

By Mr. SHOUP (for himself, Mr. McClure, and Mr. Hansen of Idaho):

H.R. 15686. A bill to amend chapter 2 of title 16 of the United States Code (respecting national forest) to provide a share of timber receipts to States for schools and roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona (for himself, Mr. Gross, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Crane, and Mr. Quillen):

H.R. 15687. A bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VEYSEY (for himself and Mr. Keating):

H.R. 15688. A bill to establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, to require licensing and inspection of all blood banks, and to establish a national registry of blood donors; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 15689. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against the individual income tax for tuition paid for the elementary or secondary edu-

cation of dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 15690. A bill making appropriations for agriculture-environmental and consumer protection programs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 15691. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide income tax simplification, reform, and relief for small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS (for himself, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Gettys, Mr. Curlin, Mr. Williams, Mrs. Heckler of Massachusetts, Mr. Rees, and Mr. Abourezk):

H.R. 15692. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to reduce the interest rate on Small Business Administration disaster loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. THONE:

H.R. 15693. A bill; non-point-source pollution from agricultural, rural, and developing areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 1234. Joint resolution making

continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1973, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 1235. Joint resolution to extend the authority of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with respect to interest rates on insured mortgages and to extend laws relating to housing and urban development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

401. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to a veterans' hospital for northern California, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BOB WILSON presented a bill (H.R. 15694) for the relief of Rene P. Regalot, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### SOVIET OFFICIALS VISIT MASSACHUSETTS EXHIBIT

#### HON. LOUISE DAY HICKS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. HICKS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we live in a time when the headlines regularly tell us about high-level international meetings and summit conferences. These are important and deserve our support.

But it is equally important that we not overlook the many other contacts that are developing between the major powers, particularly the many efforts by private firms and individuals that help to encourage trade and communications. These, too, are a path to peace and understanding.

I am proud that one of the leading firms in the Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts, which I have the honor to represent, recently participated in such an exchange. The Computer Identities Corp. of Westwood is a leader in control systems for transportation, manufacturing, and distribution management and provided one of the most exciting exhibits at the recent Transpo 1972. That exhibit attracted the special attention of a visiting Soviet delegation, and I am proud to insert into the RECORD the following press release prepared by the Computer Identities Corp. The release follows:

TOP RUSSIAN TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS MEET WITH MASSACHUSETTS FIRM

AUTOMATIC CAR IDENTIFICATION (ACI) TECHNOLOGY FOR RAILCAR, PIGGYBACK, AND MARINE CONTAINER CONTROL DRAWS KEEN SOVIET UNION INTEREST

WESTWOOD, MASS.—The Soviet Minister of Railroads, Boris Pavlovich Beschev, and seven of his ranking deputies visited Computer Identities Corporation's exhibit at

Transpo '72 to discuss the firm's transportation and distribution control systems.

The distinguished Russian visitors were accompanied by U.S. officials C. Carroll Carter, Department of Transportation, and Alexis Tatistcheff, Department of State. Computer Identities executive John M. Hill, Jr., a veteran in Eastern European marketing, described the firm's technology to the group.

The Minister's delegation is concluding a 12-day tour of the U.S. that began in Washington at Transpo '72 with private meetings with Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe. A highlight of the Russian's busy tour was a scheduled visit to the Illinois Central Railroad's Intermodal Exchange Facility in Chicago. The facility features the World's first fully instrumented terminal management system, designed and produced by Computer Identities Corp., and contemporary rail/piggyback techniques.

Computer Identities Corporation, Westwood, Mass., is the leading producer of Automatic Car Identification (ACI) systems and advanced optical scanning and control systems for rail, piggyback, marine, manufacturing and distribution application. ACI is the standard Association of American Railroads system used to identify, monitor and control the movement of all railcars in North America. Nearly 2 million vehicles in North America are under ACI control.

## PEACEMAKERS

### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, American involvement in the Vietnam war has been criticized from just about every side of the prism, seemingly with negligible effect on the Nixon administration. All the arguments have been made, but the most telling of all are those which discuss the dynamics of peace in international and human relations.

I have attempted to place the Vietnam discussion in this context. Dr. William E. Smith, minister of the North Broadway United Methodist Church in Columbus, Ohio, delivered a sermon on "How peace can be won; how we can become peacemakers." It is a very eloquent expression of what this country's assignment is now and for the future. Mr. President, for this reason, I commend the May 28 sermon of Dr. Smith to the attention of this body and insert it at this point in the Extension of Remarks.

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

#### PEACEMAKER

(By Dr. William E. Smith)

I want to speak today on an urgent subject of deep concern to us all: the quest for peace. Our Lord said, "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." Love is the essential ingredient in building human relationships. "Love even your enemies," he said; "pray for those who persecute you." The style of life he advocated is the very antithesis of violence.

Yet we find ourselves involved in a long and tragic war that has recently been escalated with the mining of the harbors in North Vietnam and the bombing of its cities, a war in which over 55,000 Americans and countless Vietnamese have lost their lives, and the end is not in sight. How can peace be won; how can we become peacemakers?

This is a painful as well as controversial issue. We have sons who have fought and died in this war. At least one family in our parish has a son, hopefully alive, in a prison camp in North Vietnam. I have only the highest respect for those who out of a keen sense of responsibility to their nation served it with courage and bravery. My heart goes out to those who have lost loved ones in the struggle. Whatever criticism we may make of our involvement in this war in no way detracts from their bravery and personal sacrifice.

Let us also acknowledge at the outset honest differences in point of view. Several years ago a young man, newly commissioned in the

Army ROTC, shared with me his conflicts of conscience. "Not only do I have serious reservations about going to Vietnam because I disapprove of our involvement there," he said, "but what I dread most is that I may have to give orders that will send men to their death." For the record let it be said that he did eventually serve in Vietnam, that he continues to have grave reservations about our involvement there, but because of his very sensitive responsibilities in intelligence, he was not involved in combat. Another young man, also a United Methodist, and West Point graduate after what he called agonizing study and meditation, refused to go to Vietnam. "The war in Vietnam is immoral and unjust," he wrote. "The My Lai incident strongly crystallized my belief. I love my God and my country," he added, "but I love my God first." The conflicts of conscience in these young men are but a mirror of our own. Let us hope that the church, as the community of the reconciled, can provide the context in which these differences can be openly expressed; where honest dissent is not only tolerated but encouraged. Nothing you say can prevent me from loving you, and Thank God, nothing we do can prevent God from loving each of us.

(Christ Jesus) is himself our peace . . . In his own body, flesh and blood has broken down the enmity which stood like a dividing wall . . . For he (came) to create . . . a single new humanity in himself, thereby making peace. Ephesians 2:13-16 (NEB).

We rejoice in the agreements reached in Moscow this week between the United States and the Soviet Union. These are straws in the wind, perhaps, but nevertheless hopeful signs that the two super-powers do, indeed, want peace. Meanwhile the war in Vietnam continues unabated. The level of suffering has intensified. Until the carnage there is ended, the world will not be greatly impressed by paper diplomacy.

If we are to become peacemakers we must ask some very penetrating questions. The first is: What are the ethical guideline, the moral imperatives that make for peace? The church has spoken very clearly on this subject. The recent General Conference of the United Methodist Church approved a statement of social principles which states:

"We believe war is incompatible with the teachings and example of Christ. We therefore reject war as an instrument of national policy and insist that the first moral duty of all nations is to resolve by peaceful means every dispute that arises between or among them; that human values must outweigh military claims as governments determine their priorities; that the militarization of society must be challenged and stopped; and that the manufacture, sale, and deployment of armaments must be reduced and controlled."

In the same Conference, the Bishops' Call to Peace and the Self-Development of Peoples was overwhelmingly approved as a major thrust in which every local United Methodist congregation is urged to participate. Here is a challenge to make peace a matter of high priority.

The statement on the war in Vietnam was understandably more controversial. Broad principles are easily adopted. Agreement on specifics is harder to come by. Nevertheless, the Conference approved this statement which reads in part:

"In spite of the claims that the war is 'winding down' it is not. The deadly conflict continues unabated. Sole blame cannot be fixed. Many nations continue to supply Hanoi and the Provisional Revolutionary Government with the materials of war. The United States continues to underwrite the Saigon government and the Army of the Republic of Viet Nam, providing highly technical antipersonnel weaponry, massive air cover and military counsel at virtually every level of command. Very few Americans are

dying in Southeast Asia today, but Asian people, our brothers and sisters in God's love, continue to die as before. Once again villages on both sides are being levelled, civilians are being slaughtered and the war is being escalated. This we deplore; our hearts go out to the innocent victims of what seems to be endless, senseless carnage.

"We call upon the United Methodist Church and its members to acknowledge our complicity in the Indochinese War, to repent and seek God's forgiveness.

"We call upon the United Methodist Church and its members to pray and work for peace and the self-development of peoples around the world.

"We call upon the United Methodist Church and its members to exercise our rights and responsibilities as Christian citizens by seeking to influence and change those public policies that, for more than twenty years, have made possible and compounded military and political wrongs in distant lands."

If that statement offends or upsets you, perhaps it should. The fact is, we are involved in this war. It's easy to blame President Johnson or President Nixon in an attempt to get off the hook. But the answer is not that simple. You support the war, whether you believe in it or not, since more than half of the taxes you pay to the United States government is to pay for past, present and future wars.

Here, then, is the position of the church: it is against war in general as a means of resolving conflict, and the Viet Nam War in particular.

Suppose we adopt the "just war" theory to defend our presence in Indo-China. For some will surely say that however tragic the war may be, we entered for honorable reasons. The question which then must be faced is, do those reasons still hold? Has the purpose which we set out to achieve been accomplished? This is our second question.

Presumably we entered Vietnam to save a weak, struggling democracy in the South. Has the war, in fact, liberated the people there? I would submit that the Thieu government is anything but democratic and that the devastation we have wreaked is anything but helpful. Indeed, it may be counterproductive. A veteran of My Lai who refused to take his rifle from his shoulder when unarmed women and children were being slaughtered, has said:

"It seemed everywhere we left, if the enemy wasn't there when we got there, he was there when we left. We seemed to be sort of growing them, planting them like seeds. Wherever we went we sort of bred the enemy. He just came out of nowhere, and it was almost as if we weren't there, there would be none."

In Vietnam, American chemical attacks have ruined more than four million acres of arable land. Mangrove forests and vital croplands have been destroyed. Millions of peasants have been driven from their ancestral homes and graveyards and forcibly resettled in "refugee camps" and "new life hamlets." The peasants, of course, haven't the slightest idea what this war is all about. They do not know the difference between communism and capitalism. Do not talk to them about the sacred value of his property. They have been driven from it. Do not talk to them about Western-style democracy. They have never known it and do not want it. With growing fear and bitterness, they are only trying to stay alive.

The delicate fabric of traditional Vietnamese family relationships, village life, and Buddhist-Confucian values has been ripped to shreds. Cities are gutted with millions of anonymous refugees. Over the last decade Saigon has increased in size more than 500 percent and now has a population density of nearly 13,000 people per square mile. Shoe-shine boys, pickpockets, barmaids, pimps, and

prostitutes are among the highest paid workers in the land.<sup>3</sup>

We are concerned, and rightly so, about the burdens this war has imposed on Americans. But think of the Indo-Chinese! For twenty-five years they have been engaged in civil wars and have been fighting foreigners. According to some accounts more than a million people have been killed, 90 percent of them civilians. (240,000 civilian casualties in South Vietnam in 1968 alone.) Defenders of our policies talk about the violent inhumanity of communism. They point to instances of Vietcong terrorism. Crude bombs have been thrown into public parks and village leaders have been murdered. There was the Hue massacre during the Tet offensive. But the B-52's and fleets of helicopters are ours. The napalm and CS gas are ours. The flame-throwers are ours. The folding-fin rockets and cluster bombs are ours. We have dropped twice the bomb tonnage on Vietnam than all the Allies dropped on all enemy targets during World War II. A specialist, describing the effects of our new and highly technical weaponry, writes: "(these new weapons) are primarily effective against decentralized agricultural populations; they devastate broad areas . . . they are designed to be used against defenseless people; and they demand undisputed air superiority to be effective. Use of the weapons results in the indiscriminate slaughter of civilians and soldiers alike."

I ask you, is this any way to preserve and strengthen democracy—by destroying it?

What is war doing to the United States? For one thing, it has divided us, polarized and created tensions among otherwise peace-loving and patriotic citizens. This has been severely damaging to our spiritual health. The war has also forced us to re-arrange our priorities. Hunger and poverty, the decay of our inner cities, the control of violence, unemployment—these and other urgent problems worsened by the day because so much energy and such a large outpouring of our resources have been channeled into the war. Worst of all we have become a war-oriented society. The book, *American Militarism: 1970* an outgrowth of the Congressional Conference on Military Budget and National Priorities, opens with the words:

"Our country is in danger of becoming a national security state. Since the end of World War II we have spent more than one trillion dollars, or two-thirds of the total expenditure of our federal government, on armaments and armed forces. Today, almost eighty percent of our federal appropriations are allocated to defense and defense-related costs."

Richard Barnet, a former State Department official, is far more pointed when he bluntly insists that "the central activity" of our government is "planning and carrying out wars."

The final question is the most important one. How do we become peacemakers? What can you and I do to change the bloody course on which our nation and the world seems bent on following?

At the turn of the century William James wrote in his classic *Verities of Religious Experience*:

"What we need now to discover in the social realm is the moral equivalent of war: something heroic that will speak to man universally as war does, and yet will be as compatible with their spiritual selves as war has proved to be incompatible."

How can we find a "moral equivalent of war"?

(1) For one thing, we can respond to the "Bishops' Call for Peace and the Self-Development of Peoples". Our Commission on Christian Social Concerns suggests very specific ways:

(a) Use copies of this sermon, the May 26 issue of *Tower Talk*, which contains "The



Bishops' Call for Peace . . .", and supplementary materials provided for group discussion.

(b) Attend the slide presentation of the air war in Indo-China next Sunday, June 4, at 4 o'clock. These slides will make the violence of the war painfully real, and will be followed by discussion. (The meeting will be held in Fellowship Hall).

Vietnam is symptomatic of much larger and complex problems which need to be thought out in global terms. How do racism, economic exploitation, population explosion, the arms race (peace by "balance of terror") affect the prospects for peace I know of no more higher priority than facing these crucial issues head-on. It has been said that if mankind does not end the war, war may end mankind.

(2) We can register our opinion. Politicians, especially in an election year, are very sensitive to what voters think. Last week a private citizen of Weston, Massachusetts paid for a full-page advertisement in the *Columbus Citizen-Journal*. "Our President Needs Your Help," her message began. This at once raised patriotic feelings in the readers' minds. She continued by saying that we must let our president know how we feel.

"Tell him . . . that you think our honor depends on being true to the principles that our founding fathers laid down when they created this great country. And that means we must stop our daily bombing and all other attempts at forcing our will on this devastated country."

You may disagree with Mrs. Worden. If so, then let your challenge be known. The hottest places in hell, we are told, are reserved for those who in the midst of a moral crisis refuse to take a position. The future of our nation and of the world are at stake. You can help shape that future by asserting your beliefs to those who make decisions. If democracy is to live, we must exercise this freedom of expression.

(3) And we can act. On Wednesday of this week astronaut Col. Donn F. Eisele, a native of Columbus, was sworn in as a member of the Peace Corps. What prompted him to leave a very secure post in the space program? He said that as he orbited the earth in Apollo 7 four years ago, he was impressed by "the wholeness and uniqueness of the earth." He added, "It's all we've got. If we don't watch out, we'll end up destroying it." On July 1 he will begin work in Bangkok, Thailand, hoping to reduce the mistrust, fear and frustrations felt by millions of people who are "denied the basics of a decent life."

That's what it means to be a peacemaker—not simply to call for a cease-fire, or even a pull out of Vietnam—but to give ourselves and our resources to the building of a just and humane society throughout the world. "Blessed are the peacemakers." God grant that this may increasingly be our role, and the role of our nation, in this strife-torn world. Amen.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Daily Christian Advocate, Proceedings of the General Conference of the United Methodist Church, Atlanta, Georgia, April 16-28, 1972, p. 241.

<sup>2</sup> *Evergreen*, April, 1971, p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> James Armstrong, *Mission: Middle America*, New York, Abingdon Press, 1971, pp. 102-103.

<sup>4</sup> Quotation by Bishop Armstrong, *Ibid.*, p. 106.

<sup>5</sup> Knoll and McFadden, *American Militarism: 1970*, p. 11.

<sup>6</sup> Richard J. Barnet, *The Economy of Death*, New York, Atheneum, 1969, p. 62.

<sup>7</sup> *The Citizen-Journal*, Columbus, Ohio, May 23, 1972, p. 9.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. C-5.

## THE WATERGATE CAPER

### HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist Mr. Joseph Kraft had a most interesting column in the Sunday edition of the *Washington Post* concerning the recent effort to place electronic surveillance on the operations of the Democratic National Committee.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important subject, I place the column in the *RECORD* herewith.

The article follows:

[From the *Washington Post*, June 25, 1972]

#### THE WATERGATE CAPER

(By Joseph Kraft)

Solid, practical reasons argue that Republican leaders were not directly connected with anything as inept as the recent attempt to enter Democratic headquarters at the Watergate complex. But you don't hear anybody saying that President Nixon and John Mitchell couldn't have been involved because they are too honorable and high-minded, too sensitive to the requirements of decency, fair play and law.

You don't hear that anymore than you hear that Falstaff was thin, and the absence of even an attempt to make the moral case points up the true connection between the Republican chiefs and the Watergate affair. The central fact is that the President and his campaign manager have set a tone that positively encourages dirty work by low-level operators.

The President's record goes back a long way. Every election he has fought since 1946 has featured smear charges, knees in the groin and thumbs in the eye. That includes the 1970 election when he campaigned as President.

Preparations for the 1972 election indicate some change in the old pattern. Mr. Nixon seems to be trying to stand above the battle. Hence the rarity of press conferences and other personal appearances.

But there are still signs of the Old Adam. On Vietnam the White House often implies—and occasionally says flatly—that those who disagree with the President are helping the enemy. So it is a question whether Mr. Nixon can stick to the aloof stance. The more so since he has Mr. Mitchell as campaign manager.

The remarkable thing about Mr. Mitchell is how so intelligent a man could have compiled, in such a brief career as a public figure, so many deep associations in matters involving chicanery and the cutting of corners. The most delicate cases he brought as Attorney General—the charges against Angela Davis, the Berrigan Brothers, the Chicago 7 for conspiracy, and Mayor Joseph Alioto of San Francisco—turn out to have had an astonishing insufficiency of evidence.

His claim of authority to bug domestic subversives without advance judicial approval was unanimously rejected by a Supreme Court dominated by Nixon appointees. The man he chose to head the sensitive criminal division at the Justice Department had to retire after figuring in a gamy Texas scandal involving fraud and bribery.

Even as Mr. Mitchell became campaign manager for 1972, the Republicans refused, in plain contradiction with the spirit of the new law on campaign spending, to divulge the names of big contributors who gave before the statute became applicable. The very

name of Mr. Mitchell's outfit—the Committee for Re-election of the President—smacks of deception. It implies that the candidate is not familiar shopworn you-know-who from Whittier, Calif., but some noble, heroic spirit with a permanent claim on the White House.

Inevitably such deeds and misdeeds generate a climate, an atmosphere. The atmosphere in Washington these days is as unmistakable as it was during the last days of Harry Truman.

Then a blind eye was turned to taking gifts and doing favors. Now the special tolerance is of using unethical means for partisan purposes. Bending the law for political advantage is involved.

