EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOW GOES THE ECONOMY?

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, former Secretary of the Treasury John B. Connally wrote an article for the June 30, 1972, issue of Life magazine in which he corrected many misconceptions which have surfaced in recent attacks on our economic system.

I ask unanimous consent that this important article be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOW GOES THE ECONOMY?

(By John B. Connally)

The current partisan outcry about the state of the U.S. economy prompts me to paraphrase a time-honored observation in order to say: These gentlemen cannot see the forest because they have their heads buried in the weeds. After 18 months at the Treasury Department, I say this with a deep concern about the stark contrast between the enormous contribution of a growing U.S. economy to the lives of all Americans and the dismally negative picture painted by the doom criers.

For the sake of perspective, let us consider a few very basic elements which make the American economy the wonder of the world.

Nowhere else is the average man so well fed, so well clothed, so well housed.

Nowhere else have the luxuries of life come to be so commonplace. In fact, many things thought to be luxuries in other lands are considered necessities in the United States—from frozen orange juice to air-conditioning, toasters to TV.

Our economic progress has vastly increased the range and variety of jobs, products, services and leisure activities—as well as leisure time.

These—and other—massively shared benefits of the American economic system are entirely disregarded in the attacks made on the very fundamentals of that system.

DISSIDENTS ATTACK BUSINESS FOR MAKING MONEY

One of the most fashionable exercises of those attacking our system today is to flail at the profits of business. Well, let's look at the ledgers. Profits of manufacturing firms in the United States take only about 4c of each sales dollar after taxes. In the most basic industry—food—profit margins are even lower, amounting to about 1c on a dollar of sales. As a percentage of the total economy, corporate profits in 1970 and 1971 were at their lowest levels since the 1930s. By another measurement, it is estimated that profits for 1972 will be 0.4% higher than they were in 1966. There is no justification here for the demagogic charge that profits are damming up the flow of money into the pockets of the public.

Such a charge completely distorts the effects of profits. It is a canard that they benefit only the rich. A profitable economy provides more jobs and more rewards for all Americans. Profits lead to better paychecks, pensions and working conditions.

There is another glaring fallacy in the ogre concept of business. This is the implication that only a few people own the whole thing. More than 32 million Americans own publicly listed shares of stock in business enterprises—and millions more participate in ownership in other ways. General Motors Corporation, to cite the big example, is owned by more than three million people. Whether or not you call them fat, that's quite a few cats.

A good many misconceptions about business are transferred into the argument that there should be no more growth in the U.S. economy. Growth, say the negativists, benefits only the rich and produces only pollution to plague the rest of the people. This is pure poppycock. The benefits of growth have always been widely distributed throughout the U.S. economy. The cliché that "the rich get richer and the poor get poorer" needs to be corrected for the American experience, for it is a fact that as the economy grows, both rich and poor alike make gains. We need real economic growth to distribute more of the fruits of our system more widely to more people. Recognizing that need, the Nixon administration at the same time has demonstrated a firm will to make certain that growth is not contaminated by pollution.

DISSIDENTS ATTACK 1969 TAX REFORMS

No issue can get further out of focus when challengers begin their campaign oratory than the matter of taxes. Some of the most strident voices now filling the air would leave the impression (1) that the Nixon administration has lowered taxes for corporations and increased taxes for individuals, (2) that it has lowered taxes for the rich and increased taxes for the poor, and (3) that the rich pay little or no taxes at all. False on all counts.

In this administraton's first four years, corporate income taxes will have increased by nearly $5 billion, while individual income taxes have declined by nearly $19 billion. For a family of four earning $7,500 a year, there is a saving of $270; if their income is $15,000 the saving is $448. In addition, excise taxes on automobiles and telephones have been cut by $3.5 billion—reductions which have their greatest effect on individuals.

Taxes paid by the poor have been reduced by as much as 82%. Taxes for those in the "middle income" brackets have been cut by 10% to 13%. Taxes for those who earn more than $100,000 a year have been increased.

Some 15,300 persons earned more than $200,000 in 1970. About 15,200 of them paid federal taxes averaging $117,000, which amounts to an effective tax rate of almost 60% of their taxable income. Try telling those rich that they escaped taxes. There were only 106 individuals in that income level who assert they owe no federal income taxes. This happened because they had legally supportable exemptions and deductions, mostly of the kind that a large number of taxpayers use: high income tax payments to state and local governments, medical expenses, charitable contributions, casualty losses, mortgage interest payment and other deductions we feel are fair when making out our own returns.

In the loose generalizations about closing "loopholes" and tax reform, some of the sharpest attacks have been made on two changes in the tax structure which were part of the Revenue Act of 1971. These are the job development tax credit and the acceleration of corporate depreciation allowances.

