubert H. Humphrey and most of the others have been attacking the Democratic Party far more than the Republican Party—but without saying so.

What they are saying is that for the past several decades the national government has been neglecting its job, has failed to do what most needed to be done and at best its actions were inadequate, tardy, and ill-conceived.

It is Senator McGovern's central thesis that the present mess, which he finds the country in, is the result of past failures. That is a reasonable thesis.

But who is most responsible for the failures and shortcomings of the past which Senator McGovern and Senator Humphrey most often cite?

Somewhat it gets overlooked that the Democratic Party has controlled Congress for 36 of the last 40 years. And that a Democratic president has been in the White House for 28 of the last 40 years.

It is objective history that almost all of yesterday's actions and inactions, which Senators McGovern and Humphrey say created today's "mess," were the actions of a Democratic Congress and a Democratic president.

Here are their main indictments:

On going to war—The indictment is that presidents have put the U.S. into war too hastily and too recklessly. Yet a Democrat has been president at the outset of this period's four major wars—from World War I to Vietnam.

On ignoring Congress—The indictment is that presidents have taken the nation into war without congressional approval. Two Democratic presidents have done that—Harry Truman in the Korean war and John F. Kennedy in the Vietnam war.

On inflation—The indictment is that inflation is terrible. Inflation was at its highest under the Johnson administration and is being checked under the Nixon administration.

On Congress's eroding powers—The indictment is that congressional power and initiative have been waning for many years. But nobody forces Congress to neglect its law-making role. The Democratic Party has controlled 18 of the past 20 Congresses during which congressional power and initiative waned.

On tax reform—The indictment is that it is scandalous that tax reform has been so long delayed and that tax loopholes are not plugged. But Congress writes the tax laws and the Democrats put the loopholes in and have thus far refused to take them out.

On welfare reform—The indictment is that the welfare system has proved to be unworkable and unjust. Democratic Congresses wrote the welfare laws and have done most to resist reform.

If the present is the result of past neglect, as Senator McGovern repeatedly contends, then the responsibility must rest on those who have done the neglecting most of the time.

One conclusion seems justified: that Senator McGovern ought to be campaigning as

an anti-Republican, anti-Democratic third-party candidate to be consistent.

GEORGIA JAYCEES ADOPT RESOLUTION SUPPORTING OUR ACTIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there is no finer, more active group of young men in the United States than the Georgia Jaycees.

These young men are dedicated to God and country, and are helping to develop the future of this Nation. They are determined, aggressive leaders and when this group enacted this resolution, I believed it to be something all America should read.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I include this in the RECORD:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Georgia is a dynamic, prosperous and progressive State, and presents an environment second to none, in which its citizens may work, live and raise their children so as to become qualified citizens of the State of Georgia and the United States of America, and

Whereas, because of decent actions and stands by our nations highest elected officials and our military forces in Southeast Asia to put a stop to the invasion of South Viet Nam by the Communist backed aggressors, and

Whereas, said actions were not only necessary, but long in coming, and

Whereas, these actions and stands have caused much unrest and dissent among students and other groups, and

Whereas, the news media always plays these violent actions up more than those of the working American, who believes in our nation and its actions abroad, and

Whereas, the Georgia Jaycees are a dynamic young men's organization, dedicated to community involvement and civic service, and one concerned with continued success and progress of its State and Nation, and

Whereas, the Georgia Jaycees have listened to and discussed the unrest and dissent by many groups against the actions and stands by these United States in Southeast Asia, and

Whereas, the Georgia Jaycees in its efforts and attempts as a concerned public civic organization herewith states its position and reasons upon which it bases its opinion on the actions and stands by these United States in Southeast Asia, and

Now therefore be it resolved, by the Georgia Jaycees that they are in favor of the present actions and stands by these United States in Southeast Asia, and it is hereby resolved by the membership of Georgia Jaycees, in accordance with its Constitution and By-Laws, that they go on record as being in favor of the actions and stands by these United States in Southeast Asia for the following reasons:

1. That the United States, being the main economic and military backer of South Viet Nam, cannot allow the Communist inspired invasion to succeed and take over free South Viet Nam.

2. That the United States has paid a price of over 50,000 dead, 300,000 wounded and 1,000 MIA and POW, and cannot allow these sacrifices to have been in vain.

3. That the United States must continue to protect all remaining forces of the American military, and continue to try to have our POW's released.

4. That the United States must continue to support the Vietnamization program in any manner put forth by our officials and military forces.

5. That a vast majority of American people want out of Viet Nam, but only at the price of getting our POW's back and stopping aggression forever.

6. That a vast majority of American people support our Nation's recent actions and stands in Southeast Asia, but the news media has not shown this side of the story.

7. That if more Americans would stand up and support actions and stands by these United States in Southeast Asia, they would counteract all the unrest and dissent.

WASHINGTON REPORT

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my policy to publish a weekly news report to keep my constituents advised of my activities in their behalf. The following is the text of my report of June 5, 1972:

BUTZ SEES FARMERS' INCOME UP \$2 BILLION

In his first annual report as Secretary of Agriculture, Earl L. Butz recently said American agriculture is moving into a "new and promising future." Farm income should be up \$2 billion from last year and exports will hit a record \$7.8 billion level this year, he declared. Farm production is up 9 percent over last year.

Rural development programs hit \$2.8 billion, double that of 1969, with housing loans more than triple the 1969 total of \$500 million—up to \$1.6 billion this year.

FOOD IS A "BEST BUY"

Although food prices have gone up (178%, in fact, from 1957 to 1971), the average American's disposable income has gone up faster (222% during the same period). Result is that a smaller percentage of the pay check goes for food than ever before in history. In 1947 Americans spent 25% of their pay check for food. By 1950 this had dropped to 22.2%, by 1959 to 20%, and in 1971 food expenses took just over 16% of the average pay check.

That is nothing short of amazing when you consider that many people of the world spend over half their income for food. While food takes only 16.3% of the U.S. consumer's income, in Canada it takes about 20%; Western Europe and Japan 37-39%; Eastern Europe 36-54%; India 60%; and some African countries 70%. The American farmer is the most efficient in the world, and he is producing the best quality food in history.

GROCERY BILL NOT ALL FOR FOOD

Nearly 28 cents out of each dollar a shopper spends at a grocery store goes for items other than food.

This interesting bit of information was revealed by Dr. Don Paarlberg, Director of Agricultural Economics for the United States Department of Agriculture, at a House Subcommittee hearing. The breakdown in percent of what the average supermarket spending was in 1970 is as follows:

Food items 72.3 percent; alcoholic beverage 5.0; tobacco 4.0; health and beauty aids 3.6; soap and laundry supplies 2.4; housewares and household supplies 2.1; paper products and foil 1.7; pet food 1.2; magazines, books and records 0.3; and other items 7.4.

SALUTATORIAN SPEECH

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, we hear much today about the apathy and cynicism of modern youth, but I think this salutatorian address by Ronald Miller at the high school commencement exercises in Rawlins, Wyo., shows that some young people are still idealistic and eager to serve their country at every level. Ronald has proved his own patriotism by accepting an appointment to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. I insert his remarks in the RECORD:

SALUTATORIAN SPEECH, RAWLINS HIGH SCHOOL COMMENCEMENT, 1972

(By Ronald Lee Miller)

Honorable Teno Roncalio, Superintendent of Schools Shultz, Board of Education of School District No. 1, Administration and Faculty of Rawlins High School, parents, friends, guests, and most importantly, fellow graduates:

Tonight, May 23, 1972, will be long remembered by each and every one of us. To some, this ceremony marks the end of all formal education; to others, this night is just a springboard to higher goals. Yet, all of us must remember that high school graduation is a stepping stone into life. No matter what we choose to do or where we choose to go, from now on, we will be on our own. We will cease to have contact with parents, friends, teachers, and others who have influenced our lives and sheltered us from the real world. Each of us must decide for himself "Where am I going?" The answer to this question will be one of the most important decisions of each of your lives, for your whole future could be affected by its outcome. Some of you have already decided upon your plans. To you I say "Congratulations" because you are starting your career in the finest manner possible. But many of you do not know what lies ahead for you. You may have thought that these decisions do not have to be made for long periods of time to come. But, as was once said, "The Future is something which everyone reaches at the rate of sixty minutes an hour, whatever he does, whoever he is". You must decide as soon as possible on your future goals so that these goals may be reached that much more quickly. Remember, "The Future comes like an unwelcome guest". Be ready for it.

As the graduates of 1972 step out into society for the first time, they are faced with more pressures and problems than any other graduating class in our nation's history. Never before have jobs been so scarce, even for the most learned of persons. Never before have politics and the government been scorned and mistrusted by so many citizens. Never before has one single issue, such as the Viet Nam situation, split the country to so great an extent. Pollution and ecology have never played so important a role in each of our lives as they do now. Crime, drugs, and other pressing problems of today are indeed threatening the very foundation of our society's structure.

Now is the time for each of us to decide how to handle these problems and then to take deliberate measures to alleviate the conditions that presently plague every person in this country. Not only must each of us decide "Where am I going?", but we must determine, as a whole, "Where is our country going?" Will democracy as we know it crumble or will the citizens of the United States decide to make an effort to solve these problems? The younger generation—you and I—

must take the initiative in this struggle because we are the leaders of tomorrow. In a very few years the responsibilities of this country will be ours to handle. We must be ready for these important duties which will occur at every level of government and society from the family level to levels of international importance. These responsibilities, no matter how large or small, are ours and they cannot be shunned or ignored. Public apathy is at its highest level ever in our country. We, as a society, cannot allow the so-called "silent majority" to exist in the next generation as it has in the present one. This is easily said but not so easily done. Neither proclamation nor legislation will make people care about their surroundings. It is up to all of us to do our part with the hope that others will follow suit. Becoming active in government and politics from the "grass roots" level up, participating in civic, social, and service organizations, doing your job to your fullest capabilities, working in your church organizations and taking an active interest in social programs for various underprivileged groups are all ways of "doing your part".

You cannot afford to wait, for hesitation and apathy on the part of its citizens will eventually cause the downfall of our great country as we know it today. Good Luck.

RIGHT TO KNOW

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, for some time now Massachusetts has been operating a State lottery as a means of helping to raise necessary revenues without adding unnecessarily to a heavy tax burden. Unfortunately, the newspapers and broadcast stations of Massachusetts are hampered in giving full coverage to this official State function by an outmoded Federal law that treats lotteries as some sort of unspeakable crime which the media are forbidden to discuss.

The following editorial from the Thursday, June 15, edition of the Boston Record American outlines forcefully and persuasively the case for repeal of the Federal laws which hinder dissemination of information about official State run lotteries. I hope the Members of the House will read it, and support the bill to correct this situation now pending before the House Judiciary Committee when it is reported to us, as I hope it will be.

The editorial follows:

RIGHT TO KNOW

So many states, like Massachusetts, have turned to public lotteries as sources of revenue, they have created entirely new demands for public information which could never have been anticipated—and, of course, were not—when the 51st Congress, in 1890, enacted strict lottery information regulations.

Congress' concern at that time was prompted by privately promoted—and often crooked—schemes. The need for this protection still exists. But the time has now come to exempt the so-called state lotteries from the general prohibition and for the same general reason—the protection of the public.

Existing federal laws not only still require the Postal Service to impose outmoded restrictions on newsworthy information about state-operated public lotteries as

on those privately and illicitly promoted, but also forbid states from using newspaper advertising as a means of disseminating it.

These papers believe they have the same obligation to give full coverage to all aspects of this state's lottery—and those in New Hampshire, Connecticut and other nearby states, too—as they would any other newsworthy event.

These are no private games of chance—as earlier illegal promotions were—but lawful and important producers of public revenue. All the funds are public; and certainly the public has a right to know every detail of how those funds are distributed between prize winners and the state treasury. That is, certainly, a matter of primary public interest.

When the handling of huge sums of money escapes examination and disclosure, that is the time opportunities for abuse and fraud increase.

It is for these reasons that we urge Congress to amend Title 18 of the U.S. Code to exempt state conducted lotteries from prohibitions against publication and advertising which now force the states to resort to less efficient—and more expensive—methods.

FARMERS MUST LIVE, TOO

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, last April a lot of people were concerned over advertisements of a Washington-based food store chain which advised its customers to eat meat substitutes, because the price of meat to the producers was too high.

We pointed out at that time that producer meat prices had just returned to the level of 20 years previous and that they were then, in fact, on another downward slide.

The other day, I read a newspaper report that this food store chain reported a profit increase of 85 percent against a sales increase of 17 percent over the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, producers are not getting too much for their food products. They are not getting enough.

Carroll Fey, editor of the Edgerton Enterprise, in southwest Minnesota, recently wrote a pertinent editorial on farm prices which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues by inserting it in the RECORD:

FARMERS MUST LIVE, TOO

Food prices have risen, but before condemning farmers and ranchers and threatening them with a wave of controls, a few facts must be considered if the nation wishes to continue eating in the style to which it has become accustomed.

Foremost among these facts is that farm prices still remain at preinflation low levels. Food prices have risen because of inflationary increases in handling costs. The plight of the farmer is well expressed in an article appearing on the editorial page of a major daily newspaper. It is pointed out that, "Farmers and ranchers are expected to stay on the land rather than join the job-seekers in the city . . . On the other hand, farmers and ranchers are not expected to make more money ever, because if they do the cost of food will go up. When beef prices rise to levels of 20 years ago, the protest is loud and clear . . . Bear in mind that farmers and ranchers are consumers, too, and as con-

sumers their expenses have gone up more than 100 percent during the same period that prices they receive for their products have remained stable."

The conclusion reached in the article quoted above is much to the point—the food we buy today is one of the best bargains in the marketplace. "... even if beef prices have climbed up to 1952 levels."

MEAT PRICES RISING TO ALL-TIME HIGH: IMMEDIATE REPEAL OF MEAT QUOTA ACT NEEDED

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, recent newspaper articles and food market studies indicate that, after a brief decline this spring, meat prices are again skyrocketing upwards. It is probable that by mid-summer, the price of meat will be even higher than it was this winter. In fact, the price of meat may reach an alltime high, forcing this important element of the American diet off the dinner table.

Part of the reason for the rise in meat prices is due to a piece of anticonsumer legislation passed in 1964—the meat import quota law. This law restricts the amount of foreign meat—the type used in hamburgers—entering the American marketplace. This creates a scarcity of supply in this type of meat—known as processing meat—which our own meat producers cannot fill. The meat import quota law must be repealed. I have introduced legislation to repeal this law, and my bill has been cosponsored by some 50 Members of the House. Recent trends, however, indicate that the meat price situation is becoming more critical, and it is imperative that this legislation receive consideration early this summer.

In a speech in the House on May 11, I pointed out that a number of Department of Agriculture economists were predicting that meat prices would rise during the summer months. I also provided an analysis of price quotes on the Chicago livestock market which clearly showed that the price of cheaper cuts of meat, which those with large families and those on fixed and low incomes rely on, were being artificially maintained at high levels by the meat import quota.

Since then, new data has become available which indicates that the meat price situation is becoming more critical.

CHICAGO MEAT MARKET

For example, I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point an update of the daily price quotations of the Chicago market, as reported by the National Provisioner Daily Market Service. The first column of figures is the highest printed prices for the 30 days preceding August 15, 1971—the base period on which prices would have been frozen if the phase I controls had been extended to meats—as they should have been and as they were during the Korean war. The second column of figures is the market quotations for May 5, 1972. The third

column is the price quotations for June 16, 1972:

	Top half		
	Base	May 5	June 16
F.o.b. Midwest River points:			
Ch. Strs. 5/600	53	55	58
Ch. Strs. 6/700	53½	55	58
Ch. Strs. 7/800	54	54	57-57½
Ch. Strs. 8/900	53½	53	56-56½
Carcass, cows and bulls			
(CHGO) cows, North:			
C.C. 350/up	48½	52½	52½
Bng. Utl. 400/up	45½	49	50½
N. Bolo Bulls 500/up	50	54	55
Boneless processing beef			
Fresh C. & C. (packed), frozen:			
65, buls. beef 90% In	65	72	73½
66, Bnls. chucks	66	72	73½-74
61, Trmgs. 85/90%	61	68	69
50, Trmgs. 75/85%	50	57	59
Froz. Shank Meat (Percent)	65	72½-73	72½-73
Froz. Shldr. Clods	68	74	74½
Aust.-N.Z. frozen imported meats f.o.b. port of entry (30 days):			
Cow meat 90% Vis. In	61½	67½-68	70
Bull meat 90% In	63½	69-69½	72½
Shank meat	64½	69½	72½
Bnls. mutton 90% In	38	44½-45	44½-45
Primal cuts beef—U.S. Choice or equal:			
Less than carlot	(1)		101-102
Trad. loins 40/50	98	93	101-102
Trad. loins 50/60	1.00	93	101-102
Trad. loins 60/70	1.00	93	101-102
Ribs 25/30	72	73-74	75-76

1 Choice.

These columns show several things. First, by May 5, the price of the better cuts of meat which the American growers specialize in had fallen back from their highs of February to approximately the level of last August. But now, the price of these choice cuts—the steaks and roasts—have risen sharply, and not all of this price increase has reached the retail supermarkets yet. Second, the price of processing meat has been consistently above the level of last August. This means that the Meat Import Quota Act is working—and the consumer who can least afford it is suffering.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, FOOD PRICES

These price trends have been documented by the Community Committee on Consumer Prices, a volunteer civic organization of 250 individuals from my Cleveland, Ohio, congressional district, which has been watching prices since the start of phase II on last November 13.

In the latest price survey finished in late May, the committee recorded 1,712 items in various Cleveland area stores. The committee found that 522 or 30 percent of these items increased in price between last November 10 and the latter part of May. It is particularly interesting—and distressing—to note that of the 1,082 food items checked, 467 or 43 percent have increased in price since the start of phase II.

While meat, fresh fruit, and vegetable prices were never covered by the price controls of last August 15—a terrible mistake—they are a major part of the food purchases of the average family. These fresh food items have been those which have had the most numerous and largest price increases. This situation is absolutely intolerable at a time when the wages of most Americans have been frozen or limited to small increases. It

is even worse for retirees who have not received an increase in social security benefits for 18 months. The 22d District Consumer Committee found that of 68 beef items checked in May, 53 or 78 percent had increased in price since last November. Six out of eight lamb prices had increased. Seven out of 14 luncheon meats had increased; 37 out of 40 pork prices—or a total of 92 percent of the pork items—had increased in price. Forty-seven out of 109 dairy items increased in price. Even in canned fruits, 14 out of 33 items had risen in price. Fifty percent of the canned vegetable items also rose—22 out of 44 items checked—while a fourth of the frozen vegetable items were most costly. Among the fresh foods not covered by the price freeze, only poultry appears to be fairly stable.

I would like to list some of the price changes found over the last half year in various Cleveland-area food stores.

The list follows:

Item and quantity	Early November	Late May
Beef per pound:		
Liver	\$0.54	\$0.78
Hamburger 24 to 30 percent fat	.59	.69
Ground chuck	.79	.89
Sirloin butt	1.19	1.38
Sirloin—Super right	1.09	1.37
Chuck steak	.69	.79
Round—Top steak	1.14	1.34
Swiss steak	.99	1.29
Rib roast	1.38	1.54
Fish:		
Starkist tuna, solid	.49	.59
Frozen haddock fillets	.89	1.09
Bumble Bee—Red salmon	1.09	1.19
Canned fruit:		
Mott's applesauce—35 ounces	.42	.52
Kroger's pears—16 ounces	.25	.35
Cell-u, peaches, unpeeled halves—16 ounces	.43	.51
Fresh fruit:		
Sunkist oranges—6 medium	.59	.79

The magnitude of the price increases in beef can be seen by adding up the cost of 53 items checked in early November and comparing the cost of buying those same items today. In November one could have purchased these 53 pounds of various cuts of beef for \$62.23. Today, those items would cost \$67.57, an increase of 8.5 percent.

This list of price increase goes on and on, and while the subject of my remarks today is meat prices, I would like to mention a disturbing finding of the Consumer Committee: For the first time since the start of phase II, these volunteers have begun to find a general upward drift of prices in a broad range of items. The previous surveys found that, in general, phase II was working. It now appears to be starting to disintegrate. For example, bread prices are drifting up. Fundamentals such as soups and cereals are increasing in price—only a few cents here and there—but when wages are stabilized, these increases add up. Also, for the first time, categories other than foods are beginning to increase in price. Soaps and detergents have increased significantly. A 5-pound, 4-ounce box of Tide laundry detergent has increased from \$1.39 to \$1.49 since the start of phase II. The price line on small appliances appears to be breaking down.

A chrome Kenmore two-slice toaster has gone from \$7.97 to \$8.99. The Waring Blender, Futura 900 model has gone from \$25.95 to \$27.95. These price changes are an ominous sign to the American consumer, and may soon force a complete reconsideration of the wage-price controls policy.

WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF FOOD PRICES

These findings indicate what every shopper knows—food prices are high and are rising. The question is, will they continue to rise?

The quotes from the Chicago livestock markets indicate that they will. Those quotes are wholesale quotes, and indicate rising prices which have not yet been passed on to the consumer. The wholesale price index for May, released on June 2, indicates that while the wholesale index of all commodities rose 0.6 percent between April and May, the prices of farm products and processed foods and feeds increased by 1.4 percent. The index for farm products, processed foods, and feeds rose at an annual rate of 7.8 percent from November to May. Beef on the hoof cost 4.5 percent more in May than in April and 17.5 percent more than last May. In the period from February to August 1971, it advanced at an annual rate of 3 percent. In terms of food prices, we were better off before the freeze of last August—and it is obvious that the freeze should have been applied to all food items.

Speculation that beef prices will decline in July and August—the traditional marketing period—has been seriously questioned by consumer analysts. Many of the producers appear to be holding back, waiting for higher prices. Beef prices will also be increased by one of the worst droughts to hit southern California, Arizona and parts of Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado in years. The drought is causing many ranches to cut their operations by 25 to 30 percent. Consumer demand is higher, particularly since other types of meat will be scarce this year and will therefore be increasing in price faster than beef. For example, the production of veal, lamb, mutton, and pork will all be down this year. Thus the total production of all American meats this year is estimated at 37 to 37.5 billion pounds, down from 37.78 billion pounds last year. Thus, even though beef supplies are increasing, they are not increasing fast enough to meet total consumer demands for meat.

There is more bad news for the grocery shopper in the months ahead. Because of the unusually warm winter, the fruit trees did not "harden off" or rest and revitalize themselves. Then, in the budding period, there were severe frosts, particularly in the Great Lakes area. I recently asked the Department of Agriculture what this would mean for this year's fruit harvest. They have informed me that the peach crop will probably be down 12 percent from last year and that some other fruit crops may be damaged. This, of course, means that fresh fruit prices will be much higher this summer than last year.

There are a number of things that can be done. Controls on meats might be es-

tablished. The price commission might take a closer look at the prices charged producers, the rates charged for the shipping of livestock, and the markup of the processors and retailers—though it appears that the retailers are generally reflecting only the higher prices they are being charged. The consumer can try to purchase other items in less demand, such as poultry and, often, fish.

The Congress, of course, should take this opportunity to review the entire range of agricultural programs. At the present time there is a wide range of supply-limiting marketing orders and price support programs which not only cost the taxpayers \$5 billion per year in Government programs, but are also estimated to increase the cost of all foods on the American dinner table by 15 percent.

The Congress should also immediately repeal the Meat Import Quota Law. While the world meat market is rather tight this year and repeal of the law might not lower prices, it would certainly help stabilize them, particularly the prices of the cheaper cuts and processed items—hot dogs, hamburgers, luncheon meats, and others. The 1964 Meat Quota Act, was an anticonsumer piece of legislation when it was first passed and we are feeling its effects today. It is absolutely senseless to continue this program which gouges the pocketbooks of our urbanized society for the benefit of a few thousand large cattle producers.

SENATOR THURMOND GETS L. MENDEL RIVERS AWARD FROM NCOA

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, on May 25, 1971, it was my pleasure to inform this body of the continuing interest shown by the Noncommissioned Officers Association of the United States of America (NCOA) with regard to legislative actions of concern to the American military community and their encouragement to their worldwide membership to accept the challenge of American citizens by citing their views directly to their Congressmen.

At that time I reported also that the NCOA, through their legislative committee, initiated a special annual recognition award for the national legislator who, in their opinion, is most worthy of recognition for his efforts in furthering the ideals of democracy, freedom, and patriotism on behalf of our beloved Nation.

During this 11th annual NCOA convention in San Antonio, Tex., on April 7, 1972, Senator STROM THURMOND of South Carolina was honored as the first recipient of the L. Mendel Rivers Award for Legislative Action. I strongly endorse their selection of Mr. THURMOND as being first deserving of such coveted recognition because he has, indeed, and continues to serve as a great champion of all

legislation dedicated to furthering the ideals which comprise the criteria for such an award.

I further note with pride and ask that each of you join me in extending appreciation to the NCOA for their sustained interest and unwavering dedication to the principles on which this great Nation is founded.

I consider it a personal honor to again apprise you of an organization (NCOA) which has in the period of 1 year esteemed itself as a representative body of a most important element of American society which allows us the opportunity of their collective thinking and has bestowed highest honors of their own on two of our great colleagues, Senator STROM THURMOND, and the late L. Mendel Rivers.

DEFENSE OUR FIRST PRIORITY ACCORDING TO FORMER SPEAKER JOHN W. MCCORMACK

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, following my remarks about priorities, I placed in the RECORD excerpts from three of the Federalist papers. These excerpts, from the pens of James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, demonstrated that one of the principle reasons for establishing our Union of States was to provide for the common defense.

There are undoubtedly many who will say that these are dead voices speaking from the dim and all but forgotten past and that the views that prevailed in 1787 are irrelevant to the last third of the 20th century. In refutation I would like to quote the words of a great American who sat in this body for 42 years and for 30 of those years served as majority leader, minority whip, and Speaker.

I hope that those who choose to ignore and disregard the eloquence and wisdom of Madison and Hamilton will listen to and heed the down to earth commonsense of John W. McCormack.

Mr. Speaker, the advice that former Speaker McCormack has given us came in the form of an interview with Bill Duncliffe of the Boston Record American-Sunday Advertiser. The pertinent paragraphs follow:

Men talk in good faith about "first priorities" like water and air pollution, conservation, and other things.

I agree with them, on the domestic level—but they don't specify that. There are so many matters that are our "first priorities" on the domestic level. But what really is our first priority?

You can't have any of these questions solved in the American way of life unless we preserve this country of ours. So our first priority is to take those steps that will reasonably guarantee the preservation of the United States of America.

Now those other things are vitally important, but if a foreign government took over our nation or changed our form of government none of them would be priorities at all.

So they are all priorities now only if we have the American institutions of government in existence.

Whether we like it or not we must have a strong America because there are forces in the world today who would take advantage of a weak America.

It could be that in the future the Soviet Union—and I'll name names, they're our immediate potential enemy—could create a weaponry system that will overshadow all others.