Probably the gang that tried to break into Democratic headquarters had reasons of its own. The attempts to link them with Mr. Nixon through Charles Colson of the White House staff show association but not guilt. It is hard to believe that there was anything at Democratic National Committee headquarters the Republican wanted badly enough to run the risk of being caught in the act of breaking and entering.

But members of the gang have important Republicans as clients. At some point in arranging the Watergate affair they had to stop and ask themselves what these patrons would think of the caper. Given the climate generated by the President and Mr. Mitchell, they could come to only one conclusion. Namely, that doing the dirty on the Democrats would earn them good marks and high favor.

So there is a connection, albeit indirect, and also a lesson. Unless the President and Mr. Mitchell clean up their own operations, they are going to be made to pay a price. They will find that they cannot get away with keeping the President above the battle. They will see themselves trapped in the miasma of disbelief and suspicion which, after almost four years of the Nixon administration, is thicker than ever.

PEARL S. BUCK, RENOWNED  
DAUGHTER OF WEST VIRGINIA,  
REACHES HER 80TH BIRTHDAY—  
HER LIFE IS AN INSPIRATION

### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, today we honor a great American, Pearl S. Buck, on her 80th birthday. Last week I called attention to this coming occasion and the accomplishments of Miss Buck. Her achievements have had an impact throughout the world. As a writer of renown, as the only American woman to win the Nobel Prize for literature, as a devoted humanitarian, she has truly left her mark on our civilization.

I supplement my earlier remarks by re-emphasizing Miss Buck's association with our State of West Virginia of which she is a native. In 1966, the West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia honored her as its distinguished Daughter of the Year. To demonstrate further the esteem in which we hold her, efforts have been underway for the past 7 years to restore her birthplace, a farm home in the lovely countryside of Pocahontas County.

The Pearl S. Buck Birthplace Foundation formed through the sponsorship of

the West Virginia Federation of Women's Clubs, has purchased the home site and is now actively working on its restoration as a living memorial to this fine lady. This will be a living institution, contributing to the fuller understanding of mankind just as Miss Buck herself has done so much to ennoble the human spirit.

#### MISSISSIPPI EXPORTS BOOMING

### HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the demand for Mississippi products in the world marketplace has increased substantially in the past few years. The goods and produce of Mississippi has long been attractive to world traders. With the development of an outstanding State port on the gulf and expanding ports open to international trade on the Mississippi River, trade with the State's producers directly is possible and increasing. This has meant a great deal to the State and has made an important contribution to our overall economy.

I am proud of the success that has been made, and I include in my remarks here a copy of an article from the Natchez Democrat, entitled "Mississippi Exports Booming":

#### MISSISSIPPI EXPORTS BOOMING

JACKSON.—World trade is making an increasingly important contribution to Mississippi's economy. It has become a vital part of the economic activity generated by manufacturing, farming, mining, fishing, banking and forestry.

The Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board reports that according to a survey of exports by states, prepared in 1969 by the U.S. Department of Commerce, the growth rate of Mississippi export trade in manufactures was close to the national average during the sixties. The state's foreign sales of manufactured products rose by one-third between 1966 and 1969 and more than doubled over the decade to reach an estimated value of \$181 million in 1969.

Mississippi's principal export was paper and allied products, ranking among the top six in the country. Overseas sales advanced to between \$43 and \$50 million in 1969, a high for the decade. Recent shipments from the Port of Gulfport, amounting to some \$32 million in lumber products, will greatly enhance the already impressive figures in the next USDC study.

Agricultural commodities shipped from the state to foreign destinations were estimated at \$158 million in fiscal year 1969-70. On a per-capita basis, Mississippi ranked 11th nationally.

Mississippi farmers have a growing stake in exports of agricultural commodities. In fiscal year 1969-70, 19½ cents of every dollar received in the state from farm marketings came from foreign sales.

Soybeans accounted for the bulk of the states' overall gain. At a value of \$48.2 million in 1969-70, these sales abroad had advanced by more than two-thirds in a four year period. Mississippi's staple cotton market accounted for some \$46.3 million, placing the state second in the nation as an exporter of this commodity. Cottonseed oil sales accounted for some \$7.1 million.

The state's lucrative fishing industry recorded exports valued at \$2.5 million in 1969. After a drop brought about by the effect of

Hurricane Camille in August of 1969, Mississippi is again a real contender for the foreign seafood market.

Among the variety of products being shipped to all points on the globe are: Bentonite; protein meal; rice; non-electrical machinery; transport equipment; farm machinery and fabricated metal products; livestock, particularly breeding cattle; observatory planetariums and bus bodies.

Mrs. Dorothy Y. Ferguson, manager of marketing for the Mississippi Marketing Council, estimates that 1972 will be a banner year for Mississippi exports, both in manufactured items and agricultural products.

The continuing growth of ports, especially river ports, plays an important part in Mississippi's international trade picture. The state now has four Ports of Entry, with Vicksburg being added to the list of Pascagoula, Gulfport and Greenville.

Exports are a sizable contribution to Mississippi's economy which assumes even greater importance when we consider that exports generate work for at least 12 out of every 100 employees in Mississippi.

#### THE DISCOVERY HOUSE PROGRAM FOR DRUG ABUSE

### HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the drug abuse epidemic which has ravished our country is one of our most serious problems affecting all of us in one way or another. Most of our present rehabilitation programs have failed to put the drug abuser into a profitable and usable citizen. In other words, our rehabilitation programs are not working.

The Discovery program of the Contra Costa County Medical Services of Martinez, Calif., has been in existence for only a short time. However, its main goal is the rehabilitation of drug abusers through residential treatment. Employed in the county-wide drug abuse program are: detoxification, pre-therapy, games, encounters, rap sessions, and seminars. There are three cardinal rules in the discovery program. They are:

First. No drugs or alcohol;

Second. No violence or threats of violence, and

Third. Active participation.

There are rap centers in the county which have been very profitable in terms of getting together with the patients and discussing their personal problems or whatever problems they might have. There is a program called ROSA—Relatives of Substance Abusers—which was started with the goal to equip relatives of abusers who have sought or are seeking help with psychological and social tools that will enable them to reach out to other families with the same problem.

At the rap centers, techniques employed which have been very successful are rap sessions, seminar concepts, encounter groups, and sensitivity awareness. The encounter group experience is based on the synanon game—a form of attack therapy.

The type of drug abuse program which is incorporated in the Discovery House program here in Contra Costa County as part of the Contra Costa County Medical

Services is the residential drug treatment, incorporated along with the techniques I have previously mentioned. The residential treatment at the Discovery House is the closest one can come to grips with drug abuse and substantially rehabilitate the drug abuser in a positive environment with trained professional people who are genuinely concerned about the drug abuser and his problem.

I feel the Discovery House program for drug abuse should be supported fully by the county, State, and Federal medical services. I congratulate them for their humanitarian work which has brought meaningful change in the lives of many now responsible citizens.

#### REMARKS OF COL. OLIVER M. HUSSMANN

### HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, the patriotic remarks of Col. Oliver M. Hussmann, recently delivered before the Missouri National Guard Association on the commemoration of their silver anniversary conference in St. Louis, Mo.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY COL. OLIVER M. HUSSMANN, PRESIDENT, MONGA

Webster defines a Patriot as "one who loves his country and zealously guards its welfare; especially a defender of popular liberty." This is the kind of patriot I was taught to admire and emulate. The kind who has fought for his country throughout its history. The kind who admits the imperfections of government, but loves his country even more in spite of them.

Today we have a new kind of patriot. The draft dodger who skulks into Canada, Sweden, or any other country that will grant them asylum. Those who trample and spit upon the Flag. Those who bomb and burn our public buildings and academic institutions. Those who condemn our involvement in Viet Nam and publicly esteem our enemies. Those who question every word uttered by our leaders, but willingly accept as the whole truth any and all charges levied against us by our enemies.

There are many in this country who find favor with this new type of patriot. We find these "sob sisters" amongst our clergy, amongst our so-called intellectuals and even amongst our leaders in the Congress and the Senate. They say we should not have become involved in Viet Nam and now because we are so involved, the new type of patriot must be permitted to vent his frustrations as he desires.

The National Guard is made up of men. Men from many walks of life. Men in different stages of maturity. Men of different social antecedents. Men of various religious beliefs. Men with different political convictions. These qualities and characteristics which each individual possesses, must be nurtured, moulded and fused with those of the next man until, as an entity, we can move forward in a concentrated effort toward a common goal. We must resolve to do everything in our power to again convince the people of our country that Webster's definition of a patriot is and always will be correct.

There are too many in this country who



have forgotten that the two ideologies—Democracy and Communism—cannot live side by side except by artful truces and so-called cold wars, neither of which can nurture a real lasting peace. The tentacles of Communism creep insidiously wherever they gain a foothold. Our land, our way of life, our freedom and our liberty, as we know them, are the prizes Communism strives to take from us. Guardsmen must be constantly prepared to fight this threat. We must not permit ourselves to become the weak link in the defense of this great nation.

There is a greater need for the existence of the Guard today than ever before. We must let our fellow citizens know that the enemy wants us to be careless, lazy and uninspired in the desire to defend our country. That he looks upon us with utter contempt when we say we are tired of war. We must make the public realize that America needs its men—soldiers and citizens alike—to work continuously to improve our defensive posture while there is still time. If we wish to maintain for our children the liberty, freedom and safety which we enjoy, we must be prepared to defend these truths to the death. Consider for a moment what life would be like without these privileges we accept so matter-of-factly.

One thing is certain; we have the organization to build such a defense. We have the know-how and the money in this country to develop such a defense. Most important of all, we have US, the National Guard. We can discourage aggression now. All we have to do is feel the urgency, to realize the practicability of being prepared, and to work—work as men dedicated to the principle that the freedom we enjoy shall not perish.

Our silver anniversary is an opportune time to rededicate ourselves to the task at hand, to filling our ranks with true patriots, to teaching, to absorbing lessons learned, to building a defense capable of filling the needs of our people, our community and our country.

Guardsmen have taken such dedicated stands many times in history; always in the cause of freedom and liberty. Our citizen-soldiers, our National Guard, is older than the Nation itself. Dedicated men of the early colonies organized units and trained to defend their settlements long before the Declaration of Independence. Many of our present-day Guard units trace their history directly to these early groups of citizen-soldiers.

We need to review the heritage willed us by those who early stood in the defense of our country. We need to relive the struggles of the past, to see in our minds eye and feel in our hearts the valiant stand they took so this nation might be free. We need to think of those who stood with Washington at Brandywine and Germantown. We need to be reminded of the Guardsmen, militiamen, minutemen, call them what you will, who bled at Bunker Hill. We need to trace their footprints that marked with blood the snows of Valley Forge. We must bend our backs and grasp with freezing fingers the frosted oars with Washington as he crosses the icy Delaware. We must lay siege with him to the heights of Yorktown. We must strive with those who followed Lee, Sherman and Grant. We must feel the fury of the charge at San Juan. We must share with them the blood and sweat of the Philippines and the Mexican Border. Let us follow "Black-Jack" Pershing through the holocaust of WWI. Eisenhower, MacArthur and Patton through the war to end all wars. Let us relive with them Argonne, Chateau Thierry, Corregidor, Normandy and MIG Alley. Finally Korea and Viet Nam. For the first time in history American fighting men find themselves in the unusual position of fighting a battle they cannot win, a war they are not supposed to win. A classic study in frustration.

Is Freedom, Democracy and the American way of life, which was bought at such a

tremendous price to be lost to the most deadly enemy that has ever threatened free men? Has the sacrifice they made, been made in vain? Can we not continue the fight, can we not as citizen-soldiers bolster the defenses, man them effectively and surely, against any and all attacks of an enemy? Can we not show a love for our country? A love that surmounts all fears, all weaknesses and dedicates men to preserve with their lives the land they love?

I am not asking that we dedicate ourselves to becoming a nation of warmongers. No, I ask that we dedicate ourselves to work for peace. I firmly believe a strong aggressive, defensive posture is the best offense available to a country whose democratic ideals prevents it from initiating an attack against any enemy unless provoked beyond endurance.

Until we have made our country so impregnable, so invulnerable that an attack would be suicidal, will our enemies keep their distance. Until we have done this, the possibility of America becoming a major battlefield in a new world conflict becomes more apparent with each passing day.

Gentlemen. Now is the time for us to look to our defenses, time to follow the heritage which is ours. The time to demonstrate, once again, to all the world, that democracy is a living thing, transcending all other ways of life, and worth protecting at any cost.

#### VA DIRECTOR JOE ANDERSON HONORED FOR SERVICE

#### HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, probably no other Member of this body is more aware than yourself of the many outstanding abilities of the man who served as your administrative assistant for nearly 3 years, Mr. Joe Anderson.

Since leaving your staff and becoming Muskogee Regional Director of the Veterans' Administration, Joe Anderson has unselfishly dedicated his time and efforts in behalf of the veterans of Oklahoma and our Nation.

I was recently provided with a resolution adopted by the Disabled American Veterans of Oklahoma which indicates the very high regard and appreciation felt for Joe by all veterans in Oklahoma. This recognition of Joe's consistent and tireless efforts, above and beyond the call of duty, demonstrates the outstanding record he has achieved as our Regional Director for the Veterans' Administration, and I include the text of the DAV resolution at this point in the Record:

#### RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Disabled American Veterans of Oklahoma hold many meetings each year at the state, district, and chapter level to inform veterans and their beneficiaries of changes in laws and regulations affecting veterans' programs; and

Whereas, Joe W. Anderson, Director, Veterans Administration Regional Office, Muskogee, Oklahoma, has contributed significantly to the success of these meetings by having himself and/or other members of his staff present to discuss various phases of veterans' programs. Many of the meetings convened on weekends, but participation of the Director and his staff was not reduced on this account, and, now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Department Convention,

Department of Oklahoma, Disabled American Veterans, held in Lawton, Oklahoma, June 9, 10, and 11, 1972, does hereby express and record its appreciation to Joe W. Anderson and his staff for outstanding service far beyond normal duty requirements to the ex-servicemen of Oklahoma; and, be it further

Resolved, that copies of this resolution be sent to Joe W. Anderson, Director, Veterans Administration Regional Office, Muskogee, Oklahoma; to Donald E. Johnson, Administrator, Veterans Affairs, Veterans Administration Central Office, Washington, D.C., and to the members of the Oklahoma Congressional Delegation.

#### THE SALT AGREEMENTS

#### HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Washington Post carried an excellent background article by Chalmers Roberts on the strategic arms limitation agreement reached in Moscow. Mr. Roberts notes that the concessions made by both sides involved a mixed nuclear basket of apples and oranges, and the ability to reconcile this mix has produced an agreement which is a sensible and stabilizing step in the direction of curbing the arms race.

In discussing the prospects for SALT II and the use of the proposed Trident submarine and B-1 bomber as bargaining chips, Mr. Roberts says:

A good many in and out of Congress deride the bargaining chip argument. I do not. History teaches that Moscow respects muscle, not weakness. I thought there was validity in years past to the contention that keeping the American ABM program going was a bargaining chip; I think it proved so. The same argument now has validity.

Mr. Roberts concludes that the SALT agreements are very important in themselves, but that they are far more important in terms of a continuing process of attempting to achieve "a more stable and rational relationship." Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record I include the Roberts article and commend it to the reading of my colleagues. The article follows:

#### JUDGING THE MERITS OF THE SALT AGREEMENT

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

In judging the merits of the strategic arms limitation (SALT) agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union it is necessary to do two things: first, to appraise the meaning of the anti-ballistic missile (ABM) treaty and the details, including the numbers, of the interim agreement on offensive weapons; second, to judge the twin pacts in the larger context of the changing Washington-Moscow relationship. The two seem to me to be inseparable.

The ABM treaty has the great virtue of so limiting such defensive measures as to remove fears on either side that the other could indulge in a first strike attack. If such an attack could ever be conceivable to any rational leader, it would become so only when he felt that his own weapons and the bulk of his population would be so protected by an elaborate nation-wide ABM system as to make a second or retaliatory strike by the other nation a risk worth taking.

Given the undoubted ability of the offensive to overwhelm the defensive and given

the grave doubts by many experts as to the efficacy of any ABM system, such fears doubtless have been gravely exaggerated in both Washington and Moscow. But that does not detract from the fact that such fears have existed, that they impelled vast expenditures regardless of their validity and that under terms of the SALT treaty on ABMs this should come to a halt if not an end. "Zero ABMs," which means a complete abolition by both sides of any ABMs, would have been better than the two site option agreed upon. But two, at least, is far, far better than unlimited ABMs.

So at least one factor that threaten to destabilize the balance of terror has been cut back to manageable proportions. It seems to me it would make sense for Congress to refuse funds for the building of an ABM around Washington despite the asymmetry that would involve, given the existence of a site now in existence around Moscow. Likewise it would make sense for the Soviets not to build their second site around an offensive missile field. Should Congress so decide, the Moscow decision is most likely to be affected by the Soviet perception of a changing Moscow-Washington relationship.

Now turn to the offensive weapons agreement. It is evident enough that the Nixon Administration paid a stiff price, negotiated at the finale in Moscow, to win Soviet assent to inclusion of a limitation on submarine launched missiles (SLBMs). I think, however, it was a price worth paying.

The United States long has had a triad of strategic weapons systems: ICBMs, SLBMs and long-range bombers. According to the figures presented to the Senate Armed Services Committee by Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, the sum total of the rival triads (one bomber being equated with one missile) will be 2,499 for the Soviets to 2,167 for the United States. Even these figures are not the whole story, however. The total megatonnage in the Soviet arsenal under the agreements is much the larger but the total number of American warheads, due to the American multiples (MIRVs), is far larger than that of the Russians.

In sum, the apples and oranges of nuclear weaponry have been added up to what can fairly be termed rough parity for weapons of one nation that can reach the soil of the other. Even here, it should be noted, some of the American apples have been excluded from the basket: the fighter-bombers based in Western Europe and on carriers, known as forward based systems (FBS). It seems to me the net of all these figures and factors is that the offensive agreement is a good deal for both superpowers.

In reading over all the official American explanations, by the President, Secretaries Laird and Rogers, Adm. Moorer and above all by Henry Kissinger, one is struck by a single theme: it would have been much worse if there had been no agreements reached. It is an uncontested fact that, as Sec. Laird kept saying so loudly and so long, the Soviets did have a great momentum going on offensive arms, from the giant SS-9 missiles to submarines. So, as the admiral put it, "we have forestalled a 1977 ratio of about three to two in their favor." I have no doubt he is right because I have no doubt that Moscow would have gone on building, lacking an agreement, to something like that amount of superiority. At some point the United States would have responded with a new program of its own.

The action-reaction phenomenon in strategic arms has been evident for years, for decades in fact. The current Soviet momentum clearly dates from the humiliation Moscow suffered in the 1963 Cuban missile crisis. The American preponderance at that time, in turn, was the result of early Kennedy Administration decisions to build a vastly superior force, rather than to accept some form of parity.

President Nixon was the first chief executive to accept parity as a principle though he sought to soften the blow to American pride by using instead the word "sufficiency." Whether he did so as an intellectual exercise, or whether he did so because he knew the Congress and the country simply would not put up the money for superiority in such costly weapons, is not material. That can be left to the historians. The fact is he did so. And only because he did so is there the agreement now before Congress for approval. Perhaps the best clue to Mr. Nixon's submarine decision was Dr. Kissinger's remark at a Moscow press briefing. Discussing the high price paid for the submarine section of the agreements, Dr. Kissinger remarked that "the United States was in a rather complex position to recommend a submarine deal since we were not building any and the Soviets are building eight or nine a year, which isn't the most brilliant bargaining position I would recommend people find themselves in."