The purpose of these two tax changes was threefold. First, they were designed to create new jobs by stimulating the demand for capital equipment. This they are doing and doing very well: capital spending is up 10% this year over last and employment in the machinery industry is rising rapidly. Second, the job development tax credit and the accelerated depreciation allowances were designed to keep the United States competitive in the world markets and thus save jobs. Third—and this is particularly important—the only way for the real wages of working people to rise in the long run is for productivity to rise. One important source of productivity growth is investment by businessmen in new plants and equipment—the very purpose of these tax changes. The program is working: new jobs are being created at twice the normal pace.

FAR-REACHING INITIATIVES

To take this positive view of the economic timber in the 1970s is not to suggest that there are no weeds. We are all aware of the faults and shortcomings of the American economy. This is an imperfect world inhabited by imperfect people; perfection is a worthy goal which is not readily attainable. The unemployment percentage is too high and inflation has been at an unacceptable level. There is industrial pollution. We have suffered a competitive loss in world trade.

Facing up to these problems, the Nixon administration has taken sweeping initiatives to work toward their solution. To list just some of these, the administration has:

Adopted a federal budget policy designed to spur economic recovery and generate new jobs.

Imposed price and wage controls to assure that the business expansion is not dissipated in more inflation but, instead, will create growth in both real output and real employment.

Reduced the international cost of the dollar to restore the competitive position of American trade and increase employment through higher levels of U.S. exports.

Increased spending on manpower programs to more than $5 billion for fiscal year 1973 and expanded the number of people in those programs to record levels.

Established computerized job banks to help match job-seekers and job vacancies.

Created special job programs for veterans and for unemployed scientists and engineers.

Instituted a public service employment program to provide jobs for those who find it especially difficult to obtain work.

Asked the Congress to pass legislation overhauling our antiquated welfare system in order to boost the incentive to employment.

Proposed special revenue-sharing with the states and local governments which will increase the effectiveness of our manpower programs.

Asked the Congress for a revision of the minimum wage laws, which will remove the employment obstacles for young and inexperienced workers.

REAL INCOME UP FOR FIRST TIME IN 7 YEARS

Along with its other far-reaching effects, President Nixon's program adds up to the most comprehensive attack ever undertaken against unemployment by any government anywhere. Through the manpower programs and rapid economic expansion this year and next, it has set the forces in motion for a return to full employment in 1973. By the end of this year, we should be closing in on the interim objective of a 5% unemployment rate, including liberated women seeking their first job and many others who would not be in the labor market if there were not a flourishing economy.

Meanwhile, what's happening to the working man and his family? From 1965 through August 1971 the real take-home pay of the average American worker, after adjustment for inflation and taxes, showed no appreciable increase in spite of the ever-larger gains in pay which were negotiated during that nearly seven-year period of time. Inflation and taxes chewed up all of the increase in pay on the way home.

President Nixon's economic program recognized the strain that had been put on the standard of living of the average American family. He came to grips with the fact that the only way the American worker would be able to beat inflation would be to have the federal government slow it down, which is what the price and wage control program is doing. While many prices will continue to rise, the average family is now realizing a substantial gain in its standard of living. Real spendable income is rising sharply—at a 5% annual rate since last August—marking the first gains since 1964. As inflation continues to slow in the months ahead, the American standard of living will continue to improve.

WHERE WE ARE GOING

For years the U.S. economy was in the grip of a synthetic, inflationary prosperity fueled by war. With defense making heavy calls on manpower (President Nixon inherited more than half a million men in Vietnam), the unemployment rate was artificially low. The country was seized by an inflationary psychology—the expectation that wages and prices would automatically continue to spiral upward. The competitive position of the U.S. in international trade was weakening ominously.

There was no quick and easy solution for this complex set of problems. To deal with them took months of detailed research and planning. Then there had to be close, courageous decisions. Intuitive solutions do not work to solve intricately complicated problems.

President Nixon had the vision to see that the troubles of the economic system called for a systematic set of actions designed to lessen price inflation, spur domestic economic growth and repair our international trade shortcomings. His decision to control prices and wages punctured the inflationary psychology—and to the astonishment of some vocal doubters, the American people showed that they supported the freeze. While no one claims that all the problems have been solved, there is notable progress. The rate of inflation has been cut in half. Real take-home pay is advancing for the first time in seven years. Real production is increasing. The competitiveness of the American dollar and the American worker in foreign markets is being restored. The federal tax burden on the poor and the middle class has been eased. With half a million men brought home from Vietnam and three times that many moved out of defense production, the unemployment rate is still too high to warrant any complacency. However, the U.S. economy is providing more jobs than at any time in history—more than 80 million, and new jobs are being created at an unprecedented rate.

What is even more important than these highly positive signs along the road is the direction we are going. Four years ago the U.S. economy was heading further into the war-fueled flames of inflation. Our trade position was turning toward disastrous weakness. Our employment picture was shadowed by the influences of war. Now—in all instances—the direction is changed. Oliver Wendell Holmes once said: "I find the great thing in this world is not so much where we stand, as in what direction we are moving." In 1972, the U.S. economy is moving toward prosperity without serious inflation and without war.