If they develop it before we do, they're not going to let us catch up. They'll either blackmail us, or force us to be subject to them. And if we don't, they'll destroy us.

And yet, so many people in America will probably misunderstand what I say—but I've always spoken my view.

There are people who think, "Well, the Soviet Union isn't bent on world domination."

Are they bent on it? Yes. Will they attain it? That's another question. Have we seen any evidence of any change in their intent? No, we've seen evidence of a change in their tactics, based on necessity.

Have we seen any evidence of a change of intent on the part of Red China? No. Their tactics, yes, but their intent, no.

Does that mean that I think they are going to take over country after country themselves? No, but they can do it through having governments established that are subject to their domination and dictation, like Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary today, beginning with an imposed coalition government.

North Vietnam started out the same way. Even Red China, with a coalition government that had Communists in it. But they got rid of the non-Communists very quickly, and what could the people do?

The Communists controlled the army, the internal police, and the jails, so what could the average person do, if they wanted to live? And the first law of human nature is self-preservation.

I believe its vitally important for the people of America to realize that the Atlantic Ocean is no longer our first line of defense. And that means we've got to be prepared before the fact.

We'll never get another opportunity, like after Pearl Harbor, to prepare ourselves after the fact. Back then, we had time to build up our great natural resources, our economy, manpower, and military strength. It took us three years before we started affirmatively on the road to victory in both Europe and the Far East.

But today, we won't have three seconds.

If we are going to be prepared, our national defenses will have to be prepared before the fact. We'll never have another opportunity to prepare ourselves after the fact.

The price for defense is the premium we pay for peace in America, because the only thing the leaders of a nation like the Soviet Union fear is power.

Now, we want power for peace, but they want it for other things, the internal subversion of other countries.

If the Soviet Union would disavow in principle and in fact trying to engage in internal subversion with the forces within a nation to overthrow a form of government they don't like, if they want to be a Communist nation economically, why I don't agree with them, but we can live with them.

So, if they want to disavow their intent of constant interference in the internal affairs of other nations, we'll get along with them all right.

But until they do, we've got to be on our guard.

No matter what the view of any American might be on this or that question, we should be solid in having a strong and adequate national defense.

THE HISTORIC RENEWAL AND DEDICATION OF THE MURRAY HOUSE AS A HAVEN FOR MENTALLY HANDICAPPED ADULTS

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the great privilege and honor of participating in the dedication of the Murray House located on Main Street, Paterson, in my congressional district of New Jersey. The commentary of the guest speakers and particularly the remarks of Bishop Lawrence B. Casey of the Diocese of Paterson, Mayor Arthur Dwyer, Mrs. Anthony Ventimiglia, and Mr. Arthur Rigolo eloquently described the new horizons and lasting renewals that can be recreated through the action of people motivated by the warmth and indepth feeling of caring for each other—"selfless love" was the conclusion expressed by the staff of Murray House in the program that evening.

Through the creativity and vitality of Rev. John B. Wehrlen "Father Jack" and the help of many volunteers, elementary, high school, and college students and friends of Father Jack who assisted in a comprehensive renovation program, the Murray House now stands recreated, shining in its new role as a shelter home for mentally handicapped adults after over a century and two decades of providing a headquarters for the art of healing, a religious and recreation center. Donations of food, clothing, furniture and money were also made to the cause of Father Jack.

In September 1971, Murray House received its first two residents and the beginning of what promises to be an even more exciting and rewarding achievement in the life of this historic site: A haven and self-sustaining family life experience for mentally handicapped adults.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues here in the House and preserve in this historic journal of Congress the following real life story that provided the name for the Murray House which was dedicated on May 19, 1972. It seems fitting and appropriate that I relate to you the story behind the name as it was written by the Murray House staff in commemoration of this home, renewed with hope and promise by those who cared to help improve the quality of life for others less fortunate and enable them to experience the warmth and security of the communion of people as a family unit:

LIFE OF JIMMIE MURRAY

Along with her new role she also received a new name—The Murray House.

Her new life she received from the dream and faith of Father Jack. Her new name she received from a special little boy, Jimmie Murray.

Jimmie was the first born of five children born to Kit and James Murray. Jimmie was a physically healthy baby filling the lives of James and Kit with happiness and joy.

When he was six months old however, Kit noticed that often Jimmie would get a tense, frightened expression on his face. This would last only for a few seconds and then he would return to his normal play. It happened frequently enough to cause his mother concern, yet at that time the pediatrician's examination showed nothing wrong. When Jimmie was approximately nine months old, he developed a cold, with a fever of 104. He was taken to the hospital for observation and tests. Jimmie was found to have brain damage. What this meant for Jimmie in the Doctor's words to his mother was that "He will never become the President but he'll always make a living." Jimmie was retarded.

The rest of Jimmie's life story and that of his parents could have been a sad, guilt ridden, story. It would be wrong to say that James and Kit accepted Jimmie's defect as a matter of course. It was heart breaking, but their love and faith enabled them to accept Jimmie as he was. They placed no conditions on life and happiness. Jimmie had taught them not to take life for granted. Because he could not speak, he taught them to listen in a different way, he taught them to love and showed them the depth of their own capacity to love. Even his little brothers and sister learned and shared their love with him.

Because James and Kit refused to hide Jimmie or over shelter him, he developed as any other child, only a little slower. He took his first steps when he was five years old. At six he spoke his first word, "MA."

Jimmie's growing years were never easy. He constantly suffered from convulsions, high fevers and required almost constant attention day and night. James and Kit had one weakness—they were not made of iron.

Kit herself was eventually rushed to the hospital suffering from fatigue. While in the hospital, Jimmie's father made the most important and hardest decision of his life. With the help of Monsignor Joseph Brestel, a life long friend, Jimmie's mother was convinced it was best to place Jimmie in a Special School where trained people could care for him.

Shortly after Jimmie's tenth Birthday he was admitted to Woodbine State Home. This was to be his home for the next few years. On May 29, 1969 Jimmie's parents received a call from the school. Jimmie had died.

Since Jimmie was one of God's Special Children, it was decided to have friends donate to Father John Wehrlen as it had been Jimmie's parents good fortune to meet this wonderful man of God through Jimmie's aunt, who had worked with Father Wehrlen while he was assigned to St. Philip's, Clifton. Jimmie's parents became very close friends with Father and when Father Jack finally got his home for his special children he called them and asked if he could name the home after Jimmie.

Jimmie's memory will be lasting forever in the home named after him. Jimmie's name on the Murray House reminds and teaches us what love means and the limits to which love sometimes calls us. It teaches us too that the greatest service we could give to our family here is the gift that made Jimmie's life happy and full—the gift he received from his Mom and Dad—selfless love.

In closing, may I ask my colleagues to join with me in commending the Murray House staff and wishing them continued success and happiness in this highly noble cause that they have unselfishly dedicated themselves to on behalf of our handicapped. Our heartiest congratulations and best wishes are extended to Murray House Staff: Rev. John Wehrlen,

Rev. Richard Oliveri, Miss Lillian Gallagher, Carl Zipper, Louis Tatil, Joseph Duffy, and Kathy Bradley, Michelle Duffy, Tom Ramseyer, Bob Anygi, and Mary Lee, Secretary.

PEOPLE HELPING PEOPLE

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, local organizations play an important role in communities across the Nation. Burlington Aerie No. 150, Fraternal Order of the Eagles, established on Apr. 28, 1901, is an example of a local group furthering community projects and ideals through positive self-direction and service. Membership today numbers 3,675.

The Aerie sponsors a number of social activities throughout the year. Saturday night dances are held for members, their families, and their guests. Mother-daughter and father-son banquets are another example of family oriented entertainment. An annual "Salute to Teachers" banquet, especially honoring those teachers who have retired in the previous year, is also held. At the banquet, a tuition scholarship is awarded to a high school senior for Southeastern Community College in Burlington.

The list of donations by the Eagles to community projects, made possible by volunteer fundraising functions, is impressive. Donations are: \$5,400 to the Burlington Municipal Swimming Pool; \$1,500 to the Dankwardt Park Shelter House; \$1,000 to the swimming pool at Boy Scout Camp Eastman; \$500 for the Salvation Army New Building Fund; \$500 to the YMCA Remodeling Fund; \$3,000 to the Des Moines County Association—Hope Haven School—Fund; \$800 to the establishment of the "Ten Commandments" Monument, in front of the Burlington Memorial Auditorium; \$700 to the shelter house at the West Burlington Civic Park; \$1,500 to the Burlington Community Field; \$1,000 to the reconstruction of the Community Field Grandstand after it was destroyed by fire; a \$1,825 donation to Productions, Inc., for a sheltered workshop type operation for retarded children and adults; tuition payments for 11 Burlington police officers for a short course in law enforcement at Southeastern Community College; and yearly contributions to the Burlington United Fund.

A \$1,000 grant was secured from the "Golden Eagle Fund" by the Aerie for the senior citizen groups of Burlington. And a \$1,000 grant was obtained from the Order's "Jimmy Durante Children's Fund" for both the Hope Haven School, and Productions, Inc.

In manpower activities, volunteers have donated more than 500-man hours in cleaning the YMCA outdoor camping facilities, and stockpiling firewood for use during the summer camping season.

The Eagle's have a slogan—"People Helping People." Certainly, members of Burlington Aerie No. 150 deserve credit

for their unselfish service in Burlington and Des Moines County. They are fine representatives of the value of community spirit in the United States.

NIXON'S SUMMIT STATECRAFT

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, having just returned from Russia, I have had the opportunity to watch the Nixon efforts at trying to reach some kind of agreement on several matters with the Soviet Union. It is certain that much was accomplished which never would have been done without this effort on the part of the President.

No one has said it better than Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in the May 31 issue of the Washington Post which I am sure all of my colleagues will want to read.

The article follows:

NIXON'S SUMMIT STATECRAFT

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Moscow.—Three nights running last week, Henry Kissinger, President Nixon's national security adviser, sat until 3 a.m. with Soviet SALT negotiators and refused to be panicked into concessions on the last two sticking points.

Then, at 11 a.m. on Friday, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko informed him the Soviet government had finally accepted compromise formulas on these two questions: whether missiles on the obsolescent Soviet G-class submarine would count against the 950 submarine-launched missiles authorized by the freeze; and a complex, delicate question dealing with SS-9 silos, which house the giant Soviet intercontinental missiles.

At the end of the Wednesday night session in the Kremlin, the exhausted Kissinger woke up the equally fatigued President Nixon with a phone call a few minutes before the break-up at 3 a.m. Thursday to report no progress. The President's response: hold fast; don't cave in.

What this incident reveals is not that the Nixon-Kissinger team can claim bargaining triumphs over the Russians. Which side got the most out of the dramatic agreement on strategic arms limitation (SALT), if either one did, will not be known for a long time. What the incident does illustrate is the fundamental principle that has guided the President during three years of the most wide-ranging and now successful negotiations ever conducted with the Russians.

The principle: the U.S. wants agreement with the Soviet Union on many issues, starting with SALT, but not a single one of the issues is so important that it can be purchased at cut rates by the Russians.

In short, the President sought by a variety of tactics to inform the Kremlin that, however unfavorable the impact on his reelection prospects, failure was always an acceptable possibility.

Kissinger himself made that fact inescapably clear when, at the invitation of Communist Party chief Leonid Brezhnev, he made his secret visit to Moscow in mid-April. Contrary to reports that Kissinger went to Moscow to warn Brezhnev in advance about mining the harbors of North Vietnam, his real purpose was to try to break the SALT deadlock.

Kissinger's implicit message to Brezhnev was this: the President can come to the

summit conference and comfortably leave it without signing a SALT agreement. Moreover, Kissinger rejected an appeal that the U.S. use its influence to encourage the Christian Democratic Party of West Germany to support the Moscow-Bonn treaty. That would have been American money in the summit bank, but it went beyond Mr. Nixon's formula of businesslike negotiating based on facts not gimmicks.

Likewise, the President's decision to mine Haiphong harbor was the clearest possible signal to Moscow that he was willing to sacrifice the long-planned summit meeting itself to prevent disaster in Vietnam. That message was not lost on the Kremlin.

There are other, lesser examples of the President's studied, restrained approach toward negotiating with the Russians, an approach calculated not only to obtain equity but also to transform a generation of Soviet love-hate for the U.S. into something very different—a healthy, genuine respect.

Certainly Mr. Nixon's extraordinary success here confirmed his judgment that the Soviet leaders respect bargaining strength if wisely employed. With China looming always in the background, Mr. Nixon's bargaining power was obviously enhanced. But Soviet fear of that most ominous threat—an anti-Soviet alliance between the U.S. and China—simply will not suffice as the whole explanation of the President's success in Moscow.

Brezhnev has more in mind than China. One week before Mr. Nixon arrived, Vietnam disappeared from its customary leading position in Pravda. The color television presentation of the President's arrival and of his astute speech to the Russian people on Sunday was unprecedented, and certainly not essential. The explanation lies partly in China, but much of its lies far beyond, in a genuine stirring for a new order.

As Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin told us at the glittering Kremlin reception that capped the eight-day summit: "Events like this are made by men, not by the elements." As a principal in the event-making, Mr. Nixon and his prudent, painstaking negotiating approach are an example of statecraft not easily praised too much.

COLLINS RADIO PRESIDENT SAYS U.S. INDUSTRY NEEDS AMERICAN SUPPORT

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. COLLINS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, all of Texas was proud to see the AFCEA present Bob Wilson its gold medal of achievement. Collins Radio is a world pacesetter in communications. Collins Radio comes from a different Collins family, and I am no stockholder.

But I am an enthusiastic booster of their electronic genius. We are all impressed with the dynamic Bob Wilson who now heads the Collins Radio Co.

Here are some sections of a news report from the Dallas Morning News of June 7, 1972:

Robert C. Wilson, President and Chief Executive Officer of Collins Radio Company, has been named recipient of the Distinguished Service Gold Medal Award presented by the Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association, it was announced in Washington, D.C.

Colonel W. J. Baird, USA (Retired), Gen-

eral Manager of AFCEA, said the Medal is given annually "In recognition of Executive Leadership, Professional Guidance, and outstanding and meritorious Service to Country."

Wilson was named President of Collins last November. He previously was Executive Vice President of North American Rockwell Corporation."

United States industry is having to fight a dual battle against unfair foreign competition and against antitechnology Americans at the same time, the president of Collins Radio Co. charged.

Robert C. Wilson called upon this nation's industry to "address head-on" the antitechnology mood that he said is evidence among many Americans who fail to realize that society as a whole benefits from industrial and technological growth.

Speaking before the 26th annual convention of the Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association in Washington, Wilson also said:

Few (Americans) seem to recognize the penalties our society will pay if we lose the struggle now taking place for world communication leadership. And make no mistake, "we are losing."

Wilson said that foreign governments recognize the importance of communications while in this country the industry is attacked by "accusing voices" attacking the industrial and technological saga upon which their nation's strength has been built.

He said that "technology is moving very rapidly" and the United States position is slipping.

"As communicators," Wilson said, "we can't sit back and watch our central nervous system decay and hope that someone else will save it before it is too late."

A DEEPLY CONCERNED CITIZEN

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my good friend W. H. M. "Bill" Stover, recently called my attention to a short message he hopes to convey to all Members of Congress, urging them to back up the President in his new approach to ending the conflict in Vietnam.

As I agree with Bill Stover that his message deserves the careful attention of all my colleagues, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

A DEEPLY CONCERNED CITIZEN

Every patriotic American expects you to back the President in the present emergency, regardless of political persuasion; or of your personal assessment of why our forces now are in Vietnam; or who initially was responsible for getting us involved.

And this means finances as well as words. It might be well to recognize that the vast majority of citizens approve this too-long delayed action the President now undertakes to end the stupid, needless slaughter of the flower of our youth.

Unless you gentlemen on the Hill do close ranks soon, this Nation is doomed. Some are content to blame Communism for all our ills. But I believe that much of the violence in America during the past decade is the direct result of irresponsible rhetoric by persons in high places who are supposed to know better.

I suggest that far too many such persons sit in elective seats in the Congress. These should not forget that the same people who voted them in—can and surely will vote them out—if sufficiently provoked. And that point, for some, already has been reached.

Our country is almost down the drain. With lawlessness and rebellion and treachery encouraged from the top, many now lack the courage to fight for freedom, or the will to live with decency. But, it's our country—right or wrong.

What can you do about it, Mr. Legislator? What will you do to help return America to a truly American people? At least you can think twice before you speak. I hope.

HERBERT HARMAN— OUTSTANDING CITIZEN

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. CASEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my fellow Members a man whose dedication and service have done much to advance the community spirit of my district.

Herbert A. Harman of 18506 Kingstown Court in Houston has been an outstanding member of the Bay Area Lions Club for the past 4 years, and his service in that organization has been so outstanding that his fellow members have asked me to take this opportunity to acquaint you with his record.

I would like to quote from a letter I recently received from a friend and constituent, Mr. Robert D. Sheets, president of the Bay Area Lions Club, concerning Herb Harman's outstanding service to the club and his community, which is located in the NASA Manned Spacecraft Center area of my district.

BAY AREA LIONS CLUB,
Houston, Tex., May 30 1972.

Hon. BOB CASEY,
Congress of the United States
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CASEY: I understand that individuals are sometimes nominated for special honors and recognition by the Congress and by the President, particularly when their contribution to their community, church and nation is outstanding and continuing.

I would like to nominate an individual for consideration of award and recognition. His name is Herbert A. Harman and he resides at 18506 Kingstown Court in Houston. He has been a member of the Bay Area Lions Club over four years and during that time he has held nearly every office and has done a magnificent job in anything he has undertaken. He has served on various committees and projects throughout his involvement in Lionism. He headed our non-profit Christmas Tree Project which is designed to supply Christmas trees at our cost to the community or to allow people who could not afford a Christmas tree to get one at no cost. He led our White Christmas Project which collected food, toys and clothing from donors in each of the Clear Creek School District schools and donated them to 365 needy children in 60 families in the Bay Area last year. He initiated two spectacular fund raising campaigns almost single handedly—one selling fertilizer and the other selling glasses commemorating the Apollo missions—the proceeds supporting our Lions Club charities and projects.

Herb has been very interested in children, particularly children who are less fortunate than most. He has been very active in recruiting children to attend our Crippled

Children's Camp in Kerrville and led a Bicycle Rodeo in Nassau Bay where children were instructed in bicycle safety and had their bikes registered by the Harris County Sheriff's Department. He is the sole dual-award winner as Lion of the Year in two successive years, which is the highest honor Lions Clubs award their members. Herb has been President, First Vice-President, Projects Chairman, Membership Chairman, Director and Tail Twister in our Club. His enthusiasm for service to mankind is contagious and many Lions respect Herb for his leadership, devotion and commitment above all.

Herb's activities are not limited to Lions. He is particularly active in church and community affairs too. He recently was Co-campaign Chairman for Clare Schweikart in the local school board election; is a leader in developing facilities and fund raising for the Boy Scouts in Friends of Scouting, and has served the Clear Lake Methodist Church as Sunday School Superintendent, and as Chairman of the Commission on Education as well as a member of the Council on Ministry and the Administrative Board. He is indeed a well-rounded Christian ideal individual whom it is a pleasure to nominate for official recognition by the Congress, the White House and our Country.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT D. SHEETS,
President.

I join Mr. Sheets' sentiments—Herb Harman is truly an outstanding individual.

THE LATE HONORABLE PHILIP J. PHILBIN

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of our former colleague, the Honorable Philip J. Philbin of Massachusetts.

It was my privilege to have him as a close personal friend, and I have never known a finer or more considerate person. His genial disposition and warm concern for humanity gave him a natural friendliness which won the lasting affection of Members on both sides of the aisle.

A graduate of Harvard University and Columbia University Law School, he served for some years as an aide to the late Senator David I. Walsh of Massachusetts. Subsequently, in 1940, he was elected to serve as Congressman for the Third Congressional District of his State, a position he held until he left Congress in 1970.

Phil Philbin was an outstanding legislator, and served his constituency, his State, and the Nation with deep dedication and marked distinction. As a longtime member of the Committee on Armed Services and, at one time, its chairman, he became an expert in the complex area of national security.

Also, one of his major areas of concern was for the welfare of our servicemen and women. He devoted himself to working for better pay, working conditions, housing, and retirement benefits for our service personnel, and, as an attorney, maintained an intense interest in matters of military justice.

A learned and cultured man, Phil had an inexhaustible fund of knowledge on a wide variety of subjects. He was widely read in the classics and an accomplished pianist. A star athlete at Harvard, he played with their great team in the Rose Bowl in 1919.

Phil Philbin will be greatly missed by those of us who were privileged to know him. We were enriched by his friendship and we are diminished by his death.

I join my colleagues in mourning his passing, and I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

VALEDICTORIAN SPEECH

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, last week at the graduation ceremonies of Notre Dame Academy of Middleburg, Va., the valedictorian was Miss Adair Frances Montgomery, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Edward C. Montgomery of Hillsboro, Va.

Her message sounded a note of optimism, and I feel it is of sufficient impact also to be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech follows:

VALEDICTORIAN SPEECH, NOTRE DAME ACADEMY, MIDDLEBURG, VA., JUNE 4, 1972

As the time approached for the graduation of the class of 1972, our comments about the swift passage of years became more frequent. And truly the years have flown for us as we look back over the many days we've spent here at Notre Dame and realize they have come to an end.

In looking at the world around us, we must acknowledge the accelerating pace of change and the resulting increase in confusion for our minds. Much of the literature that the seniors have studied in English, Moral Guidance and social studies has concentrated on rapidly expanding technology. The most emphasized aspect of this advancing technology is the vast "un-humanness" present in today's society. Many writings are depressing and the authors, pessimistic. They say Man has become a tool, instead of a builder; a follower, rather than a leader.

But is this true? Or more importantly, can we afford to let it be true? A decisive "no" is the answer voiced by one graduate and echoed by her fellow classmates. This is what Notre Dame has taught us.

We must not sink into the depths of despair and depression. We can not allow ourselves to indulge in escapism through drugs, despondency, alienation or any other form of suicide. We must not be overcome by the pressures and decisions of life in a highly complex and transient culture.

Instead we must turn to the knowledge we have absorbed here at Notre Dame. Knowledge that has prepared us for the future by proposing a solution to all life's difficult problems. It can be stated in one word: optimism. It is the ability not merely to cope with reality but to appreciate it. Our answer lies in finding the joy in simply being alive, in noticing the way a cat walks on silent feet or the hundreds of different shades of blue in a summer sky, in seeing a butterfly draw nectar from a lilac blossom or a horse shimmer in the sunlight as he shakes flies from his back. These are the beauties of life that God has made for us that we may take heart in them.

Just as realities such as these are not bound by time, but rather are eternal, so does friendship transcend age. Friends are certainly a source of happiness and comfort and we graduates of 1972 thank all you friends for coming this afternoon. And as we commence a new journey, we hope that bound by our mutual friendship, you will share the optimism of Notre Dame for developing a better world with us.

ADAIR F. MONTGOMERY.

TRAGIC SITUATION IN NORTHERN IRELAND

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the bombings and the bloodshed in Northern Ireland grows increasingly worse and the death toll continues to rise. The latest tragic death figure in that land has risen to 374. Since the beginning of 1972, 168 people have died. Over the course of the last 2 years I have continually voiced opposition to the tragic situation in Northern Ireland. I have opposed the British use of the Special Powers Act, which permits British troops to snatch up civilians in the middle of the night and detain them in internment camps for an indefinite period of time—without trial. In these camps, citizens are subjected to the worst sort of inhumane treatment.

In light of these events, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a significant event which took place recently in New York City. On Saturday, June 3, 1972, a group of 22 courageous individuals began a 48-hour "hunger strike" to protest the internment policies in Northern Ireland. I had the honor of visiting with these people during the course of their strike and was struck by the intensity of their feelings against the repressive and dangerous British activities directed against their brethren in Northern Ireland.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the participants in this memorable event. Their names follow:

Eileen Crimmins, 1245 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Brian McGeever, 109 Seaman Avenue, New York, N.Y.

Linda Slobban Israel, 300 North Broadway, Yonkers, N.Y.

Jim Connolly, 153 West 188th Street, Bronx, N.Y.

Connie Buckley, 2523 Aqueduct Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.

Bridget Brannigan, 2707 Briggs Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.

Maureen McKenna Armstrong, 137 McLean Avenue, Yonkers, N.Y.

Sister St. Hugh, 325 East 194th Street, Bronx, N.Y.

Robert McCann, 67-35 Yellowstone Boulevard, Forest Hills, N.Y.

Jim O'Gara, 2473 Davidson Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.

Kathleen Walsh, 206 East 17th Street, New York, N.Y.

Bob Murray, 32 Morgan Place, North Arlington, N.J.

Angela Power, 306 East 96th Street, New York, N.Y.

Michael Skeahan, 73-19 53rd Avenue, Massapequa, Long Island, N.Y.

Sean Enright, 176 East 81st Street, New York, N.Y.

Martin Lyons, 2671 Briggs Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.

Gabriel Kennedy, 2544 Valentine Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.

Mary Kennedy, 2544 Valentine Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.

Frank Grady, 85 St. Andrew's Place, Yonkers, N.Y.

Catherine Heggarty, 353 West 57 Street, New York, N.Y.

Peter McGowan, 86 Camp Street, Springfield, Conn.

Kathleen Carmichael, 2850 Paulding Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.

Matthew P. Higgins, 35-61 92 Street, Jackson Heights, N.Y.

Liam Hogan, 119 East 233rd Street, Bronx, N.Y.

Thomas Egan, 114 Nagle Avenue, Bronx, N.Y.

Frank O'Boyle, 118-16 Rockaway Boulevard, South Ozone Park, N.Y.

Ed. McGuinness, 238 East 9th Street, New York, N.Y.

MAINTAINING AN INDEPENDENT VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL SYSTEM

HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, considerable apprehension has been expressed during the past several months about the possible effect of pending national health insurance proposals upon the Veterans' Administration hospital system. Officials of the veterans organizations and Members of Congress have voiced the fear that the Veterans' Administration system would lose its identity as an independent hospital system devoted to the care and treatment of the Nation's veterans.

President Nixon is ever mindful of the Nation's obligation to its veterans. Last week, at the dedication of a new Veterans' Administration hospital at Columbia, Mo., the President issued a statement in which he expressed the intention of maintaining and reinforcing the independent system of Veterans' Administration health care facilities when and as required.

This clear, concise expression of President Nixon's philosophy on veterans' medical care should serve to allay the fears of those who express concern about the future of the Veterans' Administration hospital system. The President's statement of June 16, 1972, follows:

PRESIDENTIAL STATEMENT, DEDICATION OF VA HOSPITAL, COLUMBIA, MO.

Today the Veterans Administration is dedicating a new hospital in Columbia, Missouri. This brings the nationwide system of veterans' hospitals to a total of 167, with more under construction and in the planning stage.