In discussing the agreements, Secretary Laird has said he accepted them only on the premise that the United States will go forward with the multi-billion dollar Trident submarine and the equally costly B-1 bomber and some other programs as well. In essence, this is the old bargaining chip idea now being applied to the SALT II round due to begin this fall. The hope is to reach a permanent treaty covering offensive weapons systems to replace the five-year interim agreement now before Congress.

A good many in and out of Congress deride the bargaining chip argument, I do not. History teaches that Moscow respects muscle, not weakness. I thought there was validity in years past to the contention that keeping the American ABM program going was a bargaining chip; I think it proved so. The same argument now has validity. But that is not to say that everything that Sec. Laird and the Joint Chiefs would like is necessary, or even desirable at the speed they request. It seems to me further funding of the Trident project makes sense, in part because it will tend to move the core of the strategic power more to sea where it is least vulnerable. The B-1 is of lesser value, in my view, and should receive only limited funding at this point.

In his remarks at a Moscow dinner for Mr. Nixon, Soviet President Nikolai Podgorny remarked that despite "differences of social systems," there are "objective factors that determine similarity of interests" that influence Soviet-American relations. It was of course such a Kremlin view that permitted the Soviet leaders to let the President come to Moscow at a time he had challenged Soviet interests by mining the harbors of North Vietnam. It was simply one more demonstration of practicality over principle. One could say the same thing about Mr. Nixon's climb down from "superiority" to "sufficiency."

This sort of thing was codified in the declaration of basic principles signed in Moscow by President Nixon and Soviet Communist Party chief Leonid Brezhnev. They said, among other things, that the two nations "will proceed from the common determination that in the nuclear age there is no alternative to conducting their mutual relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence." Or as Dr. Kissinger put it to members of Congress at the White House: "We are compelled to coexist."

This theme, of course, is not new. Back in 1954 President Eisenhower declared that "since the advent of nuclear weapons, it seems clear that there is no longer any alternative to peace, if there is to be a happy and well world."

Just as many Americans have difficulty accepting parity instead of superiority, so the Russians have difficulty abandoning the secrecy on which they have so long counted, from Stalin through Khrushchev. This is evident in their refusal to give the numbers of their own ICBMs or to agree to a definition

of "heavy" missiles and other pertinent terms. In short, the old suspicions of the Cold War are far from gone. It took a long time, on our side, for officials to abandon such terms as "International Communism." It would be useful for Secretaries Rogers and Laird to abandon the phrase "negotiating from a position of strength," which they both used in their testimony to Congress. And it would be useful for the Soviets to abandon some of the jargon of their own ideology such as "the imperialists."

The SALT agreements seem to me to be very important in themselves. But they are far more important if they form part of what Dr. Kissinger has called "vested interests in a continuation of a more formal relationship" between the two nations. We should, as Dr. Kissinger went on to say, "have no illusion" that such will occur or that, if it does, it will be quick and simple. The ideological differences, and the national rivalries too, remain. But there are, as Podgorny said, "objective factors" as well which tend to force each nation to move in the direction of a more stable and rational relationship.

Each side interacts on the other. In the past when the Soviets were weak the Americans sought to exploit that weakness. If America becomes weak, I have no doubt the Soviets will exploit that weakness. The changes therefore must be gradual, not precipitate. To me, the Nixon demand—as specified by Sec. Laird—for massive new arms goes too far. But so, in the other direction, does the budget cutting program of Sen. George McGovern. It is up to Congress, as it approves the SALT agreements, to find the mean between the extremes. If it does, then 1972 could well become a date to remember when hope superceded fear without allowing illusion to supplant rationality.

## MONEY FOR EDUCATION

### HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, when talking about educational problems, the word "crisis" automatically springs to mind. One year there is a crisis in science education and we are not keeping ahead of the Russians. The next year we discover a reading crisis and that Johnny cannot read. The year after that it is something else. The fact of the matter is, there are crises. But they are symptoms of a much bigger, more pervasive, and continual crisis that has been present in education for some time and has been growing worse and worse. That is the financial crisis.

The real irony of this situation is that in terms of supply and demand, there are almost enough qualified teachers to provide the needed educational services of our society for the first time since World War II. Yet we find that because of cost factors and inflation, school district after school district cannot take advantage of the supply and instead find themselves cutting back in terms of educational services. This means that instead of smaller classes, there are larger ones. Instead of more individualized instruction, there is less. Instead of more time to meet the pupils' needs, the teacher has less.

Then comes the demand to cut back on the frills. I do not believe that special teachers for art, music, drama, indus-



trial arts, and physical education are frills. Yet these are the first to go.

I want to make it clear that I do not believe that the culprit in the increasing cost of education and the cutbacks is teachers' salaries. It is true that teachers' salaries have gone up—but at a pace that is behind and not ahead of other professional workers. This despite the fact that teacher salaries have long been considered notoriously and even scandalously low in our society.

For the most part, one cannot fault the efforts that have been made at the local level to provide adequate funding to meet the educational needs of the community. Since 1966 when the Elementary and Secondary Act went into effect, State and local taxes have supplied an additional \$15.7 billion for schools raising the total revenue collected from their own tax sources to \$39 billion. Over the same time, funds from the Federal Government have increased from \$900 million to \$2.9 billion.

It is clear that States and localities cannot continue their massive efforts without help. I recognize that there are many problems with Federal aid to education that must still be worked out. For all of that, the Federal Government remains that last major untapped source of adequate funding to meet the financial crisis about which I have been talking. I was pleased to have been a supporter of the Quality Education Appropriations Amendment to the Office of Education Appropriations bill. This successful amendment added nearly \$354 million to key education programs. This is an encouraging step for those of us who believe in a reordering of our national priorities. Education must come higher on our list of national concerns.

#### IN MEMORIAM—MARTHA TURNER LONG

#### HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the people of Marion County, Fla., in acknowledging their deep sense of loss at the untimely passing of Martha Turner Long at the young age of 35. Mrs. Long gave 7 years of loyal, efficient, and devoted service as secretary to the Marion County Planning and Zoning Board and its director. By her courteous and polite manner, she brought great credit and recognition to herself, her office, and to Marion County. She was a dedicated wife and mother, held in high esteem by all whose lives she touched. Her exemplary life has contributed to our heritage and traditions and will serve as a goal that we and future generations should strive to attain. I wish to express my sympathy to the family of Martha Turner Long, an ever-faithful servant of the public and a contributor to good government.

#### A MAN NOBODY KNOWS

#### HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, Mr. Stephen T. Spilos, one of Michigan's best known authors and historians, has been writing a series of articles on Detroit people and places.

One of his recent articles concerns Col. Philetus W. Norris, a native of Michigan who served as superintendent of Yellowstone National Park at its inception.

It is particularly appropriate that the article should appear during this National Parks Centennial Year. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article, published in the *Detroit, Mich., Legal Advertiser* of Thursday, June 1, 1972, be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

#### "A MAN NOBODY KNOWS" WAS ONE OF MICHIGAN'S GREATEST

(By Steve Spilos)

(NOTE.—This is another in a series about Detroit people and places by Steve Spilos, noted historian and award winning author.)

One of the most legendary figures to come out of the west—or the east—is Colonel Philetus W. Norris, Wyoming's "Man from Michigan."

Col. Norris served as superintendent of Yellowstone National Park from 1877 to 1882. He was among the first to induce Congress to provide funds for Yellowstone.

The unusual thing is that he did it with poetry, penned with a stubby pencil by the light of his campfire.

One of his poems, "The Wonder-Land," a name cherished by all Michiganders, carried this appeal to Congress:

"Oh, for wisdom in the councils  
Of our nation's great,  
To protect these matchless wonders  
From a ruthless fate."

Written in 1878, the year Congress made the first appropriation of its kind "to preserve, protect and improve the people's heritage," the poem was printed in P. W. Norris' book, "The Calumet and the Coteau," which he dedicated to his friend and mentor, Morrison R. Waite, Chief Justice of the United States.

This year, in observance of Yellowstone's 100th birthday, President Nixon's National Parks Centennial Commission has planned an outstanding series of commemorative programs.

They would have had a stirring effect on Col. Norris, who is buried in Detroit's Woodmere Cemetery overlooking the Rouge River.

As a result of Yellowstone becoming the first national park in 1872, the national parks system has grown to include more than 280 areas in the nation, including Michigan's Isle Royale, Pictured Rocks and Sleeping Bear Dunes.

Worldwide the Yellowstone idea found ready acceptance and now more than 100 nations have national parks.

H. M. Chittenden, historian of Yellowstone Park, refers to Col. Norris as "one of the unique and picturesque characters in the history of the Park . . . Endowed with extraordinary energy, he entered his new charge with genuine enthusiasm and unbounded faith in its future value to the people."

Col. Norris upheld America's most valued traditions. He explored the west, uncovered a new trail into Yellowstone, cutting off at

least 100 miles from the old trek, and excavated Indian burial mounds for the Smithsonian Institution.

He was a practical man, capable of surviving in the wilderness, but cognizant that words and knowledge were the instruments of a cultivated society. His classroom was the wide open spaces—God's imprints upon the ledger of time.

An explorer, scout, cavalry man, land developer, realtor, sanitation expert, subdivider, politician, poet and lover of freedom, he educated himself under the stars from the Montezuma charcoal swamps of New York to the Continental Divide.

He carried books in his knapsack and pocket of his hunting shirt to read by the campfire.

Col. Norris was born in Palmyra, New York, on Aug. 17, 1821, six years prior to the discovery of the entablatures there by Joseph Smith, founder of the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-Day Saints.

When he was only eight years old, Norris earned his first dime guiding hunters through the dense moss-draped pine and hemlock forests around the great falls of the Genesee River near Portage, New York.

His grandfather, Deacon John Norris, fought at Bunker Hill. His father, John Norris, Jr., was a pioneer mill-builder and soldier in the War of 1812. From his mother, Azubah Phelps, who was of pure Welsh ancestry, he inherited his love of mountains and of song.

The Norris family arrived in Michigan in time for the Black Hawk War and the first of several severe cholera plagues. The elder Norris became ill, and young Norris helped his mother support a large family of sisters, including twins.

While herding wild ponies on the "blue joint meadows" of Conner Creek, he liked what he saw, and after the Civil War he built the village of Norris on a thirty foot high plateau between the forks of the creek.

His vast drainage project was considered the most advanced in Michigan at the time.

The Wayne County Atlas of 1876 contains a map of Norris, which is now a part of Detroit. One of the buildings was a Deaf and Dumb Asylum, now the Lutheran Institute of the Deaf.

The asylum stood on Railroad Avenue, now Nevada, near Mt. Elliott, the heart of Norris. At the intersection of Mound and Seven Mile Road stood an Indian Mound, and he built a log cabin on it.

P. W. Norris married Jane K. Cottrell of Fayette, Ohio, in 1845, and on their wedding trip, he cleared a road through the woods to Pioneer, Ohio, which was originally settled by Norris.

Philetus and Jane had four children, Edward, Aurelia, Ida and Arthur. Ida is buried in Woodmere next to her father. Arthur, a veterinarian, married Ida Tewksbury of Romeo, Mich. She was a school teacher in Norris where she met Arthur.

Arthur and Ida had seven children, the second, named Ralph Arthur Norris, was a doctor. He in turn married Elizabeth Estelle Gardner, and they had two children, Aurelia Betty Gavin, of Birmingham, and Ida Louise Garn, of Troy, Mich.

Col. P. W. Norris had an outstanding Civil War record. He served as a Union spy and captain of the West Virginia Mountain Scouts. Disguised as an Indian he penetrated Confederate lines, and there was a \$5,000 reward on his head.

He was disabled by a severe shoulder and spinal injury caused by the fall of his horse when it was shot under him in a guerrilla fight near Laurel Mountain.

Norris returned to Pioneer and was elected to the Ohio legislature; then assisted in the re-election of B. F. Wade to the U.S. Senate in 1863.

He then became a member of the Sanitary Commission, and was at the front caring for

the wounded in the bloody Spottsylvania campaign, and also served at Kelley's Island, the confederate prison on Lake Erie.

The most unusual chapter of his brilliant career took place when he returned to the Custer battlefield—the year after the news of Custer's defeat at Little Bighorn rocked the nation.

Col. Norris retrieved the bones to his frontier friend, Lonesome Charley Reynolds, Custer's chief scout, and brought them back to Michigan wrapped in a handkerchief. For many years this was a deep mystery until someone read about it in an old issue of Norris' publication, the Norris Suburban.

While engaged in ethnological research for the Smithsonian Institution, Col. Norris died at Rocky Hill, Ky., after a brief illness. He was buried at Elmwood Cemetery in Detroit on Jan. 17, 1885, and a short time later was removed to Woodmere.

In memory of his long life in the wilderness, and his great love of America's most treasured gifts, his grave was covered with a bower of pine needles.

His services to Yellowstone National Park, as well as to the nation, have too long gone unrecognized. It has taken a hundred years for this man who nobody seems to know to gain his rightful place in history.

One of the features of the centennial observances will bring officials from all over the world to Yellowstone this September in attendance at the Second World Conference of National Parks. Their main concern is the challenge facing the national parks in the next 100 years.

With man's spirit prevailing—as it does—Col. P. W. Norris, the "Man from Michigan," will be there.

#### CHARITABLE OVERKILL

### HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in my office reposes a rather bulky package from my home State. It contains some 9 pounds of charitable solicitations mailed over a 10-month period to a single individual, John F. Ruedi, the widely known golf professional at the Coronado Country Club.

Mr. Ruedi religiously saved each solicitation sent to him from January through October 1971. He explained the net weight would have been substantially higher had he not discarded many of the cover envelopes.

In itemizing the contents I counted 140 individual requests for money from 86 different organizations. One soliciting group, apparently through the indiscriminate use of multiple mailing lists, sent five identical letters.

Included among the solicitations were 17 sets of assorted greeting cards—averaging six cards per set—three key chains, two ball point pens, eight combs, a plastic napkin holder, and numerous decorative stamps and gummed address labels. All of these were unordered.

Unfortunately, this is by no means an isolated example. Millions of Americans are being deluged with similar requests for donations. It is virtually impossible to judge the worth of these causes since information concerning the identity of the solicitor and the percentage of the contribution which will actually benefit

the purported cause is hardly ever provided.

In many instances 85 to 90 percent of the donation winds up in the pockets of promoters and advertising agencies. This overhead takes the form of consultant fees, retainers, staff salaries, commissions, mailing expenses, printing costs, and the purchase or rental of mailing lists.

In this period of increased consumer protection; with the advent of truth in lending and regulations concerning packaging and advertising—it only seems fair that the contributor be afforded some degree of protection from unscrupulous solicitors.

I am committed to offering, at the appropriate time, legislation that would provide this protection. Unfortunately, Mr. Ruedi's case, which at first hearing sounds quite extreme, is actually fairly typical, I would imagine. Most of us get this kind of mail, in this kind of quantity, but few of us would take the trouble to catalog it as Mr. Ruedi has done. On sheer volume alone the need for reform seems self-evident.

#### STATE AND LOCAL FISCAL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972

### HON. K. GUNN MCKAY

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 22, 1972

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, I share the concern voiced by Appropriations Committee Chairman GEORGE MAHON, who said:

The revenue sharing bill recommends a program that separates two inseparables—political responsibility for taxing and responsibility for spending.

I feel that the revenue-sharing bill as passed is a bad bill. The formula used for allocating funds is wasteful in that it sends much of the money where it is not needed. The bill is bad in that it places control of public money outside of the control of officials elected by the people. And, the bill is bad because it spends billions of dollars we do not have.

I felt that bringing the bill before Congress under a closed rule was also an error and was, in fact, in direct violation of the standing rules and traditions of the House of Representatives.

I had hoped for an open rule under which the bill might have been amended to arrive at a more equitable formula for helping those States and cities that have very real needs. As it stands, we have turned loose a river of money running, as Mr. MAHON noted, "a mile wide and an inch deep."

I do think it would be possible to draft revenue-sharing legislation that would meet the needs of our Nation. But, with a deficit of over \$30 billion in the present Federal budget, I did not feel the bill the House has passed was sound fiscally or otherwise and I had no alternative but to vote against it.

In light of Congress action, I will not be surprised to see the administration and congressional leaders ask for a tax raise.

#### THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1972

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Robert Clark, former president of San Jose State College, now president of the University of Oregon, said:

To keep young people off the job market our society has made the college or university a holding operation for some of our students—a kind of advanced baby sitting enterprise. Higher education should be available to all qualified aspirants who can profit therefrom; but they who do not want higher education should not be coerced to enter—we all believe that society has oversold itself on the value of college education for all youth and undersold the importance and dignity of socially productive and useful work of other forms.

On June 8 the House of Representatives, disregarding strong, bipartisan opposition, including the Republican leadership and—perhaps surprisingly—hundreds of college and university presidents such as Robert Clark, quoted above, approved an \$18.5 billion higher education aid bill (S. 659) which was also supposed to help stop busing. The vote was 218 to 180 in favor of the bill.

The inability of this bill to do anything significant to restrict busing was fully explained in my newsletter 2 weeks ago. But its provisions specifically dealing with higher education are just as bad in their own way. It establishes a guaranteed annual income for college students, regardless of their ability or willingness to study, in the form of a "Basic Opportunity Grant" for each student of \$1,400 per year from Federal tax funds, minus whatever his family contributes to his education. This is in addition to the enormous subsidy which taxpayers are already giving students by holding down tuition fees at State colleges and universities through the tens and hundreds of millions of dollars of State tax money handed to these institutions each year.

As Democratic Congresswoman EDITH GREEN said during the House Floor debate:

I do not happen to believe that every student attending an institution of higher education is "entitled" as a matter of right to \$1,400 of other taxpayers' money. I think any student financial aid supplied by the Federal Government should depend on the academic achievement and the motivation of the student. There are many, many Members in this Chamber who worked their entire way through college and did not have a dime of Federal financial assistance. Those of you who watched the CBS documentary two or three weeks ago, "Higher Education—Who Needs It?", know that we have a surplus of Ph.D.'s and many thousands of college graduates who cannot find a job. To use an economic incentive to try to persuade every student to go to college is following a wrong course of action.

Furthermore, as Congressman EARL RUTH pointed out in the debate, when the money available to students from existing Federal aid programs is added to the \$1,400 guaranteed annual student income provided by this bill, a student



could get as much as \$7,900 per year from the taxpayers just for enrolling in a college and living away from home. Congressman RUTH asked:

Are we going to start a new practice—college students leaving home to become eligible for Basic Opportunity Grants? This will be happening even in wealthy families.

The bill also provides \$685 million more for "educational research, reform, innovation" although the Office of Education already has 50,000 tax-financed contracts for this purpose whose administration and supervision has been described by the General Accounting Office, according to Mrs. GREEN, as "absolute chaos and confusion." And, adding insult to the injury of the betrayal on busing, the bill provides \$100 million for planning metropolitan school districts and educational park—massive school consolidations in urban areas which would necessarily involve large-scale busing.

House passage of this bill marks something very close to a final surrender of whatever remained of the independence of our colleges and universities. President Nixon should be urged to veto it.

#### INSULATING LABELS

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the frustration which citizens properly express at the complications which beset them as a result of legislative acts or bureaucratic determination is especially well expressed in an editorial written on June 22 in the Desplains Valley, Ill., News.

The publication's editor, Harry Sklenar, knows his community well. The points made in the editorial, I believe, are of special significance:

#### INSULATING LABELS

Poverty is now being segregated by State Governmental officials.

According to the federal government definition of "poverty," the term means that you have an income of \$3,500 or less annually and one child. The "poverty" income figure then ranges upward, depending upon the additional number of children in the family. Under this classification, your child is entitled to certain things, such as free textbooks, free school supplies, and free summer schooling and bus trips designed to upgrade the cultural level.