JOURNET KAHN SKETCHES A NEW APPROACH TO EDUCATION

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Milwaukeean Journet Kahn outlined his ideas of an innovative educational system, blending disparate approaches now in use, in an article in the Milwaukee Journal of June 26. Mr. Kahn, who is on a leave of absence from his post as professor of psychology at St. Xavier College, Chicago, has conducted experimental programs there and at Marquette University. His article follows:

TRADITIONAL CONCEPTS, PRACTICAL EDUCATION CAN AND MUST BE SYNTHESIZED

(By Journet Kahn)

As strong, perhaps stronger, than opposition to the war in Vietnam is the contemporary college student's decade long rebellion against "traditional" education—the lockstep, general requirements, departmentalized survey course program with its rigid sequences, packaged information and credential awarding grades and degrees.

We are now witnessing the pendulum swing—credit for life experiences (political campaigning, wine tasting, managing a co-operative), elimination of all requirements, self-designed curricula and choose-your-subject-as - you-learn - and-do-your-own-thing.

These extremes are aberrations of two presently existing authentic approaches to liberal learning: the conservative-classical tradition of great books programs (Hutchins, Adler, Barzun), oriented to the Western intellectual tradition of the past, and the progressivist-liberal approach, involving the blending of preprofessional training and formal studies (Antioch and Old Westbury), the acquiring of basic reading and writing skills (Miles College) and numerous "interdisciplinary" programs such as ecological studies, Latin American problems, women's studies and futuristics.

It would be perhaps an oversimplification to characterize the one as elitist, the other as mass-democratic, but there is in our society the tendency to regard the liberal arts as proper for the leisure class and to look upon practical education as appropriate for the masses.

These authentic approaches are not wrong, but each by itself is incomplete. What is needed is a genuine synthesis to overcome the present chaotic condition of higher education in America.

One favorite method of resolving the tension is to hide behind the mask of educational pluralism. The multiversity attempts to harmonize the opposition of almost every diverse educational approach imaginable by enclosing them within a single campus wall and placing them under a common administration authority. The smallest colleges often follow suit.

Reform takes the shape of tinkering with structure or creating another small institute in some empty academic corner. This is nonreform in the highest sense. And if a modest foundation grant can be secured for support it is futile, perhaps even dangerous, to begin to ask questions.

No concrete model has been extensively developed which would provide an authentic integration of the highest intellectual attainments of the last 4,000 years with the knowledge, methods, problems and technology of contemporary life. Such a synthesis of the best features of the conservative and liberal positions would produce a person whose understanding of and skills in dealing with contemporary life are thoroughly rooted in sensibilities both historical and humane.

Integration could take many forms. Numerous "subject matters" may be placed under common theme. A course on revolution would study this phenomenon in science, industry and technology as well as in political and social life.

A theme such as violence would bring together the "Iliad" and the Kerner Report, the numerous filmed documentaries on race riots, an amplified telephone conference with Daniel Walker, author of "Rights in Conflict," audi tapes of psychoanalytical lectures on aggression.

Live, in-person teachers would participate in the totality of the course, now leader now learner, to remove departmentalist blinders and to assure the multi-integration of content and method wherever teaching leadership occurs.

Idealistic, certainly, but this is true of any blueprint that has not yet been brought into existence. Impractical, perhaps, but consult with Charles Silberman and Frank Newman on the practicality of our current educational achievements.

A single attempt that is creative, radical and new may bring together a dozen people in an integrative venture with a longevity of a year or two. Its success is not whether it will have reformed the American academy but how the lives of the participants will be, from that time on, irreversibly changed.

CONSERVATION OF BASE ACREAGE REQUIREMENTS

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, when we established conserving base acreage requirements, Montana's base was excessively high compared to other States in the Nation.

Though in the last 2 years Senator MANSFIELD, Representative MELCHER, and I have managed to obtain some redress for Montana, the conserving base is still too high.

Montana has a special problem that in time will plague other Northern Plains States. Saline seep, growing at the rate of 10 percent annually, is destroying our farmland. The seep occurs where there is an accumulation of groundwater when summer fallow has been practiced. Conquering the problem requires a change in cropping practices, but a further reduction in the conserving base is essential to such a change.

In response to our request, the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service has now informed Senator MANSFIELD, Representative MELCHER, and me that local county committees have been empowered to allow changes in the conserving base requirements to meet the saline seep problem.

Since other States may soon be similarly affected, and because Montana's experience may be helpful, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD copies of our correspondence and the ASCS response.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., July 7, 1972.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate,

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is in response to your letter of June 14 relative to adjusting conserving bases on Montana farms and the statement by Mr. Norris E. Hanford regarding the extent of saline seep affecting some Montana farms.

In reply to your comment that conserving bases are too high for Montana farms when compared to other States, we wish to explain that farm conserving bases were established on the bases of the 1959 and 1960 history for every wheat and feed grain farm in the United States. The farm history method was used to reflect the various farming practices carried out in the different areas.