This latest addition will provide health care services primarily to the veterans of central Missouri. But its opening also symbolizes the strong and continuing commitment of this Administration to making the best possible medical care available to every eligible veteran.

Fulfilling the Nation's obligation to its veterans is a matter of justice and national honor. Meeting their medical needs is one of

our highest national priorities. To insure that they are met, I intend to maintain and reinforce the independent system of Veterans Administration health care facilities when and as required.

THE LITHUANIAN SPIRIT

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, this week is the anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, one of those brave nations along the Baltic littoral which was formally absorbed into the Soviet Union years ago. Although the territorial boundaries of that nation have been erased in name by Russia's action, in spirit the identity of that small but spirited republic remains fresh in the minds of millions of people who love freedom.

In past history, it is not difficult to encounter examples of how a nation, overrun by a conqueror, has kept its culture and ethnic heritage alive and well in spite of all efforts to assimilate its people by the authorities. This is done through overseas colonies of people who remain true to their backgrounds and by the loyal attachment of the native population to the language, culture and ethnic background that is uniquely theirs.

Poland is a classic example of this. In fact, so strong was this desire to keep all that was Polish alive and thriving, that a Polish cultural rebirth was created by Poles in exile. Lithuania is no exception to this kind of occurrence.

Persecuted by the czars and militarily subjected by the Bolsheviks, Lithuanians abroad kept the language and culture alive and well. Today in America it can be found in many States and cities, where colonies of these citizens tenaciously remain attached to all the appurtenances of their origin.

Meanwhile, in Lithuania itself, the people stubbornly refuse to allow themselves to be Russified and homogenized so they will be assimilated into the great Russian culture and life style.

In fact, there has been a rebirth of ethnicity in Lithuania, as young Lithuanians, determined to reassert their ethnic identity, have stood up to the ruling regime. There has been some violence and even reports of self-immolation by young activists.

This holds a lesson for us all. Here in America we have seen a rebirth of ethnic pride in a dozen different immigrant communities. Millions upon millions of ethnic Americans or hyphenated Americans have reasserted their heritage with pride and an insistence upon recognition.

Fortunately, in America, there is no need for a violent reassertion of ethnic identity and individuality. Here, there has never been forceful demand by Government upon immigrant groups to merge their identities into an anonymous mass. In Russia, unfortunately, the authorities still feel that identifiable mi-

norities must be stamped out and made good Soviet citizens, or else.

As a result, these people, especially the young among them, have stood up for who and what they are or wish to be, living examples of the impossibility of forcing assimilation upon a strongly defined cultural group. Surely the Kremlin will eventually and inevitably come to this belated but vital realization.

Just because a man or woman insists on the right to be a Jew, a Lithuanian, a Latvian or an Estonian, or any one of a dozen other heritages, does not mean that the Soviet regime should bring to bear all of its forces to prevent that right from being exercised.

Only tyrants act in this manner. They have never yet succeeded in stamping out the yearning of a free people to be themselves. It has failed with the Jews and shall fail with the Lithuanians.

CONSUMER MOVEMENT'S TOP AWARD TO CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege and pleasure last Wednesday night to attend the second annual Distinguished Service Awards Dinner of the Consumer Federation of America at the Mayflower Hotel, where a most impressive honor and a well-deserved one—was paid to our charming and conscientious colleague from Missouri, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN.

Congresswoman SULLIVAN, who has been working for consumer causes and for progressive legislation in every field during her great career in Congress, was presented the Consumer Federation's Distinguished Public Service Award "for understanding the dimensions of the consumer interest, for recognizing the need for a more rational, humanitarian, and purposeful system, and for active participation and outstanding leadership in achieving increased protection for all consumers."

It was the second such award to be made to a public official by the Consumer Federation of America. Last year's award, the first to be made, was given to Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan.

All of us in the House have for years looked to LEONOR SULLIVAN for leadership, guidance, and wisdom on consumer issues coming before the Congress. She has been the author of, and the driving force behind, some of the most important measures passed by Congress to improve the lot of the American citizen, from the food stamp program to the Truth in Lending Act.

In presenting the award to Mrs. SULLIVAN on behalf of the consumer movement in the United States, Mr. George E. Myers of the Credit Union National Association—CUNA—a vice president of the Consumer Federation of America, said of her that, "No elected official in

America today has done more to improve the lot of the American consumer than Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN."

REMARKS BY CONGRESSWOMAN SULLIVAN IN ACCEPTING AWARD

As usual, the gentlewoman from Missouri spoke with great sincerity and deep insight when she delivered her acceptance speech upon receipt of the Distinguished Public Service Award. It was an outstanding talk by the ranking woman Member of the House who has learned how to make the American legislative system work effectively in the public interest. I was deeply impressed by her remarks. Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I submit the text of Congresswoman SULLIVAN's remarks at the Consumer Federation of America awards dinner, as follows:

REMARKS BY CONGRESSWOMAN LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

I have no idea what it would be like to receive the Nobel Peace Prize or the Fermi Award for Atomic Energy Research or the Pulitzer Prize for Journalism or Letters, because none of these is in my field of special competence, but I can tell you what it is like to receive the Second Annual Distinguished Public Service Award of the Consumer Federation of America—it is one of the nicest things that has ever happened to me as a Member of Congress. It is an award I shall always treasure because of what it stands for in a field to which I have devoted most of my energies in the Congress for nearly 20 years.

I feel particularly honored in receiving this award following its presentation to only one other person so far—Senator Philip Hart of Michigan who is certainly one of the great figures of the consumer movement in this country. He has been a worthy successor as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly to the late Estes Kefauver of Tennessee who mastered the technique of Congressional investigative procedure and then used it relentlessly and brilliantly in the public interest, and especially, as Senator Hart has done also, in the consumer interest.

To be honored at the same affair as Sidney Margolius makes my award even more meaningful to me tonight because he was the first of the professional consumer writers, whose column in *The Machinist* newspaper pioneered in a field which the daily newspapers and the magazines assiduously neglected for so many years.

Today, however, every major newspaper in the country has at least one writer, and sometimes teams of them, specializing in consumer news, using brand names and company names and specific details such as we once found only in Sidney Margolius' column in the Labor press and in the other publications which had the courage and imagination to carry his enlightening dispatches. Fortunately, the pioneer has not been resting on past laurels nor has he been eclipsed by his many successors in the field of consumer journalism; his influence has grown with the national interest in this field and I am proud indeed to be honored alongside Sidney Margolius tonight.

The Consumer Federation of America is comparatively a come-lately in the field of national organizations—is it only six years since David Angevine organized the first consumer assembly which provided the inspiration and the impetus for the formation of this healthy and vibrant consumer organization? But while the organization itself is very young, the men and women who have been the architects and builders of this Federation in most instances have been active in the consumer movement all of their adult

lives. Long before there was a Consumer Federation of America, these men and women were working effectively together informally in ad hoc committees on all of the major pieces of legislation of the past generation which have erected the framework of the consumer protections we now enjoy in this country.

I know this from long personal experience because any legislative achievements I have had in the consumer cause in the last 20 years have been due at least in part—and often to a great degree—to the efforts of men and women in this room tonight and some who would undoubtedly be here to night if they were still among us.

When I started 18 years ago on the legislation which eventually became the Food Stamp Program, about the only support I received outside of my own City of St. Louis and a handful of Members of Congress—Senator Aiken, Senator Humphrey, and a few of the Pennsylvania Members of the House—came from some of the people in this room tonight. They were among the few Americans who could understand in 1954—during the 1954 recession—the urgency of outlawing hunger in the United States.

And it was that year also when Arnold Mayer first came to see me about the horrible conditions under which the poultry workers in this country were forced to work—in filthy plants where the product often arrived in diseased condition but was nevertheless processed and packaged and shipped for sale in interstate commerce. Heaven only knows how many consumers were made ill by this garbage, but Arnold Mayer knew that poultry workers were contracting diseases in the plants and that some had actually died from this exposure. We were able to establish from government medical sources that something like 27 diseases carried by poultry could be transmitted to humans. Yet there was no Federal inspection of poultry except on a voluntary basis, paid for by some segments of the industry as a sales promotion tool. This was not in some ancient or medieval period of history—it was just 18 years ago, 1954. Within three years we have a compulsory poultry inspection law enacted—not only for all poultry in interstate commerce but even, under some circumstances, for poultry moving only within a state.

I believe it was the first law ever enacted to provide machinery for compulsory Federal inspection of any food item moving only in intrastate commerce.

Even though the 1957 law was never used to regulate intrastate poultry sales, it nevertheless established the principle of Federal concern and responsibility for food safety within the states, and from that beginning came the subsequent Wholesome Meat and Wholesome Poultry Acts of the late 1960's, when we had far more help than we had in 1957.

And I remember, too, what Evelyn Dubrow did over the years in developing support for the great Senator Paul Douglas's Truth in Lending idea, and what the late John Edelman did for elderly consumers, and how the women of the REA co-ops were organized by Erma Angevine to work for consumer legislation, and how she and her then boss, former Congressman Clyde Ellis and also the Farmers Union fought for inclusion of agricultural credit under Truth in Lending in the 1967 hearings, when Sidney Margolis and Sarah Newman and Esther Peterson and Father McEwen and Pat Greathouse of the UAW, and William Hutton, and I. W. Abel of the Steelworkers, and spokesmen for CUNA, and other groups represented here came forward to testify in favor of the strong provisions of what became the Consumer Credit Protection Act of 1968; and I recall the help given me by Ralph Nader and his people on the Fair Credit Reporting Act of 1970; and I can only say I am grate-

ful indeed for all of this invaluable assistance from so many groups and individuals in the consumer movement.

The danger in citing some names is that you leave out many others also or equally entitled to credit. One name I must mention here—in any discussion of the work I have tried to do in the Congress—is that of Charles Holstein, for the past nine years on my Consumer Affairs Subcommittee staff, who has worked with me for 19 years in a multitude of consumer battles—and staff people who have worked with him to enable me to do the things you have honored me for accomplishing.

Of course, in this audience nearly everyone here knows who has done what in the consumer movement in these past years, and it would take all evening to recount each role and its significance, but not many of you may know how I actually got started as a consumerist Member of Congress. The women of what is now one of the constituent organizations of CFA, the nationally recognized St. Louis Consumer Federation, approached me after my first election in 1952 and asked me to speak to their members about my plans and intentions on pending consumer issues in the Congress. So I went to the library in St. Louis and started reading up on these issues, and found they were far more complex than I imagined. So I went to their meeting and threw myself on their mercy: I am going to be your Congresswoman, I said, and I want to work for consumer causes, but you're going to have to tell me what the problems are, and what can be done about them. That was the start. From then on, they fed me ideas, criticisms, and suggestions, and constantly raised questions. I hope I haven't ever let them down. The moral of the story is that if you want to influence Congressional votes on consumer issues, you can turn lots of Members of Congress into consumerists by teaching them what they should know about these issues. Once they get their feet wet in consumer causes—and you can always get them interested in some consumer issue regardless of their politics—you will find them working hard to impress their voters on how much they care. We have all seen some of the unlikeliest Members of Congress at some time or other turn into consumer activists on a particular issue. But you usually have to reach them through people in their own home districts—people with problems which cannot be solved except through Federal legislation. Once the problem registers on the Member's mind, then it is time to talk about solutions. But you must keep after them, as you all know.

Too often, when consumer issues come up on the House Floor, the "consumer-alert" system hasn't been brought into play—no one is in the galleries watching to see who is absent and calling their offices to find out why. We almost lost the garnishment title to the Consumer Credit Protection Act in 1968 because of absenteeism in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. We saved it by only four or five votes. The food stamp program was dehumanized in 1970 because of absenteeism during a teller vote. The rollcall votes are of course important, but what happens in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union under the five-minute rule is often more critical to the outcome. I have seen you people work your hearts out on great causes when you are really steamed up about them, counting noses, checking on absentees, and buttonholing Members outside the chamber, after organizing the writing campaigns back home, so I know you can mount an effective lobby when the stakes are clear enough to your organizations. The consumer causes don't always get that kind of support when it is needed—so don't depend upon the few conscientious ones to do all of the

work; back them up with your potent presence and assistance.

Right now, in the Committee on Banking and Currency, we are deeply involved in bitter controversy over the rights of consumers in buying homes. The Subcommittee on Housing has agreed to a bill which would write into law far-reaching and badly needed consumer protections in the purchase of FHA-insured homes and in the settlement charges and fees assessed on all home-buyers at that fateful and financially disabling moment of closing.

We have had a parade of industry witnesses come before the full Committee in the past week to mourn that writing these protections into law will bankrupt the building industry, or make the purchase of homes even more difficult financially for the average family. How do we get word to consumers of their stake in this legislation?

The Committee is deeply divided. Some key Members are wavering. An effort in the Subcommittee to strike these protections out of the bill failed by the dangerously narrow margin of a 7 to 7 tie vote. Whatever happens in the Committee we are going to have this battle again on the House floor. It will be a bruising one. I hope I will be able to look up in the galleries and see a lot of consumerists keeping score—and see some in the corridors, too, lining up wavering Congressmen. And I would like to hear some mail coming into Congress endorsing my Housing amendments.

If we lose, then the average family buying a home will continue to go the mortgage closing ceremonies as the inevitable victim of a traditional system of kickbacks to lawyers and developers and real estate dealers, unearned fees, mysterious charges of all kinds, and other forms of tribute to ancient custom or to deliberate, fast-dealing; if we win, we will really have something for consumers everywhere to celebrate. Are you prepared for the battle? Not many consumer voices have been heard from as yet on this issue which hits people where they live—or hope to live.

In every Committee of the House and Senate are other bills which can be made into effective vehicles for important consumer reforms. There is no standing Committee with legislative powers which is a "minor" Committee from the consumer standpoint—from Agriculture to Ways and Means.

In each of the standing Committees a resourceful and conscientious Member of Congress can always accomplish worthwhile improvements in behalf of consumers if he knows what the issues are and how to attack them, and what questions to ask or amendments to offer.

The 93rd Congress will provide an excellent opportunity for the consumer movement to score tremendous advances, because there will be an unusually large number of new Members learning the ropes and anxious for help and advice. Many of them will land on the so-called minor committees where they will fret about their lack of influence. What they will need to become effective are some good ideas, which the men and women in this room, and the organizations you represent, can help provide them with.

At the same time, don't neglect the rest of us—those of us with seniority who are in a position to shape major bills which will help make this a more consumer-oriented society. We will always need informed suggestions, and the public support for our bills or amendments, which you can bring about.

You have done much—you have already worked some near-miracles in the legislative field—in the few years since this organization was formed, and I am looking for more of those achievements from you in the years ahead. That's why your award means so much to me tonight—as recognition, yes, from citizens whose consumer dedication I respect; but also as a commitment between us

that we will continue to fight on together for what we believe this country should be to even the lowliest among us. Thank you very much.

THE GOLDEN BULL OF HUNGARY

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, 750 years ago, Hungary, the land of my grandparents, established the firm foundation for centuries of constitutional government. Shortly after the English nobles exacted the Magna Carta from King John, the free people of Hungary won strikingly similar concessions from their monarch, Andrew II. Called the Golden Bull of Hungary, this historic document guaranteed certain basic rights, including personal freedom and the right to resist tyranny. The fascinating story of how the people of Hungary secured these liberties is well described in the account which follows below.

Americans who are accustomed to thinking of the evolution of constitutional government solely in terms of the Anglo-Saxon experience may be surprised to learn that parallel developments were taking place simultaneously elsewhere in Europe. Unfortunately we are also apt to forget that, while we still enjoy the freedoms first guaranteed to English-speaking people by the Magna Carta, history has been less kind to the people of Hungary. The Communist regime which usurped power in 1945 abrogated the principles of the Golden Bull and, in less than a generation, nullified the traditions which endured for three-quarters of a millennium.

The anniversary of the Golden Bull thus provides a timely reminder that ideals of the American Revolution will not be realized completely until all those who share them can enjoy their benefits.

Include the following:

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE GOLDEN BULL OF HUNGARY

(Prepared by Dr. William Sólyom-Fekete, Senior Legal Specialist, European Law Division, Law Library, Library of Congress, June 1972)

Hungarians and their freedom-loving friends all over the world celebrate this year the 750th anniversary of one of the most important events of Hungarian history: the issuance of the Golden Bull (Bulla Aurea) by King Andrew II of Hungary. This constitutional document was granted in 1222, only seven years after the issuance of the Magna Carta of England to which it bears a striking resemblance in content despite the geographical distance and the ethnological and historical differences between England and Hungary. This anniversary presents an excellent opportunity to take a look at this important part of the thousand-year old Hungarian Constitution.

The Hungarians appeared in Central Europe at the close of the ninth century. At that time they already had an ancient constitution based on an agreement of the dukes of the seven tribes, one provision of which assured the leadership of the nation to Duke Árpád and his descendants. The prince formed a council from among the leaders and officers of the nation which assembled frequently.

Árpád's descendant, St. Stephen, obtained the royal crown from Pope Sylvester II in 1001 and assumed the title of King of Hungary. He was recognized by the Pope as the converter of the Hungarians to Christianity. From the earliest stages of the Kingdom, the laws were adopted by the royal council which consisted of the King and the nobility.

King St. Stephen's laws included a statement of human rights that was unique for that age: "Henceforward no earl or knight shall dare to place a free man in bondage."

The successors of King St. Stephen in the eleventh and twelfth centuries strove to consolidate the Kingdom and continued to strengthen the centralized administrative organization. This system was based on the counties led by administrators who were appointed or removed by the sovereign. These lord-lieutenants were responsible for the administration of the extensive real property owned by the king which was the source of both the economic and the political power of the Hungarian kings.

As a result of this centralized system of administration, the tendency toward autocratic and absolutistic rule by the kings became more prevalent, but such efforts usually met with vehement resistance by the nation.

The events immediately preceding the issuance of the Golden Bull were very similar to those in England which led to the issuance of the Magna Carta in 1215. King Andrew's succession to the throne after the death of his brother may be compared with the succession of King John to the throne of England. The political and economic conditions of Hungary also resembled those of England, and that is probably the reason why the contents of the Magna Carta and the Golden Bull are so similar.

The Hungarian nobility and the freemen enjoyed several privileges under the unwritten, ancient constitution of the nation, which were jeopardized by the absolutistic efforts of King Andrew II. The King nurtured extensive economic and political reform plans to strengthen his own power at the expense of the nation. This led to a serious conflict between the nation and its King.

The conflict was resolved in 1222 at the Diet of Fehérvár, where King Andrew II was confronted with the demands of the nobility and the freemen. He agreed to affirm their "ancient rights and liberties obtained from King St. Stephen."

The Golden Bull did not establish any new rights or privileges for the nobility but confirmed, for the first time in written form, the existing rights. However, by doing this the wisdom of the framers of this document avoided the weakening of the royal power, as Count Julius Andrássy, the well-known statesman, pointed out by saying that the Golden Bull, in contrast to the Magna Carta, "was designed to strengthen the King's power, as well as to assure the privileged classes their rights."

The great importance of this constitutional document is attributed to the fact that the King recognized that the nation had rights inviolable even by the King himself.

The most significant of these rights were: direct contact with the King at the annual diet; personal freedom; freedom from taxation; and the right of resistance.

As was mentioned before, the kings of Hungary usually held a royal council frequently where legislation was discussed. The Golden Bull provided that the King must call a diet annually, and each member of the nobility had the right to appear there in person and participate in the management of the affairs of the nation.

The personal freedom established by King St. Stephen was corroborated by the provision that no freeman should be seized or his property destroyed without—to use a modern phrase—"due process of law" that is, with-

out first being duly cited and convicted of a criminal action.

The freedom of the nobility from taxation was a privilege which at the time of its origin was not detrimental to the state because the crown properties yielded enough revenue to sustain the economic power of the country. The Hungarian nobility enjoyed this privilege until 1848, when the nobility itself renounced it voluntarily to strengthen the independence of the country.

Probably the best-known and, according to many scholars, the most important feature of the Golden Bull was the codification of the right of resistance. King Andrew declared that if he, or any of his successors, should violate the dispositions of the Golden Bull, the nobility had the right to resist and contradict without incurring the crime of treason.

This provision of the Golden Bull was also a confirmation of the customary law existing in the 13th century, and was so deeply embedded in the spirit of the Hungarian nation that it survived through the centuries, even after its formal repeal in 1687. This right of resistance constituted the legal basis of Hungary's struggle for independence and freedom from oppression through the centuries.

TAKING A LOOK AT LITTLE LEAGUE

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, every summer we encounter the annual debate on the value of organized sports for children. Eventually the argument often comes down to: is the child's development better served by participating on a Little League team, or playing on his own without adult supervision.

Both sides to this question have specific examples to back up their position. Those who favor organized play point out that the child is properly taught the fundamentals of the game and is protected from serious injury. The proponents of sandlot ball say that screaming moms and dads and win-at-all costs coaches ruin the fun of the game for the youngsters.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, there is no answer to this endless argument. Rather, much like any debate concerning an institution that has been established by man, the ultimate question mark concerns the individual. The most perfected institution can be destroyed by a single individual. This, more than anything else, is the central point of dispute over Little League baseball.

Last summer I recall vividly a story written by Washington Star staff writer, J. D. Bethea. This was a chilling account of a tyrannical Little League coach who apparently believed himself to be a combination of Vince Lombardi and Ted Williams. His brutalizing tactics on the young men under his command were disturbing, to say the least.

This summer J. D. Bethea took another look at Little League baseball, and, happily, found a different story. He discovered a man of compassion whose first concern was not for winning, but for the development of the youngsters on his team—not only as baseball players, but as individuals.

Mr. Speaker, obviously this other-side-of-the-coin story does not resolve the eternal controversy of Little League baseball—to be or not to be. It does point out that the determining factor about the worth of an institution is the individual. Observing how well established the Little League program has become, it is our hope that more and more of the men who coach our youngsters are of the type that Mr. Bethea discovered this summer.

With that in mind, I place in the RECORD "Taking a Look At Little League," by J. D. Bethea from the June 15, 1972, edition of the Washington Star:

TAKING A LOOK AT LITTLE LEAGUE

(By J. D. Bethea)

The kid at bat was an interesting study. He was a nice youngster, but as a Little League baseball player he was sort of out of it. As an outfielder Frank was impossible. As a batter he was horrible. His only strong point was being short. Frank managed to get a lot of walks because of his minimal strike zone.

The bases were loaded. Frank swung his bat and, shockingly, made a slight connection with the ball. It dribbled about three feet in front of home plate.

Frank simply stood at the plate as if transfixed. His coach, Dave Jones of Reston, Va., was yelling, "Run, run." Frank yelled back, "Where, where?" The opposing catcher, in the meantime, calmly picked up the ball and tagged him out.

In many instances the youngster would have been afraid to return to the bench after such a play. With Jones, however, the player was complimented upon finally making contact with the ball.

There is every possibility that Jones would make the perfect model of a Little League baseball coach. Particularly if, as a parent, your emphasis is not necessarily on winning games.

A jovial, outgoing individual whose sense of humor is most appealing to youngsters, Jones earns his living as Washington correspondent for the Tulsa, Okla., Tribune. He also coaches a Little League team called the Cobras.

The Cobras have indicated that they are a good team, but they haven't been winning. Jones' team has now lost seven of its last eight and spirits are, naturally, less than ebullient.

"Look, I want to win. I always want to win. I'm a very poor loser," Jones said. "My main problem is the feeling that I can't transmit this to grade school kids. Hell, I'm a guy who watches a game on television and ends up screaming at my set."

A typical example of Jones' influence on his team was evident following a recent 2-1 extra-inning loss. In Little League a 2-1 score, in extra innings yet, is about as rare as a pterodactyl.

As his team slowly trudged off the field, tears streaming down the faces of some players, others fighting them back, Jones gave one of his patented pep talks. Then he told his boys to give the opponents a cheer and go over and shake their hands.

"Little League to me means emphasizing sportsmanship and respect for others," Jones said. "I also don't allow the players to criticize one another. A child at this level is very sensitive. You can't tear him down without making him cease to produce."

"I've got one boy now by the name of Steve. He's an outfielder and he's a good player. In our last game Steve struck out three times. He slammed his helmet down and cried and talked about quitting. Heck, the kid has talent. Another year and he's going to be a fine player. Right now he's in a slump. So I try to build confidence."

Jones is not alone in his attempt to instill in youngsters a competitive spirit, tempered with adjusting to adversity and having fun at the same time. There are other Little League coaches who believe that the youngster's welfare is more important than winning.

They'll probably all be bald soon from pulling out their hair in frustration at errant calls by umpires and defensive lapses in the field. What's important, however, is that they will eventually develop the ulcers and not the kids.

GALLUP POLL SHOWS NIXON STRONGER

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, the Field Enterprises, Inc., through the Gallup poll has been releasing repeatedly the standing of the President versus other candidates in the other party. The Gallup poll has been remarkably accurate on past occasions and I felt that the placing of this in the RECORD would be of help to my colleagues who might not have noticed it. This is taken from the Campaign-Urbana News-Gazette of Sunday, June 11:

GALLUP POLL—NIXON STRONGER

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—Gov. George Wallace has registered sharp gains in the latest test elections, at the expense of Sen. Hubert Humphrey, and to a lesser extent, Sen. George McGovern. This has produced President Nixon's widest lead to date over both Humphrey and McGovern, despite the fact that the size of Nixon's vote has not increased since the previous measurement, taken in early May.

McGovern makes a better showing than Humphrey in the latest trial heats, conducted in late May. He trails Nixon by 13 points, 43 to 30 per cent, while Humphrey lags behind Nixon by 17 points, 43 to 26 per cent.

In the previous (early May) trial heats, McGovern trailed Nixon by eight points while Humphrey was 11 points behind.

The tables below show the trend in the trial heats since mid-April with Gov. George Wallace included as a possible third party candidate:

(In percent)

	Nixon	McGovern	Wallace	Undecided
1972				
May 26-29	43	30	19	8
Apr. 28-May 1	43	35	15	7
Apr. 21-24	45	32	16	7
1968				
May 26-29	43	26	22	9
Apr. 28-May 1	45	34	15	6
Apr. 21-24	44	31	16	9

The latest findings indicate that a "sympathy vote" may be operating for Wallace following the May 15 attempt on his life.

Wallace's current vote of 22 per cent in a match-up with Nixon and Humphrey represents his highest score yet recorded. His previous high of 21 per cent was recorded during the presidential campaign in late September, 1968. His support steadily fell off from then until the election when he won 13.6 per cent

of the vote to 43.0 per cent for Humphrey and 43.4 per cent for Nixon.

Remarkably, the September, 1968, trial heat figures almost exactly match these recorded in the latest Nixon-Humphrey-Wallace trial heat. Nixon won the support of 43 per cent in the earlier survey, compared to 28 per cent for Humphrey and 21 per cent for Wallace, with 8 per cent undecided.

From that time, however, the Wallace vote started to fade, with his losses translating into gains from Humphrey. By election eve, as the Gallup Poll indicated, Nixon had only a slim margin over Humphrey.