However, according to the terms of the \$33,865 state grant to Argo-Summit schools, that "poverty" family must live in a "target area," defined as one with a large number of families on ADC and welfare rolls.

Under this further definition of "poverty," a family in this category whose children attend Walsh, Walter, or St. Joseph school cannot register their children in the summer school program simply because they are not living within a "target area."

Thus, in a sense, this segregates and labels the "poverty" child as much as any racial slur. Incidentally, 169 children were found qualified under these guidelines.

This government labeling not only slurs and segregates the child, but labels the neighborhood area, as such labeling really means that the area is comparable to a "slum" or "ghetto."

Such labeling has a relation to property values of the area, for few new residents care

to move into a section designated as a "target area," meaning large numbers of low income persons.

The slur also casts a reflection on the majority of persons who have upgraded their property or possess an income level sufficient to raise the median wage level.

Thus, what the slur really says is that if you live on one side of a line, your child is eligible to attend the summer school to improve his reading, and if you live on the opposite side of the line, your child cannot, regardless of what your income level is.

And, in the opinion of this writer, that is as much discrimination as any racial label.

#### LITHUANIAN RESISTANCE TO FOREIGN DOMINATION

### HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the tiny Baltic State of Lithuania has been subjected to foreign invasion and domination for centuries. In 1253, Mindaugas was crowned by Pope Innocent III as king of a united Lithuania. This unification laid the groundwork for an eventual political union with Poland and the general political and cultural extension of the Lithuanian State. This union lasted until 1795, then Lithuania was annexed by imperial Russia. The courageous Lithuanians continually revolted against repressive czarist rule and finally forced the Russians to abandon their policy of assimilation and acculturation of the Lithuanian people in 1905.

Lithuania has had little freedom in the 20th century. After Russian colonization, the German aggrandizement during the First World War sought to eliminate the sovereignty and identity of this determined Baltic State. During World War II, Lithuania was one of the few countries to experience the brutality of both Hitler and the Soviet Union.

On June 22, 1941, Nazi forces overran Lithuania. The peoples of this nation have never seen real freedom and tranquillity since that day. A victory by the Allies during the war wrested control from the Germans, but ultimate authority went to the Soviets. Rule by the Communists for a quarter of a century has stifled this once vigorous, proud nation, into part of the Soviet orbit in Eastern Europe. Moreover, Soviet-sponsored dictatorship has vitiated all forms of political expression and liberty. But, the Lithuanian people have steadfastly refused to submit to alien rule. They have steered an independent course of action, wherever their energies could be exerted. For example, thousands of Catholic Lithuanians have consciously and vociferously kept their faith, despite the unremitting hostility and disbelief of the Communists.

Many in the West do not realize the magnitude of the struggle waged by the Lithuanian loyalists for 8 years—1944–1952—against the Soviets. The losses incurred by the Lithuanian guerrillas reached 40,000 dead in military actions alone during this period.

On this day more than 30 years ago, the most dehumanizing and persistent oppression began by the Nazis, and more

recently by the Soviets. The proud heritage of the Lithuanian people is filled with examples of resistance and determination, regardless of the odds or obstacles in their path. It is because of this courage of conviction and resistance to alien rule, that I wish to commemorate this day and ask all peoples to pause and take account of the great achievements of the Lithuanian people as symbols of independence and freedom throughout the world.

#### JOB OPPORTUNITIES IN THE FUTURE

### HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, last month I noticed an excellent series in the Evening Star by Sylvia Porter on the prospective job market facing our young people in the decade ahead. These were so interesting, and the facts she developed so important to our understanding of job opportunities ahead, that I am asking unanimous consent to have these articles reprinted. I commend them to you for your interest in appraising your constituents of the facts concerning the need for revamping our educational system to provide career training for the eight out of 10 jobs in the 1980's which will not require a college degree.

Some of the facts Mrs. Porter developed are interesting: For instance, by 1980, two-thirds of our work force will be producing services, not goods; before this decade ends, she says, the glut for teachers will be so big that there may be nearly two applicants for every job in the public school system; there will be, however, bright job opportunities in 2-year colleges, vocational, and technical schools.

The articles follow:

#### Dwindling Jobs—1

(By Sylvia Porter)

True or false? . . .

The fastest growth in government jobs in the years ahead will be jobs in federal agencies.

Most workers in the United States are employed by companies producing goods.

In view of the population explosion, the biggest expansion in jobs for teachers will be in elementary and secondary schools.

Increasing automation in the office will reduce the number of jobs for office workers.

Good jobs for high school graduates will shrink dramatically as more employers demand that workers have college degrees.

Jobs in agriculture also will dwindle near to zero because of the mechanization of farm work along with the virtual disappearance of the small farm.

The work force is growing older as the population generally lives longer, and thus more and more key positions are being filled by middle-age and older employees.

If you answered "true" to any of these questions, you were wrong. If you answered "true" to most, you flunked.

Taking the questions one by one:

There will be considerable growth in the numbers of government jobs at all levels—an estimated 33 percent increase during the 1970s. But the growth will be much greater at the state and local levels than at the Federal levels.

More than half of the U.S. work force today is producing services, and goods—services covering the range of medical, teaching, banking, insurance, painting, writing, advising, planning—making up the first service-dominated economy in world history. And by 1980 the overall proportion of our work force in services is expected to expand to two-thirds. More than 85 percent of the new jobs now opening up are in the services. By contrast, manufacturing jobs will increase an average of only 1.3 percent a year during the 1970s.

The fastest expansion in teaching jobs will be at the college (two-year and four-year) level. During this decade the increase in the number of elementary teachers is slated to be a mere 3.3 percent and many would be elementary and secondary school teachers will be forced to find new types of jobs.

Automation in the office has reduced opportunities for certain types of workers—but sharply increased demand for other important categories ranging from business machine operators and copying machine repair people to computer programmers, tape librarians and tape perforator typists. If you are interested in a clerical career, you will find the prospects are brightest for work with office computers or in the operation of office machines.

Sure, there's a great push toward college education, but the biggest numbers of jobs in this country still are going to non-college graduates, including high school drop-outs. There will be tremendous opportunities for mechanics and repairmen, particularly for automobile and airplane mechanics, for business machine and appliance servicemen.

The decline of the small farm has been going on for more than a century, and by 1980 the entire food supply probably will be grown by 3 percent of the labor force. However, many new agricultural occupations are opening up in big "agribusiness" and in the technical-scientific aspects of modern farming.

Finally, instead of growing older, the work force actually is growing steadily younger, with about two of the three new jobs being filled during this decade by Americans aged 24 to 25. A key force behind this trend is today's scarcity of workers in the age range of 30 to 45 (not many babies were being born in the depression 1930s). As a result, corporations and other employers are being compelled to reach into the younger age brackets to find executive and other talent—and this is creating an extraordinary opportunity for many American men and women now in their late 20s.

#### WHERE ARE THE JOBS?—II

(By Sylvia Porter)

Before this decade ends, the glut for teachers will be so big that there may be nearly two applications for every job in the public school system. Between now and 1980, we may train as many as 4,200,000 new elementary and high school teachers, says the Labor Department, but there will be only 2,300,000 jobs waiting for them.

Even at this early point, large numbers of graduating teachers are being compelled to abandon the field for which they trained so enthusiastically. Even now, the immediate future is clearly grim for the record numbers of college students majoring in education.

Moreover, the trends for elementary and high school teachers will remain grim for a period.

Declining birthrates have been shrinking enrollments, and elementary school enrollments as distant as 1980 are expected to be still below 1968 levels. Also reducing the overall numbers of teachers needed is the growing use, especially in high schools, of a new array of educational hardware—such as instructional television and language laboratories. Another strong trend with important implications for teachers is toward non-resident, non-degree courses—adult education, home-study programs, TV teaching.

#### OPPORTUNITIES LISTED

But despite this over-all picture, there are bright job opportunities in the teaching fields if you are alert to the chances, willing and able to grab them. For instance:

In two-year colleges—including junior and community colleges, vocational and technical schools: The expected growth in the numbers of openings for teachers in this type of school is more than double the expected growth in four-year colleges. The greatest number of new opportunities will be in public institutions.

In ghettos and poor rural districts: As one illustration of the teacher-training programs, Fordham University has set up a work-study scheme for "teacher advocates" specializing in teaching and helping youngsters in trouble with the law. The teachers, age 21-35, are living in the neighborhoods in which they're teaching, working toward masters' degrees, receiving stipends of \$90 a week while they work-study.

In adult education—training-retraining: So impressive is the surge in this field that "andragogy"—the science of teaching adults—is rapidly becoming a new teaching specialty and is being pushed hard by the U.S. Office of Education. About 69 million Americans age 16 and over have less than a 12th-grade education.

In school administration: From preschool through college.

In subjects where teachers remain scarce: Math, for instance, the physical sciences, consumer education. The U.S. Office of Education is funding projects to develop innovative environmental education programs across the country—including new techniques for teacher training in this field.

In teaching the handicapped: The mentally retarded, physically handicapped, socially maladjusted, the delinquent child. Today, fewer than half of the nation's handicapped school-age children get the special educational services they need so desperately.

In early childhood education—including day care centers and kindergartens: Pre-primary school education is one of the biggest of growth industries in this era—and all the sex barriers are down, so opportunities for men and women are equally bright.

In educational research and development: A vitally important new field in which there will be fascinating opportunities as public and private funds pour in to spur research into many fundamental questions. For instance, why can't Johnny read? Why do drop-outs drop out? How can we best prepare the retarded child to lead an independent life? How does poor nutrition affect learning?

A nationwide network of educational research labs is now being built to further this effort—most of the labs in connection with major universities. Demand for well-trained, well-qualified educational research and development specialists must expand.

In the federal teacher corps: If you are a qualified applicant interested in working with children from poor families and in training others to work with such children. You'll get a fairly arduous two-year college internship program with "long hours, low pay and as much frustration as anyone should take."

You can obtain vital guidance on careers in teaching from these key sources: National Center for Information on Careers in Education, 1607 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009; National Education Association, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036; U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

#### WHERE ARE JOBS?—III

(By Sylvia Porter)

You've surely heard about the layoffs of technicians from coast to coast—particularly in the aerospace industry.

If you've been interested in going into a

technical career, you're probably also aware that the federal government has been stepping up efforts to retrain and reroute unemployed engineers, scientists and technicians. And perhaps you know, too, that the National Society of Professional Engineers, along with other engineering societies, has been conducting a market survey to find out how the unemployed can be retrained for jobs in other fields ranging from food processing to finance. The long-range prospects for technicians are favorable. By 1975, more than one million new interesting technical jobs promising good salaries will open in this country, predicts the U.S. Office of Education.

The well-known jobs are for computer and other electronic technicians, electrical, mechanical technicians, draftsmen. Here are other fields, most of which you can learn in two post-high school years or less:

Appliance Service Technicians: Install, maintain and repair appliances.

Architectural and Construction Technicians: Help develop new building techniques and new building materials; design future structures such as astrodomes, space-ships, sea laboratories.

Automotive Technicians: Help design new traffic control systems, smog control devices, automatic automobile guidance systems and new auto safety features.

Chemical Technicians: Work in new fields of chemistry, especially biochemistry; help develop new materials from chemicals, such as new plastics, new foods, new fertilizers.

Electromechanical Technicians: Help design products ranging from new computers to artificial hearts and other artificial organs for humans.

Fire Protection Technicians: Help develop new types of fire-control systems, including systems for supersonic transports, sea labs and other artificial environments.

Health Service Technicians: Assist medical teams on the new frontiers of medicine such as bioengineering techniques to save and prolong life.

Instrumentation Technicians: Help develop new families of instruments to facilitate space exploration; work on pollution control and automated medical devices.

Library Technicians: Work primarily in public school libraries but also in colleges and universities and in business, medical and other specialized libraries to help people with materials; write book descriptions for card catalogues; order books from publishers; operate and maintain audiovisual equipment such as slide projectors and tape recorders.

Metallurgical Technicians: Help develop new miracle metals and alloys for use in construction, machinery, medicine.

Radiologic Technicians and Technologists: Backstop highly trained radiation specialists, especially those working on health and safety aspects of atomic energy plants; monitor and analyze the air, food and water we consume; do research on effects of radiation on plants, animals and people; use X-ray techniques for the detection and treatment of disease.

Sanitation and Environmental Technicians: Help prevent and control air and water pollution; inspect and prevent contamination of food; improve methods for waste disposal.

#### WHERE WILL THE JOBS BE?—IV: CITY HALL

(By Sylvia Porter)

An astounding 10 million Americans work for state and local governments, while another 2.8 million work for the federal government. "The government"—federal, state and local—has become the nation's biggest single employer in virtually all fields.

About one in four new jobs for men and women opening up in the United States is a government job. In some areas (Wyoming, West Virginia, Washington, D.C.), the ratio is one new government job for one new private sector job.



And although cutbacks in city employment are making headlines the nation over—in New York City alone, payrolls have been cut by 10,000 jobs during the last year—the most dramatic growth by far is taking place in jobs at state and local levels.

More specifically, job opportunities in state and city governments will soar by 40 percent in the 1970-80 period, the Labor Department predicts—double the growth rate for the labor force as a whole. At this moment, estimates the National Civil Service League in Washington, more than 750,000 state-local jobs are opening up annually for people at all levels of educational achievement and across the occupational board.

About a quarter-million of these are openings for professional, administrative and technical (white collar) workers. Hundreds of thousands work in "financial control activities" (taxes) and in protective services (police work and firemen).

"Working for city hall," in short, will be among the biggest categories of increasing job opportunities in the 1970s.

The forces behind the upsurge in state-local government employment are fundamental: the relentless population migrations from rural to suburban and urban areas; the exploding demand for essential public services this trend brings; the ever-greater call for more and better education, housing, health services by all age groups.

With the single exception of jobs for elementary and high school teachers, employment in city and state agencies will climb steadily and sharply.

As for pay scales, they have been spiraling upward—reflecting the movement throughout the country to make pay scales for government workers comparable with those of workers in private enterprise and also the efforts of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees and similar unions to which more than one in three state and local government workers now belong.

In most U.S. cities now, clerical workers earn more than they would at comparable private jobs; so do those in many data-processing jobs. In New York City, an experienced computer operator earns 11 percent more working for the government than he would in private industry; a carpenter or electrician earns 62 percent more working for the city than he would in private industry.

In Boston, an experienced computer systems analyst working for the city earns \$1,125 a month; in Chicago, he earns \$949. In Boston, a carpenter working for the city earns \$666 a month; in Chicago, he earns \$1,051. In Boston, the plumber earns \$648 a month; in Chicago, \$1,077. These are averages for a standard work week, which is only 35 hours in most work categories.

If you are interested in working for your city, call, write or visit the city hall's personnel or civil service office—or call or write the particular agency for which you'd like to work.

Other excellent sources of information include the local school board; city clerks; school or college counselors or placement offices; the state employment service office.

Or inquire through one of the following organizations:

American Institute of Planners, 917 15th St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20005; Federal Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20460; National League of Cities, 1612 K St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20006; National Civil Service League, 1825 K St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20006; International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., 11 Firstfield Road, Galtersburg, Md. 20760; American Public Welfare Association, 1313 E. 60th St., Chicago, Ill., 60637; National Association for Community Development, 1424 16th St., NW, Washington, D.C. 20036.

#### DOOR-TO-DOOR SALESMANSHIP

(By Sylvia Porter)

How would you like to:

Go into business for yourself;

Earn \$15,000 to \$40,000 a year;  
Set your own time schedules, deadlines, work pace;

And all this "without any experience necessary"?

Door-to-door sales—the "world's smallest independent business"—might answer all these dreams if you like this type of work and if you have what it takes to make a go of it.

Door-to-door selling is this country's oldest method of merchandising. Among familiar products initially introduced to the American public by door-to-door salesmen are the washing machine, silk and nylon stockings, the vacuum cleaner, sewing machine, radio.

Today, 1,500,000 to 2,000,000 are in door-to-door selling—about half of them women. And the numbers continue to grow. Students turn to it to finance tuition costs, teachers and others lean on it to increase their incomes, women move in to supplement the family's income and fill up idle hours.

The whole field of direct selling is expanding, spurred particularly by increasing willingness to pay a premium for the luxury of "shopping at home." The field is also diversifying to a wide range of goods and services. There are now an estimated 2,500 to 3,000 direct selling companies—many of them glamor stocks in recent years—grossing about \$4 billion annually, double the volume of only a decade ago.

Should you attempt to go into the direct selling field? Here are some guidelines from the Direct Selling Association, the trade association which recently put together a code of ethics for its members:

Earnings: If you are selling part-time, your earnings in commissions will be about \$30 to \$50 a week. If you work full time and are lucky, you'll probably average \$10,000 to \$15,000 a year. If you're in the minority of "born" sales people (or their field supervisors), you may manage \$40,000 or more annually.

Women earn at least as much as men do.

Advantages: You're on your own and can set your own work load, time schedules, financial goals. You can get started with virtually no experience, can get in or out of direct sales at any time, normally need no capital to begin with.

Warning: steer clear of any direct sales company that requires you to make a big investment in sales gear before you even hit the road.

Disadvantages: You may not be able to achieve the income you seek unless you are willing and able to spend a considerable amount of time away from home. You may have to carry heavy sample cases on your route. The field has more than its share of hard sellers and unscrupulous dealers of one type or another—some of them illegally representing their wares and others regularly violating the federal truth in lending law.

And always lurking in the background is the prospect of stricter federal laws and regulations to set standards for direct selling and crack down on the abuses which have resisted all the industry's efforts at self-policing.

#### THE HUMAN COST OF COMMUNISM

##### HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, those who urge an immediate American withdrawal from Vietnam regardless of the consequences appear not to have given serious consideration to exactly what those consequences would be. If they had it is unlikely that they would advance such a

proposition as a serious policy alternative.

There has been a great deal of discussion in this country of indiscretions committed by our own soldiers. In instances where Americans have acted in an inhumane manner, when they have been callous in their treatment of civilians, it is just and proper that we should be critical. Such indiscretions have, however, been the actions of individuals. They have never been the policy of our Government.

Exactly the opposite is true with regard to the campaign of terror practiced by the Vietcong. Sir Robert Thompson recently noted that—

Everyone has heard of My Lai, but who has heard of Calbe, where the Vietcong, after its capture, lingered only to murder the wives and children of all the local militia? Or of the Montagnard village of Dakson, where they moved from hut to hut with flame-throwers incinerating more than 250 villagers, two-thirds of them women and children.

These acts of barbarity, the murder of thousands in Hue, were not accidental. Robert Thompson, the British expert on guerrilla warfare, states that—

These were not aberrations, nor savagery for savagery's sake, nor the work of undisciplined soldiers acting in violation of instructions, but part of a ruthless deliberate policy designed to break a people who would not otherwise bend to their will.

How many would be murdered if the Vietcong were to come to power in South Vietnam today. Robert Thompson writes that—

Four years ago I estimated that it would be several hundred thousands. I now wish to amend that figure to well over one million (out of eighteen million people).

This must not be permitted to happen. Those who would turn their backs upon these brave people who have depended upon the good word of the United States should consider the consequences, not only for the South Vietnamese, but for American honor as well.

I wish to share with my colleagues Sir Robert Thompson's article concerning "The Human Cost of Communism" as it appeared in the New York Times of June 15, 1972:

THE HUMAN COST OF COMMUNISM: "IF THE NORTH TAKES OVER THE SOUTH, WHAT WILL THE BLOODBATH BE?"