Because of the common practice in Montana half the cropland and keeping the other half in summer fallow, conserving bases in Montana are higher than the national average. The established conserving base on Montana farms normally represent acreage which would be summer fallow in the absence of the set-aside program. In many cases, the adjustment in the conserving base for these farms would merely accommodate the required set-aside. However, where a producer has a legitimate situation of "saline seep" and as a result will change his summer fallow rotation to a ⅓-⅔ rotation or continuous cropping, we have authorized local county committees to reduce the farm conserving base to accommodate the change provided a determination is made that soil conditions and moisture in the area will support increased cropping, and he establishes to the satisfaction of the county committee that he will increase the crops on the farm.

Sincerely,

ELVIN J. PERSON,
Deputy Administrator, State and County Operations.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 14, 1972.

Mr. CLAUDE FREEMAN,
Acting Director, Grain Division, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FREEMAN: Some adjustment in conserving base acreage has been made in Montana in the past two years. More is needed to make Montana's conserving base acreage equitable in relation to other states to prevent the necessity for double fallowing, to adjust uneconomic farming operations, and to accommodate changes in farm management.

More is also going to be necessary to encourage Montana producers to alter farming practices and to stop saline seep destruction of fine farming land, caused by an accumulation of groundwater when summer fallow has been practiced.

We have appealed for special consideration of this saline seep problem during the past year and hope that conserving base regulations this year in Montana, and other Upper Plains areas where saline seep can develop, will be drafted to encourage adjustment of cropping practices to stop the water accumulation and destruction of cropland.

Soil scientists indicate a need to shift out of summer fallow to annual crops that will use water before it can accumulate on top of an impervious shale layer. Obstacles to this shift should not only be removed but incentives should be provided.

Enclosed is a copy of a presentation made to House and Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee in regard to this problem. If further information is needed, please call on us.

Very truly yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD,
LEE METCALF,
JOHN MELCHER,
Members of Congress.

NEWSPAPER EDITORS JOIN FIGHT TO WIN RELEASE OF PEERS REPORT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert Fichenberg, chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, has written Defense Secretary Melvin Laird requesting the release of the Peers Commission report which describes the cover-up of the MyLai massacre.

As many of my colleagues may know, I have filed suit in Federal district court pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act seeking the release of this document.

The Daily Oklahoman and the Oklahoma City Times have also been attempting for 2½ years to win release of the Peers Commission report and other documents relevant to the MyLai massacre. Jack Taylor, assistant State editor of the Daily Oklahoman has written a series of excellent articles concerning the MyLai massacre and the Government's attempt to cover up the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have a right to know the full story of the MyLai massacre. The Department of Defense and the Department of the Army should release the Peers Commission report which I have requested and the other documents requested by the Daily Oklahoman so that the real story behind the MyLai massacre may be known.

Mr. Fichenberg's letter to Secretary Laird and a recent article by Jack Taylor follow:

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS,
Albany, N.Y., June 26, 1972.

Hon. MELVIN S. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY LAIRD: As chairman of the Freedom of Information Committee of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, I call upon you to release the complete "Report of the Department of the Army Review of the Preliminary Investigations into the My Lai Incident", submitted by the investigative panel headed by Lieutenant General W. R. Peers and known as the Peers report.

Suppression of this report has continued long past any reasonable period. There no longer is any valid reason, justifiable by any policy, law or regulation to deprive the public of information to which it is properly entitled. Continued suppression of the Peers Report not only is contrary to the Freedom of Information Act and Army regulations, but is contrary to the best interests of the American people, the Army and the United States Government.

No doubt you are aware of the 2½-year effort by the Daily Oklahoman and Oklahoma City Times to obtain from the Department of the Army copies of official records on the My Lai incident. Although the struggle of the Daily Oklahoman and Oklahoma City Times ultimately was partially successful, the records that were released were heavily censored. However, despite the Army's heavy censorship of the records that it did release, examination of even these records revealed major errors and discrepancies between official Army records and prior investigations, leading inescapably to a number of fundamental questions about the Peers Report. I since learn that additional records have been released, but not the full report.

I enclose a copy of the latest letter to Secretary of the Army Froehlke from Charles L. Bennett, managing editor of the Daily Oklahoman and Oklahoma City Times, requesting release of the full Peers Report and citing authority in the laws and Army regulations for such release.

As you know, requests for release of the Peers Report have come not only from the news media, but from members of Congress, including members of the Armed Service Committees of both houses of Congress.

On the basis of the citations in Mr. Bennett's latest letter, plus an examination of the 2½-year exchange of correspondence between Mr. Bennett's newspapers and the Department of the Army, it is clear that no question of security, no question of the possibility of hindering any other possible investigation, no question of the possibility of prejudicing any possible trial now exists. But it does appear that the Department of the Army has made a monumental effort to deprive the public of access to the facts.

Since no existing regulation prohibits such disclosure and the Freedom of Information Law virtually requires such disclosure, I can think of no reason for continued suppression of the Peers Report except one: a cover-up by the Defense Department to protect its own.