Wallace's gains in the latest trial heats up (seven points from the previous test against Humphrey, up four versus McGovern) reinforce survey findings reported Friday. These showed Wallace now tied with Humphrey and McGovern is the top choice of the nation's Democrats for the nomination, and far ahead of his two rivals among Independents, winning 36 per cent of their support to 25 per cent of McGovern and 11 per cent for Humphrey.

With many political observers of the opinion that Wallace will not run as a third party candidate this year, it is important to see where his vote would go in the event he does not enter the races.

To determine this, registered voters choosing Wallace were asked to select between just the two major party candidates in each of the two trial heats.

The national findings show Nixon benefitting over each of his two leading rivals, if Wallace is not in the picture.

Nixon would gain 10 points with Wallace out, while McGovern would pick up only four points. The President would gain nine points to only six for Humphrey.

The following tables show the vote in the latest test runs, with and without Wallace:

	Nixon	McGovern	Wallace	Undecided
With Wallace				
3-way race	43	30	19	8
2-way race	53	34		3
Without Wallace				
	Nixon	Humphrey	Wallace	Undecided
3-way race	43	26	22	9
2-way race	52	32		16

The latest trial heats are based on in-person interviews with a total of 1180 registered voters out of a total sample of 1540 adults interviewed May 26-29 in more than 300 localities across the nation. These questions were asked:

Suppose the presidential election were being held TODAY. If Richard Nixon were the Republican candidate and George McGovern (Hubert Humphrey) were the Democratic candidate, and George Wallace ran again as a third party candidate, which would you like to see win? And suppose Wallace is not in the race, which candidate would you prefer—Nixon or McGovern (Nixon or Humphrey)?

OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to my colleagues' attention an example of outstanding achievement by a high school team in my District. I am referring specifically to the Carle Place High School Physical Fitness

Team, consisting of six young men, ninth grade, through senior, who walked away with top honors in the Northeast Regional Competition, and finished eighth in the national meet, which was held on Thursday, June 15, at the U.S. Marine Corps Base in Washington, D.C.

The Carle Place High School team was in competition with 17 of the country's finest teams, and the tests were exceedingly difficult. Therefore, it is with great pride that I offer my congratulations to Coach Victor Travaglianti, and to the members of the Carle Place High School Physical Fitness Team, namely: Wayne Giglio, Art Lavery, John Madeo, Ray Izzo, Mike Fenster, and Russ Kohn. I am sure all of my colleagues will join me in applauding these young men, not only for the desire to excel physically, but more importantly, for the dedication, sacrifice, and self-discipline that we required in order for them to do so. At a time when many young people have been receiving negative publicity, it is gratifying to know that the so-called "generation gap" is not as wide as some would have us believe.

SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME: TRAGEDY, YES; GUILT, NO

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is no more heart-breaking affliction that can be visited on parents than the incredibly tragic and unfortunately unsolved "crib death," or sudden infant death syndrome.

A member of my district staff and her husband went through this horrible experience. The following article from the New York Times of June 19, 1972, tells the agonizing experiences suffered by parents when this occurs.

A TRAGEDY WITH AN AFTERMATH OF GUILT

"A simple child,
That lightly draws its breath,
And feels its life in every limb,
What should it know of death?"

—WILLIAM WORDSWORTH.

(By Judy Klemesrud)

Wordsworth's "We are Seven" is one poem that Mrs. Judith Choate can recite by heart, and often does. Early one morning in 1965, the willowy, former fashion model tiptoed into the nursery of her West Side apartment and found her 5-month-old son, Robert, dead in his crib.

The baby was the victim of "sudden infant death syndrome" (S.I.D.S.), or "crib death," the mysterious disease that is the nation's No. 1 killer of infants under 1 year of age. Each year approximately 10,000 babies die of crib death—1 in every 350 live births. The cause is still unknown.

The grief-stricken Mrs. Choate immediately sought out other parents who had suffered the same tragedy, and today she is the executive director of a growing national organization dedicated to helping parents who have lost a child to crib death.

It is the National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death, a tax-exempt charitable corporation whose headquarters are in a tiny office on the 20th floor of 1501 Broadway.

From here, Mrs. Choate, now 32 years old, and one secretary spend much of their time mailing out literature on crib death, which, as letters the foundation has received testify, can have devastating psychological effects on the family involved.

Marriages have broken up following a crib death (or "cot death," as it is known in England) because a husband refused to live with a wife who "let a baby die." Older siblings of the victims have become emotionally scarred. (Nightmares and bed-wetting are frequent results.) Guilt-ridden mothers have withdrawn from friends and relatives and refused to leave their homes for months. Suicides have been reported. Couples have refused to have further children for fear of another crib death.

Other couples, like Arthur and Ann Siegal (he is president of the R & H Advertising Agency) decided upon adoption. The Siegals adopted two children after their 16-month-old son, Danny, died of S.I.D.S. in 1966. They also have two natural children, one born after the adoptions.

"My pediatrician recommended we have another child right away," said Mrs. Choate, whose husband, Edward, is manager of the Music Box Theatre in Manhattan. "He told my husband, 'Get her pregnant right away,' and we had another child 11 months later."

Today, in addition to two adult children from his first marriage, the Choates are the parents of Michael, 10, who was with his mother the morning she found her infant son dead in his crib, and Christopher, 6.

"That was the longest period of my life," Mrs. Choate said, talking about Christopher's first year—the period when infants are most susceptible to crib death. "I had to fight myself from going into his room every five minutes to check on him."

The National Foundation for Sudden Infant Death was founded in 1962 as the Mark Addison Roe Foundation, started by a Connecticut couple whose infant son was a victim of S.I.D.S.

SOME THEORIES HAVE BEEN DISCOUNTED

Today the foundation has 20 chapters throughout the country, plus 12 others in formation. There are no dues paying members as such, but the foundation has a mailing list of 12,000 couples and individuals, Mrs. Choate said.

The literature details the latest theories as to what causes crib death, plus those that have generally been discounted: External suffocation in bedclothes, allergy to cows' milk, bleeding in the spinal cord, lead poisoning, radiation fall-out, smoking, adding bleach to the diaper wash, air pollution, fluoridation and suffocation by pet animals.

The theory advocated by Dr. Abraham B. Bergman of Seattle, the boyish-looking 39-year-old president of the foundation, is that a sudden spasm of the vocal cords closes off the airway during sleep.

The pediatrician repeated his theory at a recent meeting of the foundation's New Jersey chapter in a Lutheran church in Englishtown, N.J., then called for a "bill of rights" for S.I.D.S. parents.

These rights, he said, would include an autopsy of every suspected crib death victim by a competent medical examiner; the results given to the parents within 24 hours ("This is medically possible," he said); and accurate counseling and information about S.I.D.S. for the family, to make the loss of the child easier to bear.

One of the major efforts of the foundation, and also of a smaller group working with S.I.D.S. parents—the International Guild for Infant Survival, in Baltimore—is to acquaint medical examiners, law enforcement officials and the public with S.I.D.S. (As a result of the two groups' efforts, crib death was the subject of a recent "Marcus Welby, M.D." television program.)

Dr. Bergman said that public officials who

are not informed about S.I.D.S. often immediately assume that any baby who died in his crib was a victim of child abuse. "As a result," he said angrily, "they treat the parents like criminals."

PARENTS TREATED "LIKE CRIMINALS"

"I highly resent this association between crib death and child abuse," Dr. Bergman told the 60 persons at the meeting. "It's very easy for a doctor to recognize the difference."

Mrs. Choate, who was also at the meeting, said that among the questions she was asked by a medical investigator following the death of her son were:

"How many times did you hit the baby?"

"Did your other child choke or in any way abuse the infant?"

"Did you let your dog bite the baby?"

Two international conferences, in 1963 and 1969, were held on crib death, but research is only beginning. Last year the Federal Government spent only \$46,000 on research and prevention of the disease. This summer, according to Dr. Bergman, 20 college students, operating under a \$90,000 Federal grant, will conduct interviews on how crib deaths are handled in 150 American cities.

"Just what do doctors know about crib death?" a distraught sounding father who had lost a son the week before asked Dr. Bergman from the audience.

"Not much," the pediatrician admitted. He said that crib death was neither predictable nor preventable, that it has been around since antiquity and is not increasing, that slightly more boys die of it than girls, and that it is most likely to occur in the winter among 2-to-4-month-old infants born prematurely or of low birth weight to low income families.

He reassured the parents that crib death was not hereditary, and that an S.I.D.S. death does not mean an increased likelihood that a subsequent baby will suffer the same fate.

After the speeches, several of the New Jersey couples were interviewed about their S.I.D.S. infants and the situations they had encountered after the deaths.

Unlike most of the parents, Kevin and Mary Ann Deas of East Brunswick, N.J., were actually present and only inches away from their 11-week-old son, Michael, when he died of S.I.D.S. last April 21. The Deas had just returned from an afternoon drive to the Jersey Shore when they discovered their son dead in a baby bed on the second seat of their station wagon.

"There was no sound, absolutely nothing," the 27-year-old Mrs. Deas said. "It was really eerie because, for some reason, I'd been thinking about crib death all day—and I wasn't even sure what it was."

The couple said they considered themselves fortunate in that most of the officials they dealt with knew about S.I.D.S. A policeman assigned to their case had lost an infant to crib death a few months earlier, and so had a rescue squad driver.

Like many of the parents, the Deas said that they now were probably over-protective of their surviving son, Kevin, who is 2.

"I BLAME MYSELF"

"I'll go to his room in the middle of the night," said Mr. Deas, a 29-year-old salesman of hospital equipment, "and I'll twitch him, just to see if he is still alive."

Crib death and guilt feelings tend to go hand-in-hand, and one mother who suffered severely was Mrs. Donald Hill, 25, of Belleville, N.J., whose first and only child, Monica, died last February 1 at the age of one month.

"I blamed myself," Mrs. Hill said. "The baby was crying the whole day before she died, and I kept picking her up. Then I decided the next time she cried I wouldn't pick her up, and when I went into her room I found her dead."

Mrs. Hill was so distraught that she refused to return to her apartment after the

death. She and her husband stayed with relatives for two months, then moved to an apartment two miles from the old one. She has since returned to her job as an X-ray technician at East Orange General Hospital, and is expecting another child next January.

To Mrs. Harris Goldberg, of Englishtown, N.J., who with her husband heads the New Jersey chapter, the thing that was most disturbing after the death last June of her 16-month-old adopted daughter, Jennifer, was the complete indifference of her pediatrician.

"She didn't bother to contact us in any way," Mrs. Goldberg said, "and I had taken Jennifer to see her many times. A few months later I saw her in the supermarket, and she snubbed me completely. But from what I've learned in this group, doctors feel terribly guilty, too, and perhaps that was what was wrong in her case."

The meeting came to an end when Dr. Bergman told the couples he hoped the foundation would "self destruct" in five years as people come to understand crib death and S.I.D.S. parents learn to cope with their guilt feelings.

"That's when we will have achieved our goal," he said, "when a family feels no more guilty about losing a child to crib death than they would if the child died of pneumonia, meningitis or leukemia."

THE HONORABLE RICHARD H. POFF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 14, 1972

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of sadness that I learned of the decision of our colleague, RICHARD POFF, not to seek reelection to the 93d Congress, in order to accept an appointment as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia. He has one of the greatest judicial minds that I have known, and his ability is being recognized as he leaves his seat in the U.S. Congress, for a seat on the highest judicial branch of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

"Dick" has served almost 20 years in the U.S. Congress—that lengthy term is an open manifestation of the esteem in which he is held by his constituents in the Sixth District of Virginia, where I have visited and confirmed. He has served his district, and the Nation, with dedication, devotion, integrity, and quality. His legal abilities have been well brought out in his long years of service on the House Judiciary Committee, and repeatedly demonstrated on the floor. I know that his clear and perceptive mind will faithfully and excellently serve any legal body. In the future, as in the past, when he received the Distinguished Flying Cross in World War II, to the present where he has worked and labored so many years, his superior abilities will be recognized.

I am sorry to see him leave the Congress, as we all are, but I am confident he will give many more years of meritorious and dedicated service to Virginia, and to the Nation, in his new role.

FLAG DAY REMARKS BY ALEXANDER CONTRACT

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, Fourth of July is just around the corner, and our American flag always plays an important part in the celebration of this patriotic event.

Just recently, Mr. Alexander Contract, a constituent of mine from Carlisle, Pa., delivered an address for Flag Day services conducted at the Middletown Elks Lodge No. 1092 in Middletown, Pa. Because this address presents some very technical and interesting background information on our Old Glory, I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I would like to mention that Mr. Contract's presentation is particularly significant and moving because during the late 1930's and early 1940's, he was a member of the Russian Secret Police and a bodyguard for Josef Stalin. He defected to America after World War II and was naturalized in 1955.

Mr. Contract loves our free America because he has lived in a society where the freedom of the individual is subordinated to the interests of the State. The wonderful thing about Mr. Contract is that he does not appreciate America passively but, instead, demonstrates this appreciation dynamically, convincingly, and effectively. He is, indeed, a very fine example of a good American, and he is, certainly, deserving of his fellow Americans' deep respect.

I am, indeed, pleased to have the privilege of inserting Mr. Contract's remarks into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: SPEECH DELIVERED BY ALEXANDER CONTRACT

The story of the origin of our national flag parallels the story of the origin of our country. As our country received its birthright from the peoples of many lands who were gathered on these shores to found a new nation, so did the pattern of the stars and stripes rise from several origins back in the mists of antiquity to become emblazoned on the standards of our infant republic.

The star is a symbol of the heavens and the divine goal to which man has aspired from time immemorial; the stripe is symbolic of the rays of light emanating from the sun. Both themes have long been represented on the standards of nations, from the banners of the astral worshippers of ancient Egypt and Babylon to the 12-starred flag of the Spanish Conquistadors under Cortez. Continuing in favor to the present patterns of stars and stripes on the flags of several nations of Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Americas.

The first flags adopted by our colonial forefathers were symbolic of their struggles with the wilderness of a new land. Beavers, pine trees, rattlesnakes, anchors, and various like insignia with mottoes such as "Hope," "Liberty," "Appeal to Heaven," or "Don't Tread on Me" were affixed to the different banners of colonial America.

The first flag of the colonists to have any resemblance to the present stars and stripes

was the Grand Union flag, sometimes referred to as the "Congress Colors." It consisted of thirteen stripes, alternately red and white, representing the thirteen colonies, with a blue field in the upper left-hand corner bearing the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew, signifying union with the Mother country. This banner was first flown by the ships of the colonial fleet in the Delaware River in December 1775.

In January 1776, the Grand Union flag became the standard of the Continental Army which had come into being some months before—in June 1775. It was also carried by American Marines and Bluejackets comprising an expeditionary force to the West Indies in 1776.

Some Americans still believe that Betsy Ross made the first flag, although historians dispute this story. Another disputed story is that the first stars and stripes displayed in the face of armed enemy was at Fort Schuyler, August 3rd, 1777. The flag was improvised. The white part came from a soldier's shirt; a captain's cloak supplied the blue of the union; and the red stripes came from the flannel petticoat of a soldier's wife, who gladly donated it for the purpose. However this was probably a Grand Union flag.

Continental Congress passed a resolution that established the stars and stripes on June 14th, 1777, but did not specify the arrangement of the thirteen stars on the blue union, except to say that they should represent a new constellation.

General Washington, when the star-spangled banner was first flown by the Continental Army, is reputed to have described its symbolism as follows: "We take the stars from heaven, the red from our Mother country, separating it by white stripes, this showing that we have separated from her, and the white stripes shall go down to posterity representing liberty."

Realizing that the flag would become unwieldy with a stripe for each new state, Captain Samuel C. Reid, USN, suggested to Congress that the stripes remain thirteen in number to represent the thirteen colonies, and that a star be added to the blue field for each new state coming into the Union. A law of April 1, 1818 that resulted required that a star be added for each new state on the 4th of July after its admission but that the thirteen stripes remain unchanged.

A 48-star flag came with the admission of Arizona and New Mexico in 1912. Alaska added a 49th star in 1959, and Hawaii a 50th star in 1960.

There is no fixed order for numbering the stars in the flag, nor are stars assigned to particular states. The stars represent the states collectively, not individually, and no particular star may be designated as representative of any particular state.

One of our most memorable flags is the one that flew over the Capitol in Washington on December 7, 1941 when Pearl Harbor was attacked. This same flag was raised again on December 8th when war was declared on Japan, and three days later at the time of the declaration of war against Germany and Italy. President Roosevelt called it the "Flag of Liberation" and carried it with him to the Casablanca Conference and on other historic occasions. It flew from the mast of the USS "Missouri" during the formal Japanese surrender on September 1945.

Another historic flag is the one that flew over Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1945. It also rippled above the United Nations Charter meeting at San Francisco and over the Big Three Conference at Potsdam. This same flag was flying over the White House on August 14, 1945, when the Japanese accepted surrender terms.

Now that I have talked about the origin and history of our great flag, let us reflect on

the respect and pride due our flag by practicing Americanism.

Americanism is best explained in such simple phrases as; the goose bumps that run up and down your spine, while you stand at attention and the colors pass by, or the angered repulsive feeling you get when you read of the desecration of our flag, or the tear that rolls into your eye when they bury a young soldier who didn't forsake America—instead he died.

You can promote Americanism by sponsoring parades, participating in patriotic services, and encouraging the flying of the flag Daily, not only on holidays. See that there is a flag displayed at all meetings you attend, and by renewing your allegiance to our flag Aloud at the start of these meetings and services.

There is good reason to believe that the majority of the people of the United States favor the orderly processes of the law as a means for resolving disputes. There is also good reason to believe that our social order, which is founded upon law and order, is strong enough to withstand the challenges of today, and many days to come. The real tragedy is not that our society may surrender to lawlessness, but that those who attack the law, in an effort to achieve social reform, have gone to the wrong "battlefield."

Some of the most influential voices in our midst deride our allies and applaud our enemies, bewail our shortcomings and ignore our virtues.

These influential critics would have us believe that theirs is an accurate impression of America today. But we would make a mistake to regard them as representative of the majority in this country.

The knockers may outshout the boosters, but they will never outnumber them.

The important thing is to do something, and not to excuse oneself with the thought that "I can do so little it will make no difference." It does make a difference. America is People—Not Things. If each of us does his own particular job a little better, and raises his personal standards a little higher, our country will gain in strength and character.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, Mr. Speaker, I think it well that we stop to salute our educational establishment with all its ramifications. During the school year that is just closing, over 50 million people—48 million students and 2 million teachers—were a part of our elementary and secondary schools. No other activity in the country involves one-fourth of the population on a full-time basis. The revenues of our elementary and secondary schools alone, not counting our many institutions of higher education, amounted to \$50 billion. In the truest sense, this represents a massive investment in the future.

I have always regarded education as the bridge from the past to the future. The great ideas and disciplines which we have learned throughout history are transmitted to a new generation who will become our leaders and our workers. Young minds are challenged with knowledge and they are taught specific skills, but most important of all, they have an

opportunity to learn how to think for themselves.

I think our schools are doing a good job preparing students both for life and for careers. We must strive always to do a better one.

GAO REPORT SUBSTANTIATES NIX HEARINGS

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, I have moved for the inclusion in the RECORD today excerpts from a General Accounting Office report, dated June 13, 1972, which confirms testimony before my Postal Facilities and Mail Subcommittee that the U.S. Postal Service has thrown away \$8 million in architectural drawings by canceling 20 large postal projects after planning on each of the projects had been completed. The excerpts include the transmittal letter from the Comptroller General and a schedule showing the amounts spent on the planning of these projects.

These projects were canceled for no better reason than the fact that postal planners came up with the idea that parcels should be sorted in different buildings than regular mail. In order to justify their theorizing, the planners eliminated projects which had been designed over 2-year periods in order to avoid the unfavorable comparisons that could result when new projects are completed.

Postal planners have determined for themselves that \$8 million is not a great deal of money. In fact, considering the amount of money they are spending today, they believed that it would not be noticed.

It would not have, but a dedicated postal employee, Mr. John Tracy, a retired colonel, protested to postal officials. He had noticed that some architects were being paid standby fees months after projects had been canceled. A little further study revealed the size of the mess within his area of knowledge, some 20 projects. There are at least 20 other projects that have been closed down for the same reason. We learned about Mr. Tracy because of his courageous action. He retired from the Postal Service soon after. He appeared as a witness before our subcommittee this spring.

My thanks go to the General Accounting Office, to Mr. John Ols, and Mr. Frank Medico who worked so hard on this report.

What can the Congress do about the casual destruction of \$8 million worth of planning?

I think that all we can do for the present time is to try to prevent further waste. But, we surely must consider whether or not legislation will be necessary in the future to reassert a congressional interest in a public agency that wastes public money. Wasting public money will not contribute to the solving

of postal problems. So-called postal managers must be reminded that throwing tax dollars away, raised from postage, will not bring better mail service.

The excerpts follow:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Postal Facilities
and Mail, Committee on Post Office and
Civil Service, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In a letter dated February 28, 1972, you requested that we prepare a study on the costs resulting from canceling certain postal building projects which were so advanced that architectural and mechanical design plans had to be put aside. As agreed to with your office, we verified the financial data furnished to us by your staff concerning architect-engineer (A-E) contract amounts and related payments for 20 Postal Service projects. We reviewed in detail the projects in Atlanta, Georgia; Chicago (North Suburban), Illinois; Dallas, Texas; Inglewood, California; and Murray Hill Station, New York, N.Y.

The results of our study are summarized below and are presented in greater detail in this report.

The Postal Service paid A-E contractors about \$2.8 million for the architectural design of five multistory postal buildings in which preferential mail (letters) and bulk mail (advertising circulars and packages) were to be processed. Of the \$2.8 million, about \$2.4 million was for A-E design work, and the remaining amount was for such items as subsoil tests, travel, foundation investigation, and termination fees. The A-E contracts for the design of the five multistory buildings were terminated because the Postal Service decided that it would be more economical to process preferential and bulk mail in separate specialized buildings rather than in one multistory building.

The Postal Service plans to build, at an estimated cost of about \$950 million, a network of 21 major and 12 satellite buildings to handle bulk mail. It also plans to either construct new or modify existing buildings to handle preferential mail. This preferential mail network is to consist of 177 buildings costing about \$4 billion. The Postal Service expects that the bulk mail and preferential mail networks will be fully operational by June 1975 and July 1978, respectively. The Postal Service estimated that these two networks would reduce annual operating costs by about \$300 million and \$1 billion, respectively. Our Office is in the process of reviewing the implementation of these two networks, and therefore we are not in a position to comment on the validity of the estimated savings or on the desirability of the networks.

We believe that the Postal Service will receive little, if any, benefit from the work performed by the A-E contractors on the design of the five postal buildings. The buildings being designed to handle both preferential and bulk mail were multistory postal buildings, whereas the buildings to be used in the preferential and bulk mail networks are designed to handle either preferential mail or bulk mail in separate specialized buildings.

We were informed by several of the A-E contractors that very little benefit could be obtained from the design work performed under the terminated contracts. The A-E contractors also stated that their design work would be of no value if a different site was acquired or if a different A-E contractor was subsequently selected to design a postal building.

Our verification of the financial data showed that the Postal Service had made payments totaling about \$5.2 million to A-E

contractors for the remaining 15 A-E contracts before terminating them. Of the \$5.2 million, about \$4.9 million was for design work performed by the A-E contractors and the remaining amount was for such items as subsoil tests, travel, and a termination fee. Selected data relating to the 20 terminated A-E contracts are contained in the appendix.

We have not requested the Postal Service or the A-E contractors to review or formally comment on the information contained in this report. In accordance with your request, this report is also being furnished to Congressman H. R. Gross. We plan to make no further distribution of this report unless copies are specifically requested, and then we

shall make distribution only after your agreement has been obtained or public announcement has been made by you concerning the contents of the report.

Sincerely yours,

R. F. KELLER,
Deputy Comptroller General of the
United States.

APPENDIX I

SELECTED DATA FOR CERTAIN TERMINATED A-E CONTRACTS

Facility location	A-E contractor	Date of contract	Contract amount		Payments			Total	Date contract terminated or suspended
			Design fee	Construction services and supervision fee	Design	Other ¹	Suspension costs or termination fee ²		
Atlanta, Ga.	Stevens and Wilkinson, Partnership; Cooper, Carry & Assoc., Inc.	Jan. 17, 1969	\$1,027,000	\$313,800	\$513,500	\$19,192	\$27,471	\$560,163	Dec. 12, 1969. ³
Carbondale, Ill.	R. A. Nack & Assoc., Inc.	Dec. 17, 1968	89,524	39,450	89,244	6,484		95,728	May 7, 1970.
Chicago, Ill. (south suburban)	Perkins & Will Partnership; Illinois Bell & Bell Co.	Feb. 6, 1968	170,000	219,120	170,000	15,544		185,544	Do.
Chicago, Ill. (north suburban)	do	do	536,895	219,120	536,895	57,022		593,917	Do.
Dallas, Tex.	Harwood K. Smith and Partners	Oct. 18, 1968	815,315	309,685	813,770	45,035		858,805	Do.
East St. Louis, Ill.	Hellmuth, Obata & Kassabaum, Inc.	Apr. 15, 1968	213,000	101,000	213,000	24,382		237,382	June 5, 1970.
Gary, Ind.	Fred Collins	Nov. 20, 1968	164,224	79,570	164,224	3,538		167,762	May 7, 1970.
Inglewood, Calif.	Angel/Mock Assoc., Inc.	Mar. 30, 1970	256,030	78,728	167,949	1,135	83,068	252,152	June 26, 1970. ³
Jacksonville, Fla.	Willis, Veenstra, Register & Cummings	Jan. 6, 1969	311,397	85,961	229,687	9,256		238,943	May 7, 1970.
Madison, Wis.	John J. Flad & Assoc.; Davenport Assoc.	Jan. 10, 1969	318,700	91,300	381,814	10,211		329,025	Do.
Morgan Station, New York, N.Y.	Edward Durrell Stone & Assoc.; Ames Assoc.; Frederick Harris Assoc.	June 29, 1967	2,538,000	(*)	1,926,491	58,357	58,498	2,043,346	May 15, 1969.
Murray Hill Station, New York City, N.Y.	Frank Grad & Sons; Hart, Benvenaga & Assoc.	June 12, 1964	378,000	126,000	402,827	119,555	29,000	551,382	May 12, 1970.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Deeter, Ritchey, Sippel and M. Baker, Jr., Inc.	Jan. 15, 1969	1,125,000	410,600	237,298	2,465		239,763	Aug. 15, 1969. ³
Rapid City, S. Dak.	Kirkham, Michael & Assoc., Inc.; Meese, Peterson & Foss, Inc.; Dunham Assoc.	June 25, 1968	74,900	37,300	74,900	15,126		90,026	Do.
Riverside, Calif.	Ruhnaw, Evans & Steinmann	Nov. 27, 1968	143,500	58,100	144,858	3,960		148,818	Do.
Salem, Oreg.	Carkin & Sherman	Jan. 16, 1969	163,874	107,055	163,874	5,807		169,681	Do.
Salt Lake City, Utah	Ashton, Brazier, Montmorency & Assoc.	Sept. 4, 1968	276,269	128,460	276,269	5,187		281,456	Do.
San Antonio, Tex.	Ford, Powell & Carson	Jan. 14, 1969	340,618	115,870	340,618	18,274		358,892	Do.
Syracuse, N.Y.	Quinlivan, Pierik & Krause; Heuber-Hares-Calvin	Jan. 17, 1969	388,000	190,175	367,973	21,088		389,061	Do.
Tacoma, Wash.	Seifert, Forbes & Berry	Sept. 30, 1968	222,792	92,500	222,662	4,937		227,599	Do.
Total			9,553,038	2,803,794	7,374,853	446,554	198,037	8,019,444	

¹ Other payments were for such items as travel and subsoil investigations.