(By Robert Thompson)

LONDON.—The present invasion of South Vietnam and the intense fighting of the last few weeks draw attention once again to the human suffering caused, on an almost unprecedented scale, to the Vietnamese people by the continuing war. I am not here considering the battle casualties which, although on each side they have probably reached 500,000, can at least be regarded as "legitimate" in war.

Nor am I considering the refugees who, although their plight may be tragic, are at least still alive.

What should most concern us is the number of civilians who have been killed in both halves of Vietnam, and those who may yet die in the future, as part of the human cost of Communism.

The Western conscience is immediately pricked by an American-committed atrocity, such as My Lai, and by the civilian casualties caused by the bombing of the North (although such casualties are now likely to be far less than during 1965-68 because of the development of the extremely accurate "smart" bomb).

Little or no attention, however, and certainly no equivalent reporting, has been given to similar Vietcong or North Vietnamese atrocities which have occurred on a scale that makes Mylai almost insignificant. These have not occurred because of some aberration, accident or inaccuracy of bombing. They have occurred, both selectively and indiscriminately, as a matter of deliberate policy.

At the time Hanoi complained of six civilian casualties, as a result of the first American raid on the North after the invasion began, she was firing 122-mm. rockets indiscriminately into Saigon and Phnompenh, killing more than ten times that number.

Her Russian 130-mm. guns have pounded Anloc and Quangtri to rubble. They will do the same to Kontum and Hue if they get within range without any consideration whatsoever for the civilian population.

Everyone has heard of Mylai, but who has heard of Caibé where the Vietcong, after its capture, lingered only to murder the wives and children of all the local militia? Or of the Montagnard village of Dakson, where they moved from hut to hut with flame-throwers incinerating more than 250 villagers, two-thirds of them women and children?

Most people have heard of the massacres at Hue in 1968 where the Vietcong and North Vietnamese, after its capture, executed 5,700 people (as assessed from the mass graves found afterwards) but who knows that in captured documents they gloated over these figures and only complained that they had not killed enough? These were not aberrations, nor savagery for savagery's sake, nor the work of undisciplined soldiers acting in violation of instructions, but part of a ruthless deliberate policy designed to break a people who would not otherwise bend to their will.

The world cannot plead ignorance because it has all been well documented. The evidence has been authoritatively put together in a compendium prepared, surprisingly, for the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary (the meat was obviously too red for Senator Fulbright and the Foreign Affairs Committee).

There are distressing implications for the future. If the invasion succeeds and the North takes over the South, what will the bloodbath be? Four years ago I estimated that it would be several hundred thousands. I now wish to amend that figure to well over one million (out of eighteen million people).

The critics of the war may claim that the forecasts are exaggerated. But Colonel Tran Van Dac, a North Vietnamese officer who defected after twenty-four years in the Communist party, stated that the Communists, if they win would slaughter up to three million South Vietnamese, and another colonel, Le Xuan Chuyen, who defected after twenty-one years, stated that five million people in South Vietnam were on the Communist "blood debt" list and that 10-15 per cent of these would pay with their lives. When asked in an interview if the possibility of a bloodbath had been exaggerated he replied: "It could not be exaggerated. It will happen."

#### MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

### HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadis-

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

How long?

#### ACCURACY IN MEDIA AND PUBLIC BROADCASTING

### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, when our committee had hearings on appropriations for public broadcasting, I raised the serious question with reference to Sander Vanocur.

I place here in the RECORD a complaint by Accuracy in Media, Inc. to William B. Ray, Complaints and Compliance Division, Broadcast Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C. The letter explains itself. I trust Mr. Vanocur realizes that he has not violated just the regulation of the FCC with reference to fairness, he has violated the law. In the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967, there appear these words:

All matters of controversy must be presented in balance and perspective.

I am sending a copy of what is contained in this RECORD to the Federal Communications Commission for action as a violation of the law. I am also sending a copy of this to Mr. Frank Pace, the chairman of the board of directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting as well as to John Macy, president of CPB, and asking what action they intend to take in this matter.

I think everyone in the Congress realizes the wording I quoted above from the law was put in with a very definite purpose, to be sure that all matters of controversy were presented in balance and perspective. I intend to see that this is enforced, as I happen to be one of the authors of the act. At the time the act was written, those who were here in Washington seeking such legislation, came into my office and requested that language to be in the act and supported my amendment in the committee to place those words in the act.

Accuracy in Media is a nonprofit organization here in Washington which had or has had on its national advisory board Dean Acheson, Murray Baron, Ambassador Elbridge Durbow, Dr. William Yandell Elliott, Eugene Lyons, Morris L. Ernst, Dr. Charles Burton Marshall, Rear Adm. William C. Mott, USN, retired, and Edgar Ansel Mowrer. This gives you some idea of the impartiality of Accuracy in Media. I have watched it and it has done a pretty fair job of trying to bring some balance to the media and is to be commended for those efforts.

The letter follows:

ACCURACY IN MEDIA INC.,  
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1972.

Mr. WILLIAM B. RAY,  
Complaints and Compliance Div., Broadcast  
Bureau, FCC, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. RAY: On April 26, 1972, WETA and other stations throughout the country broadcast a program produced by NPACT and distributed by the Public Broadcasting Service entitled "Special Report: The President on Vietnam."

This program consisted of a statement by President Nixon taking about 16 minutes and a commentary by four individuals, including the moderator, Mr. Sander Vanocur, who were generally critical of the President. The commentary took the balance of the hour.

In introducing the commentators, Mr. Vanocur said:

Since the White House announcement of the President's address, we of NPACT went to work trying to arrange a politically balanced panel of individuals to discuss the issues raised by the President. Well, our panel tonight is not balanced. There's no spokesman for the administration. And this is not our doing.

Mr. Vanocur went on to explain that they had tried to get someone from Congress or the White House to speak for the administration, but they had not been successful. He had succeeded in lining up two journalists and Mr. Richard Barnet of the Institute for Policy Studies, all of whom were known to be critics of the President.

Accuracy in Media, Inc. wishes to file a complaint against NPACT and PBS for violation of Section 396 (g) (1) (a) of the Public Broadcasting Act with respect to this program. This act requires that all programs and series of programs be produced with strict adherence to objectivity and balance. Mr. Vanocur told his audience that NPACT had not obtained a balanced panel to discuss the President's address, and this was demonstrated to be true by the discussion that ensued.

We have pointed this out to NPACT, stating our belief that the program violated both the Public Broadcasting Act and the Fairness Doctrine. Counsel for NPACT replied that the program was balanced since it included a 16 minute talk by the President, and this was supposed to balance the 44 minutes given to his critics. Also, NPACT argued that the Fairness Doctrine did not require balance for this particular program, and counsel cited a number of other programs produced by NPACT that had been better balanced on the subject of Vietnam.

Finally, NPACT tells us that the panelists were selected not for their political viewpoints, but for their knowledge and expertise. He said that the statement by Mr. Vanocur was not meant to imply that the panelists held views necessarily opposed to the Administration.

We find NPACT's response unsatisfactory. It fails to deal at all with our complaint of violation of Section 396, and we wish to make this the main basis of our complaint to the Commission.

It seems clear to us that Mr. Vanocur knew full well that his panelists represented views that were critical of the Administration and that this was why he made his introductory remark of explanation. We reject the idea that the program was balanced because it included the full statement by the President.

We said this in our reply to NPACT:

"You suggest that giving the President 16 minutes of air time in an hour segment met the requirements of balance. We disagree. If a newspaper such as The New York Times were to publish the President's talk and then quote only unfavorable reactions to it, it would be condemned by all for blatant one-sided and biased reporting. You contend that this is precisely the way in which a broadcaster can achieve balance. It is exceedingly strange that what would be regarded as extreme one-sidedness in a newspaper should be regarded as the epitome of balance in a television broadcast."

"The simple fact is that the President of the United States was not a mere participant in your program. He delivered an important newsworthy address. Had he denied you the right to televise it (possibly on the ground that he knew you would use his 16 minute talk to justify a 44 minute attack on his policies), you would have been indignant. You decided to put on a commentary, pre-



sumably to "discuss the issues raised by the President," as Mr. Vanocur said. We may assume that you regarded these as controversial issues of public importance. Mr. Vanocur knew that under the Fairness Doctrine and under Section 396(g)(1)(a) of the Public Broadcasting Act a licensee is obliged to present all sides when he airs discussions of controversial issues of public importance. Certainly the views of those citizens who support the President of the United States have as much right to be heard as those who oppose him. Licensees are obliged to air the significant views of those in the community they serve. If a large part of the community wishes to express or hear expressed views that support the President of the United States, the licensee has a positive obligation to seek out persons capable of articulating those views and putting them on the air. One of the objects of this exercise is to gauge the reaction of the public to what the President has said. If a licensee is so selective that he airs only the views of the President's critics then he really misinforms his audience, creating the impression that no support for the Administration exists."

We do not believe that the excuse that a member of Congress or an official of the Administration was not available excuses NPACT from its obligation to provide a balanced panel. No member of the panel was from Congress and there was no official representative of the opposition party. NPACT found two journalists and a scholar. Surely it would have been possible to find a journalist or a scholar who would have taken a view more sympathetic to that of the President. There is no evidence that NPACT made any effort to find such a person.

We note that this is not the first time that NPACT has produced a panel comprised wholly or predominantly of Administration critics to discuss a presidential address.

We ask that you find NPACT and PBS in violation of Section 396(g)(1)(a) of the Public Broadcasting Act. We ask that they be instructed to produce a program on the subject of Administration policy in Vietnam that will rectify the lack of balance in the April 26, 1972 program and that they be advised to avoid production of similarly unbalanced programs in the future.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAHAM H. KALISH,  
Executive Secretary.

DOROTHY ROACH OF  
AUSTIN, TEX.

HON. J. J. PICKLE  
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, every office on this Hill knows the value of that employee who "knows the ropes"—and the same holds true for offices at every level of government.

In Austin, Tex., Dorothy Roach was that employee since 1968. With experience in many fields of government, Miss Roach has been called the "real" mayor of Austin on more than one occasion. Serving as Administrative Secretary for the Austin City Council, Miss Roach repeatedly was called upon by city officials to lend her expertise to the benefit of the city.

A few days ago, however, Miss Roach passed away at the early age of 54, and she left a gap which will not be easy to fill. I join with the city of Austin in mourning her passing and in praising her good wishes.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD

an article from the Austin Statesman about Miss Roach.

The article follows:

#### MUNICIPAL SECRETARY DIES AT 54

Dorothy Roach, administrative secretary for the Austin City Council, was found dead at her home Monday morning.

Administrative aide Chuck Space found Miss Roach when he went to her home after she did not report to work. Time or cause of death had not been determined Monday morning.

Miss Roach, 54, had been with the city since March 1968.

Mayor Roy Butler said she "was a loyal and devoted municipal employee and of immeasurable assistance to the entire city council."

"Since this council took office more than a year ago, she has spent long hours attending to council affairs as an administrative secretary," said Butler. "On many occasions, we would have been lost without her expert and dedicated help."

Before joining the city staff, Miss Roach worked for the U.S. Department of State in Washington, D.C.; had been a legal secretary for former Sen. Ralph Yarborough, and had been employed by a construction company.

She was a native of Lipan and attended public schools in Mineral Wells, Adams Business College in Mineral Wells and Texas Wesleyan College in Fort Worth.

Funeral will be at 4 p.m. Wednesday in the Weed-Corley Funeral Home.

She is survived by a brother, George M. Roach of Austin.

#### PORT VUE TEACHER HONORED AFTER 45 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, in the course of a lifetime you meet many people and, if you are fortunate, you may meet a few who, regardless of position or wealth, stand head and shoulders above the crowd. You find your life has been enriched merely by knowing them. I have been so fortunate. I have met such people and one of them is a warm, gracious lady who has touched the lives and won the hearts of untold thousands in my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

She is Miss Thelma Smith, a school teacher who is retiring after devoting 45 years of her life to teaching children, molding their future and, thereby, molding the future of their community. Recently Miss Smith was honored at a testimonial dinner and I was privileged to join with more than 200 of her friends, associates, and former students in paying tribute to this wonderful woman. As one of them observed that night: "Miss Smith is not a name to us, she is legend."

Indeed she is. The years she spent working with students went far beyond the confines of the classroom. She did more than just drum the "three R's" of education into the minds of young children. Her interest in students and their activities knew no bounds. In fact, during World War II, she assumed the duties of a head football coach and not only turned out winning teams but also developed two All-Americans.

This remarkable lady lived by a simple

motto which won for her the love, respect, and admiration of all who came in contact with her. "What you are is God's gift to you," she would say. "What you become is your gift to God."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD a newspaper account of the testimonial dinner, written by Eleanor Kratzer of the Daily News. It will acquaint my colleagues with a unique individual, one who practiced what she preached—Miss Thelma Smith, of Port Vue, Pa.

The article follows:

#### PORT VUE TEACHER HONORED AFTER 45 YEARS OF SERVICE

"What you are is God's gift to you. What you become is your gift to God."

That was the message inscribed on a small piece of paper which Miss Thelma Smith placed on the desk of one of her pupils, James Trovato, when he was a student in her class in the Romine Ave. school in Port Vue, now the Port Vue Elementary School.

Last night, Mr. Trovato served as the toastmaster at a testimonial banquet honoring Miss Smith in the ballroom of the Youghleny Country Club.

More than 200 residents of Port Vue and friends from other neighboring areas were there to pay tribute to the teacher who is retiring after 45 years of service in the Borough School. Their presence was evidence of their belief that Miss Smith had lived by those few words and has produced a handsome gift to God that is reflected in the love of her hundreds of pupils and associates through the years.

Opening the program, Mr. Trovato said, "We are honoring one of the finest people I know in the field of education. She was always ready to lend a helping hand and has reached out and touched everyone here in some way."

As the tributes were presented by associates, former students and community leaders, there was a warmth and sincerity in their words that could have stemmed only from a deep love and respect for the honoree.

Peter Gallo, the South Allegheny School Board president, described Miss Smith as a dedicated leader and added, "Miss Smith is not a name to us, she is a legend."

Vincent McKeeta, superintendent of the school district, explained his common bond with Miss Smith—"We are both ex-coaches. She gave the school in which she was head teacher a home environment and having her there made administrative tasks easier."

As president, Robert Erkel said that "the Borough Council wondered at first what the cold arm of Government could do to recognize and honor such a warm person." The answer was a resolution which he read, commending Miss Smith for her self-sacrifice, loyalty and devotion during 45 years of teaching the borough's children and for her successful efforts to mold future citizens of the community.

Congressman Joseph Gaydos extended greetings from Washington, D.C., noting that "she has earned the undying gratitude of the community and its leaders through her faithful service. She is an example of what a school teacher should be at a time when children spend more time with their teachers than with their parents. She is a quality teacher whom those just entering the profession might well emulate." He added that the event will have a place in the Congressional Record.

A friend of her high school days, Stella Keenan, recalled early experiences with Miss Smith.

Former Port Vue Mayor A. Jacobyansky recalled two all-American football players who were on teams Miss Smith coached. He reiterated figures cited by Mr. Erkel indicating that the Port Vue-Liberty rate is the

lowest in the County, stating "You don't prevent crime by arresting people but by training children. The record demonstrates that South Allegheny has done a better job of training than most school districts, largely through the services of fine dedicated teachers like Miss Smith."

Dannie Giger, Junior High School principal, recalled associations with Miss Smith and added "your retirement will be a great loss to the school district and an even greater loss to Port Vue for you have been outstanding in the classroom, in recreation and in the PSEA."

Two players on Miss Smith's teams, John Waskowich and George Bubanik remembered incidents during their experiences with the coach. A retired teacher, Mrs. Bess Van Fossion, spoke as a friend and for PSEA, suggesting that Miss Smith look upon retirement as graduation to another way of life.

James Blaha, vice president of South Allegheny School Board commented "I pass this way but once and I was fortunate enough to become acquainted with Miss Smith and privileged to have her as a teacher. In a class of 30, it was as though she had only one student when help was needed. She may retire from the classroom but she will never retire from the hearts of her students and the families in the community."

Mrs. Lois Alworth remembered the Meladeers, a group of junior high girls who asked Miss Smith to be their leader and advisor as they sponsored socials and other activities and went on trips to a cottage at Maple Grove.

Mrs. Charles Gibson, chairman of the planning committee, extended the welcome and introduced Mr. Trovato, noting that he has been an educator and is now director of a federally-funded agency in Allegheny County, PEP. The invocation was offered by the school nurse, Mrs. Carl J. Fritz.

Introduced as other committee members were Mrs. LeRoy Sutton who presented the gift to Miss Smith; Mrs. Lester Schneider and Mrs. Jacobyansky. All are members of the Port Vue Women's Club which took the initiative in planning the event, assisted by other groups in the community.

Borough and school personnel were introduced, along with Miss Smith's family and some of her athletes. Paula Mihalko and Bonnie Campbell presented the honoree with a book containing pictures of her students, today and yesteryear.

In her response, Miss Smith commended the teachers and personnel serving in her building and she accorded special recognition to Ethel Hoak Stanley who, she said, was most helpful as she embarked on her career as a teacher in Port Vue 45 years ago. She also expressed gratitude to those responsible for the banquet and to those who attended.

## IMPORTS UNDERMINE AMERICAN INDUSTRY

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, we have heard many reports and complaints recently concerning foreign imports and their impact on the economy of the United States.

In this connection Mr. Nat Goldfinger, research director of the AFL-CIO, provides an interesting insight into the impact of these imports on employment. In an article in the Washington Post Sunday, Mr. Goldfinger reports that:

The deterioration of the American position in international trade resulted in the

net loss of about 900,000 job opportunities from 1966 to 1971.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the article in the RECORD herewith.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 25, 1972]

### IMPORTS UNDERMINE AMERICAN INDUSTRY

(By Nat Goldfinger)

(NOTE.—Hobart Rowen, assistant managing editor for business and finance, is on vacation. The following article by Nat Goldfinger, research director of the AFL-CIO, is the last in a series of guest columns. Rowen will resume "Economic Impact" next Sunday.)

The American economy is in trouble at home and abroad. The deterioration of the American position in international trade resulted in the net loss of about 900,000 job opportunities from 1966 to 1971. The situation is worsening at present. The industrial base of the American economy is being undermined and narrowed.

Merchandise imports were \$2.9 billion greater than exports in 1971, according to the Commerce Department's official accounting—the first reported trade deficit since 1893. This deficit jumped to a yearly rate of \$6.5 billion in the January-March quarter of 1972. Many more jobs are being wiped out by the rising tide of imports than are involved in exports.

Between 1965 and 1970, there was a loss of 122,500 jobs in radio, TV and electronic component production, according to the industry association. Scores of thousands of additional jobs have been wiped out in a rapidly spreading number of industries. Communities throughout the country are adversely affected.

Estimates indicate that, last year, imports of autos were about 20 per cent of the U.S. market, TV receivers more than 30 per cent, radios and tape recorders more than 90 per cent, sewing machines and calculating machines nearly 60 per cent, cassettes 100 per cent and baseball mitts about 90 per cent. Similarly, large proportions of U.S. production of other industries are being displaced—typewriters and shirts, industrial equipment and knit goods, pianos and steel, tires and work clothes, shoes, textiles and glassware.

This process, which displaces U.S. production and employment, often results in very little, if any, price benefit to the consumer, who is also a wage or salary earner. Imports are sold at the American price or close to it. So the economy loses a growing part of its productive base, workers lose their jobs, while the benefits go to profits. Moreover, the recent devaluation of the American dollar—which was loudly advertised as the solution to these problems—has actually contributed to the continuing inflation that plagues the American people. And the U.S. position in the world economy continues to get worse.