If you wonder why there exists a deepening lack of public understanding of the defense establishment and a widening credibility gap between the American public and the Army, I think you need look no further than the Army's policy with respect to release of the Peers Report.

Everything points to a cover-up, with implications of the hope that this all will blow over and the public eventually will forget about it. This may be an unfair inference, but certainly the lack of any valid reason for continued suppression of the report doesn't lend much credence to any other conclusion.

Thus I think you can perform no higher service to the department that you head, and to our country, than by ordering the release of the Peers Report immediately, so that the American public can judge the facts for itself. This would go a long way toward restoring the public trust that the government in a democracy must have to thrive and, indeed, for democracy to survive.

I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. FICHENBERG.

[From the Daily Oklahoman, June 30, 1972]

EDITOR WANTS LAIRD TO BARE PEERS REPORT—STRONGLY WORDED LETTER CRITICIZES MY LAI SECRECY

(By Jack Taylor)

Accusing the Army of an apparent "monumental effort" to hide the facts in the My Lai massacre, an official of the American Society of Newspaper Editors has asked the secretary of defense to order the controversial Peers Report released to the public.

In a strongly worded letter urging release of the full report of the Army's investigation into the 1968 incident, Robert Fichenberg, chairman of the ASNE's Freedom of Information Committee, also said continued suppression of the report appears to be "a cover-up by the defense department to protect its own."

LONG FIGHT CITED

He cited the Army's decision to keep the report secret as an example of the kind of policy that has fostered public disaffection with the military in recent years.

The letter to Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, dated Monday and released Thursday night, was prompted by The Daily Oklahoman's 2½-year struggle to obtain official Army records—including the Peers Report—about the incident.

PART OF IT PUBLISHED

It is the first time the secretary of defense has been asked to intervene in the up-to-now strictly Army policy decision.

Some heavily censored records were released to The Daily Oklahoman in April and the censorship was overturned in June after an appeal to the secretary of the Army. But the Army has continued to deny access to the Peers Report, the subject of a second appeal by The Daily Oklahoman and a law-suit brought by a Wisconsin congressman.

The report was written in 1970 after a four-month secret inquiry by a commission headed by Lt. Gen. William R. Peers. It led to accusations against 14 officers on grounds they had covered up initial reports of the massacre within the now deactivated Americal Division. Only one was brought to trial and he was acquitted.

Extracts of the report were published May 21 by The Daily Oklahoman, which found part of the otherwise secret report attached to the massive public record of the trial of Lt. William L. Calley, central figure in the massacre, and June 4 by The New York Times, which obtained classified documents surreptitiously.

The Army has repeatedly refused to release the full Peers Report, however, claiming various exemptions including the assertion this month that issues of national security are involved.

"Suppression of this report has continued long past any reasonable period," Fichenberg, executive editor of the Knickerbocker News-Union-Star in Albany, N.Y., said in his letter to Laird.

"There no longer is any valid reason justifiable by any policy, law or regulation to deprive the public of information to which it is properly entitled.

"Continued suppression of the Peers Report not only is contrary to the Freedom of Information Act and Army Regulations, but is contrary to the best interests of the American people, the Army and the United States government."

Citing The Daily Oklahoman's efforts to obtain records and the initial disclosures based on a study of the records that were released, Fichenberg added:

". . . despite the Army's heavy censorship of the records that it did release, examination of even these records revealed major errors and discrepencies between official Army records and prior investigations, leading inescapably to a number of fundamental questions about the Peers Report."

The newspaper executive said, ". . . it is clear that no question of security, no question of the possibility of hindering any other possible investigation, no question of the possibility of prejudicing any possible trial now exists.

"But it does appear that the Department of the Army has made a monumental effort to deprive the public of access to the facts.

"Since no existing regulation prohibits such disclosure and the Freedom of Information law virtually requires such disclosure, I can think of no reason for continued suppression of the Peers Report except one: a cover-up by the Defense Department to protect its own."

Referring to current public disaffection with the military, Fichenberg added:

"If you wonder why there exists a deepening lack of public understanding of the defense establishment and a widening credibility gap between the American public and the Army, I think you need look no further than the Army's policy with respect to release of the Peers Report.

"Everything points to a cover-up with implications of the hope that this all will blow over and the public eventually will forget about it.

"This may be an unfair inference, but certainly the lack of any valid reason for continued suppression of the report doesn't lend much credence to any other conclusion," Fichenberg said.

PENSION PROTECTION LEGISLATION

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of testimony I presented recently on pension protection legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

PENSION PROTECTION LEGISLATION

(By ROBERT P. GRIFFIN)

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before the Subcommittee on one of the most important legislative issues to come before this Congress. After numerous studies, including a thorough and extensive study conducted by your Subcommittee, the time has come for Congress to take action and to respond affirmatively to the demonstrated need for workers for more effective protection of their pension rights.

It is a sad fact of life that nearly one out of every four retired persons is living on an income below the poverty line. Liberalized social security benefits can do much to correct this situation, but the social security system cannot shoulder the entire burden.