² Several A-E contractors did not charge the Postal Service for suspension costs or a termination fee.

³ Indicates the date contract was suspended.

⁴ Not applicable.

A SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it has been estimated that in the year 1971-72 there will be a total enrollment in our elementary and secondary schools of some 48,204,104 pupils and that there will be over 2 million classroom teachers in these schools. What these figures say is an irreversible commitment to education.

While there are differences in approaches to educational methodology, the fact remains that there can be no quarrel with that commitment to education as an indispensable instrument to insure the welfare and progress of our citizens and, consequently, our country.

Education speaks for a mobile, upward society, for the cultivation of the inquiring mind, for the understanding of interpersonal relationships as well as for the development of each individual's highest potential.

Our dollars for education are investment and not expenditure. Our returns are manifold and immeasurable in terms of human values.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, years ago education often was synonymous with rote memorization. Today in our increasingly complex and problem-filled society, the spectrum of education is considered to range far beyond that process. Late 20th century education continues to involve the dissemination and acquisition of knowledge. However, knowledge is but one of its components.

Education now means learning to understand and empathize with other cultures and peoples. Education means learning to analyze problems clearly and searching for solutions to those problems. Education means recognition of a world outside of one's self and one's community. And education means allowing natural curiosity and creativity to surface—to be stimulated by life's experiences and the joy of discovering new things.

It is through this type of education that the characters of free men are most fully developed. Thus, it is indeed appropriate that it is given an important place

in our society. Certainly, it is a crucial element in our effort to make this Nation—and this world—a better place in which to live.

As a former teacher, I am particularly proud to have this opportunity to salute our country's 50 million educators and students.

WELCOME VIVIAN SPITZ

HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, today we welcome as a new reporter to the U.S. House of Representatives, Mrs. Vivian Spitz.

I had the great pleasure of having Mrs. Spitz report a number of my trials during my days of practice in Denver, Colo.

She is not only a gracious woman but an outstanding reporter. I wish to extend my congratulations not only to her but to you and members of your staff on selecting such a competent person to record the proceedings from this day forward in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HON. SAM GIBBONS' LATEST
QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, each year, I send out a questionnaire to those living in my congressional district to ask for their opinions on major issues facing the Congress and our country. The responses I receive will be helpful to me. The following is the questionnaire which I recently sent out. Each question provided for "his" and "her" answers with multiple choices:

CONGRESSMAN GIBBONS ASKS YOUR OPINION
CHINA

What do you think the United States' position should be toward China? (a) immediate recognition of China, (b) limited trade and cultural exchanges with the Chinese, (c) we've done too much already.

UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment nation-wide is approximately six percent of the labor force. The federal government should: (a) provide public service employment opportunities, (b) increase unemployment compensation benefits, (c) assume no further responsibility.

AMNESTY

Should the federal government grant: (a) unconditional amnesty to both draft-evaders and deserters? (b) amnesty upon condition of equivalent public service in the United States? (c) no amnesty?

HEALTH INSURANCE

The federal government should: (a) pay for health care for all Americans, (b) pay for health care for poor persons and for "catastrophic" illnesses, (c) continue present health care programs, (d) have no role in providing health care.

TAXES

Would you like to see: (a) the system simplified and corporations and wealthy individuals pay more? (b) the system simplified but tax distribution stay the same? (c) no change? (d) corporations pay less?

REVENUE-SHARING

The federal government should: (a) share its tax revenues with the cities and states for whatever programs they decide on, (b) share its tax revenues only when there is a surplus, (c) continue providing grants and loans for specific purposes rather than "sharing revenues", (d) not provide cities and states with federal tax funds when Congress has no authority over how the funds are spent.

PRICES

Do you think that the government's control of prices has been: (a) ineffective, (b) fairly effective, (c) very effective.

TRADE

What should our trade policy be? (a) increase trade by lowering tariffs and quotas so that goods can flow freely between nations, (b) keep policy as it is, (c) further restrict trade by increasing tariffs and quotas.

PRIORITIES

The most urgent national problem facing us today is: (a) the economy, (b) tax reform, (c) pollution, (d) the Vietnam war.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

On behalf of consumers, the federal government should: (a) conduct tests on products and issue public reports, (b) create a special agency to handle consumer complaints, (c) do nothing under the philosophy of "let the buyer beware."

FAULT, NO FAULT OR STRICT
LIABILITY?

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the American Bar Journal contains further interesting insights into the continuing debate on no-fault insurance:

FAULT, NO FAULT OR STRICT LIABILITY?

(By C. L. Gaylord)

In 1910, a small town lawyer from Outagamie County in Wisconsin argued to his Supreme Court that the automobile was a dangerous instrumentality and should be put in that legal category with "the locomotive, ferocious animals, dynamite and other dangerous contrivances" so as to render the owner absolutely liable for its use. In view of the comparative sorrows and hardships the automobile has caused since then, he may well have understated the case. The court rejected his argument and started Wisconsin law down its long tortuous road of liability based on fault in automobile accident cases (Steffen v. McNaughton, 124 N.W. 1016). Five other states were already travelers on that same road. That lawyer is dead, and it probably cannot cheer him that he may have been right after all, as unsuccessful appellants often are.

At that time, the automobile was a new factor, legally and socially. The court had to decide issues arising from its operation as matters of first impression. They had to search for precedents arising out of situations before the automobile was known. They chose the "negligence and fault" doctrine instead of absolute or strict liability. We may now have come full circle. Automobiles are again posing new legal and social problems, perhaps not foreseeable by the judges who made the first decisions. But the road these judges chose has come to a dead end and things are piling up. Legislators and courts may have to start over again, as a matter of first impression, to find solutions.

One of the solutions proposed is "no-fault" insurance: theoretically, the elimination of the fault concept in compensating accident victims for their losses. It is popular with most legislators and laymen. It is unpopular with the American and most state bar associations.

"NO FAULT" IS UNPOPULAR WITH ASSOCIATIONS

Generally the belief is that it is unpopular with professional associations because it is against the economic interests of their members. It is suggested that much revenue would be lost to the legal profession if "no-fault" were adopted, which is very likely true. The associations give other reasons for their opposition, but the explanations are suspect to the laymen. They seem negative in nature, and what affirmative proposals are presented appear designed to divert attention from the issue. The layman still believes that attorneys are a devious bunch of rascals and mainly dedicated to self-interest.

The reaction is unfortunate because it may prevent a careful analysis of the merits of the no-fault proposals. If some of them, as now proposed, are passed, the remedy may be worse than, or at least inappropriate to, the ailment. But when the professional explanations are considered, the layman probably should not be faulted for his attitude. Many lawyers themselves are embarrassed by the public statements opposing no-fault, even though they may also be wary of the suggested no-fault plans.

When a pamphlet of the American Trial

Lawyers Association declares that, instead of no-fault insurance, safer cars should be designed, a merit rating system introduced to reduce premiums for safe drivers and law enforcement improved, can the layman be blamed for looking a little peculiar and saying that, of course, these are all very worthwhile proposals, but what have they to do with no-fault insurance? Can't we have these things and no-fault insurance? And when it is suggested that insurance companies should pay interest on successfully litigated or settled cases from the date of injury and that claims adjusters should be licensed to make them more responsible, can he be blamed for wondering why these recommendations have to be separated from a no-fault program?

Or when the moral approach is made that eliminating the fault concept allows the wrongdoer to avoid paying for the wrong he's done, should we be surprised that even lawyers have difficulty rationalizing why the burden of enforcing this punishment should rest on the innocent injured person? Why should he bear the economic loss and emotional trauma occasioned by having to prove the other fellow wrong? Hasn't he suffered enough already? Why should society require him to assume the prosecution of the guilty? If the wrongdoer is to be punished, why shouldn't it be done through the criminal laws? If he is guilty of an offense, he should be charged criminally, but why should the civil remedies be used for punitive purposes?

SHOULD A WRONGDOER RECOVER FOR HIS
INJURIES?

It is not infrequently said that no-fault should be opposed because justice requires that a wrongdoer should not be allowed to recover for his own injuries. Eliminating the fault concept will allow him to be rewarded for his own wrongdoing. Is it unreasonable for the thoughtful layman to reply that he hopes there aren't very many drivers around who are insane enough to risk death and criminal prosecution merely to become seriously injured so they can profit from their own wrongdoing? And he suggests that most persons who have been in accidents, or who have much to do with the investigation or litigation of issues arising from them, know that usually there is very little difference, even legally, between the innocent and the wrongdoer; that most persons involved in accidents aren't intentional "wrongdoers" or criminals but rather just folks that something "happens" to without their being "good" or "bad" having anything much to do with it.

Why should we feel so vindictive about them? If the so-called "wrongdoer" loses an arm or leg, isn't he as disabled as an innocent person so injured? Isn't he as unable to care for himself and his family? Does the fact that he may have been more negligent mean that he will not need medical attention? Will the grocer give him free food and the landlord free rent? Should his family be punished vicariously for what he may have done or failed to do?

One can reasonably infer from what some members of the legal profession have said that if a person is not responsible in damages for what he does, he will go wild on the highways, mayhem will result, and the highways will become a playground for the uninhibited irresponsibles.

Is there any wonder that some laymen feel the legal profession is putting them on a bit? Laymen don't want persons like that driving cars on the highways with or without liability insurance. They don't want "uninhibited irresponsibles" playing "bump-a-car" on the roads under either a no-fault or fault plan. Obviously these drivers are uninsured anyhow. The insurance companies are not fools and neither are persons who purchase uninsured motorist coverage. They know that the

fault concept is not keeping the jockeys off the racetrack.

There are also lawyers who oppose no-fault plans because the plans fail to cover all victims of accident and illness. They say they oppose these programs until a general national health insurance plan is provided for everyone. For instance, a statement of A.T.L.A. objects that the plans provide coverage for the drunken driver but "not for the hapless housewife who falls down the basement steps."

There is, of course, logic to this approach. But the layman wonders if the insistence that economic salvation must be universal and simultaneous for everyone before it is acceptable for anyone is really in good faith. He knows there is no chance of a general national health insurance plan of such scope being acceptable in the foreseeable future. He also knows that the "drunken driver", while the most inflammatory comparison, would constitute a small percentage of the no-fault beneficiaries. And, while he doesn't know the statistics of hapless housewives who fall down the stairs each day, nor how many more do so on holidays and weekends, he is aware of the auto accident toll and that serious problems are resulting from it.

And then, of course, we have the unanswerable: It is not the "American Way" to allow a person to escape individual responsibility for what he is and what he does. But is the layman to infer that it is the "American Way" to be without compassion for the injured and disabled because of a fraction of negligence on their part; to punish a man economically for years because of a momentary, often unintentional error; to visit his sins, if sins they are, upon his family, and to force him and them on to the welfare rolls? If so, then workmen's compensation laws, which do not depend on fault, should be abolished as un-American, as should social security for the permanently and totally disabled.

CONCEPT OF "NO-FAULT" SHOULD NOT SOUND NEW

Should lawyers be surprised that the parade of these horrors does not alarm laymen? Why should the superficially reported concept of no-fault insurance sound new or ominous to them? For years they have taken out hunting insurance, flight insurance and carried regular accidental death and dismemberment policies. They have also had collision and comprehensive insurance on their automobiles. They know that under those policies negligence doesn't have to be proved to recover for their losses. If they are injured they receive the amount of coverage purchased for the injury. If they are killed, their beneficiary gets the death benefits. If their car is damaged, they collect the deductible coverage. All without fault being involved. Could something like this be adopted and eliminate the complex problems we now encounter in trying to collect damages from the other person?

Leaving everyone to take out his own accidental injury and property damage insurance, as distinguished from liability insurance, would be fine if everyone operated a motor vehicle and if this were all there were to the no-fault proposals. An applicant for a driver's license could be required to purchase a minimal amount of accidental injury, death and property damage insurance to protect himself against loss as a condition of being licensed. If someone placed greater value on himself and wished more coverage, he could buy more. But everyone would have to provide for himself.

However, not everyone drives an automobile, and not all injured persons are drivers of automobiles. Pedestrians would not be protected by the driver's policy, for example, since it would not be a liability policy. And it isn't reasonable to expect everybody to take out some accident insurance to protect themselves against injuries from the opera-

tion of an automobile by someone else. If they don't drive, why should they have to buy insurance to protect themselves against those who do? And that, of course, is not all there is to the no-fault proposals.

No-fault proposals can't remain merely academic concepts if they are to do any good. They must be implemented, and the implementation causes the problems. Some of the plans—the actual Massachusetts program and the proposed Wisconsin Assembly Bill—deal primarily with claims of under \$2,000, plus medicals and other specials. They are extremely bland legislative acts and should not be objectionable to even the most economically motivated attorney. These smaller claims are generally paid by insurers to claimants without attorneys' intervention unless there are substantial liability issues. The marginal cases which the lawyers do get involve a great deal of difficulty for nominal compensation because of these liability factors. Since this legislation eliminates the liability problem, the attorney could conceivably do better on these cases than he does now.

If these plans are acceptable because of their blandness, they should be unacceptable to serious legislators and lawyers for the same reasons. They do not greatly help those who need help the most: the seriously injured.

Proponents of no-fault argue for it because of the claimed great financial losses incurred by long work lawfalls, delays in getting cases to trial and claimed exorbitant fees of lawyers. However, these factors are generally not present in the minor cases covered by the plans. Persons with claims of under \$2,000 generally do not have these hardships. The arguments apply to claimants' having serious injuries, but the legislation does not. Something has taken a curious turn.

Other plans depend on a pseudo-workmen's compensation arrangement. The surgeon who loses a finger or two from his suturing hand and cannot continue his profession receives the same few hundred dollars as the janitor who loses the same fingers but who can continue with his job without loss of income. This should be satisfying to those who are democratic by nature and who believe in the equality of man. The plans are great levelers. But are they really fair?

All of the plans are urged because it is represented that claimants will not have to hire attorneys to get adequate compensation. It takes a real believer to accept the proposition that once these bills are passed, some magic transformation will occur and neither claimant nor insurer will be unreasonable, that each will agree as to the nature and extent of injuries and disability, and that each will trust the other. It has not happened in workmen's compensation cases. There is no reason to believe self-interest will not enter into no-fault cases.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS WILL BE ACCELERATED

It is also claimed that settlement of claims will be greatly accelerated and hardships accordingly reduced by some administrative system. Nothing in the history of administrative agencies encourages anyone to think this.

What is understandably least publicly discussed by no-fault proponents and, therefore, least understood by laymen is that no-fault plans also involve sacrifices. If fault is eliminated, there will be more claimants and a much larger percentage of them will successfully prosecute their claims. There is nothing necessarily wrong with this since this is the intent and purpose of no-fault. But who will pay the bill? It is reasonably safe to assume that insurers are not going to become suddenly philanthropic and reduce their margin of profit. And, since no-fault proponents proselytize on the appealing promise that motorists will have lower in-

surance premiums, it seems apparent they don't intend to have motorists, as a class, assume the increased costs. Only two other groups remain: taxpayers and the victims themselves. Who picks up the tab depends on the social attitudes of the planners.

Whether the no-fault proposal is a social security arrangement, a workmen's compensation plan, or a Massachusetts-type plan, a limited amount of funds is spread among more claimants through a scheduling or limitation of damages. The victims pay by receiving less compensation than they would receive under the fault system. The victims, of course, can generally least afford it. These plans exhibit a strange compassion.

The taxpayers, of course, will not be neglected since they will share the cost of the numerous personnel that will be required to administer the particular system. The more complex the system, the more personnel required. Assuming the fondest hope of no-fault proponents—the elimination of private legal counsel—all that has happened is that the taxpayers are now providing legal counsel at taxpayer's expense in the form of personnel, to represent claimants and insurers. Realistically, of course, there will still be private legal counsel in addition to the personnel hired by the taxpayers, as in workmen's compensation cases.

Is it necessary for no-fault insurance proposals to be complex and to involve costly administrative systems? Some think not. They believe that the difficulties arise from the failure to separate the concept of "no-fault" from the matter of damages. The legislative proposals are really misnamed. They aren't just "no-fault" proposals. They are also enactments to dictate and limit damages. If, as the proponents of no-fault suggest, it is the fault concept that is slowing up settlements, forcing people into lawyers' offices, tying up court calendars and causing the hardships, why not simply eliminate the fault concept and leave damages to be determined as they now are?

That is the simple solution proposed by the lawyer from Outagamie County years ago: Make the driver of an automobile strictly liable for injuries to others which arise from his use of the automobile, without regard to fault, but utilize the traditional method of determining damages. The strict liability concept has been applied to certain situations for many years by most courts. They hint at it in others. Other countries have successfully utilized it in automobile cases. Perhaps it is time to recognize the automobile as a dangerous instrumentality and impose that standard of care with reference to it. The only questions would be: Were you injured or have property losses arising from the operation of a motor vehicle by someone else? What amount will make you as economically whole as you were prior to the accident?

Some will say, of course, that allowing an injured person to recover without regard to his own fault is the ultimate in freedom from responsibility and is objectionable for all the reasons mentioned. But maybe the reverse is true: It is the ultimate in human responsibility. If the other person can recover for injuries arising from your operation of a motor vehicle, negligent or not, it means that you are responsible for all of your acts and the consequences therefrom. Your intentions, good or bad, careful or careless, make no difference. It recognizes a basic truth of life: All acts have consequences. The intent of the actor is irrelevant to the consequence. Things happen regardless of the motives or character of the initiator.

This strict accountability, retaining the common law measure of damages, should meet with the approval of the opponents of no-fault. What is more individualistic than this concept? What should cause a driver to be more careful than the knowledge that he is fully responsible for someone else's in-

juries if he has an accident? The courts recognize that strict liability is a deterrent when they impose it on persons using other dangerous instrumentalities. These devices are used at the peril of the user. Why shouldn't it have the same deterrent effect on automobile drivers? Shouldn't it promote defensive driving? And, if an accident happens, attention can then be concentrated on making the injured persons as whole, physically and economically, as possible, instead of niggling over who was most to blame and thereby increasing the hardships on the injured persons.

Isn't it time to free the courts and attorneys from the imposed preoccupation with whose fault an accident was and the fetish of apportioning blame? Who, except the moralists, care who is to blame? The injured need help. The distressed need relief. A physician who would let a person suffer because that person may have been in the intersection a second or two later than the other would be severely rebuked. He should and does do what he can to give relief based on need, not on fault. Perhaps legal remedies should attempt to do the same.

AUTO ACCIDENT COURT CASES WOULD BE REDUCED

A review of almost any state's supreme court's reports reveals a high percentage of the court's time devoted to appeals in automobile accident cases. In most of these the court has had to decide arguable issues of fault. When one considers pretrial investigations and preparations, the trials in the lower courts, the appellate preparation and the work of the supreme courts, the total judicial and lawyer time devoted to haggling over whose fault the incident was, in just these reported cases, is cause for dismay.

Surely judges, as well as laymen and many lawyers, must become exasperated with the enforced continuous contemplation of the many legal and factual uncertainties involved in determining and apportioning blame. Surely, they have something better to do with their time and talents than this.

In February of 1969, an article appeared in the *American Bar Association Journal* which recommended that other states try Wisconsin's limited comparative negligence doctrine as the answer to no-fault compensation schemes. The article asked: "Why experiment with an untried scheme that dispenses with the adversary system when the Wisconsin doctrine is successfully meeting the test of time?" Under the limited comparative negligence doctrine, the defendant, if he is guilty of the greater negligence, pays the plaintiff an award diminished by a percentage equivalent to the plaintiff's negligence. Recently, in a reasonable effort to moderate escalating tensions, the American Bar Association recommended the adoption by other states of the Wisconsin system as an alternative to no-fault plans. The impression apparently is that Wisconsin is relatively free from discontent because of its unique doctrine.

The unrest among laymen, spontaneous or otherwise, has been underestimated by the Bar. There was and is no reason for complacency in Wisconsin. Within eighteen months of the appearance of the article, the Wisconsin Supreme Court in *Vincent v. Pabst Brewing Company*, 177 N.W. 2d (1970), was asked to adopt a "pure comparative negligence system", to eliminate the necessity of plaintiff's negligence being less than defendant's in order to recover damages but diminishing the award by the percentage of negligence apportioned to plaintiff. The court denied the request, and urged the state legislature as the proper deliberative body, to study the two doctrines—"limited comparative" and "pure comparative" negligence—thoroughly and to make the choice between the two. The warning that there was a third choice was mentioned by Justice Hallows,

who dissented, and wrote: "What I do fear is that if the doctrine of pure comparative negligence is not adopted, the whole fault system in torts will be repudiated and a no-fault system akin to workmen's compensation adopted."

The legislature did not pay much more attention to the majority's suggestion that it choose between the two comparative negligence doctrines than the majority paid to Justice Hallows' warning. By that time, the assembly members had discovered the political popularity of no-fault and have been lambasting the legal profession with it ever since. Hearings have been held by the assembly and no doubt many of its members are attempting to find the better solution to the problem, but the media releases have been more in the nature of vituperative attacks on the legal profession than a discussion of the merits of the proposals.

LEGAL NICETIES WILL NO LONGER SUFFICE

What should be clear from the Wisconsin experience is that legal niceties in the negligence field are no longer going to suffice. It may have been already too late, when Justice Hallows wrote his dissent, for the acceptance of the pure comparative negligence doctrine as a specific to quiet the restlessness of the proponents for no-fault. Introspective court decisions, hidden in advance sheets and sepulchered in books, are having difficulty being heard above the hostile clamor of the news media. And, along with the noise, there is great confusion. Something new and dramatic and simple is needed.

Perhaps that something "new" is something old. We often get the best view from a distance and maybe we can now see a little more clearly that the old argument for strict liability has considerable merit after all.

It takes the proponents of "no-fault" at their word that it is "fault" that is causing the problems and injustices, and it eliminates "fault." If the proponents are candid and not merely using the no-fault programs to insinuate more currently unacceptable proposals into eventual legislation, this should satisfy them.

On the other hand, it salvages the common law measures and method of determination of damages. For those who oppose no-fault plans but are aware of the intensity of the plans' supporters, this may be a wise settlement.

Justice Hallows' recently quoted Justice Frankfurter of an earlier era and said: "Wisdom too often never comes, and so we ought not to reject it merely because it comes late." Perhaps the time has come at last for the wisdom of those who argued years ago, and lost, for the concept of strict liability in automobile accident cases.

THE REAL ROAD TO PEACE

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have known for months that the President has been preparing his own analysis of American foreign policy. We know that much of this was being done before his historic mission to China and also before the United States/Soviet meeting in Moscow. He has finally completed an exclusive article for *U.S. News & World Report* titled, "The Real Road to Peace: A New Foreign Policy for a New World."

I have just returned from 2 weeks in

the Soviet Union. Sometimes the backwash of an ocean wave tells far more in the sands about the impact than the wave actually does when it occurs. I was there during a portion of the President's visit and for a full week after he had departed. It was during these days that I think I picked up the backwash and could read some of his imprint in the sands. It was easy to understand from talking with the average man on the street that the Nixon visit had a terrific impact on the average Russian person—not only those who had seen him in person, but those who had watched him on television.

His words would have been dazzling if they had not been accompanied by a low profile and sober earnestness.

When the President talked of peace, he hit the Russian people in their softest spot. Most of those living in the Soviet Union had gone through a traumatic experience in World War II during which time millions of countrymen had given their lives.

I cannot speak for those who lead Russia, but I came away with a firm feeling that the people themselves would make almost any sacrifice and take any journey or route, no matter how difficult, if they could truly achieve peace in their lifetime. The President, in this article, demonstrates how peace can be achieved and is willing to accept his responsibility in helping to achieve a lasting peace:

THE REAL ROAD TO PEACE

(By President Richard M. Nixon)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—About this article: President Nixon began preparing this analysis of American foreign policy—written expressly for "U.S. News & World Report"—before his historic mission to Peking. The Chief Executive refined and revised the paper after his return from China, and did more work on it as he flew home to the United States from the Moscow summit. He completed the final version that appears on these pages on Sunday, June 11. This is the first signed article prepared exclusively and specifically for any publication that Mr. Nixon has written since he became President.)

A NEW FOREIGN POLICY FOR A NEW WORLD

Every generation can truthfully say that it lives in a new world. But in our time, the world has been changing more rapidly and more drastically than in any previous age. An intelligent foreign policy must not merely keep abreast of this change, but anticipate it; it must not merely ride with the tides of history, but seek to direct these toward the great goals that we as a Nation believe in.

In the past three years, the foreign policies of the United States have undergone sweeping and far-reaching changes—but they have also preserved a basic consistency. We have retained our basic sense of America's purpose, but have adapted the way in which that purpose is pursued to the changing circumstances of a changing world.

In the years immediately following World War II, the United States was left inescapably with the primary responsibility for maintaining peace in the world, and for helping those nations which had been devastated by war to get back on their feet.

But the world has changed profoundly since those days. The conditions which then shaped American policy have been fundamentally transformed.

The nations of Western Europe and Japan—prostrate and exhausted after World

War II—have experienced, with our help, a near-miraculous recovery. Our allies everywhere have become more independent and self-assured.

Developing nations have also acquired a new capacity to provide for their own security and well-being. A new sense of national autonomy now guides most of their decisions.

The overwhelming dominance of our earlier military might vis-a-vis that of the Soviet Union has given place to a more balanced military equation. Our military capacities are still second to none, but we can no longer expect the sheer fact of a massive American superiority to keep the peace everywhere on earth.

The solid bloc of Communist nations which confronted us after World War II is a solid bloc no longer. And even as the Communist nations have moved from solidarity to diversity, and even to intensive rivalry in their relationships with one another, so they have changed in the post-Stalin period from unremitting belligerence to a posture of at least partial accommodation with the rest of the world.

The result of all these changes has been a movement away from the rigid bipolarism of the 1940's and 1950's toward a more fluid and heterogeneous, multipolar international order—one that is more balanced and stable because it rests on broader, more diversified foundations.