This deterioration has been accelerating in the past decade. Imports of manufactured products more than quadrupled between 1960 and 1971—from \$6.9 billion to \$30.4 billion. In the January-March quarter of 1972, manufactured imports were up to a yearly rate of \$35.9 billion. Moreover, in 1960, such imports were only about half the level of manufactured exports; by the first quarter of this year, the United States imported a greater volume of manufactured goods than it exported. The major causes of this deterioration are the following:

In the world of the 1970s, nations manage their economies. Other countries have direct and indirect subsidies for their exports plus direct and indirect barriers to imports. The result is that foreign products surge into the huge American market, while U.S. exports are often blocked or their expansion is retarded.

The export of American technology has been reducing or eliminating America's technology and productivity leadership in many

industries and product lines. U.S. firms have transferred American technology and know-how to their foreign subsidiary plants. And there have been additional technology transfers through patent agreements and licensing arrangements of U.S. firms with foreign companies.

As a result, foreign plants, operating with American technology, probably are nearly as efficient as similar factories in the U.S. But employment costs frequently are 50 to 90 per cent lower, and there may be the additional advantages of lower taxes and operating in markets protected by foreign governments.

Sharply rising investments of U.S. companies in foreign subsidiaries have been key factors in the export of American technology and the loss of American jobs. Direct investments of U.S. firms in foreign facilities shot up from \$3.8 billion in 1960 to about \$15 billion in 1971. The book value of such investments in foreign facilities rose from almost \$32 billion in 1960 to more than \$78 billion in 1971.

Although an estimated 25,000 foreign affiliates are controlled by about 3,500 U.S. corporations, the bulk of these foreign operations is highly concentrated among the corporate giants. Prof. Peggy Musgrave of Northeastern University reports that in 1966, "Over 80 per cent of taxable income which U.S. corporations received from foreign sources . . . went to 430 corporations with assets size in excess of \$250 million."

The Chase Manhattan Bank's newsletter reported last year that "foreign sales of U.S. affiliates in manufacturing alone totalled almost \$60 billion in 1968 and are estimated at between \$70 and \$75 billion in 1970." That is more than twice the volume of exports of manufactured goods from the U.S.

The mushrooming growth of multinational corporations, most of them U.S.-based, is a new factor in the accelerating deterioration of the American position in the world economy.

A U.S.-based multinational corporation can produce components in widely separated plants in Korea, Taiwan and the U.S., assemble the product in Mexico and sell the item in the U.S. at American prices, possibly with an American-brand name. Or the item is produced and sold in foreign markets, in competition with U.S.-made products.

U.S. Rep. James Burke and Sen. Vance Hartke have introduced the Foreign Trade and Investment Act of 1972, which is aimed specifically at dealing with these basic causes of America's deteriorating position in the world economy.

The bill, for example, would remove the tax subsidies and other incentives that encourage U.S. companies to establish foreign subsidiary operations. It would provide government regulation of the export of American technology and capital. It would also set up a "sliding door" limitation on most imports, related to the level of American production—annual import quotas, based on the number of items imported into the U.S. in 1965-1969, as a percentage of U.S. output. In that way, imports would be permitted to increase as U.S. production rises.

The Burke-Hartke bill's restraints on imports and on the outflows of technology and capital are tailored to meet America's needs in a world of managed national economies and multinational corporations. The bill represents a practical way of dealing with a serious economic and social problem.

### WHAT THE FLAG MEANS TO ME

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Arlington-Fairfax Lodge No.



2188 of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of which I am a member, recently conducted an essay contest on the subject "What the Flag Means to Me." The contest was under the direction of Donald G. Kennedy, esteemed leading knight, and over 500 seventh and eighth grade pupils in the two counties participated.

The judges were Herman C. Anderson, past president of the Virginia State Elks Association and two of our past exalted rulers, Lester S. Blaylock and Kenneth M. Webber. They were greatly impressed by the high quality of the essays submitted and found that the task of choosing the winners was both time consuming and highly rewarding.

U.S. savings bonds were presented by Douglas Hedrick, exalted ruler, to the two winning contestants, Guy Ferguson, of Annandale, and Traci L. Kuntzelman, of Arlington. Honorable mention awards were made to David Alexander, of Springfield, and Susan Weinburg, of Arlington.

I feel that the Members will be interested in reading the essays of the two winners. The sentiments expressed reflect credit on them as well as on their parents and teachers:

WHAT THE AMERICAN FLAG MEANS TO ME  
(By Guy Ferguson)

The American Flag means to me the symbol of a proud people and its Nation. It stands for freedom, truth, honor and prestige; but most of all it symbolizes faith for the faithful, hope for the hopeful and truth for the truthful. Americans should stand up for their flag and what it stands for, because if Americans did not stand up for their flag, then there would be no America.

WHAT THE AMERICAN FLAG MEANS TO ME  
(By Traci Lee Kuntzelman)

"Liberty and justice for all."  
These words, very familiar to all Americans are in a sense exactly what "Old Glory" stands for. Along with these words, others should be added. Words, like freedom, power, peace, glory, honesty, integrity, help, compassion and most of all hope. Hope not only for American citizens, but hope for all mankind. The hope that peace, love and freedom will reign over the world.

#### ATLANTIC UNION ENDORSED

**HON. PAUL FINDLEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues in the House an excellent editorial in the Cincinnati Enquirer endorsing the Atlantic Union resolution, House Joint Resolution 900. The Enquirer wisely points out that the resolution deserves the consideration of the Congress before adjournment. The editorial stresses the fact that this resolution, when introduced in the Senate on March 17, 1972, was sponsored by nine of the 16 members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, including Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, as well as HUGH SCOTT.

Sponsorship of the resolution has grown every year and the Enquirer concludes that this year "the resolution may

well get the active floor consideration it deserves." I certainly hope that will be the case. In this body it has been approved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs and will soon be before the Rules Committee.

Text of editorial follows:

#### TOWARD ATLANTIC UNITY

From the time Congress began considering the Atlantic Union resolution in 1949 (when its prime sponsor was Tennessee's Sen. Estes Kefauver), its sponsorship has grown year by year both in size and influence. Hence, when it was presented to the Senate for consideration March 17, its sponsors included not only the Senate's two party leaders, Hugh Scott (R-Pa.) and Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.), but also nine of the 16 members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. That circumstance, combined with the fact that the resolution was approved, 22-9, by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, suggests that the resolution may well get the active floor consideration it deserves.

The resolution's goal is to create a delegation of 18 eminent Americans to organize and participate in a convention of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) members to "explore the possibility" of agreement on:

A declaration that their common goal is the transformation of the NATO alliance into a more effective unity based on federal principles.

A timetable for the transition by stages to this goal.

A commission to facilitate advancement toward such stages.

Any plan upon which such a NATO conference would agree would, of course, be subject to the approval in accordance with the constitutionally prescribed procedures in each of the signatory nations.

The Atlantic Union resolution had its origins several years before the beginning of World War II. Clarence K. Streit, a League of Nations correspondent for the New York Times, was gravely disturbed by the manner in which the Western allies were dissipating their vastly superior military and economic power in the face of the Axis threat. He proposed, as a remedy, the application of the same principles that underlay the establishment of the United States as a federal union in 1789.

The threats that beset the free world have changed considerably since Mr. Streit's book "Union Now" appeared. Yet the considerations it enunciated are as compelling today as they were in the 1930s.

The Atlantic Union resolution deserves the thorough-going debate its sponsors seek.

#### NATURE AS A POLLUTER

**HON. FRED SCHWENGEL**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the current public concern over pollution is encouraging. What a pity it is that it had to come this late, when the problems have become almost overwhelming. We all owe a debt of gratitude to the concerned individuals who were farsighted and concerned enough to alert us to the spoiling of our environment while there was still a chance to save it.

The public's awareness and knowledge of pollution problems is still pitifully inadequate. Many groups are calling for the enactment and enforcement of laws to curb pollution, but they are aware

of only the most obvious sources of pollution. Sewers and industries discharge their wastes into our air and water, causing what is called point-source pollution. Point-source pollution is easily recognizable, and we are taking steps to clean up this problem.

Few people realize, however, how little good these steps will really do. Legislation aimed at point-source pollution is capable of handling only 7 percent of the total problem. Nonpoint source pollution causes an estimated 700 times as much sheer pollution as all the sewers in our country. Erosion is at the root of the total problem. This is the means by which our streams are being clogged with chemicals, wastes, and the silt which was once valuable topsoil.

Erosion is a natural process. Nature herself, by sending spring floods, wind, and summer rains, is slowly eating away our valuable, fertile farmland and depositing it where it is at best worthless and at worst a lamentable pollutant of our once sparkling lakes and streams.

Many people in the legislature today are anxious to solve the problem of erosion, and are eager to point fingers, looking for someone to blame. The easy thing to do is to blame the farmer. However, as with so many quick and easy answers, blaming the farmer is not only wrong, but is blinding us to the real nature of the problem.

These disturbing problems behoove us to take a positive approach—one that may not be easy, but that is thoughtful and which comes from understanding rather than belligerence.

Streams that drain our lands have always carried sizable quantities of sediment. These sediments are derived from erosion in upland areas, and from cyclic erosion in gullies and drainage channels. Special erosion problems flare up, especially in the spring, when heavy rains cause landslides, flood scour, and sheet erosion. These types of erosion can cause catastrophic damage and are nearly impossible for local landowners to prevent. These erosion problems, while occurring at irregular intervals, can cause lasting damage and deterioration of the environment. Sediment released can cause permanent damage to the shape of stream channels, and organic sediment—not necessarily soil derived—often does more harm to aquatic environments than inorganic sediment.

The bill I have introduced, H.R. 15596, will clear up the administrative logjams that in past years have stymied local landowners and Department of Agriculture officials in their efforts to build sound watershed programs. Lack of coordination has resulted in wasted funds and the abandonment of many well-planned programs. My bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make binding agreements for up to 10 years with people in all levels of the program, from local landowners to Federal officials. These agreements will include specific requirements to insure that needed steps are taken to make the programs work, from beginning to end. I sincerely hope that this bill will receive immediate and serious consideration by everyone who is anxious to save our imperiled environment.

GORDON CANFIELD

**HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, in Paterson, N.J., it would seem that the heavens had opened as a tropical storm swept across that area. However, when it would seem no person would or could be out under such conditions, Mrs. Widnall and I joined a large number of the citizenry of that area as they paid their last respects to one loved and respected by all. Highly elected officials and citizens who had been served by Gordon Canfield were present to say a final thanks for the many, many things he did for one and all.

The Paterson News editorial of June 21 so eloquently expresses the deep feelings of all toward our former colleague and why so many were in attendance at his final rites.

The editorial follows:

[From the Paterson (N.J.) News,  
June 21, 1972]

GORDON CANFIELD

Inherently warm and friendly, Gordon Canfield did not by accident set a record for years of service in his congressional district. Even his loyalty and steadfastness as a Republican could not wean from him an almost incredible devotion of thousands of Democrats who crossed party lines to support him and re-elect him term after term.

Gordon Canfield stood high in the councils of federal government. His work for the party could have won him the title Mr. Republican but as representative of the Eighth District in Congress, in his civic endeavors and his friendships he was oblivious to party lines.

He probably had performed personal services for more people in Passaic County than any other man before or since. Consequently he was supported by Democrats and Republicans alike to such an extent that he inevitably ran far ahead of his ticket. He got votes for his running mates, and one year he was the only Republican to survive a Democratic landslide.

Gordon Canfield loved his work, he was happiest moving among his constituents and even out of Congress. After 10 terms and 20 years as congressman and years before that as secretary to Rep. George N. Seger, he was in the forefront in civic endeavor despite failing health.

Over the years honors were heaped upon him at home and in Washington and he was "Gordon" to presidents, national leaders and hundreds of Representatives and Senators.

It was an experience to walk down a Paterson street with him because every step seemed to be marked with a Canfield wave and hello. All this may have taxed a person of less patience but to him it was love of his fellows.

His voice was heard and his influence felt in civil rights, national defense, the missile program, narcotic control, NATO, health and welfare and he had the honorary title of Father of the Coast Guard.

In one campaign he was called critically "the man who only did little things for little people." This boomeranged and won him added loyalty from the thousands for whom Canfield went to bat in Washington bureaucracy. He cut through miles of red tape for constituents with problems.

The News family and a wide multitude share the sorrow of his loyal wife and helpmate, Dorothy, his sons, Carl and Allan, and the rest of his devoted family.

His death Tuesday at his home in Hawthorne marks the end of a distinguished career but his memory will be fresh for many years.

**GOP—THE REAL PARTY OF CHANGE****HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. David Broder, in the following article in the Washington Post of June 13, 1972, takes a look at the scorecard of major legislation passed by Congress this session and comes up with some embarrassing questions for the Congress. This analysis, by the national political reporter of the Post, a newspaper with few, if any, pro-administration leanings, underscores the problems facing Mr. Nixon's opponents in the coming election campaign.

The article follows:

A FALLOW CONGRESS

(By David S. Broder)

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

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

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

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

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

But that about exhausts the lists of significant legislation passed this year. It's a meager catalogue, compared to the needs of the country or the promises Democratic presidential contenders have been making on behalf of their party.

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

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

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

Yet in all these years, the Democrats will go into convention, less than a month from now, with a record of congressional inaction.

To date, the Democratic Congress has neither given the President a final up-or-down vote on his own proposals in these four vital areas nor developed and passed alternative programs of its own.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**STRICTER GUN CONTROL LAWS  
NEEDED****HON. LESTER L. WOLFF**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues in this body are aware, I have taken the floor on many occasions to urge the enactment of stricter gun control laws. It seems clear to me that we could significantly reduce violent crimes if we made it more difficult to obtain guns.

A recent editorial broadcast on radio station WOR in New York City expresses the need for stronger laws and I include it at this point in the Record so that my colleagues may be aware of this viewpoint.

The editorial follows:

EDITORIAL

Speaking for WOR AM, Station Vice President and General Manager, Robert S. Smith. America needs tough gun control legislation.

It is needed to protect men like John Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Robert Kennedy, and George Wallace. It is needed to protect the 21,000 Americans killed by guns every year.



A United States Senate subcommittee recently voted to bar the sale of snub-nosed pistols, pistols like the one that seriously wounded Alabama Governor Wallace last week. The bill is already running into opposition from the powerful gun lobby. That lobby must not again win the fight against tough gun control laws.

Every American owes it to the families of those 21,000 Americans killed by guns every year to fight for tough gun controls. Every American should fight for the passage of the subcommittee bill banning the sale of hand guns. Every American should fight for laws banning the sale of parts used to make home-made guns, the so-called "Saturday night specials." Every American should fight for laws requiring the registration of the 25-million owners of hand-guns in this country.

Tough gun control legislation is urgently needed. Tell your Congressman, Senators, and the President to ignore the special-interest gun lobby. Tell them tough gun control legislation is needed now.

#### FEDERAL STUDENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

**HON. MARVIN L. ESCH**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the following remarks for the benefit of the many high school seniors in my district who have recently graduated and are faced with a number of important decisions.

There are a number of Federal student assistance programs which will provide loans or grants for students to acquire a college education. These are administered through each individual school and interested students should contact the admissions director of the school which they plan to attend.

The Congress last week approved major legislation which would expand the financing available to every student to a maximum of \$1,400. The goal of this legislation is to insure that no deserving student who is interested in furthering his education will be denied further schooling for lack of funds. The President has not yet signed this bill into law, but is expected to do so in the near future. While the funds will not be available during the fall semester, it seems likely that they will be available next spring. This program will also be administered through the individual school and one should consult the admission authorities.

Opportunities are not limited to those who want to complete 4 years of academic training. The scientific and technological revolution is creating career opportunities in hundreds of different fields. It is estimated that there will be more than 1 million new job opportunities in technical fields by 1975.

Training for these technical positions generally do not take a college education—and may be completed in 1 to 2 years. Three kinds of schools have programs for technicians.

#### HOW TO BECOME A TECHNICIAN

You can qualify for some technical positions with just 1 year of study after high school. Most take 2 years. Some require a degree that is called an AAS—associate in applied science.

Three kinds of schools have programs for technicians.

First. Technical institutes. These give intensive courses concentrating almost entirely on what you will need to know in your career. Since technicians must understand why things work as well as how they work, technical institutes give some courses on scientific theory and mathematics. But these are held to a minimum.

Second. Junior and community colleges offer programs similar to a technical institute's, but with more emphasis on theory—and also some courses in liberal arts. If you decide to continue your education and get a 4-year degree, you can often transfer credits you earn to most 4-year colleges, but for technical institutes, as well.

Third. Area vocational—technical schools. The subjects they teach are geared to work available in the area where the school is located. Area school's have 1-year as well as 2-year programs. They also offer some courses on the high school level and some adult education courses. Admission requirements are liberal.

All three types of schools are primarily for high school graduates. If you are not a graduate, do not worry. Most of these schools can help you arrange to complete your high school education. Special work in high school science and mathematics also helps. If you are still in school, check with your counselor.

#### HOW TO FIND OUT ABOUT TECHNICAL SCHOOLS NEAR YOU

There are four places you can write for nationwide directories of accredited schools that offer technical education. These directories cover most or all of the fields described in this booklet:

Engineers' Council for Professional Development Guidance, 345 East 47th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

National Association of Trade and Technical Schools, 1601 18th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

Accrediting Commission for Business Schools, United Business Schools Association, 1730 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Occupational Education Project, American Association of Junior Colleges, One DuPont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

You can also study to be a technician at home. For a list of accredited home-study schools, write:

National Home-Study Council, 1601 18th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

For information on State or community schools, and ratings of the schools in your area, see your high school counselor. Since he knows your abilities and interests, he can also help you pick the field to specialize in.

The local office of your State Employment Service keeps up on the technical schools near your home. They can help you pick your special field through vocational testing.

There may be community organizations with youth-counseling services, as well.

If you want more detailed information about any of the following areas of specialization, here is where to write:

Library and Information Science: Library Education Division, American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

Chemical: American Chemical Society, 1155 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Health Service: National Health Council, Health Careers Program, 1740 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10019.

Electronic Data Processing: American Federation of Information, Processing Societies, 201 Summit Avenue, Montvale, N.J. 07645.

#### LIGHT THE FIRST CANDLE

**HON. H. R. GROSS**

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a Washington newsletter entitled "Post-Age," whose editor is Arthur M. Brandel, has written a brief review of the first year of operations of the U.S. Postal Service.

It is a succinct, well-written piece and I offer it for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

#### LIGHT THE FIRST CANDLE

It hardly seems possible that it is only a year! July 1 is the official anniversary of the establishment of the United States Postal Service.

Despite the talk of continuity, the Service already is working on its second Postmaster General, E. T. (Ted) Klassen. He is under enormous pressure and it is hard to say how long he will be willing to continue. Now 63, he already had retired once from business when he left the presidency of American Can.

The first PMG, Winton M. "Red" Blount, who engineered the removal of the Postal Service from the wing of Congress, now is busily trying to get into Congress himself as the Republican candidate for the Senate from Alabama.

It is proper to take stock of that one year. Rates have risen. That was inevitable. It was a pretty good ride for many, many years. In some respects, USPS resembles many cities. The modern buildings emerge, giving a veneer, to the appearance of improvement to the community. Yet as one moves about, one finds the slums remain, deteriorating further, the municipal services are no better, the apathy is just as obvious. One comes away with the realization: it really is a growing slum rather than a vital city.

While postal executives strive valiantly to turn things around, morale is low, improvements in working conditions are slow and the lack of esprit de corps is all too evident from the man who delivers your mail to the postmaster in charge of your local post office.

By Klassen's own testimony 80% to 85% of USPS costs are labor-related. The issue of employee relations is integral. Union recognition was one of the first actions undertaken by the new Service. However, union leadership really is untested. For years the leaders were lobbyists, not union leaders as in private enterprise.