As the 1971 White House Conference on Aging concluded in its final report: "Social Security benefits provide a basic protection which should continue to be improved but which can be augmented through private pension plans."

Unfortunately, according to a report of the Social Security Administration last year, only one out of every five security recipients receives private pension benefits. This situation exists despite the fact that over 30 million American workers are covered by private pension plans and over $130 billion has accumulated in private pension fund assets.

Clearly we have a case where there is not enough bang from the pension buck.

Mr. Chairman, I believe most Americans believe in the work ethic and would rather be working than on welfare. But if all that remains at retirement are empty promises and an economic prison, the work ethic will soon disintegrate.

In recent months, I have received many letters from disillusioned workers who are handed an empty platter after years of faithful service. Whatever the reason for not receiving a pension, the unfulfilled expectation justifiably leaves a bitter taste and very often a permanent economic scar.

The plight of these workers reminds me of the Biblical story of Jacob who toiled for seven years for a girl he did not love. It took him another seven years to reap his reward.

I suspect that many American workingmen would be happy if they could be assured a full pension after 14 years of labor.

A couple of months ago, a story appeared in the Detroit FREE PRESS describing the anguish and anger of a Clare, Michigan, worker who saw 20 years of service under a pension plan go down the drain when his employer shut down operations. In the words of this man, "It just doesn't seem right. That was my money that went into the pension fund. If I hadn't put it there, I would have had it in wages." I would appreciate having the entire text of this article from the April 24, 1972, edition of the Detroit FREE PRESS inserted in the hearing record following my statement.

It is certainly true that some, if not all, of an employer's contribution to a pension plan would go to increase wages in absence of the plan. Since workers do give up current wages for income security at retirement, is it too much to ask that they be given a reasonable assurance of receiving a pension when their working days are over? I think not.

Mr. Chairman, as you may know, I have introduced two bills affecting private pension plans. S. 2485, which was referred to the Finance Committee, would establish minimum vesting standards and a reinsurance program for pension plan terminations. S. 2486 is pending before this Committee and would establish fiduciary standards for pension plan administrators, require much better disclosure of the terms of pension plans to workers, and provide workers with the opportunity to enforce their rights in court.

Although S. 2485 is not before your Committee, there are several significant features of this legislation which I believe are worthy of inclusion in any bill reported by this Committee.

First, the bill would establish a 10-year minimum vesting standard. A substantial number of plans already meet this standard and would incur no additional cost. The Federal standard should not be less than what many plans currently provide.

Furthermore, a plan which has been in existence for less than 10 years on the effective date of the act would have to meet the 10-year vesting standard either five years after the effective date or after the plan had been in existence for more than 10 years, whichever is later.

All plans established after the effective date of the act would not have to meet the 10-year standard until after the plan had been in operation for more than 10 years. But in any event such a plan, as well as plans described in the preceding paragraph, would have to provide at least 15-year vesting.

Existing plans more than 10 years old would have five years after the effective date of the act to meet the 10-year rule, but during those five years the plan would have to conform to the 15-year requirement.

These phase-in provisions should assure that no plan is faced with a high initial cost impact. If severe problems still exist, the Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to grant a temporary variation from the vesting requirements with respect to certain plans or categories of plans where the new rules might impose severe cost burdens on the employer.

Second, the proposed vesting standards would apply to service before as well as after the effective date. Older employees should not be penalized by discounting past service. These individuals are currently in the greatest danger of losing pension benefits.

Third, my bill would eliminate any "continuous" service requirement. Thus, a worker who participates in a plan for 10 years has a vested right despite the fact that there may have been breaks in employment during his tenure with the employer. Such breaks in employment, whether for disciplinary or other reasons, should not lead to the forfeiture of a worker's right to his pension.

Fourth, my bill would provide complete insurance protection for all types of pension plan terminations. It would apply even to certain partial terminations in order to assure full protection for all workers and to protect the integrity of the insurance fund.

Fifth, the insurance program in S. 2485 would cover not only all terminations but also all losses of vested benefits. If Congress decides to provide insurance protection for workers' pensions, it must go all the way and provide total protection. There is no evidence that an insurance fund, financed through reasonable premiums paid by each plan, cannot cover all losses. In fact, some have argued that the incidence of pension plan terminations and pension losses is so small as not to justify the creation for insurance program.

While I cannot accept that conclusion, I do believe the initial premium rate of 0.2 per cent of the unfunded vested liabilities of a plan, as provided for in S. 2485 and other pension proposals, will be adequate for the foreseeable future. Furthermore, this rate as applied to the current total vested liabilities of all plans will require annual premiums averaging only one-half of one per cent of current annual contributions to pension plans.

Sixth, Title II of my bill establishes the principle of employer responsibility for any deficiency in the pension fund on termination. This responsibility would be met by the purchase of insurance from a proposed Pension Benefit Insurance Corporation (PBIC) in the Treasury Department and by payment of any deficiency in the event of a voluntary termination or in the event of an involuntary termination where the unfunded vested liabilities are uninsured.