When I came to the Presidency, I felt strongly that American foreign policy could not advance American interests unless it adapted promptly to this new diplomatic environment. That adaptation—in its simplest form—required us to place a greater emphasis on negotiation with our adversaries and on partnership with our allies.

These new requirements, in turn, presented us both with tough challenges and with exciting opportunities. The fact that we could no longer carry out certain responsibilities singlehandedly may have restricted our autonomy, but it also lightened some of our burdens. The fact that simple military superiority was no longer an adequate response to a stronger and more diversified Communist challenge complicated our diplomacy, but it also provided new avenues to progress and peace.

Despite all the changes in the world, one key reality has remained unchanged: American participation is still the *sine qua non* of any stable and harmonious international order. The mature wisdom that we cannot make peace all by ourselves must not be confused with the dangerous illusion that peace can possibly be achieved without us. If the United States were to follow the course advocated by the new isolationists, peace and freedom in the world would be placed in mortal danger. The new conditions of the 1970's call for creative redefinition of American leadership, not for its sullen abdication.

If we were to turn inward, if we were to lay down our world responsibilities, if we were to indulge in an orgy of self-concern and self-gratification, then we could be very certain that the vacuum we left in world affairs would rapidly be filled by others. We could also be certain that such a world would be less safe for America, less safe for democracy, and less safe for mankind.

Neither security nor peace can be found in hiding from reality. Already too many generations, on too many occasions, have paid the terrible price of self-indulgent efforts to travel that escapist route.

It is not our aim to make this an American century—but neither can we be content to let it be the century in which America is eclipsed. We cannot achieve a just and stable world order solely by our own exertions. But such an order cannot be built without the active participation of the United States.

We have chosen, then, to continue our active leadership role in the world, even as we have decided to carry out that role in new

ways. The fundamental goal of that leadership is the building of an effective—and lasting—structure of peace.

In building a structure of peace, the most important consideration is the achievement of a set of agreements, of understandings, and of practices, by which those seeking change will undertake to do so only through peaceful means.

This is the way to a generation of peace. This is the heart of our foreign policies.

Already those policies are bearing fruit: After a generation of hostility, a new and more promising page has been turned in our relations with the People's Republic of China.

After an era of confrontation, an era of negotiation has now opened, as evidenced most strikingly in the whole range of our talks and agreements with the Soviet Union.

After a period of uncertainty and adjustment, our alliances are being renewed and strengthened.

After 10 years of war, our involvement in Vietnam is coming to an end—in a way that leaves our purposes intact, and that will contribute to a lasting peace in the Pacific.

After a decade of recurrent crisis, a beginning has been made in building an international monetary system fair to the United States and fair to the world.

THE SUMMITS

The absence of healthy interaction, verging at times on policy paralysis, in this country's relations with the two major Communist powers was one of the most dangerous elements in the world situation when this Administration took office in 1969. George Washington's perceptive warning from the Napoleonic era—that indulgence of "permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations would render a nation 'a slave to its [own] animosity'—had come alive in the cold war era, the more grimly because missiles, not the muskets of Washington's day, now bristled in the arsenals of all three parties to this deadly impasse. If the world was to be freed from confrontation as a way of life, we saw in 1969, new relationships must be developed with both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China.

As we pursued this goal, we recognized that certain changes had taken place in the expectations of the Communist leaders. Whatever hopes they might once have cherished that the capitalist nations would collapse in a cloud of Marxist dogma had been dissipated. Consequently, they had come to seek ways of living with a United States, a Western Europe and a free Asia that were growing stronger, not weaker, and that had enough experience with unpreparedness to maintain their guard rather than lowering it.

This was a policy change of profound importance; but it is important to recognize that it was a change of the head, not of the heart. It was a rational, calculated assessment that the old tactics would not work.

Neither the Soviet Union nor China abandoned its particular view of the world. But both accepted the idea that their own best interests would be served better by negotiation than by confrontation. We held the same view concerning the best way of serving American interests. Thus began a series of initiatives which have culminated this year in the first visits of an American President to Peking and to Moscow.

With China, the opening was perhaps more dramatic because the hostility and isolation between us had been more stark. As I had written in the quarterly journal *Foreign Affairs* back in 1967, before coming to the Presidency:

"Taking the long view, we simply cannot afford to leave China forever outside the family of nations, there to nurture its fantasies, cherish its hates and threaten its neighbors. There is no place on this small

planet for a billion of its potentially most able people to live in angry isolation."

Pursued patiently from the first days of this Administration, this logic began moving matters forward—imperceptibly at first, then a year ago with the first high-level diplomatic contact between our two countries since the Korean War era, and finally this February with my "journey for peace" to Peking.

With that journey, we began to bridge a gulf deepened by 22 years of bitter silence between the world's most powerful nation and the world's most populous nation. We demonstrated that nations with very deep and fundamental differences can discuss those differences calmly, rationally, and frankly, without compromising their principles or sacrificing their vital interests.

Our meetings with the Chinese leaders did not produce any magic formula by which our differences would be dissolved. We did, however, make some important beginnings toward the expansion of cultural, journalistic, and educational contacts, toward broadening trade, and toward strengthening and expanding the communications we established.

Most importantly, we agreed on some basic principles of international conduct which will reduce the risk of confrontation and war in Asia and the Pacific. We agreed that we are opposed to the domination of the Pacific area by any power. We agreed that international disputes should be settled without the use or the threat of force, and we agreed to apply this principle to our relations with one another. And we reached these understandings without giving up any of our previous commitments to the Republic of China* or to our other friends.

In sum, the visit represented a long first step toward establishing a continuing, fruitful dialogue with the People's Republic of China, in a way that will contribute to peace not only in the Pacific but in the entire world. The second and succeeding steps are already being taken with visits to Peking by legislative leaders, periodic ambassadorial meetings in Paris, and other contacts which would have seemed impossible only a year ago.

In charting the course to better relations with the Soviet Union, we faced a different and in many ways more complex situation than we faced in dealing with Peking. The USSR by the late 1960's was conducting, as the United States had long done, a global foreign policy; each of us had interests and activities impinging on those of the other at many points around the world. Each of us possessed a nuclear force capable of destroying civilization should total war break out.

This latter fact alone argued powerfully for United States-Soviet meetings at the highest level to help lessen the danger of war. Yet the concrete reality of our differences—and of the armaments those differences had called into being—also argued that any worthwhile summit conference must hold out correspondingly concrete prospects for settlements on some of the really tough issues. Summit atmospherics, we felt, would be worse than nothing; too often in the past the world had seen false euphoria, the "spirit" of this or that meeting site, lead only to complacency, miscalculation, and disappointment.

We therefore embarked on a process whereby the American and Soviet leaders, rather than being "airlifted", as it were, to the summit—with the current necessities of going there in haste, of traveling light, and of returning quickly to the lowlands of old relationships—would be able to come up to the summit on a solid road built all the way to the top, so that the heavy negotiating

*Editor's note: Chinese Nationalist Government on Taiwan.

baggage could be brought along and real gains could be made. We therefore entered into negotiations with the Soviets across a broad range of issues, hoping to create a momentum of achievement by which progress in one area would contribute to progress in others.

That momentum developed. In the area of arms control, in addition to seeing the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons brought into force, the United States and the USSR reached agreement on treaties barring weapons of mass destruction from the ocean floor and prohibiting the possession or production of biological and toxin weapons. Our talks on limiting strategic arms produced accords on a more reliable Washington-Moscow "hotline" communications system and on measures for notification and consultation designed to reduce the risk of an accidental nuclear war. They also made significant progress toward nuclear arms curbs, with personal intervention on my part and on that of the Soviet leaders helping to break deadlocks in the negotiations at several points along the way.

It was this progress at the talks in Vienna and Helsinki, together with the historic four-power agreement concerning Berlin, which last fall finally paved the way for the Moscow summit.

Plans for this meeting were not altered by the events of the seven months between their announcement in October and my trip in May—a fact which contrasted sharply with the derailment of summit hopes in 1960 by the U-2 incident and in 1968 by the invasion of Czechoslovakia. This in itself was evidence of a new maturity and stability in American-Soviet relations.

Events in Moscow in May fully corroborated that evidence. While we did not negotiate instant peace, or perfect an imperfect world overnight, or liquidate a quarter century of fundamental differences between us, we did lay the foundation for a new relationship between the two most powerful nations on earth. The hallmarks of that new relationship are without the use or threat of force, and emphasis on areas of cooperation rather than points of conflict.

Our agreements for joint American-Soviet efforts to combat pollution, advance medical science and public health, and work together in science and technology can be expected to broaden with the passage of time, creating a steadily growing vested interest in peace between our two countries. The dramatic space cooperation agreement, including an Apollo-Soyuz rendezvous and docking mission in 1975, points in this same direction. So does the comprehensive trade agreement which should be worked out in a matter of months by the U.S.-USSR Commercial Commission which we set up at the summit.

But we did more at Moscow than construct valuable bridges in these relatively noncontroversial areas; we also dealt head-on with the principal military issues between us.

With respect to Europe, there was joint agreement to build on the reduction of tensions begun by the recent Berlin and West German treaties. Exploratory consultations will soon begin leading toward a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and toward special talks on mutual and balanced force reductions in Central Europe.

With respect to the dangers implicit in contacts at sea between the world's two largest navies, we concluded the first high-level U.S.-USSR military-to-military agreement since the end of our World War II alliance, aimed at preventing naval incidents.

Third, and most important to the prospects for peace, we signed an unprecedented agreement limiting the strategic nuclear missile forces of the United States and the Soviet Union.

The treaty limiting each nation to two ABM sites and the interim agreement freezing certain categories of offensive missiles for

five years mark the beginning of the end of the unchecked nuclear weapons spiral that began in 1945. They enhance the security of both parties, at the same time that they substantially lessen the danger of global war. The accords protect the existing strategic balance by freezing weapons categories in which we could not in any case have fielded new systems by 1977, and in which the USSR could and would have done so in large numbers. Thus they maintain a situation in which United States defenses are fully sufficient and second to none in the world.

The choice for both sides has really been whether to limit arms, or to have a runaway nuclear arms race—and in such a race there would be no winners, only losers. Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union would, over the long run, allow a situation to develop in which either would confront the other with the sort of overwhelming nuclear advantage which the United States held at the time of the 1962 Cuban missile crisis. To continue the nuclear arms spiral unchecked would set up a contest in which neither side could win, because neither would feel it could afford to let the other win.

The achievements in Moscow, of course, were only a beginning, in each area where gains were made, there is still a long road ahead. Just and enduring peace settlements must be fashioned in Indo-China and the Middle East; détente in Europe must move from possibility to realization; arms limitation negotiations must press toward a permanent curb on offensive weapons.

But I believe that a good basis for progress is provided both by the specific agreements signed at the summit and by the declaration of "Basic Principles of Relations between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" which was agreed to on my final day in the Soviet capital. The mutual commitments in these principles—to avoid direct confrontation; to exercise restraint and constructive influence in dealing with smaller conflicts which could trigger a major war; to assert no claims of special privilege or spheres of influence; to emphasize consultation, negotiation, and cooperation in our relationships—all these pledges look away from the pattern of a hostile past toward a safer and more open world.

Like the rules for conduct on which we agreed with the Chinese leaders in Peking, these principles must now be proved in practice. But if they are proved, then the world will be well on the way from a season of summits to a generation and more of lasting peace.

It would be a mistake to regard either of these summit journeys as a cure-all for the world's ills. In international affairs the concoctions labelled "panaceas" are all too often poisonous. One reason the summits were so successful was their purposes were so realistic. As I said to the people of China, "While we cannot close the gulf between us, we can try to bridge it so that we may be able to talk across it;" and to the Soviet people, "We shall sometimes be competitors, but we need never be enemies." Similar in motive though independent in conception, the two meetings have moved us closer to our great objective: the end of perpetual confrontation between the free world and the Communist powers, and the establishment of better American relations with all the peoples of the world.

OUR ALLIANCES REMAIN ESSENTIAL

The energy with which we pursued new relationships with those who have been our adversaries has been matched in every respect by our efforts to build a new spirit of partnership in relations with our friends.

As I told the Congress on my return from Moscow:

"Maintaining the strength, integrity and steadfastness of our free world alliances is the foundation on which all of our other initiatives for peace and security in the world

must rest. As we seek better relations with those who have been our adversaries, we will not let down our friends and allies around the world."

The fact that our friends and allies are stronger now means that we can and should cast off any remnants of paternalism, along with any expectations that our prescriptions will always or automatically be heeded. It means that we can and will expect our allies to contribute more of the human and physical resources required for defense and development around the globe. Our task, however, is not to default to them, but to join with them in this effort.

A balanced reordering of responsibilities will draw upon the new self-confidence which many of our friends are now experiencing—and, indeed, will help to further it. A heedless shedding of our responsibilities, however, would undermine that self-confidence and imperil peace.

In particular, the security of the Atlantic Alliance and the strength and prosperity of the Atlantic world have been cornerstones of American policy ever since World War II. This is still the case today.

One of my first moves as President was to help shore up the NATO alliance, then 20 years old and considered by many to have a proud past but no future. In revitalizing this alliance, we made clear that we considered the day of American domination of NATO to be over; we broadened the process of consultation within the alliance; and we took the initiative in expanding its concerns—through the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society—to embrace a wide range of the social, environmental and technical challenges that now confront industrialized nations.

The results have been heartening. The obituaries that were pronounced so freely over NATO in the late 1960s proved decidedly premature; few have been heard in these first years of the 1970s. Not only has NATO maintained the security of Western Europe, but its European members agreed in 1970 to pick up an extra \$1 billion of the security costs, and in 1971 they assumed an additional \$1 billion of the burden. Meanwhile, movement toward economic and political cooperation in Europe—including agreement on entry of Britain, Ireland, Denmark and Norway into the Common Market—has proceeded in a way that gives great promise for the future.

Across the world in the Pacific, we have given special attention to maintaining the strength of our ties with Japan—and we have reinforced those ties by our voluntary agreement to the reunification of Okinawa with the home islands of Japan. The task of the '70s is to reshape and strengthen our ties with Japan to move from the paternalism which characterized our post World War II relations to a mature partnership which is more attuned to the realities of Japan's new economic vigor.

There is a tendency in some quarters to overreact to the frustrations of the conflict in Southeast Asia and to the accumulated burdens of America's quarter century of post-World War II leadership. There are well-intentioned but world-weary Americans who would have the pendulum swing away from dominance on the one extreme to diffidence on the other, from the danger of overextension to the danger of inward preoccupation. These people hope—and some other people fear—that the new doctrine of this Administration prescribes a unilateral withdrawal from the world.

Such observers are wrong about what this country should do and wrong about what this Administration is doing. The ostrich is not about to replace the eagle.

To be sure, we have been able to scale down substantially the American military presence abroad, not only in Vietnam but elsewhere. But this is a reflection of the

growing strength of our allies, not a jettisoning of our commitments. An effective American presence abroad, and a strong military assistance program in many free nations, will continue to be required for the foreseeable future.

We are able to look to others to join more fully in economic assistance efforts. But here, as well, we must maintain strong leadership—which is why the Congress and the executive branch must work together to shape a new approach to foreign assistance.

We are placing heavy emphasis on negotiations with potential adversaries. But we have no intention of bartering away time-tested friendships. Our negotiations can and should lower barriers with our opponents; but we shall continue taking every precaution to prevent them from raising barriers with our allies.

THE NIXON DOCTRINE

What has come to be known as the Nixon Doctrine is essentially a plan for strengthening our alliances, for spreading more equitably the burdens of peacekeeping, for enlisting more nations more fully in the task of securing their own defenses, and for helping ensure that future conflicts which are peripheral to the central interests of the great powers should not directly involve the great powers themselves.

Small powers can start small wars, but only the great powers can bring on large wars. The entire world has an enormous stake in ensuring that the nuclear arsenals of those nations possessing them should never be used.

We of course all hope for a world in which there will be no war of any sort. But we must nevertheless prepare for the likelihood that disputes will break out between smaller nations, and that these will involve the use of arms.

There have already been more than a hundred armed conflicts of one sort or another between nations since the end of World War II. While our ultimate goal must be the elimination of such conflicts, our intermediate goal must be to prevent them from triggering a disastrous war on a world scale.

In my State of the Union Address last January, I summarized the Nixon Doctrine this way:

We will maintain a nuclear deterrent adequate to meet any threat to the security of the United States or of our allies.

We will help other nations develop the capability of defending themselves.

We will faithfully honor all of our treaty commitments.

We will act to defend our interests, whenever and wherever they are threatened any place in the world.

But where our interests or our treaty commitments are not involved, our role will be limited.

We will not intervene militarily. But we will use our influence to prevent war.

If war comes, we will use our influence to stop it.

Once it is over, we will do our share in helping to bind up the wounds of those who have participated in it.

VIETNAM

One area in which our new approaches to foreign policy faced a very special challenge was that of Vietnam. We have met that challenge successfully over the past three and a half years. We are coming out of Vietnam, but we are doing so with our purposes intact.

When this Administration took office, the war in Vietnam dominated America's attention. It occupied our minds, drained our resources, and sorely tried our patience.

There were nearly 550,000 American troops in Vietnam when I took office—and no plan for bringing them home. United States combat deaths were averaging more than 1,000 a month. The increasing Americanization of the war, along with a paternalistic attitude

toward the Vietnamese, has demoralized our allies while escalating our own involvement.

Faced with this compounding problem, we moved immediately on two tracks: on the one hand, we made serious and sustained efforts to end the war as swiftly as possible through a negotiated settlement. On the other hand, we undertook to prepare the South Vietnamese, both militarily and psychologically, to assume the principal burden of their own defense in case the negotiations should not be successful.

The intensity with which we pursued both open and secret diplomacy to achieve a negotiated settlement is now a matter of public record. The South Vietnamese Government has cooperated fully with us in this effort. Simultaneously, the government and people of South Vietnam have been working hard at establishing new and more representative constitutional processes, even while fighting a war for national survival. Few countries in history have experimented with the development of representative institutions in the midst of war, and even fewer have done so with the degree of success that South Vietnam has achieved. And as American troops have been steadily withdrawn, the South Vietnamese steadily—and for the most part successfully—have taken over the fighting.

When North Vietnam launched its massive invasion of the South on Easter weekend of this year, the war in that beleaguered country was suddenly and drastically re-escalated—and the character of the fighting was changed.

No longer could there be any pretense that this was a civil war, as Hanoi deployed almost its entire field army outside of its borders. Tanks, heavy artillery, armored personnel carriers, sophisticated ground-to-air missiles, and 12 divisions of North Vietnamese regular troops invading South Vietnam completely transformed the nature of the fighting. Not only has there been no domestic uprising in South Vietnam, but the stream of refugees has all been away from the "liberators," and toward safety behind the South Vietnamese lines. North Vietnam has thus stripped away the last shred of justification for treating the conflict as anything but a brutal armed aggression by the Communist North against a South Vietnam struggling to preserve its independence.

The massive North Vietnamese invasion confronted us with a new situation. It required a massive response—by South Vietnamese forces on the ground, by combined South Vietnamese and American air strikes and by United States naval power.

That response was launched. At the same time, we undertook another major effort to end the war through negotiations—with Dr. Kissinger's mission to Moscow, and with our return to the bargaining table in Paris. But the response of the North Vietnamese made clear that they still were unwilling to settle, except on terms that would impose a Communist government on South Vietnam.

Faced with Hanoi's continuing invasion and intransigence at the conference table, I decided on May 8 to take decisive military measures to help bring the war to an early end. After carefully weighing all the considerations involved, I announced my decision to mine all entrances to North Vietnamese ports and directed our forces to interdict the delivery of any supplies and cut rail and other communications to the maximum extent possible. These actions have not been directed against any other nation. They are solely designed to deny Hanoi the weapons and supplies it needs to continue its aggression.

This swift and effective response was necessary for several reasons.

First, it was necessary to protect our remaining forces in Vietnam, and to maintain the leverage needed to secure the release of our prisoners of war.

Second, it was necessary for the sake of the 18 million people of South Vietnam,

wearied and tormented by more than two decades of war, who by any standard of international law or human decency have a right to determine their own destiny, and not to have it imposed upon them by an invading army.

Third, it was necessary for the sake of future stability in Southeast Asia. With North Vietnamese armies already in Laos and Cambodia, with Hanoi already supporting a growing insurgency in Thailand, to have allowed this attempted knockout blow against South Vietnam to succeed would have raised the level of danger to all of Vietnam's neighbors—as the leaders of those nations have stressed.

Fourth, it was necessary in order to make clear to the leaders of other nations that America's pledges would be kept, and that such a direct challenge could not be made with impunity. I had said repeatedly during the preceding three years that if North Vietnam attempted to take advantage of our troop withdrawals to escalate the war, we would make an appropriate response.

Fifth, it was necessary in order to support a principle that is central to the world's hopes for a lasting peace; the principle that no nation has the right to attack the territory of its neighbor. For seven long years Americans had been fighting alongside the South Vietnamese, and more than 45,000 had died in combat. We and the South Vietnamese had labored jointly to achieve a negotiated settlement; we had been helping them prepare to defend themselves if a settlement proved impossible. At the time of the invasion nearly 85,000 American troops were still in Vietnam. Given these facts, to have stood aside when the assault was launched would have been an abject abdication of responsibility for which history would not have forgiven us.

Eleven weeks have now passed since that North Vietnamese invasion. The fighting continues, but the South Vietnamese have held. Not only have they held militarily, but the way in which the people of South Vietnam have rallied to their nation's defense should persuade even the most committed apologists for the enemy that Saigon, not Hanoi, speaks for the South Vietnamese people.

Militarily and politically, Hanoi is losing its desperate gamble. We are nonetheless prepared to settle the conflict on honorable negotiating terms which would not require surrender and humiliation on the part of anybody. We stand ready to cease acts of force currently underway against North Vietnam when our prisoners of war have been returned, our missing accounted for and an internationally supervised ceasefire throughout Indo-China has begun. We will then proceed with a complete withdrawal of all American forces from Vietnam within four months.

These are generous terms. They would end the war and bring our prisoners home. They would permit the United States to withdraw with honor. They would allow negotiations on a political settlement among the Vietnamese themselves. Now it remains for Hanoi to choose: the path of war, or the path of peace.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

A nation's foreign policy embraces more than its diplomacy—and in the case of the United States, our foreign economic policies are a vital part of the mix. This is true in part because of the enormous volume of our foreign economic activity: American private investments abroad now total some \$86 billion; the combined value of our merchandise exports and imports last year was \$89 billion. It is true also because of the vital role U.S. trade plays in the economies of most of the world's nations, and because for many years the U.S. dollar has been the cornerstone of the international monetary system.

Foreign trade and foreign investments contribute to the vitality of our own economy

and the variety of our consumer goods; many nations depend on the availability of U.S. capital; our trading partners depend on U.S. markets; the world economy depends on the stability of the U.S. dollar.

During the last decade the American position in the international economy changed dramatically. Major changes took place in the structure of the world economy. We found ourselves confronted with intense and increasing competition from other major industrialized nations. As one measure of this, between 1960 and 1971 Japan's exports increased by 493 percent and West Germany's increased by 242 percent, while those of the United States increased by only 115 percent.

The heightened competitiveness on the part of our trading partners is not something we shy from; on the contrary, we welcome it. It testifies to the success of our unprecedented efforts after World War II to help rebuild the shattered economies of victors and vanquished alike, and to provide a helping hand for the many new nations that came into being with the dissolution of the old colonial empires. Because it represents greater productivity, greater abundance, more rapid growth, it holds high promise of a better life for people, everywhere. But it also poses a new challenge to the United States. It means that the old days, in which we were willing to accept arrangements which put us at a competitive disadvantage with respect to our trading partners, are gone—and the old policies must go with them.

In 1971 we embarked on new policies designed to bring about a new international economic order. Operating under the International Monetary Agreement signed at Bretton Woods over a quarter century ago, the world in recent years had lurched from monetary crisis to monetary crisis, and it responded to them by simply putting a patch here and a patch there. For its part, the United States has run an almost unbroken series of basic balance of payments deficits since 1948. In 1971, for the first time since 1888 we experienced a trade deficit as well. Our total reserves dwindled from \$21 billion in 1946 to roughly \$12 billion at the end of 1971. And, while all of this was happening, many of our major trading partners still maintained distorted exchange rates—which favored their exports and hampered ours—and trade barriers which had the effect of limiting the access of U.S. products to their markets.

As we examined these problems last year, it was clear that far-reaching reforms were necessary. Thus, when I announced our new economic policies to deal with jobs and inflation last August 15, I included measures designed to bring about a much-needed realignment of currencies, to secure removal of barriers to American exports, and to press the other major nations toward the overdue creation of new international monetary arrangements that would be adequate for the needs of coming decades.

The aim of these moves was nothing less than a fundamental, long-term reform in the international economic system. Our goal has been to assure our products equal access to world markets and to ensure that the products of our workers, farmers, and businesses can compete on an equal footing with those of other nations.

But equal access and an equal opportunity to compete will do us little good unless the American people rise to the challenge of increased competition abroad. Faced with intensified foreign economic competition, the first reaction of many is simply to try to build a wall around America, and to hide behind it. This will not do. In today's world, there can be no prosperity behind a wall, just as there can be no security behind a wall. Only if we look outward can we go forward. And only if we show the national spirit that meets competition by becoming a more vigorous competitor rather than by running away from competition can we maintain our

greatness as a nation and our vitality as a force for good in the world.

THE DEVELOPING NATIONS

The need to think and act in new ways was also evident as we reshaped our approaches to the developing nations of Latin America, Africa and Asia—what we have come to call "the third world."

One of our central discoveries has been the fact that the very term "the third world," may imply a similarity or cohesion among developing countries which is not as strong as was once thought. For as these countries have become more dynamic, they have also become more diverse. To be sure, we are seeking to encourage a sense of regional identity among developing nations which can provide a vital impetus for progress, and for the cooperation which makes progress possible. But we are also learning to take account of unique circumstances which distinguish country from country and region from region.

Above all, we have been learning that it is not within our unilateral power to determine the future for these countries—economically, socially, or politically. This does not mean we have lost our interest in these questions, but it does mean that we see our role not as one of direction but as one of support. The potential for progress in the developing world is enormous, but it will be fully realized only as developing nations shape their own futures in their own ways.

We believe in our own system. It has worked well for us, providing more freedom for all and greater abundance for more of our people than any other system in any other country. But we also recognize that what is best for us may not necessarily be best for other countries with dramatically different histories, traditions and problems; and even more important, we believe in the right of each nation to choose its own system. Thus, however much we cherish our system for ourselves, we will not seek to impose it on any other nation.

One important manifestation of our philosophy has been a new approach to foreign assistance around the world, some elements of which have already been put into action while others are pending before the Congress.

Generally speaking, this new approach recognizes the growing capacity of other developed countries to provide foreign aid, the growing effectiveness of multilateral institutions in channeling such aid, and the growing ability of recipient nations to make their own decisions about how aid should be used.