Under the old system, pay boosts and working conditions were problems solved by Congress. Workers and their union leaders were beholden to Congress. They contributed to campaign funds. There was a political atmosphere that permeated the Post Office throughout the nation.

Then came postal reform. Labor officials had new responsibilities. They were put into the position of leading rather than lobbying. Limitations still remain, however. The right to strike is denied, but that may be changed in the next few years as the mounting demands reach Congress.

It is ironic that two years ago the publishing industry was gung ho for postal reform. The idea that a corporation would be created which would get the post office into a business-like atmosphere was exciting. They may

have visualized the carpets and soft lighting of the executive suite. They did not foresee the problems of making ends meet. They are finding that the creature they helped create is too much.

It will be a test of the caliber of the organization and the men who are directing it, to determine if USPS can withstand the pressure.

Perhaps beyond all matters affecting mail users—the issue of rates, service, etc.—is the basic approach of postal executives to their responsibilities. To what extent it is true in other parts of the country, it is still too early to tell but it is true in Washington that the attitude of the new executives is virtually identical with that of all big business: We tell you what we think you should know.

To many in Washington, this is awkward. USPS is not a private corporation. One official described it as an independent executive agency.

Where are we after a year? Fact is, most of the new men with their business background have had little previous experience with the Washington syndrome. They may have broad experience in manufacturing, marketing, finance, labor relations, etc., but Washington is a different world.

It is quite difficult for sophisticated and accomplished businessmen to understand that members of Congress, for instance, are just as successful in their chosen careers, as the most successful head of a major conglomerate. The ability to be reelected for ten or twelve years is a tough way to make a living, but it spells success by any standards. It signifies power. That is something that newcomers must learn to respect.

It is a tough league these businessmen have entered. Indeed, they are no longer businessmen. They are public servants. They are creatures of a new bureaucracy permeated by an old.

The USPS has a long way to go—if indeed it can get there. While everyone is pulling for the success of this experiment in postal service, the question is: Will there be time?

#### SUMMARY OF NEED FOR TRIDENT (ULMS) SUBMARINES

**HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am in total agreement with the Committee on Armed Services relative to an immediate substantial start on the Trident program. Because of my strong feelings in this matter, I believe it important to summarize in some specific detail the basis for my views:

#### SUMMARY

The Trident (formerly ULMS) program is not a crash program. It is an urgent, but orderly program for replacing our aging Polaris submarines with new submarines having greatly improved capabilities.

By the time the first Trident submarine can be delivered in the late 1970's the first Polaris submarines will be nearly 20 years old, and with no potential for significant improvement. These submarines have been operated hard, with two crews, to allow them to be on station a high fraction of the time. They were built to specifications based on a 20 year life and their machinery is wearing out. It is unreasonable to expect them all to operate more than about 20 years without having some major breakdowns.

The Trident submarines will be quieter and incorporate the latest technology to improve their survivability. These improvements can only be incorporated in new design sub-

marines; they cannot be backfitted in Polaris submarines.

Our Polaris/Poseidon submarines are limited in their patrol area by the range of their missiles. This forces them to operate in close range to foreign shores, thus bringing them within range of Soviet shore based aircraft. This limited patrol area simplifies the Soviet antisubmarine problem by allowing them to concentrate their sea and air forces in a much smaller area. The Soviets have been investing heavily in antisubmarine warfare research and development, and have built and continue to build improved nuclear attack submarines—one of their best ASW weapons. They have invested large resources in ASW surface ships. Also, indications are the Soviets are attempting to establish an area antisubmarine surveillance system presumably aimed at locating our Polaris/Poseidon submarines.

The first generation Trident missile will have a range of almost twice the range of the 2500 mile Poseidon missile. This initial Trident missile can be backfitted in the 31 Poseidon submarines and will provide a several fold increase in ocean operating area available to our ballistic missile submarines compared to the shorter range Poseidon missile.

The Trident submarines will have missile tubes which will provide growth potential for even longer range missiles. With this longer range missile, which will fit only in the Trident submarines, the ocean operating area available to our Trident submarines will again be increased several fold over the areas of the first generation Trident missile.

The Trident missiles will permit basing our ballistic missile submarines in U.S. ports. This will eliminate dependence on foreign basing.

The Soviets are continuing to expand rapidly their own ballistic missile submarine program. They now have in operation about 30 nuclear and diesel ballistic missile submarines of older classes and 25 of the new Yankee Class which can fire a 1300 mile range missile. In the past year they started work on their 42nd Yankee submarine, and they are now substantially expanding their submarine building facilities. They already have the largest and most modern submarine building yards in the world which gives them several times the nuclear submarine construction capacity possessed by the United States.

The Soviets have tested a missile with a range at least twice that of the present 1300 mile missile. This new missile will give their submarines the capability to strike us from points only a few days from Soviet bases. In a sense, the Soviets are already building their equivalent to our Trident missile. These developments increase the threat to our land-based strategic forces and increase the reliance we must place on our sea-based strategic deterrent.

The Soviets have a more modern ballistic missile fleet than we do. They are building more missile launching submarines today, whereas we funded our last Polaris construction in FY 1964, and finished it in 1967.

The Interim Agreement on Strategic Offensive Arms signed in Moscow on May 26, 1972 allows the Soviets to continue building ballistic missile submarines up to a total of 950 ballistic missile launchers on submarines and up to a total of 950 ballistic missile launchers on submarines and up to 62 modern ballistic missile submarines. This will allow the Soviets to continue building ballistic missile submarines at a rate of about 7 per year during the 5 year term of the interim agreement. Even under the President's recommended FY 1973 budget for the Trident program the first Trident submarine will not become operational during the 5 year term of the Interim Agreement. Therefore, it is essential that the United States proceed now with Trident submarines as proposed by the President.

Modern complex defense systems take

many years to design, develop, and produce. Trident has already been in the research and development stages for three years. The system has been carefully evaluated during this period and the Navy is now ready to move into detailed design and construction of the submarine.

In developing a new missile the long lead time is in research and development with a relatively short production span of 1½ to 2 years required to build the missiles themselves. In contrast, the production span time on nuclear components is up to 5 years under the most favorable conditions. The Navy and Atomic Energy Commission have already done the propulsion plant development work necessary to define what is needed to order the long lead nuclear propulsion plant components. Delivery of the nuclear propulsion machinery will control the construction schedules for the Trident submarines. It is therefore necessary to start production of this machinery while the missile work is still in the research and development stage.

For this reason, there is \$361 million of Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy (SCN) funds in the FY 1973 budget request to start work on the first four submarines. Of this amount, \$194 million is for ship design, long lead nuclear propulsion components, and hull steel procurement for the lead ship. The remainder, \$167 million is for long lead components for three additional ships.

It will be impossible to build the lead and follow ships on the shortened schedule proposed by the Administration if the Navy does not get the long lead machinery on order. In other words, by ordering this long lead machinery in FY 1973 the option will be kept open to authorize the lead Trident submarine in FY 1974 and follow submarines in FY 1975. However, going ahead with the procurement of the long lead nuclear propulsion machinery for the ships in FY 1973 does not commit Congress to any specific submarine building schedules. The construction schedules for these ships can be settled later, based on events as they occur.

If the nuclear machinery were delayed by lack of long lead funding, the submarines themselves would be delayed; the propulsion machinery costs would increase, and the delay in the submarine schedules would cause the total cost of the submarines to escalate. Further it is important to have a sizeable buy of Trident nuclear propulsion plant components in FY 1973 in order to get the best manufacturers to make commitments to set up production lines for this machinery and to benefit from the economics of a sizeable procurement.

The Navy estimates that if the long lead component funds of \$167 million for the follow Trident submarines were deferred from FY 1973 to FY 1974 these submarines would be delayed a year. Their cost would also increase by \$90 million, due mainly to inflation and to disruption of an orderly program resulting from the delay in ordering machinery. There would also be an increase of \$10 million in the cost of the lead ship due to loss of the economies of the planned larger procurement. If the \$194 million advance procurement funds for the lead ship were also deferred to FY 1974, the lead ship would be delayed a year and its cost would increase further.

Because of the importance of this submarine program, it's prudent to build a land prototype of the nuclear plant so that a facility will be available for demonstrating the reactor technology without involving an operational submarine. Admiral Rickover has used this approach successfully in the development of many nuclear propulsion plants over the past quarter century starting with the Nautilus. It is a main reason why the United States has not had major technical difficulties, the ships have operated safely, and the cost overruns have been minimal. \$56 million is included in the FY 1973 Atomic Energy Commission budget to get started on the land prototype. The Other Procure-



ment, Navy (OPN) budget request includes \$23.5 million in FY 1973 for engine room equipment so this prototype can be used for Navy crew training.

**COL. L. THAXTON HANSON  
HONORED**

**HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, recently, in Los Angeles, a group of people decided to honor a man who has shown, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that there is honor and fulfillment in serving our country.

Col. L. Thaxton Hanson, the man they honored, retired from the Army earlier this month. His career has proven what one man can do, if he has the incentive and foresight.

He was commissioned June 18, 1942, as a second lieutenant of cavalry. In July of the same year he joined the 6th Cavalry Group—mechanized—trained with that unit and when the 6th Cavalry was deployed later on to the European Theater of Operations, it became part of Gen. George S. Patton's glorious 3d Army. The unit participated in five different campaigns and was awarded the coveted Presidential Citation, with Captain Hanson in command of Troop C, 6th Cavalry Reconnaissance Squadron. After cessation of hostilities, in January 1946, he was assigned as Assistant Professor of Military Science and Tactics at the University of Illinois, ROTC, Urbana, Ill.

After release from active duty, Major Hanson continued to serve his country as a Reserve officer, joined the 21st Armored Division, USAR and subsequently accepted a mobilization designation assignment with the G3 Office, Chief of Army Field Forces, Fort Monroe, Va. In that capacity, he was recalled to active duty during the Korean conflict in May 1951. After his release from active duty, he moved to California in October 1952. He remained active in the Army Reserve and went on various short tours of duty at Headquarters, 6th U.S. Army, Presidio of San Francisco. From 1955 on he was associated with U.S. Army Reserve School, both, as a student and instructor, first in Santa Monica and later on at Fort MacArthur. During that time he was promoted to lieutenant colonel in 1960 and to colonel in June 1967. He was instrumental in planning for and putting into effect the National Security Management Course under the auspices of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C. Since summer 1971, he was assigned as Director of Higher Education with the 6220th USAR School, Fort MacArthur, Calif.

His awards and decorations include the Bronze Star with Oakleaf Cluster, the Meritorious Service Medal, the Purple Heart, the American Theater Medal, the European Theater Medal, the World War II Victory Medal, the Army of Occupation Medal, the National Defense Medal and the Reserve Forces Medal.

He is a member of the Reserve Officers

Association, the Association of the U.S. Army, where Colonel Hanson is presently serving as the first vice president of the Greater Los Angeles chapter after spearheading the annual Army ball as its general chairman during 2 consecutive years. He is also a member of the U.S. Armor Association, the American Legion and the Military Order of the World Wars. Colonel Hanson represents the very best of what is "American" and I salute him.

**PRISON FARE—AN EVALUATION**

**HON. HERMAN BADILLO**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, while the whole Nation was shocked at the tragic loss of life at Attica last fall I, as a member of the observers' committee, found particularly disturbing the fact that the list of requests drawn up by the prisoners dealt with basic rights guaranteed by the constitution but unquestionably denied to inmates of our so-called correctional institutions.

High on most prisoners' grievance list is prison food. Inmates of our prisons are served meals that are all but inedible, and are served them under unsanitary and demeaning conditions. Many explanations are usually advanced for this state of affairs, including financial restrictions, the size of the population to be served, and so forth. None of these explanations, however, can really stand up. At the heart of the difficulty is, in my opinion, a reluctance of our society to respect the human rights of individuals whom it considers "criminals."

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a very perceptive article that appeared in the June 21 issue of the New York Times. The article examines the quality of meals served at three prisons, the Brooklyn House of Detention for Men, the State Correctional Facility at Attica, and the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn.

Conditions at Danbury bear out the fact that our prisons do not have to remain the degrading and hopeless "storehouses" that they are now. For the benefit of my colleagues, I insert here the text of the Times article:

**A FOOD CRITIC APPRAISES MEALS AT THREE PRISONS**

Prison food has always had a bad name. Countless crime movies have shown striped inmates banging metal cups and refusing to eat the swill served up by hostile and incompetent kitchen staffs. But the bloody riot at Attica last fall focused public attention on real food in a real prison. Forty-three men died as a result of that insurrection—and food was a major inmate grievance.

To assess just how bad—or good—prison fare actually is, Raymond A. Sokolov, the food editor of The New York Times, ate the main meal of the day at three prisons: the Brooklyn House of Detention for Men, the State Correctional Facility at Attica, and the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn. He also observed the prison kitchens at work, interviewed the chefs and wardens, and talked to inmates over lunch and dinner.

Despite the fact that all three prisons have the same effective food budgets of \$1 a day a man, the results on an inmate's tray ranged from inedible to remarkably good. What follows is Mr. Sokolov's detailed report on these meals behind bars.

**RECIPE FOR APATHY AT BROOKLYN'S JAIL**

Touring the third floor cooking area at the Brooklyn House, as it is known, one is surrounded by broken and falling machinery. Ovens no longer produce even heat after almost two decades of constant use. The coffee urns have been out of commission for two years, so coffee is brewed in a steam kettle. Doors have fallen off nearly half the steam compartments.

"It would cost us \$250,000 to refurbish this kitchen," said Gus W. Levy, director of food services for the city's Department of Correction. "Requests are submitted constantly."

Staffing the kitchen is also a problem. There is a high turnover of civilian chefs, most of whom have retired from cooking careers elsewhere. These men direct a crew of 40 sentenced inmates who are rarely available for more than a few months and seem to learn little about food preparation and to care less.

"I just cook to get through my time," one of them said during a cigarette break.

On the other hand, the lessons to be learned in the Brooklyn House's kitchen at a pay rate of 20 cents an hour probably have little application to cooking elsewhere. Methods are primitive, to say the least.

For a mutton stew with tomatoes, turnips, onions, carrots, dry peas, potatoes and seasoning, the inmate cooks learn how to pour six-pound nine-ounce cans of vegetables into steam kettles. Spilled vegetables on the floor showed that this technique had not been mastered by some of the men. Others strained a mixture of water and uncooked flour into the stew to thicken the sauce.

In another part of the kitchen, a sheet of corn bread came out of an oven scorched over most of its length. And then it was 4:30 P.M., time to load up the electrically heated rolling carts and send them up to the cellblocks.

The carts are new and were purchased in answer to criticism by inmates that food was cold by the time it got to them. In theory, the carts are plugged into a socket in the serving area on each floor after a brief elevator ride from the kitchen. This did not happen during the meal witnessed on the fourth floor of the Brooklyn House earlier this month. The carts came to rest in a former dormitory area that still had a toilet in the corner. A tray covered the top of the toilet.

**SPOONING A MEAL**

Other trays were loaded by sentenced prisoners and carried to the detained prisoners (those awaiting trial) in their cells and dormitories. Each metal tray had several recessed compartments that were filled with four slices of floppy white bread from the Rikers Island bakery, an ample portion of mutton stew, one square of corn bread, beet and onion salad and metal mugs of cocoa.

In one eight-man dormitory that also had an open toilet in full view, food did arrive reasonably hot, but the inmates did little more than pick at their food with soup spoons sitting up on their cots.

The department does not permit knives and forks for security reasons. Everything has to be eaten with spoons, which are collected and counted after the meal.

Lack of cutlery, however, was not what made eating the mutton stew difficult for the men in the fourth-floor dormitory. The stew had very little meat in it, stringy gray meat at that, and the taste of glutinous, floury gravy and undercooked carrots predominated.

Since all the men in that room were enduring a seven-day methadone detoxification program, their appetites may have been

adversely affected by drugs in their systems. The cocoa had been heavily sweetened to entice them, as addicts crave sugar. In any case, they were unanimous in objecting to the meal.

#### "I FORCE MYSELF"

"On the outside, I eat well," said William Treadwell, 23 years old, who complained that prison authorities were giving him drastically less methadone than he had been permitted in a street maintenance program. "My mother fixes me steak or chicken every day. Here I have to force myself to eat so I won't starve. This stuff doesn't suit my appetite."

Actually, the Department of Correction has moved more vigorously than either state or Federal agencies toward accommodating the menu preferences of black and other minority inmates. Because of pressure from Black Muslims, who cannot eat pork for religious reasons, only 10 out of 90 meals now include pork or pork products. A year ago almost half the meals in city prisons had some pork in them.

Several menus, moreover, offer dishes especially aimed at the black or Southern palate—collard greens, jam-balaya and tuna Creole. And last Yom Kippur Eve, the agency authorized a special meal for Jewish inmates that centered around chicken barley soup and roast chicken. The Board of Rabbis also provided bottled gefilte fish on that occasion.

These concessions do little, however, to upgrade the basic kitchen operation. That would take capital improvements and a more stable staff; in other words, an appropriation of public funds.

As Brooklyn's warden in command, James S. Monroe, put it: "If you have any criticisms, remember this is your prison."

#### AT ATTICA, THE BREAD IS A SAVING GRACE

"I don't expect these men to be happy," said William Dickinson, head of programming at the State Correctional Facility at Attica. "Even if you had gourmet meals in here, they wouldn't like them. Any time you curtail a man's freedom, it's that way."

Mr. Dickinson, natty in pink shirt with white collar, was eating his first meal in Attica's mess halls and may know a "gourmet" meal when he sees one. But prisoners on all sides of him went to the heart of the matter. The baked beans had not been cooked long enough. They were starchy and raw and tough.

Several of the convicts in that maximum security prison chorused their displeasure, in spite of the guards with clubs standing over them and the man in the sealed metal booth ready to blanket the vast, cloistered mess hall in tear gas at the first sign of a disturbance.

One of the major grievances in the Attica riot was the prevalence of pork in the prison diet. Pork is still the major grievance inside the stark gray walls of this community of felons east of Buffalo.

Although pork now appears on official menus only twice a month and the Attica swineherd is being phased out, Black Muslims in the North Mess Hall refused to eat the frankfurters and everything else except gingerbread served to them at a recent main meal. They insist that the prison is passing off ground meat and frankfurters with pork in them as all-beef products.

#### CHARGES DENIED

"The only way I'd eat food they'd mixed up is if a Muslim cooked it, and I knew he cooked it," said Sanford X, of Niagara Falls, who sat motionless throughout the noon meal. He is serving a sentence for grand larceny.

Back in the Attica kitchen, Angelo Cicotti, the food manager, denied the Muslims' charges, and had food order forms to prove it.

"I think it's taken something away from our cooking," Mr. Cicotti said, as guards' clubs rapped sharply on the tile walls of the kitchen announcing that cooking must stop

for a head count. "Wouldn't you use ham in pea soup? We're doing this for a minority, not more than 125."

The pork ban, however, is the state's sole nod toward any special food preference among inmates. Though the prison population at Attica now numbers 576 blacks out of 1,210 inmates (the total is almost half what it was at the time of the riot), menus include no "soul food" entries, not even very simple substitutions such as collard greens instead of spinach.

Mr. Cicotti, who takes great pride in his recipe for spaghetti sauce, would not comment on this.

#### ONE HIGH SPOT

Mr. Cicotti presides over a kitchen staff of 35 inmates who are paid from 25 cents to \$1 an hour. Most of them are white, and this racial imbalance was behind a criticism frequently heard in the mess hall.

"You got a few farmers out there," said Harry Vega, 28, who was convicted of first-degree manslaughter.

"Let the souls do the cooking," added another black inmate.