Where the plan termination is due to a business failure or financial difficulty, the insurance alone would cover all losses of vested benefits.

In the event of a voluntary termination, the employer would be liable for the full amount of any unfunded vested liabilities. Thus, in the case of an employer who would prefer to transfer operations of a domestic plant overseas, it hardly seems unreasonable to require him to foot the bill for benefits to retired workers as well as to protect those with vested rights who have not yet reached retirement age.

The PBIC would pay any claims arising from a voluntary termination, but then would have recourse against the employer for recovery of such payments. In this way, the rights of workers would be protected in the event of a planned termination, whether voluntary or involuntary.

By making the employer liable to pay for losses due to a voluntary termination, the bill contains a powerful incentive to encourage adequate funding. In this way, the bill would operate to provide more worker protection with less government regulation than in the case with respect to other bills pending before Congress.

Seventh, recognizing the fact that the risk of termination could be significantly different as among various categories of pension plans, my bill would authorize the PBIC to establish risk categories for various types of plans. Accordingly, variations from the standard premium rate would be established where justified.

This provision offers another means for encouraging better funding by poor risk plans.

Finally, title III of S. 2485 establishes the wholly owned government corporation within the Department of the Treasury. The corporation would have sole responsibility for administering the insurance program and would be managed by a Board of Directors consisting of the Secretaries of Treasury and Labor and three Directors appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. One of the three appointed Directors would have to be a representative of labor and one a representative of management.

A considerable amount of pension plan expertise already exists in the Treasury Department where the International Revenue Service has long been required to determine whether a pension qualifies for favorable tax treatment. While it is true that the Labor Department has had responsibility for administration of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act, I believe that combined tax and insurance provisions should be administered under one department so as to provide more coherent, less burdensome regulation.

In regard to the provisions of S. 2485, Mr. Chairman, I read with interest the testimony of the President of the United Auto Workers, Mr. Leonard Woodcock, before your Subcommittee on Tuesday, June 27, 1972. Mr. Woodcock emphasized the need for Federal vesting and insurance requirements and urged several specific proposals.

For instance, the UAW leader recommended:

(1) that pension insurance be effective no later than January 1, 1974;

(2) that insurance cover loss of vested benefits earned before the enactment of pension reform legislation; and

(3) that a worker's service and benefits accrued before enactment of legislation be covered by the Federal vesting standard.

All of these proposals are incorporated in my legislation, and they represent essential ingredients for an effective pension reform bill.

Mr. Chairman, the other bill before your Committee, S. 2486, would protect against the improper use of pension funds by administrators and trustees of pension plans. The track record of the UMW illustrates very forcefully the need for such legislation.

In addition, the bill would require meaningful disclosure of the terms and conditions of a pension plan. One of the biggest problems to date is that workers either do not have access to all the information regarding their pensions or the information they do receive is a nightmare of fine print and other incomprehensible details.

The bill would permit not only Federal regulators but also workers to bring suit in Federal court to enforce the provisions of the bill. The record of the Federal Government in enforcing laws protecting American workingmen leaves much to be desired.

Finally, both S. 2485 and S. 2486 would apply to plans covering 15 or more employees. Present pension disclosure laws apply only to plans with 25 or more employees.

Pension protection is needed by all employees. In fact, it is likely that more problems may exist among small plans and new plans than among the larger, well established pension plans. For instance, a 1965 Labor Department study of pension plan terminations indicated the median number of workers covered by terminated pension plans was 13.

If it is administratively feasible, I would be in favor of minimum Federal vesting standards and insurance for all private pension plans regardless of the number of employees.

Since there is not much disagreement over the need for legislation to establish fiduciary standards and beef up reporting and disclosure requirements, it makes good sense for Congress to act as quickly as possible in this area. Of course, I would hope and strongly urge that final action be taken this year on comprehensive legislation to protect private pensions.

Mr. Chairman, the time for action has come. Through your efforts and those of the senior Republican on this Committee (Mr. Javits), action is being taken. Considering the inertia in bringing about voluntary reforms in this area, it is important to maintain the momentum that has already been achieved and to get Congress to take decisive action.

EDWARD CAPE—GBRA LEADER

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the architect and driving force for the creation of the GBRA in Texas passed away last week. He was Edward M. Cape, outstanding attorney and civil leader from San Marcos, Tex.

He has long been recognized as one of the influential leaders in the State of Texas not only in legal matters but in matters which pertain to business and economics. His counsel was sought by many.

One of the closest friends Mr. Cape had was former President Lyndon Johnson. He was one of those rare men who advised the President over and over and whose advice the President sought. Many times President Johnson has visited in the home of these pioneer leaders, Mr. and Mrs. Cape, and unfailingly followed his leadership and his advice.