Our new approach also gives a greater emphasis to private aid, to investment and to international trade as positive influences on development. It includes strong penalties designed to discourage the expropriation of American property abroad.

It is essential that we resist the temptation to cut sharply back on our aid, especially at a time when we are encouraging other nations to share more actively in the burdens of their own defense and development. To cut them off precipitously before they are able to stand on their own would freeze them in a dependent status. The result of such an attempt to realize small savings for America in the short run would surely be far greater burdens for America in the long run.

By continuing and reforming our foreign assistance efforts we can bring closer the day when all nations will fully share in—and fully contribute to—a growing world prosperity. And by doing this, we will also bring closer the day when all nations will share in a lasting world peace.

A STRONG AMERICA

As we look to the future, it is essential that our potential adversaries retain their respect for American strength. It is essential that others recognize, as I put it in my Inaugural

Address, that "... we will be as strong as we need to be for as long as we need to be." It is essential that they understand fully our desire to live in a world at peace and our determination to do what is necessary to keep this world at peace.

No nation, as long as it respects the rights of its neighbors, need ever fear the power of the United States. Our military power is maintained not to pursue American interests but to defend American interests—and in particular, our interest in maintaining a structure of peace, stability and progress in the world.

There are those who seek to discredit the idea that peace requires strength. They condemn it as a relic of a "cold war mentality" and ridicule military expenditures as wasteful and immoral.

However popular this attitude may be, and however it may be couched in the rhetoric of "idealism," it nevertheless flies in the face of all human experience. As we have learned again and again, especially in this century, there is simply no substitute for military strength sufficient to deter aggression. An America that was inadequately defended would present so tempting a target that war would become inevitable. By the same token, a weakening of our alliances would also increase temptation to the danger point. For potentially aggressive ambitions in some countries are held in check not by idealism, but by a clear recognition that they cannot be achieved except at an unacceptable cost. If we expect to maintain the peace, we must ensure that the cost remains unacceptable.

Those who scoff at "balance of power diplomacy" on the world scene should recognize that the only alternative to a balance of power is an imbalance of power—and history shows us that nothing so drastically escalates the danger of war as such an imbalance. It is precisely the fact that the elements of balance now exist that gives us a rare opportunity to create a system of stability that can maintain the peace not just for a decade, but for a generation—and we hope beyond.

The years ahead will not be easy ones. They will demand sacrifice. They will demand wisdom. They will present a challenge of the most serious sort, testing whether a nation democratically governed can do what is necessary to maintain the peace.

I believe we can and will meet this challenge, just as we have met the others that have confronted us during these past two centuries. But we should all be very clear in our own minds that it will require of us a particular kind of discipline. It will require us to exercise an extra measure of care in distinguishing between rhetoric and reality, between the easy temptation and the hard necessity. We will be told there are shortcuts. We will be told that all the things we want to do at home could be painlessly financed if only we would cut back our military spending. We will be told that we can have peace merely by asking for it, that if we merely demonstrate "good will" or "good faith" our adversaries will reciprocate and we will have no need to do more. This is specious nonsense.

A heavy responsibility lies on the shoulders of those who hold or seek power in today's world: a responsibility not to court the public favor by fanning illusions that peace can be either achieved or kept without paying its price.

TOWARD A STRUCTURE OF PEACE

The final test of a foreign policy is whether it works. As we survey the world today, we find that we have nearly completed the ending of America's involvement in the war in Vietnam—and that we have done so in a way that enables the people of South Vietnam to defend their own country while strengthening the stability of all Southeast Asia—an area of 300 million people which is

of great importance to the entire world's future hopes for peace.

We find that the dispute in the Middle East remains unsettled, but that at least a cease-fire has been maintained now for nearly two years.

We find that America's alliances are stronger, and that resentment at what was once America's heavy-handedness has given way to a renewed sense of common purpose.

We find that the dangerous isolation of the People's Republic of China has been broken, and a new pattern of communication established between the world's most populous nation and its most powerful nation.

In our relations with the Soviet Union, we find that more significant and more far-reaching agreements have been negotiated during these past three and one-half years than were achieved in all the prior years since World War II.

We still have a long way to go in fashioning a stable and lasting structure of peace. But we also know that the framework has been erected. We are moving toward a goal which has eluded the world's statesmen through all the previous decades of this century, and we are moving toward it in a more businesslike way than at any time since World War II. This would not have been possible if we had not carefully geared all of our policies toward this central purpose. It would not have been possible if we had failed to maintain our strength, to show our determination, to demonstrate our perseverance, to be courteous but firm in our dealings with potential adversaries as well as with friends, to take measures which at the time were unpopular—indeed, to take certain risks for peace.

I have often used the term "a structure of peace." I have used it again in this discussion. It is important that we understand what that term means—important because it gets to the very heart of the way in which we seek to achieve peace in the years ahead.

Many people speak very sentimentally about peace—but sentimentality cannot achieve it. It cannot be wished into being. It has to be carefully built. A sound structure of peace must embrace a worldwide network of alliances; it must include sufficient armed force to deter aggression; it must depend upon patterns of understanding among a wide variety of governments. These patterns of understanding, in turn, do not simply involve a knowledge of what other countries and other peoples are like, or what they are thinking. Rather, they must be very concrete mutual understandings as to which patterns of international behavior are acceptable and which are not, and in which nations undertake to perform in specified ways under specified conditions. Some of these understandings are written into treaties or executive agreements. Many others are not, but they nevertheless constitute an important part of that written and unwritten code by which the relations among nations are regulated.

Nothing could be more destructive of our hopes for peace than failure to recognize the need for such disciplines.

If there is one lesson above all that history teaches us, it is that in seeking peace good intentions are no substitute for patient building, for hard work, and for the maintenance of sufficient strength to preserve the peace. The world has never yet been able to agree on a set of international institutions which could keep the peace by themselves. Peace has been kept or lost by the wisdom or folly of individual nations. A balance of power is still an essential element in maintaining peace. The new agreement we have reached with the Soviet Union on limitation of strategic arms will be an important factor in maintaining such a balance. So, too, will the developing pattern of interrelationships among the principal powers and among the various groupings of nations. It is vital that no nation which might have or develop aggressive designs should ever be led to be-

lieve that it could safely pursue those designs.

STRENGTH OF SPIRIT

Finally, as we shape our foreign policy for the future, we must also look to our spiritual, intellectual, economic and political strength here at home.

Our ability to build peace abroad depends upon this strength.

Our influence abroad depends not only on the military might of our arms, but also on the moral force of our example—and for nearly two centuries now, the example America has held out to the world has inspired the hopes of millions on every continent.

The past decade has been one of division, and of often bitter dissension. It has become fashionable to see only the evil in America, to paint every shortcoming—no matter how ancient—as an urgent crisis, to denigrate not only the policies but the motives of those in positions of leadership, to substitute diatribe for debate, and in the process to drive out faith and hope with despair and alienation. It has become fashionable to say that America has lost its sense of purpose, and has to find it again. But that fashion is false. We have a sense of purpose. What we need is to rekindle our pride in that purpose—the pride that has been so mauled by the legions of petty detractors. We need to recover our confidence that we shall attain our purpose.

Looking back over this nation's record in the field of foreign policy, Americans have a right to feel proud—and we should all hold our heads high because of that record. Ours is the first nation to become a great world power without seeking power. We have recognized that with great power goes great responsibility, and we have sought to use our influence not merely in our narrow national interest but in the world interest. Young Americans have fought in four wars in this century not for conquest, not for territory, but to help ensure the right of other people to be free from aggression. Our goal has been a more peaceful world—one in which the weak will at least be as safe as the strong and in which all nations, large and small, can be secure in their independence.

Our purpose in the world is peace—not the sullen peace of defeat, not the silent peace of despair, but the solid peace that makes progress possible, and that liberates the spirit of man for the tasks of freedom. No nobler purpose has moved any nation in the whole of human history.

We pursue peace as an end in itself. But our goal is also something more. For the peace we seek is an essential pre-condition if man is to pursue those great, humane ideals that are rooted in our religious heritage and that have inspired our highest civilizations. In seeking to prevent war, we seek also to make possible those advances in human well-being in the arts and science and philosophy, in the enriching of human experience, that define man's highest destiny here on earth. If we succeed in building a lasting structure of peace, not peace alone but a chance for mankind to fulfill this higher destiny will be the monument to our success.

community in this land, should be given the fullest scrutiny by every Member of this body. It is the beginning of a permanent law.

Full participation by the House of Representatives is only possible if this bill is debated with an open rule. An open rule is fundamental to the democratic principles of representation in the Congress.

A closed rule ties the hands of House Members and places its Members in the "back seat" of the legislative process. The Senate, which is a coequal body, will be in the position to offer amendments to revenue sharing when it comes to the Senate floor. The closed rule denies House Members this opportunity—as if our legislative competence were less. Our constituents have elected us to stand up and be counted on every piece of legislation which comes before us. We are expected to amend, to improve the legislative work of a committee.

There is no excuse for any legislation going to the floor with a closed rule. When a closed rule is requested, it assumes that the wisdom of a small group is greater than the collective wisdom of the 435 Members elected from all corners of this land. A closed rule is not democracy and carries blatant overtones of "tyranny of the minority"—this is no way to inspire the confidence of the American people in the House of Representatives.

When this bill was reported out of the Ways and Means Committee, I voted against the closed rule. I spoke against the closed rule before the Rules Committee.

I have always supported Federal help for distressed cities; but I cannot support a "closed rule" which would prevent the House from eliminating the retroactive feature of the revenue-sharing proposal.

It would be unwise to distribute a "doubled-up" payment to State and local governments in the first installment. Many units of Government have not programmed this expenditure. All would take it—and all would spend it. The potential exists for a wasteful and hurried distribution of \$2.65 billion. With retroactive legislation, the prospects are not bright for prudent spending of Federal revenues, which the Treasury cannot afford to lose.

An open rule would permit tax reform amendments which would raise additional revenue to pay for this program.

If revenue sharing cannot survive an open rule in the House of Representatives, which would permit reasonable and necessary amendments to the bill, it does not deserve to be the law of the land.

ON THE REVENUE SHARING RULE

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, later this week, the House of Representatives will consider the Revenue Sharing Act, which represents a landmark in fiscal relations between Federal, State, and local governments. A bill of this dimension and scope, which touches every State and every

SENIOR POWER

HON. JAMES V. STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. JAMES V. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, although the needs of senior citizens for income, health care, and other benefits are obvious to all, and although their

claim to such benefits is unquestioned, the Government has acted to meet their needs, if at all, in a halting and even grudging manner. Too often their interests have been compromised away to the short-sighted and the tight-fisted. Even the limited health benefits of Medicare took almost 20 years to enact into law.

Such neglect is now causing a new political movement among senior citizens, a movement which will ensure that new policies, which give them the benefits they need and deserve, will be effected.

I would now like to commend to the attention of my colleagues an article on senior citizen needs and politics written by Sun Newspapers' columnist Bill Randle, and which appeared in the June 8 issue of the Southeast Sun.

The article follows:

SOUND OFF
(By Bill Randle)

I read the other day about a little old lady who had had it with the way American society treats older people. She's forming action groups involving old people to focus attention on and get programs started and expedited that will benefit the more advanced in age in America.

And I say "right on!" to use the contemporary social and political cliché.

We have heard for years now of black power, youth power, the military-industrial complex, the oil lobby, the railroad influence. Why not some organized way for older people to be heard other than around election time when the promises flow like wine and the glib phrases pour like melted butter to try to influence the Social Security vote?

Actually, this country treats its older citizens atrociously and has for most of its history, whereas in other countries, including some of the most "primitive" societies known to man, age is respected, depended on for guidance and wisdom, focused and organized around for stability and cohesiveness, even catered to for psychological and sociological reasons.

In this country, age is something to be rejected and feared. The beginning of the end for the person whose advancing years puts him (and her) in the category of useless objects . . . no longer capable of earning . . . a drain on the emotions and economy of their children and other relatives . . . still taxed and abused politically with very little if any recourse or ability to retaliate or influence events.

Now I don't really think this little old lady I mentioned above is going to have a great deal of success with her particular organization. It's kind of "Pie in the Sky" to me as a realistic observer who makes decisions and estimates based on sophisticated information. However, as such a realistic observer, I can tell you this . . . and bluntly.

The day of the ignoring of older people in American society is through. The winds of change are blowing and have been for some time. If you want to talk about dissident members of the society . . . collectively there is no more potential and dynamic political and social force in America than the mass of people 55 and older who feel common interests in actual or potential social security, medical care, tax relief, and political acceptance and power. And they are going to be heard.

What political and social thrust this movement is going to have is still questionable. Obviously, the primary thrust will be the satisfying of definite and immediate economic needs; extensions of social security, not just little token raises but heavy, meaningful increments to meet and beat the consistent drains of inflation; extensions of medical services to where, ultimately, all older people,

the ones who most need such care, will have totally free and readily available first quality medical care; tax relief at a level where no person who has worked and contributed during his lifetime will live to see the products of that effort drained away to a point where the gap between poverty and self maintenance narrows to non existence.

This batch of absolute needs could be met by almost any type of political structure.

The neo-populism of a George Wallace satisfies many older people who live in a kind of social paranoia induced by the uncertainties of contemporary America (the drug scene, rock music, long haired and abusive young people, uncaring and manipulative politicians lack of safety on the streets . . . the whole string of problems we carry in America like a giant series of albatrosses around our collective necks) and if a George Wallace, or someone with the same kind of populist charisma begins to focus on older people's problems, this is where they'll go . . . regardless of the implications of the rest of Mr. Wallace's programs.

On the other hand . . . Mr. Nixon's programs are beginning to pay lip service to the real needs of older Americans. If he begins to produce real benefits and objectively analyzes the potential power of these disadvantaged and disaffected people, then the satisfaction of those needs within this major political party structure may save it from the growing wrath of millions of newly focused and viable voters—and potential demonstrators and protestors to gain their rights—actual or imagined.

The recent successes of Mr. McGovern, who has, without much attention paid by the press, been saying very real things to please older voters, are clearly reflective of how semi-populist, vaguely anti-status quo arguments can get response that amazes the hard shelled, pragmatic political wheeler-dealer who didn't originally give him a chance.

But then the political analysts and campaign directors really don't know much about what's really happening in American society . . . or on the streets . . . or in the hearts and minds of millions of people who, for one or more reasons, are very disturbed with our established political and social powers.

Older people, among others, have had it with promises and transient hand outs and economic and psychological rejection. And, you have to remember older people have lots of time, energy and real power.

If you think you've ever seen demonstrations . . . or protests . . . just for a moment envision an army of little old ladies with umbrellas marching down Pennsylvania Avenue or closing down the Pentagon or just demanding their rights in Congress. Now that would really be something to see. And you're going to see it in the next few years in this country unless somebody starts listening closely to those winds of change.

EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION STRIKE LEGISLATION

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, whatever happened to the drive for permanent strike legislation for the transportation industry? As one committee staffer put it, as far as this body is concerned, the drive is dead—unless, of course, we have another transportation strike. An attempt to dislodge such legislation from subcommittee failed by one

vote, and that was that. I am reminded of the testimony delivered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HARVEY) before the Rules Committee last February when we were considering temporary legislation to end the west coast dock strike. At that time, Mr. HARVEY said, and I quote:

Ironically, it has been said that the Education and Labor Committee should not report out permanent legislation under the pressure of the dock strike. But from our experience with permanent rail strike legislation, we have observed that once the pressure of an on-going strike is removed, the desire for permanent legislation dissipates also.

Oh, how unfortunately true that has been. This Congress continues to insist on acting only in times of crisis, and then, only to temporarily allay the immediate crisis. The irony in this, of course, is that by so doing, the Congress is simply guaranteeing the inevitability of future crises. We have seen this happen time and time again, whether with rail strikes or dock strikes or what have you. And we are bound to see it happen time and time again in the future unless we take action on some permanent mechanism to deal with these situations. And yet we refuse to take this eminently reasonable and necessary course of action, and instead we sit back and practically invite another big transportation strike.

I recently received a letter from the Governor of our State of Illinois, the Honorable Richard B. Ogilvie, in which he pointed out that the last series of national dock strikes cost the State of Illinois \$75 million in lost agricultural export dollars. Secretary Volpe has estimated that the west coast strike alone cost our country \$83 million a week.

Earlier this year, Governor Ogilvie appointed a committee of Illinois farm leaders to study farm income problems and they reported back to the Governor with the recommendation that the Congress should pass "sound Federal legislation to establish a structure within which transportation disputes can be resolved without crippling strikes which destroy markets for farm products."

Mr. Speaker, way back in March of 1970, over 2 years ago, President Nixon sent to the Congress his message on "National Emergency Labor Disputes," along with his legislative proposal to establish just such a permanent mechanism through the Emergency Public Interest Protection Act of 1970. That bill was reintroduced in this Congress as the Crippling Strikes Prevention Act. In addition, several other bills have been introduced to accomplish the same objective by slightly different means, including H.R. 12848 which I was privileged to cosponsor with Congressman HARVEY on February 2 of this year. That measure alone has some 76 cosponsors in this body. And yet, despite all the support in the Congress for permanent transportation strike legislation, despite all the editorial and public support for such legislation, these vital measures continue to languish in committee. How many strikes, how much damage to the economy and the public interest will it take before this or a future Congress will

take the necessary action on such permanent legislation?

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would have the wisdom and good sense to act before we have another major crippling transportation strike. At this point in the RECORD I include the full text of the letter I received from Governor Ogilvie:

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Springfield, May 31, 1972.

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: The loss in agricultural export dollars to Illinois during the recent prolonged transportation disputes at our several national ports was in excess of \$75 million.

With the continuing threat of shut-downs resulting from the Pay Board's action of reducing the West Coast longshoremen's contract, Illinois remains deeply concerned with the resultant effect on net farm income.

Last August I asked a committee of Illinois farm leaders to undertake a study of farm income problems. Their recommendations were made to me at a Cabinet meeting on March 4. I quote from their Report:

"We recommend that every effort be made to secure the full support of the Illinois congressional delegation in securing sound federal legislation to establish a structure within which transportation disputes can be resolved without crippling strikes which destroy markets for farm products."

There are several bills before the Congress which if enacted would do much to protect the nation generally and agriculture specifically from loss due to dock strikes. Secretary Volpe has estimated that nationally the loss was \$83 million a week in the West Coast dispute.

I would ask that you directly and indirectly use your influence and your vote to help effect the much needed and long overdue legislation to prevent further crippling of the orderly movement of farm products into international trade.

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. OGILVIE,
Governor.

SALUTE TO EDUCATION

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the National Education Association for its fine work toward the goal of improving the quality of education for all of our citizens. But, moreover, I think that this is an appropriate time to pay tribute to education itself.

As a former educator I am familiar with the value that a good education has for our young people. I have no fonder memories than of the times in my high school classes when I could broaden the world of my students with new knowledge and new understanding. To be complete men and women we must all try to expand our views of the world around us. We must learn tolerance and understanding by becoming more familiar with the hopes and fears of our neighbors. We must employ our talents and

abilities to the fullest possible extent by being better informed of the many opportunities which exist in our society.

Education is an invaluable tool in achieving these necessary elements of adulthood. I am proud to have been a part of the educational system in my community, and since coming to Congress I have sought to do everything possible to see that the good educational system in our country is maintained.

"NONE DARE CALL IT CONSPIRACY"

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, last fall I agreed to write the introduction for a most interesting and significant book by Gary Allen entitled "None Dare Call It Conspiracy," which I will soon be bringing before you serial fashion in the RECORD. It explores the evidence for a concerted plan and pattern in the many reverses freedom, law, and faith have suffered in this century.

This book included a prediction that, like virtually all others on this subject, it would be attacked by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith—an organization which, as William Buckley once said, itself frequently engages in defamation. This prediction was right on target, and the attack began with the letter to me which follows, together with reply:

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE OF
B'NAI B'RITH,
June 1, 1972.

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ,
Irvine, Calif.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHMITZ: We were distressed to read your introduction to and endorsement of *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* by Gary Allen, and we hereby call upon you to withdraw your endorsement and repudiate this anti-Semitic propaganda book.

Because you are a political scientist, we would have expected you to detect quickly the long discredited anti-Jewish charges that allege an insidious role being played by so-called "international bankers" which this book exhumes.

Despite Mr. Allen's pitifully weak disclaimer about anti-Semitism, his book revives anti-Semitic campaigns of the 1920's carried out by agents of the late Henry Ford, Sr. through the *Dearborn Independent*—charges later repudiated publicly by Mr. Ford—and again revived in the 1930's by Father Charles E. Coughlin, the notorious radio-priest.

We can only assume that you read the book too quickly or that you did not read it at all, a not uncommon problem plaguing very busy public officials who, too often, unfortunately rely upon the judgment of others.

As a political scientist, we urge you to check with Professor Carroll Quigley, of Georgetown University, whose writings are cited extensively in *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* as being supportive of Gary Allen's thesis, whereas the exact opposite is true.

The Birch Society's campaign to distribute millions of copies of *None Dare Call It Conspiracy* is a very serious matter because the kinds of anti-Jewish lies contained in the Allen book have been used by hate groups

throughout the world for more than 50 years to foster hatred of Jews. During the 1930's and the 1940's we saw the ugly consequences of such campaigns.

Mr. Schmitz, in the name of human decency and honest scholarship we urge you to publicly withdraw your name from this book and to dissociate yourself from this insidious campaign.

We await your reply.

Sincerely,

HARVEY B. SCHECHTER.

JUNE 16, 1972.

Mr. HARVEY B. SCHECHTER,
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR Mr. SCHECHTER: Your letter of June 1 to me regarding Gary Allen's book *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, occasioned by the fact that I wrote the introduction to it, is one of the most remarkable confirmations of the book's thesis I have seen. For if you turn to pages 39 and 40, you will read:

The Jewish members of the conspiracy have used an organization called the Anti-Defamation League as an instrument to try to convince everyone that any mention of the Rothschilds or their allies is an attack on all Jews. In this way they have stifled almost all honest scholarship on international bankers and made the subject taboo within universities.

"Any individual or book exploring this subject is immediately attacked by hundreds of A.D.L. committees all over the country. The A.D.L. has never let truth or logic interfere with its highly professional smear jobs. When no evidence is apparent, the A.D.L., which staunchly opposed so-called 'McCarthyism,' accuses people of being 'latent anti-Semites.' Can you imagine how they would yell and scream if someone accused them of being 'latent' Communists?"

"Actually, nobody has a right to be more angry at the Rothschild clique than their fellow Jews. The Warburgs, part of the Rothschild empire, helped finance Adolf Hitler. There were few if any Rothschilds or Warburgs in the Nazi prison camps! They sat out the war in luxurious hotels in Paris or emigrated to the United States or England. As a group, Jews have suffered most at the hands of these power seekers."

Gentlemen, you are right on cue. Of course, I would not deny that some bigoted individuals might distort the facts and conclusions in Gary Allen's book to fit their own prejudices, just as they might do with many other books. As a Catholic, I have seen anti-Catholic bigots do this just as anti-Semites have done it. Gary Allen specifically warns on page 10 against those who "because of racial or religious bigotry . . . will take small fragments of legitimate evidence and expand them into a conclusion that will support their particular prejudice, i.e., the conspiracy is totally 'Jewish,' 'Catholic' or 'Masonic.' These people do not help to expose the conspiracy, but sadly play into the hands of those who want the public to believe that all conspiratorialists are screwballs." But if the possibility of distortion is to be accepted as a reason for the suppression of truth, then all of us are the losers.

Insofar as you speak for one of the world's major religious faiths, going back to Abraham who is the "father in faith" for Christians, Jews and even Moslems, I believe you have a duty to make an objective examination of the evidence which suggests that many of the principal manipulators of twentieth century history are characterized by a deep and abiding hostility to any genuine belief in and worship of God and any attempt to live and work according to His commandments. My experience in public life has shown me that I have much more in common with believing Jews than with the secular humanists who have gained such a predominant

position in our nation today. It would be most interesting to see with which of these two groups you find yourself and your organization most often in alignment.

There is not a word in Gary Allen's book which could possibly be construed by any reasonable man as an attack on any religious faith. Rather, he points out repeatedly that the conspirators of our time are dedicated to the destruction of all religious faith. Even for those who do not accept his thesis, the hostility of the dominant forces in the modern world to religion is very obvious and should provide a solid basis for cooperation and alliance among all believers as against nonbelievers. Gary Allen and I and The John Birch Society and many others are ready and eager for such cooperation and alliance. We have not attacked your faith. Why then do you attack us?

As for your objections to his thesis itself, it is a subject on which reasonable men may differ—but not one which you can reasonably claim to be "discredited." The arguments for it deserve to be considered on their merits. Your letter gives no indication that you have done so. In fact, I can only describe your position on the issues raised by this book as betraying a deeply entrenched intellectual bias of your own. In the interest of the honest scholarship to which you refer in your concluding paragraph, I would urge you and your colleagues to try to free your minds of this bias and then take another look at this question.

Jews and Catholics suffered and died together in both Nazi and Soviet concentration camps. You may have read of the recent beatification at the Vatican of Blessed Father Maximilian Kolbe of Poland, who was starved to death in a Nazi death camp after volunteering to take the place of a young father originally selected for the same kind of death. By your campaign against those who are making every effort to arouse the American people to the danger of totalitarian world conquest, you are making it more likely that similar horrors will take place here in America. If this happens, those on what you call "the right" will be among the first victims—I sincerely hope, not with your approval.

Yours very truly,

JOHN G. SCHMITZ,
Member of Congress.

THE TOWN OF BIG FLATS— 150 YEARS YOUNG

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on April 16, 1822, the New York State Legislature by official act, brought into being the town of Big Flats.

Located in the green rolling hills of Chemung County, once the hunting grounds of the Seneca and Cayuga Indians, Big Flats this week is marking its 150th birthday with a gala 4-day program, recalling its historic past and underscoring its burgeoning future.

The people of this fast-growing community characterize the high ideals of America's heartland and reflect in their sesquicentennial observance a faith in our Nation which should serve as an inspiration for all.

I am both pleased and proud at this time to make official note in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the town of Big Flats' 150th birthday anniversary.

SALT: THE ACCORD DESERVES OUR SUPPORT

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Alton Frye, a joint fellow of the Council of Foreign Relations and the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars has written a number of studies on the United States and foreign strategies as well as foreign policy.

He has written an extremely detailed article in the Sunday Star of June 18 in which he says:

Nothing Richard Nixon has done speaks so well of his judgment and his courage as the beginning he has made on strategic arms limitation.

In view of the length of the SALT talks and the details that were considered as well as the need of the discussions, I felt sure my colleagues would want to read the splendid article by Mr. Frye titled, "SALT: The Accord Deserves Our Support."

The article follows:

[From the Washington Star, June 18, 1972]

SALT: THE ACCORD DESERVES OUR SUPPORT

(By Alton Frye)

Cynics say it is a typical American failing to know the price of everything and the value of nothing. This human frailty is serious enough in the routine exchanges of everyday life. In the great transactions of international politics, the tendency can be fatal to the most enlightened and essential undertakings.