To an outside observer, the lunch at Attica, despite its underseasoned, hard baked beans and watery mustard that resembled none available in civilian life, did have one high spot.

The Attica bakery produced a crusty white bread of taste and substance, a bread that was better than almost anything available in ordinary supermarkets. The gingerbread, too, was moist and full of flavor.

One sign of the bakery's excellence is that Attica's new superintendent, Ernest L. Montanye, who eats lunch at home, takes some prison bread along with him.

The rest of the kitchen at Attica was in better repair than the kitchen at the Brooklyn House of Detention. But Mr. Cicotti said his ovens didn't heat evenly either and that he needed new compartment steamers.

But none of this was sufficient to explain why the beans had not been cooked long enough. Or why the sauce of molasses and brown sugar that went with them was so attenuated and scant.

The cafeteria tables are not provided with salt and pepper. And, though the food manager asserted that inmates were permitted to use forks and knives, only spoons were available for the frankfurter lunch, one for each man. No prisoner could leave the locked mess hall without turning in his spoon to a guard at the door.

This routine is of a piece with other routines in food service at Attica that set it off from civilian life. The menus are another.

Breakfast invariably consists of cereal, milk, sugar, bread, coffee and, on some days, fresh fruit or a cinnamon bun. The main meal, at lunchtime, often has no dessert, and never has a first course. Evening meals are even simpler. During one week catchup and crackers appeared twice on supper menus as a side dish in addition to bread. On a third night, by way of variety, there was mustard and crackers.

"The monotony gets you after a few years," said Frank Bloeth, who has served time on a homicide charge in several prisons, works as a clerk in the Attica kitchen and is temporary chairman of the Inmate Liaison Committee, a newly formed group that represents the prison population. "The food is never bad here to begin with. It's 10 times better than any city jail."

#### FOOD NOT AN ISSUE AT DANBURY PRISON

"The popsicle prison" is what one inmate called the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury. And compared to Attica or the Brooklyn House of Detention, it is a soft deal. Guards wear no uniforms and do not constantly intrude on life. In nice weather, the men can see visitors on a hill outside the prison. And the food strikes almost everyone as reasonably good.

"Food is not an issue here," said a silver-haired Catholic antiwar activist who was

jailed for destroying draft board records. (The United States Bureau of Prisons would not allow any Danbury inmates to be quoted by name.)

By no means do all inmates agree with him. And during the work stoppage that disrupted Danbury's relaxed routine in early March, food was specifically an issue, on a sophisticated plane. Striking prisoners demanded better communication with the kitchen.

They seem to be getting it. Henry L. McKinnis, the food service administrator, arrived only a few days before the strike from another Federal prison, but he has already started grilling some kinds of meat right on the service line. And, in a small way, he has begun doing what other prison kitchens consider impossible—offering a choice of main dishes at one meal.

"Last Friday," said the small, enthusiastic 52-year-old administrator, "the Muslims didn't want fried eggs. Now I'm boiling eggs for them. The rules aren't so strict."

Mr. McKinnis was referring to regulations printed in the "Food Service Manual" of the Bureau of Prisons. The manual instructs all institutions in the Federal system to "maintain a Navy-Marine card recipe file" (an official collection of quantity recipes). Mr. McKinnis professed to use the Navy cards in all his cooking, but insisted that the hundreds of recipes available do not straitjacket an individual cook's special talents.

"Even with the cards," he said, "an Italian person can still fix Italian food."

Inmates who have worked in the Danbury kitchen dispute this and complain that there is no room there for a cook to express himself or feel pride of workmanship.

"I wanted to make veal parmigiana the right way," said one prisoner who had worked as a chef at a Howard Johnson's near the Justice Department in Washington, "but I had to do it their way. Now I work as an orderly in the education program. Morale in the kitchen would be better if the men weren't told so much what to do. A dude likes to say, 'Those are my potatoes.'"

#### KITCHEN HELP UNPAID

Another former cook, with 10 years' professional experience, now works in Danbury's cable factory, which produces cable for the Government for everything from telephones to missiles. Men who make cable (and those who work in the prison's glove industry are paid 21 cents to 51 cents an hour. Kitchen work is not salaried, and only half those on the permanent kitchen staff receive meritorious service awards of from \$10 to \$25 a month).

Even so, many of the inmates who do cook at Danbury, according to Mr. McKinnis, have worked as cooks on the outside. If their initiative is stifled by the Prison's Bureau's insistence on standardization, at least they have an impressive battery of institutional cooking equipment to work with.

The Danbury kitchen has a big new mixer, a new vegetable chopper, two fryolators, a new tilting fry kettle the size of a bridge table, two enormous ovens, steam tables, a doughnut machine, a bun divider and molder, and a dough sheeter for pie doughs. The equipment all works.

Security measures in the kitchen are minimal. Knives, however, are kept in a locked cabinet. Yeast is closely guarded in a padlocked metal box to prevent its use in the concoction of "prison jack," which is inmate's slang for moonshine. The bakery supervisor has the only key to the box. He personally incorporates yeast into dough and keeps a tally sheet of how much is used.

Security is also unobtrusive in the dining room. Tables seat four. Chairs are movable. Knives, forks and spoons are available and are not counted after the meal. There are china cups. A liberal quotation from Goethe covers one wall. And the room even has a certain intellectual hum to it.



## A PALATABLE MEAL

in one corner, a group of young draft resisters, who demonstrated against the war inside the prison recently by climbing a water tower, were discussing the ideological ramifications of war-related work in the cable factory with the Rev. Philip Berrigan, 48, the Josephite priest convicted for antiwar civil disobedience.

The meal itself did not seem like a prison meal. The tomato rice soup was quite palatable. Grilled pork steaks came one to a customer; they were thin and on the dry side, but tasty. Vegetables came three ways: buttered green beans (canned), carrot and raisin salad, and a first-rate tossed salad with a nicely seasoned French (oil and vinegar) dressing. Long slices of "homestyle" bread were not up to the Attica standard but good enough—crusty, fresh and resilient—to be served in a restaurant. Dessert was fruit jello.

Danbury's food is, of course, open to criticism. The former sauce chef at Anthony's Pier 4 in Boston, now an inmate cook at Danbury, feels strongly that reheating meats dries them out. Mr. McKinnis said he would do better on a bigger budget. The fact that he has good equipment and the will to improve already puts him ahead of his counterparts at Brooklyn and Attica. He also seems anxious to please his clientele. And his cooks know their craft. For whole minutes at a time at Danbury you don't remember you're in jail.

## LET US KEEP THE TAX REFORM DEBATE HONEST: FACT AND MYTH ABOUT OIL INDUSTRY TAXATION

## HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have never been an apologist for the oil industry, nor do I intend to become one. However, I think that tax reform is extremely serious business and the least that we can do is present the facts as accurately as possible. One of the most amazing factual errors emerging from the general debate on tax reform concerns the amount of Federal income tax paid by the major oil companies, expressed as a percent of their total net income before taxes.

On October 27, 1971, Senator PROXMIER entered into the RECORD data pertaining to the amount of taxes paid by the oil companies. His statement, which has been repeatedly quoted since, contains very misleading factual information. He states:

... The major oil companies paid a record high amount in Federal income taxes in 1970: 8.7 percent.

This statement is purposely misleading. The Federal income tax figure of 8.7 percent represents the proportion of Federal income taxes paid as a percentage of worldwide net income. If worldwide net income is used as a base figure, then it is only proper to include worldwide income taxes paid in computing the actual effective rate of taxation. This figure, is calculated by combining foreign and U.S. income taxes and expressing them as percentage of total worldwide net income. The resulting figure, 36.5 percent, is 4½ times larger than

that cited by the Senator from Wisconsin.

To compute the petroleum industry's effective rate of U.S. income taxation, one would have to compare their U.S. income taxes to U.S. net income only—not worldwide net income. When this is computed, the resulting rate of U.S. income taxation for 1970 was 21.78 percent. While this is still lower than the average for all American corporations (36.7 percent), it is again two and one-half times larger than the figure which Senator PROXMIER quoted in the RECORD.

A better test of tax burden upon corporations is to compute the total taxes paid as a percentage of gross revenues. The rationale for this procedure is that oil companies pay many special taxes, such as severance taxes, State production taxes, U.S. property taxes, and franchise taxes, that other types of more conventional businesses are not subject to. Computed on this basis, the domestic petroleum industry pays 6 percent of its gross revenue in taxes, as compared to 5.5 percent for mining and manufacturing industrial, and a 5-percent average for all business corporations in the United States. Another fair comparison of the oil industry to other manufacturing, in light of the many claims of windfall profits in the oil industry, is the aftertax rate of return on net assets. During the last 10 years, the petroleum industry's rate of return was less than the average for all manufacturing industries in 7 of those years.

While I certainly think the oil depletion allowance and the intangible drilling expenses writeoff should be thoroughly reviewed, I do think that we should look into these matters objectively and with an open mind. Purposeful misconstruction of the facts will not aid in our quest for sound public policies in this critical area.

## SOUND OF SINGING YOUTH

## HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, first may I say on behalf of myself and my constituents that I appreciated your presence and timely remarks at the opening of the performance on the House steps today by the "Sound of Singing Youth."

I know that you and the others present will agree that this talented group of some 100 young people from the Hendersonville, N.C., area are rising Americans of whom we can be proud and in whom our faith will be justified.

Their love for God and country filled the air as they sang in the magnificent setting of the Capitol's gleaming marble with its American flag waving over them approvingly.

"This Is My Country," rang their voices and there was no doubt of it. These young North Carolinians were singing patriotic songs because they believe there is much good and right in America. They stood as living proof of it.

The group, supported by its own 12-piece rock band, was organized a year ago

by the First Baptist Church of Hendersonville, although the members of the group represent many different churches and denominations in the area.

Their appearance in Washington marked the completion of a 2,000-mile bus tour as North Carolina Gov. Bob Scott's good will ambassadors.

Mr. Speaker, we are grateful to you and your efficient office staff for making it possible for this outstanding group to appear on the steps of their Nation's Capitol.

And to the "Sound of Singing Youth," we are grateful to you for reminding us that America is a great place to live.

## GRADUATION WISDOM

## HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to insert at this point in the RECORD the text of a most interesting and thoughtful commencement address delivered by the distinguished director of the Washington Workshops Foundation, Mr. Leo S. Tonkin.

The address was delivered at the annual exercises held at Aquinas High School in the Bronx, N.Y.

The following is the text of the address:

## GRADUATION WISDOM

Your Excellency, Bishop Ahern, Reverend Clergy, Sisters, and Faculty, Parents, Friends, Graduates-to-Be.

This evening finds me occupying a position that I approach with some unease. The graduation speaker most regularly finds himself huffing and puffing about this and that, sending parents into watch-watching and students into a confirmed opinion that a generation gap exists after all. Graduation speeches either bore you to death, or lull you to sleep with a stream of vocabulary that means very little other than to the stentorian charmer who's making the remarks.

I sympathize with all of you at this moment, but it's my fate as well as yours that this show must go on. If you can put aside visions of the parties later tonight just for a short while, I promise not to be very long.

Perhaps the irony and vacuity of many graduation speeches was really driven home to me a few weeks ago when I picked up a newspaper and read excerpts of two graduation talks in the same city, on the same day, at virtually the same time and, incidentally, here in New York. Both speeches were given by two of the most noted and gifted educators in the country today. As one gentleman remarked, the younger generation is far better qualified for the world of business and government than ever before. The other fine gentleman was heard to say that never before have Americans been as poorly educated as now.

Well, I can't very well improve upon this confusing contradiction—nor shall I try. For I have nothing very academic or cosmic or mind-bending to say to you this evening. All I have to share are some feelings and emotions of my own, and that seem to be shared by many hundreds of young people that I have met in Washington or in my frequent travels to high school and college campuses across the country.

At first instance, whenever I stand before a graduating class such as this evening, I think back to those historic and splendid words that appear emblazoned upon the archives of

the United States. There, the words simply and nobly proclaim, "what is past is prologue." In contemporary language, the carpenters singing group beautifully summarize this sentiment in their hit song *We've Only Just Begun*. And that indeed might be the spirit of this evening.

You have a life ahead of you, a life with new challenges along the way, new travails and new failures, but also with new accomplishments and rewards, and new friends to be gained and older affections sustained. Throughout this journey, *change* will be your constant companion. As the world experiences flux and more change than ever before—so too will each of your lives be buffeted and fashioned by the winds of change.

Young Americans, perhaps more than the rest of our society, seem to welcome this process of change and they embrace the concept that holds no brief for the status quo. I for one applaud your efforts and idealism, that mandates a society enflamed by a new humanism responsive to the needs of our contemporary world.

All too often I am in contact with many who feel that youthful dynamism is of passing and amorphous quality, or is fraught with a negative activism that suggests little else but a tearing apart and a ripping away of the fabric of society. But this is not the case at all. Your involvement is real, and does contain within it the seeds for a vastly better tomorrow.

It rejects the negative activism of the 60's and in its place inserts a pragmatic understanding of how and why effective efforts within the system can effectuate many of the goals and objectives sought by every American.

The searchings of youth are in all of us, but it is the young, as yet unencumbered by many of the commitments of older years, and unfettered by the conventions of yesterday, who seek new answers and new compassions from each other and the world beyond. In spite of the ever-present sour voices and those who seek to sear and rupture, young people are aware that new imperatives must fill the legislative halls of the Nation, and the reasoning of yesterday must no longer be applied to the problems of today.

In a sense, young and old alike are at last seeking new answers and new trust from a political system that has often protected the demagogue or the purveyor of half truths and empty rhetoric. In every sense, a political renaissance confronts the Nation, one that seeks out truth and honest opinion, and that rests upon compassion and understanding for the needs and the personal dignity and aspirations of each American.

Now granted it's no easy task to live a vibrant life, day by day, in today's America, filled with the passions and turmoils of our time. But let me suggest a few attitudes that might help to put it together, while leavening your expectations, and softening your approach to the realities of this world.

First: Understand that progress is a reality, and that good people do exist. Seek out the things around you that are happening that are good, and acknowledge them to yourselves and to others. Then go on and discover where new progress is needed and new solutions are to be found. Make a sincere and conscious effort to look for things in people that are good, look at each friend and individual around you as you might hope that Christ would look at you—seeking not reasons to hate, but to love and to understand and to forgive.

You might remember as you set about the tasks of life, and enter a world with no small amount of despair and disappointment, that the traveler who enters the forest in order to reach the other side goes a long way when it continues to become darker and darker. And yet each step the traveler takes, if it is true and well intentioned, is a step closer to the goal and the brightness of the other side.

Secondly—as you live your lives and take positions on things and try to influence others around you, remember the words of the great German philosopher, Goethe, as he said a century and a half ago, "There is nothing more frightful than ignorance in action." This is the motto of our own student seminars in Washington, and suggests that each time you are confronted by a question or an issue—think it through as thoroughly as possible, seek out the facts and the reasoning of other people, juxtaposing this information in turn to your own judgment and common sense. Then my friends, you will be no one's pawns, but on the contrary your own formidable selves, as you act and move about the work of your lives.

Thirdly—learn to laugh at yourselves, and to understand the sagacity and beauty of a sense of humor. I don't mean to suggest that the problems you encounter are frivolous and specious, but, since all of us are only human, we are fallible and make mistakes and if we are going to avoid the lethal error of locking ourselves into those mistakes out of pride or ignorance, then we must be able to say time and again—how foolish of me, how ridiculous could I be. Laughter can heal; a smile can unite—and when turned inward it can help to nurture that beautiful and much needed quality of humility.

This brings me to the fourth and final observation I should like to share—one that concerns your interrelationships with people all about you. Indeed, the most simple and yet most profound quality that all of us have within ourselves is the gift of love: and I can only admonish you this evening to feel the vibrance and fire of love throughout your lives—and give of it unstintingly to others. For love is perhaps the only thing you will ever lose by not giving it away.

Love is one of those ethereal words that often defies explanation and even understanding; forever remaining an emotion or a feeling of the heart. But love has its roots and its causes, and all of us know the wondrous beauty that springs forth from a heart touched by love.

Our patron saint, Thomas Aquinas, puts the thought most succinctly when he says that "Goodness in the object, when perceived, is the fundamental cause of all love."

What a true and noble course this suggests for all our lives. For it leads onto the grandest road—a road in search of love, and in turn a life full of meaning and hope. It suggests that we might well be consumed by our search for goodness in others, as well as in ourselves. For all around us there is the capacity to love and the natural and wonderful desire to be loved. Within the very nature of this ethic of love lies the future hope of man and his destiny as he meets his God.

However short or long a life each of you will be granted, let it be filled with the vibrance and the energy of love. In a world filled with stress and toil—as well as the simple miracle of a bird's morning song—the essence of human affection and tenderness and love can change our lives and our world as no other force known to man.

And even aside from the world at large, in your own hearts, with love and friendship as your lifetime guides, you will experience a joy of spirit and a continuum of happiness in the simple but grandiloquent process of living—a joy and a happiness that will sustain you in the face of the inevitable loves that will be lost, and friendships that will recede into memory.

"When a man becomes dear to me," so said Emerson, "I have touched the goal of fortune," and the scriptures tell us that "He who hath found a faithful friend, hath found a treasure."

So let your lives be a search for such real treasure—sincere, honest, and ennobling friendship—and along your way, share the most meaningful thing you have to give—

your love as a human being. From this very commingling of friendship, goodness, and love—your lives will touch the very reasons for your creation.

As you can see, I've shared with you this evening only a few simple thoughts that, along the way, might dispel a tear of loneliness, heal a broken heart, or enkindle a new conviction in the essential goodness of your world. Tonight is indeed a beginning—for you and in a broader sense for each of us who have gathered here to acknowledge this milestone in your lives. Ernest Hemingway perhaps summarized this spirit best of all when he said, "We are living in the morning of an epoch, and in the fog of the early dawn, men walk confused and see strange sights. But the fog will melt under the rays of the sun which has created it."

And the world of truth will be seen to be solid and lovely again.

All the glory of life,  
All the romance of living,  
All the deep and true joys of the world,  
All the splendor and all the mystery  
Are within our reach.

## THE SUPREME COURT PICKS AND CHOOSES

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 1972

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Calumet Index, a local community newspaper, has been serving the far southside of Chicago for over 78 years.

This publication is known for its hard-hitting editorials. Typical of Index editorials is the very concise commentary of Wednesday, June 21, concerning some recent Supreme Court decisions:

### THE SUPREME COURT PICKS AND CHOOSES

If the "fix" isn't in how else can you explain the United States Supreme Court's recent decision that baseball's "reserve clause" is constitutional because, "It is an inconsistency and illogic of long standing that is to be remedied by the Congress and not by this Court."

Two years ago the voters of Illinois overwhelmingly endorsed the retention of capital punishment. A year ago the electorate of California did the same. In the meantime, the voters in dozens of other states have voiced the same demand. Yet the Supreme Court has seen fit to overrule this vast majority on the grounds that capital punishment is "cruel and unusual". Of course it is cruel and unusual. That is what makes it effective. It is a fit and suitable punishment for those who commit a foul, cruel and unusual crime.

But these arguments mean nothing to the Supreme Court and so the likes of Sirhan Sirhan and Richard Speck live on while their victims and families endure this "cruel and unusual" punishment.

Despite the long history of capital punishment, the Court stopped it overnight. But the privilege of the baseball moguls, though much more recent in origin, is protected and allowed to continue until, in the words of the Court itself—"it is to be remedied by the Congress and not this Court."

If leaving this baseball decision to Congress is good enough for some 2 dozen well-heeled sports moguls, certainly it should be good enough for millions of citizens whose decision, duly noted at the polls, has been totally ignored by the United States Supreme Court.