The point comes to mind because of the surprising reaction in some quarters to the historic Nixon-Brezhnev agreements to limit strategic arms. The general enthusiasm for this momentous breakthrough in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) has been tempered not only by grumblings on the far right but by the disturbing response of a few respected commentators and congressmen.

Crosby Noyes alleges in The Star that the agreements give Russia nuclear "superiority on a silver platter." Seeking to ward off unjustified euphoria. The Wall Street Journal wonders whether the accords should be approved "anytime during a presidential campaign." Paul Warnke terms the agreement to limit offensive weapons "slightly worse than none at all," although he warmly endorses the ABM treaty. Sen. Henry Jackson, D-Wash., reserves his final judgment on the understandings, but blasts the "comic opera" procedures in Moscow and charges that the agreements give the Soviets "more of everything."

These are thoughtful and knowledgeable observers. Their opinions will carry weight with many of their fellow citizens. But close analysis reveals that the hasty critiques of the SALT agreements share a common fault: They are preoccupied with short-term balances which are totally inadequate to measure the long-term investment in mutual security which the United States and the Soviet Union have now made. And even in gauging the short-term balances, they badly misread the ledger written in Moscow. In effect the early criticisms of the Moscow summit overstate the price and understate the value of what was done there. Let us see why this is so.

THE CONTEXT OF SALT

In 1970 the Senate urged President Nixon to make a freeze on further deployment of

strategic weapons the first priority of the SALT negotiations. While a freeze then would have set somewhat lower and more advantageous ceilings, the Moscow agreements contain a reasonable approximation of this objective—which was recommended by an overwhelming majority of senators.

The proposed treaty limits anti-ballistic missile deployment to no more than two sites with a maximum of 100 defensive missiles each, a force totally insufficient to weaken the credibility of either side's capacity to retaliate and hence to deter war. The interim agreement on offensive weapons halts ICBM deployments at the existing levels (about 1,618 on the Soviet side and 1,054 on the American) and limits modern submarine-launched missiles (SLBMs) to those now operational and under construction (710 on the Soviet side and 656 on the American).

Unnecessary confusion has grown out of the provision permitting conversion of some land-based missiles into sea-based weapons; briefly put, the Soviet Union can build to a total of 950 missiles on submarines but only if it phases out 240 launchers already deployed, i.e., if it actually reduces its land-based force to 1,400 missiles or so.

In sum, the ceilings provided in the interim agreement would permit the Soviets to deploy up to 2,350 long-range missiles on land and sea, compared with a total of 1,710 for the United States. It is the starkness of this numerical contrast which suggests, at first glance, that the United States accepted less equitable terms than it should have demanded.

But these gross figures do not reflect the crucial dimensions of the strategic bargain struck at SALT. Imbedded in that bargain are other commitments and detailed restraints which leave little doubt that the outcome of SALT is a decisive turn toward greater security. It is remarkable how far these understandings go toward fulfilling the U.S. conceptions of the requirements of strategic stability.

The United States sought explicit confirmation that mutual deterrence would be the basis for erecting a stable balance. The Soviets agreed. By curtailing ABM deployment, both sides have ratified the principle that mutual deterrence depends on mutual vulnerability. They may not welcome the condition of reciprocal terror, but they recognize the fact and acknowledge that neither has yet conceived a safe way to alter it.

The United States sought explicit acceptance of the de facto "open skies" arrangements, through which satellites keep each side apprised of the other's strategic inventory and innovations. The Soviets agreed. By committing themselves to avoid interference with observation satellites and other verification techniques, and by foregoing deliberate measures to conceal strategic capabilities from observation, the two countries have installed a necessary building block for confident progress on more substantial arms arrangements.

The United States sought to test Russian acceptance of the principle of mutual deterrence by demanding that the overall freeze include a firm limit on the gigantic SS-9 class missile, weapons which have perplexed U.S. planners because of their potential capacity to destroy American missile silos. The Soviets agreed. The interim agreement suppresses the number of super-size boosters to around 300, a level well below the danger point calculated by the Department of Defense.

The United States insisted that the freeze cover ballistic missile submarines, since the Soviet Union has been building such systems at a rapid clip (eight or nine a year) while the United States in the next five years will add no subs to the 41 it now has in service. In a decision critical to the success of the negotiation, the Soviets agreed. Without such

a limit, the present building rate would have given the Soviets more than 80 missile-launching submarines by 1977, just as their present pace of ICBM construction would have produced by that year a land-based force alone in excess of 2,800 missiles.

The blunt truth is that no U.S. effort, even on a crash basis, could have matched this Soviet rate, launcher for launcher and boat for boat, during the five years governed by the interim agreement. The interruption of the massive Soviet building program is a stupendous gain to American security and international stability.

Any genuine negotiation must produce movement toward accommodation by both parties. One can only gain a distorted picture of the process by focusing exclusively on the concessions made by one side. Yet some commentators have done precisely that, implying that the United States has been too eager in conceding presumed advantages to the Soviets. As a partial corrective, one ought to understand the numerous and substantial concessions made by Moscow in its determination to promote a mutually acceptable balance.

The foremost issue on which the Soviet Union yielded is one which casts an utterly different light on the gross balance in ICBMs and Strategic Land-Based Missiles. At the outset the Russians had insisted with considerable justification that a fair definition of "strategic weapons" would include all systems capable of delivering a nuclear attack on the homeland of the other party. In order to facilitate a preliminary understanding they reluctantly agreed to treat only long-range missiles, excluding not only the U.S. strategic bomber fleet of about 460 planes but also the enormous number of forward-based systems maintained by the United States in Europe and on aircraft carriers.

These latter types of weapons are unique to the United States, in the sense that Moscow has no true carriers and no forward bases from which to mount a strike on this country with tactical fighter-bombers.

What this means is that the Soviets have granted the Americans at least for the short run, more than 2,000 additional aircraft capable of devastating all of the Soviet Union west of the Ural Mountains. Furthermore, the U.S. B-52s are being modernized with the Short-Range Attack Missile (SRAM) which will vastly increase the lethality of the force; each plane can carry 24 such missiles. And, expensive though they are, the B-52s have demonstrated over Hanoi in recent days that they can survive and function in the densest anti-aircraft environment yet tested in combat.

Those who are tempted to toss off the significance of the Soviet concession on this point should ask themselves how we would view an understanding which left the Russians with a free and unrestricted ride on more than two thousand delivery vehicles, each one of which is quite capable of demolishing any city in the United States. Had the Soviets been adamant in demanding immediate limits on forward-based systems—which play a dual conventional-nuclear role in the NATO posture—SALT could well have collapsed.

Clearly, SALT II and the coming conferences on European security will face hard and complex negotiations on these systems and similar Soviet weapons targeted on Western Europe, including particularly the several hundred Soviet intermediate- and medium-range ballistic missiles.

Another factor is central to evaluating the simple numbers of launchers controlled by the interim agreement. The superficial Soviet advantage in numbers and sizes of missiles is paired against a staggering American advantage in deliverable warheads. Roughly described, the Soviets will have a three-to-one lead in "throw-weight" or megatonnage, while the United States will have a three-to-one lead in warheads.

The ongoing U.S. deployment of Multiple Independently Targetable Re-entry Vehicles (MIRV) on both Minuteman III and Poseidon missiles is sure to maintain that advantage for the period of the agreement; the U.S. warhead inventory may well exceed 10,000 by 1977.

Having flight-tested no MIRV system to date, the Soviet Union can hardly convert its throw-weight advantage into a warhead advantage during these years. Even if they successfully develop MIRV technology, only the larger Soviet missiles look promising as MIRV platforms, and it is not realistic to expect a complete replacement of their existing missile force with MIRV-capable boosters. Judgments may vary, but no one can doubt that Soviet acceptance of continued U.S. MIRV deployment represents a concession of the first magnitude.

The tough Soviet delegation made other adjustments in its original positions, as did the American team. The illustrations here suffice, however, to highlight the fact that SALT I began an important learning process for both sides and persuaded each that its own security required realistic consideration of the other's security needs. There were no one-sided or disproportionate concessions.

PRELUDE TO PARITY

One can only appraise the achievements of SALT I by examining the agenda for SALT II, the second phase of the negotiations which is expected to begin later this year. The true worth of the ABM treaty and the five-year missile freeze lies in what President Nixon has rightly termed the "unparalleled opportunity" they create.

Critics may damn the frenetic atmosphere surrounding the last hours of diplomatic activity, although the issues resolved in those final moments were relatively marginal ones on which the options had been thoroughly explored in advance. Arms control advocates may lament the tardiness and scope of the strategic freeze. Yet the delay in setting the freeze may prove invaluable, because the long and methodical diplomacy preceding it has engendered a degree of mutual confidence which is indispensable to further steps toward reinforcing strategic stability. SALT I has made the cautious decision; the time is at hand for bolder action.

The tight limits on ABM have virtually removed the threats to stability which might arise from defensive deployments. The pressing need now is to curb the instabilities which might arise through offensive deployments threatening the survivability of either side's deterrent weapons. Ambassador Gerard Smith stressed this point on May 9 when he told the Soviet SALT delegation that the follow-on negotiations should seek "to constrain and reduce on a long-term basis threats to the survivability of our respective strategic retaliatory forces." Both countries well understand that, unless progress is made on this front, the ABM limits may not endure.

Two central threats loom on the offensive side of the equation: (1) Highly accurate, multiple warhead systems which could destroy land-based ICBM silos, and (2) developments in anti-submarine warfare (ASW) capabilities which might jeopardize the sea-based forces.

The logic and the structure of the ABM treaty open promising possibilities for coping with these problems. The prohibition of extensive defenses greatly simplifies the deterrent problem. No feasible attack could destroy all of either side's retaliatory weapons; even a small fraction of surviving, single-warhead systems would be able to deliver unacceptable damage to an attacker.

Thus, there is no longer any need for the United States or the Soviet Union to retain the option of MIRVing its boosters, since MIRV is superfluous to deterrence in a situation where there are no defenses to penetrate. Indeed, in the new strategic environment the effect of MIRV systems is not to bolster

deterrence by hedging against a non-existent ABM system but to weaken it by posing a threat to the survivability of land-based ICBMs. Thus, in light of the guiding standard of stable deterrence, both sides should perceive their common interest in seeking a ban on MIRV systems.

The potential centerpiece of SALT II could well be a trade of the U.S. MIRV systems now in deployment for a comparable number of Soviet missiles, including the gigantic SS-9s which have caused such consternation. Land-based forces might be phased down to 500 single-warhead systems, while the U.S. Poseidon fleet could be converted to single warhead systems.

The Soviets have been reticent about entering a MIRV limit until they perfect the technology, but skillful diplomats should be able to underscore the advantages Moscow would reap by foregoing MIRV development in return for a suspension of U.S. MIRV programs before they are fully deployed and refined to pinpoint accuracies. The President has stressed that U.S. MIRV systems are intended exclusively for retaliatory purposes, but the Soviets must realize that unrestricted testing in the future may push the technology to such precise delivery accuracies that even relatively small U.S. warheads would jeopardize hardened missile silos. That prospect is still some years away, but only concerted measures to inhibit MIRV testing and deployment can guard against it.

Each side clearly has a greater interest in persuading the other not to deploy MIRV than it has in deploying such systems itself. So long as the United States persists in its own MIRV deployment, it cannot hope to induce the Soviet Union to refrain from similar weaponry. There is a powerful case for the United States to slow its MIRV programs and to offer SALT II a chance to devise mutual restraints on this provocative and unnecessary technology.

MIRV is the principal qualitative innovation which might undermine the quantitative limitations sketched by SALT I. Henry Kissinger has intimated that "questions of technological change" will be addressed in SALT II. The ABM treaty not only facilitates such an effort, it offers vital precedents, for it specifically establishes a number of qualitative limits on defensive systems. Under the treaty, development, testing and deployment of rapid-reload launchers and multiple-interceptor launchers are banned. Sea-based, air-based, space-based or mobile ABM components are ruled out and radars are strictly controlled in numbers and characteristics. Test activities are restricted to designated ranges and the upgrading of anti-aircraft systems is closely regulated.

All of these controls deal with qualitative features of defensive systems. Parallel controls applied to offensive systems and monitored by the highly effective means planned for the ABM treaty could provide a strong barricade against destabilizing modifications of offensive missiles.

A sensible course would be to limit future missile tests to perhaps 10 or 20 a year, and to specify that there be no testing at all of multiple warheads or penetration aids. To convince the Soviet Union that the United States actually eliminates its existing MIRV boosters should pose no difficulty. Satellites could monitor the destruction of Minuteman III silos, just as they could the SS-9 and other complexes.

In the radically altered setting of joint planning for mutual security, it is conceivable that the two sides can agree to more intimate inspection to guarantee that Poseidon and analogous Soviet missiles are carrying only single warheads. The exchange of technical information and crew training arrangements for the proposed joint space venture afford encouragement that the ancient shrouds over the advanced technology of both sides may now be partially removed.

Even without local inspection, however, a stringent prohibition against testing multiple

payloads could be verified reliably; since neither side could maintain MIRV systems and crews without frequent operational tests, this kind of ban would provide high confidence that neither, was retaining such weapons. Elimination of large "MIRV-able" boosters would mean that any clandestine work on a Soviet MIRV would be futile, since there would be no significant force to carry such payloads.

In short, having forestalled the instabilities that might flow from large-scale ABMD deployment, the two powers could drastically reduce the potential instabilities on the offensive side by precluding MIRV systems. And such a measure could be enforced through precisely the kinds of test constraints they are relying on to verify compliance with the ABM limitations.

ANTI-SUBMARINE WARFARE

If limits on MIRV would enhance the survivability of the land-based deterrent, there is comparable value in measures to reduce the likelihood that sea-based forces will become vulnerable. This suggests that SALT II should give intensive study to controls over anti-submarine warfare capabilities.

A first and urgent goal would be to limit the number of hunter-killer submarines and other ASW forces to levels consonant with the maximum survivability of the SLBM fleets. It may be helpful to constrain certain undersea surveillance systems, since the invulnerability of the subs hinges directly on their ability to evade detection. One important possibility would be to carve out sizeable areas of the oceans as SLBM sanctuaries in which no ASW forces would normally intrude.

A third major objective of the coming phase of arms control discussions ought to be a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons tests. There is growing confidence that national means of verification can monitor such an agreement and the administration is actively considering the proposal. By inhibiting further refinement of warheads for either offensive or defensive missiles, an end to underground nuclear tests could contribute markedly to other efforts to prevent destabilizing breakthroughs.

In weighing these and other options for SALT II a cardinal rule of systematic arms control comes into play. It is extremely helpful to have a broad and diverse set of reinforcing agreements, the violation of any one of which would be insufficient to destabilize the balance—but quite sufficient to indicate that one or the other side was acting in bad faith. Conversely, compliance with a number of interlocked arrangements would testify powerfully to the continued dedication of the partners to the common interest enshrined in the agreements.

As the two countries approach SALT II, they face a special hazard. Both sides may be so busy hedging against possible violation of the first accords—by all-out programs to modernize their allowable missiles, submarines, and bombers—that they will lose sight of the unprecedented chance to reduce their need for such hedges.

President Nixon has won some vindication for his thesis that he needs on-going strategic programs to gain bargaining leverage in the negotiations. But it would be tragic indeed if that proposition were taken to warrant full-speed ahead on a host of possibly superfluous programs. That tragedy can only become more likely if the administration feels compelled to defend the agreements of SALT I by buying off its critics with promises of major new weapons.

The United States certainly will wish to continue gradual improvements in its arsenal, but SALT I justifies a moderate, not an accelerated, pace in this realm.

From the diplomatic standpoint, it is fortunate that the planned modernization efforts take time; for example the Soviets could not reach their potential ceilings on SLBM deployment for several years. The U.S.

Trident SLBM system would not go on station until late in the decade and the B-1 bomber, if approved, is some years away from operation. There is ample time to use them as bargaining chips, and absolutely no necessity to become wedded to them before diplomacy determines whether both sides can safely content themselves with lower hedges against some hypothetical future attempt to upset the equilibrium.

The imperative task now is to sustain the momentum toward a reliable system of mutual security, a momentum which will be seriously threatened if either nation embarks on a campaign to pacify domestic criticism by intensifying the qualitative arms race.

Nothing Richard Nixon has done speaks so well of his judgment and his courage as the beginning he has made on strategic arms limitation. If SALT II is to fulfill the immense promise of SALT I, the President's diplomacy needs—and deserves the confidence of the Congress and the country. He has earned it.

LEGISLATION BY HYSTERIA

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the June 12, 1972, issue of Indianapolis News speaks eloquently of the follies of legislation by hysteria. This always crops up in the case of firearms legislation. The editorial makes the point that social problems come from people—not material objects.

GUN CONTROLLERS

We have become familiar in recent years with a political technique which might best be described as "legislation by hysteria."

There is nothing very complicated about this procedure. It is simply a matter of seizing on some national tragedy which has shocked the electorate and demanding that certain measures be taken instantly on pain of having such horrors recur in the future. Usually the measures proposed would do little or nothing to correct things, but the disorientation of public opinion frequently lets the legislation ease through anyway.

This is exactly what is happening now in the aftermath of the attack on Gov. George Wallace. We are being told the assault on Wallace proves the need for controls on handguns, and that we must move at once in Congress to put such controls into effect. A similar outcry went up four years ago after the assassinations of Senator Robert F. Kennedy and the Rev. Martin Luther King, and five years before that following the murder of President John F. Kennedy. In each case the outcry has been mistaken.

To begin with, we may note that a gun control bill was passed in 1968 after the murders of King and Robert Kennedy, and even advocates of further regulation acknowledge that this law has had no discernible effect in restraining violent crime. Predictably enough, the controllers say this is because the law was too weak and watered down, but the facts of the case suggest that further enactments would not be appreciably more successful. There is copious evidence that such efforts totally miss the point.

What kind of gun law, for example, could have stopped the attacks on Sen. Kennedy and Gov. Wallace? Anyone who is willing to make such a close-range assault, in effect trading his life for that of his victim, is hardly going to be deterred by the requirement of gun registration. He can do the deed as well with a registered gun as with an unregistered one, and will hardly be fazed by

the idea of having his weapon traced when he knows he will be captured with it smoking in his hand. Gun control is totally unresponsive to such situations.

For more routine criminals, the registration requirement is equally unreal. Someone who is out to commit a crime and want a gun for that purpose can steal one; or, alternatively, can commit violence with a knife, club, razor, or jackhandle. It is noteworthy that New York City, with its tough gun control law, is infested with violent crime. Studies of homicide show it is motivation, not the weapon used, which is decisive in criminal acts.

The gun control furore is a further example of the leading delusion of our age—that social problems derive from material implements rather than people. That conception have been proved wrong in countless different ways. The proper cure for crime is to punish criminals, not to regulate physical objects.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 228 CALLING FOR A UNITED NATIONS CHARTER REVIEW

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, with regard to our resolution calling for United Nations Charter review (H. Con. Res. 258, and so forth), which has the cosponsorship of more than 130 Members—and a similar resolution cosponsored by 67 Senators—and is still pending in the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an example of the increasing support of such legislation.

Mr. Bruno V. Bitker, chairman of the State of Wisconsin Governor's Commission on the United Nations, has just forwarded to me the following resolution which the commission unanimously adopted on May 30, 1972:

RESOLUTION No. 2

GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON THE UNITED NATIONS

Adopted unanimously at Commission meeting, State Capital, May 30, 1972.

Re Hungate-Cranston Joint Resolution calling for a conference to review the United Nations Charter.

Whereas the Secretary General of the United Nations has requested Member states to submit to him before July 1, 1972, their views and suggestions on the review of the Charter of the United Nations; and

Whereas the Wisconsin Governor's Commission on the United Nations has urged for the past 13 years the need to strengthen the Organization; and

Whereas the lack of agreement by major powers on amending the Charter should not further delay positive action by the United States to assume a leadership role in calling such a Conference; Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Wisconsin Governor's Commission on the United Nations does hereby endorse the basic concepts contained in the Hungate-Cranston resolutions now pending in Congress, and do hereby urge their immediate adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this resolution is representative of growing interest throughout the Nation in the United Nations and support for a congressional initiative in working toward revitalizing this international organization.

"GENIAL JIM"**HON. JAMES J. DELANEY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, so often we take for granted many of our national institutions. For this reason millions of people were shocked to learn that one of America's great and revered institutions, the Honorable James A. Farley, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, distinguished prior Postmaster General, statesman, and a legend to legions, had been incapacitated by exhaustion and forced to rest in the hospital.

Jim Farley has for so many years shared his wisdom, counsel, and insight with the Nation at large it somehow seemed he would go on and on, not even having time to rest.

I know his great multitude of friends will be delighted to know that he is recovering quickly and will soon resume his arduous schedule. In this connection, I would like to share with my colleagues a recent article by Ernest Cuneo concerning the hectic pace maintained by "Genial Jim," which recently appeared in the Paterson, N.J. News.

The article follows:

HOW DARE FARLEY GET CHEST PAINS

(By Ernest Cuneo)

WASHINGTON.—A wave of indignation swept New York City, as it became known that the ubiquitous General James A. Farley, following a few pains in the chest, had ordered himself off to a hospital for an examination.

It must be explained to outsiders that the health of General Farley, eighty-four this month, is regarded as the final proof that New York City is the healthiest city in the world, come hell, high water or smog, which, incidentally, frequently happens.

Farley fans were quickly reassured, however, as the burly giant from Grassy Point brushed aside the medicos to issue his own bulletins. He was feeling fine, he reported, but the doctors had insisted on a rest and, a reasonable man, he had met them more than half-way.

He would confine his working day while in the hospital to a strict eight hours and utilize only two of his battery of secretaries. Incoming calls would be restricted to members of his family because, following the old Farley formula, if you receive one you receive all, and there's no point in tying up the switchboard of the hospital.

He also agreed to restrict outgoing calls; this he has faithfully done, confining them to his famed far-flung network of prominent Democrats, and confining his inquiries into the health of his beloved Democratic party, which, of course, has been in more or less failing health since Mr. Farley departed as its national and New York State chairman.

The Hon. James A. noticed the pain in his chest as he prepared to go to a banquet. He has attended 105 banquets and 131 luncheons within the last 12 months, which is enough to give most people a pain just to think of it. During this time, an average of 120 letters a day went out over his famed green-ink signature.

At the end of this month, as he has for years, he will receive over 6,000 birthday cards from every state of the Union and every quarter of the globe, remarkably enough. Even more remarkably though, they will be answered on a first name basis. His record of personal thank-you letters still stands, and presumably will for some time.

More particularly, after the 1936 Presidential Election, James A. sat down and dictated no less than 36,000 letters to the Democratic workers, precisely enumerating what each did and assuring each that his efforts made the total possible.

This crash job wore out six secretaries; it was completed just in time to get out the Christmas cards.

Let no man decry the power of the letter. On contributed volume alone, James A. Farley was entitled to hold his Cabinet office of Postmaster General. Actually, however, the general dates his success in politics to a single letter he wrote when he was a young Democrat in a Republican county. His town was about even when James A. became a candidate for town clerk, which he won by one vote.

As the new town clerk made his way down the village street in the fall night, an elderly pillar of the Republican party accosted him.

"Jim," he said, "I voted for you, because you were the only one who wrote us a letter of sympathy when our daughter died. I think anybody that much interested in other people would be good for the town as its clerk."

Well, of course, letters have taken America's most prolific letter writer a long way since—and so has his interest in people. It is said of him that he is the only man who can walk from Seattle to Key West and never be out of hailing distance of a friend.

The personnel is different, of course, but the pattern is the same; younger people come up to him and say, "Mr. Farley, you were my father's friend, and you wrote him when he was ill," etc. etc.

The Hon. James A. Farley doesn't smoke, and pursuant to a promise he made his mother when he was a boy, he has never taken a drink, nor indeed, does he take the Lord's name in vain.

All this adds up to proof that none of these are needed to be the merriest man and the warmest companion in New York City. Like Central Park, James A. Farley is a New York landmark, the living symbol of its open-handed and open-hearted traditions.

That's why everybody is a bit indignant at the general, in violation of his own ebullient tradition, getting a pain in the chest. Thousands, of course, have written him in conventional manner. This, perhaps, explains his terrific spirit, hospital or not; James A. Farley always feels well when there are mountains of mail to answer, and from the amount of it being delivered where he's at, it is perfectly apparent that the U.S. Mails are about to receive another massive transfusion of James A. Farley's famous green ink.

CAPT. ROLAND BRANI—AN OUTSTANDING POLICE OFFICER**HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of Roland Brani, who died recently after having served as a member of the Cicero, Ill., police department for three and a half decades.

During my postcollege days when I was a news reporter and columnist, I had occasion to cover the Cicero Police Department and local court sessions. It was during this time that I met and came to know Patrolman Brani. He was a sincere, dedicated officer of the law who moved from the bottom of the ladder in his de-

partment to the rank of captain and then chief of detectives. He maintained this post up until the time of his death.

One of the truly great tributes paid to him was by the International Association of Chiefs of Police which voted him one of the 10 outstanding police officers in the Nation. Certainly the best way to judge an individual and his professional worth is by the esteem in which he is held by those who are most closely associated with him in his field.

Mr. Speaker, the town of Cicero has adopted a resolution which I insert in the RECORD as further recognition that Captain Brani served his community with great distinction throughout his long career.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Good Lord is his infinite wisdom has chosen to take unto his fold Captain Roland Brani, an outstanding member of the Police Department of the Town of Cicero for the past 35 Years, and

Whereas, notwithstanding his mild, friendly and modest nature, he was the recipient of the greatest respect of each and every man who served in his command, and

Whereas, Captain Roland Brani, known by his many friends as "Beef", had achieved an enviable record, second to none in the entire Nation, filled with feats of bravery, courage, wisdom and accomplishment in the finest tradition of American Law Enforcement, and

Whereas, his reputation as a "Law Enforcement Officer" was justly recognized and complimented when he was chosen by the International Association of Chiefs of Police, an organization comprising over 400,000 members, as one of the "Ten Most Outstanding Police Officers In The Nation",

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the President and Board of Trustees of the Town of Cicero, individually, and as duly elected representatives of the industrial, commercial and residential citizens of the Town of Cicero, and on behalf of the many Judges of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Court Personnel, Police Officers throughout the State, and all others who had the privilege of knowing or working with the "Captain," we offer his bereaved family our deepest and most sincere sympathy for the great loss they have suffered by his passing.

Be it further resolved that Captain Brani will forever be in our hearts and thoughts and we shall be eternally indebted to him for the unselfish and total dedication of his entire self to the health, welfare, safety and betterment of this Community and all of its people, and "Our Captain Roland Brani" will always be remembered by the proud citizens of the Town of Cicero as "The Most Outstanding Police Officer This Nation Has Ever Known."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?**HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 19, 1972

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

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

How long?