His death last week was noted by an article in the Austin American and it follows:

WEDNESDAY FUNERAL SLATED FOR ATTORNEY EDWARD CAPE

SAN MARCOS.—Funeral for prominent San Marcos attorney Edward M. Cape, who died Sunday, will be Wednesday at 1 a.m. at Pennington Funeral Home. Rev. Jim Folts officiating. Burial will be in San Marcos City Cemetery.

Cape, 82, died in the Rebecca Baines Johnson Center following an extended illness.

Cape, was a local civic leader who numbered three Presidents, senators and a number of Texas governors among his close personal friends.

Vitally interested in water conservation, Cape was primarily responsible for the formation of the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority (GBRA).

At the time of his death, he was chairman emeritus of the State Bank and Trust Co. of San Marcos.

Born in San Marcos Dec. 9, 1890, Cape graduated from San Marcos High School. He earned a degree in civil engineering from Texas A&M College in 1910 and an LLB degree from Valparaiso University in Indiana in 1912.

Cape returned to San Marcos and entered private law practice in 1912. He earned a reputation as an outstanding trial lawyer in both civil and criminal practice and was appointed a special judge to serve in numerous Comal and Guadalupe county trials.

In 1935, Cape was appointed to the GBRA board of directors, remaining on the board until 1947 when he became general manager and general counsel of GBRA. He served in the dual position until 1960.

As a director of GBRA, Cape negotiated a contract with the city of San Antonio and Lower Colorado River Authority under which the Comal Plant Properties became a part of the LCRA system.

He wrote the state act authorizing and legislating GBRA.

R. H. Vahrenkamp, general manager of GBRA, called Cape "a very brilliant man who never served in elective office but was of great importance in regional and state affairs."

Ruby McRell, private secretary to Cape for two years, said the GBRA "was his dream."

"He worked and fought for GBRA through 17 law suits with the city of San Antonio. He personally financed the authority out of his own pocket in the beginning and worked for 20 years through many disappointments to see it finally become a reality," she said.

A plaque at Canyon Dam and Reservoir, a water conservation project of GBRA says "Canyon Dam, April, 1966, dedicated to the wisdom and foresight of Edward M. Cape."

The special dedication ceremonies in his honor were attended by dozens of high ranking state and federal officials.

As an attorney, Cape tried hundreds of cases but never lost a civil suit.

In January, 1935, Cape was named chairman of the board of State Bank and Trust Co. In November, 1935, on the death of bank president Will G. Barber, Cape assumed the presidential bank duties too.

As bank president, Cape made numerous changes and hired a number of employes who later became well known in state banking circles. Longtime Texas banking commissioner J. M. Falkner was an early employe of Cape.

State bank assets in 1935 were $600,000. Today they stand at more than $20 million.

Cape served as board chairman until January, 1962, when he was succeeded by J. R. Thornton.

Attorney Ernest Morgan said, "I never knew a man with so many close friendships—not only high personages but everyday people. He sometimes had to walk out the back door of the bank for lunch because there were so many people waiting out front for his advice or for favors."

Congressman Jack Pickle said, "Mr. Cape was a dear friend and a strong leader. His counsel was sought by people from all walks of life—from the JP to the President. He will be sorely missed."

Although he never sought public office, his influence was felt in state political circles.

Numbered as his personal friends were Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman and Lyndon B. Johnson. He was a confidant to U.S. senators and Texas governors.

He was instrumental in bringing the San Marcos Army Air Corps to Camp Gary, later responsible for the opening of the San Marcos Army Air Field and still later the opening of the helicopter base at the present Gary site.

Cape was a charter member and past president of the San Marcos Rotary Club.

He was a member of the American Bar Association and the Texas Bar Association and was certified to practice before the Supreme Court of Texas.

During World War II, Cape served as a draft board special appeals agent.

Survivors include one daughter, Mrs. Mary Louise Thornton of San Marcos; three sisters, Mrs. Walter Tiner of San Marcos, Mrs. Hugh Echols of Baytown and Mrs. Hubert Wyatt of Houston; one brother, Enos Bill Cape of Houston; two grandsons, Captain Robert E. Thornton and Russell Cape Thornton of San Marcos and three great-grandchildren, Stacy Ann, Kendall Louise and Sarah Audry Thornton of San Marcos.

Officers and directors of the State Bank will serve as pallbearers.

QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I sent questionnaires to each of the more than 140,000 homes in my congressional district, seeking my constituents' opinions on some of the major issues and problems facing our Nation.

I have conducted such an opinion poll each year since my election to Congress in 1964, and the results have been exceedingly valuable in helping convey grassroots sentiment in my district to you and Congress on major issues as we face them.

Although the returns are still coming in, we recently set a cutoff date and with the help of volunteer workers, began the task of tabulating the answers received to that date. Accordingly, the results reported here represent approximately the first 11,000 responses, although the total will probably reach nearly 15,090.

The questions, and tabulations of the answers, with my accompanying comments on each, are listed below, in an order starting with those responses with the largest clear-cut majority opinion.

1. Do you favor busing of school children across district lines to achieve racial balance?

Yes, 611 (5%); No, 10,209 (95%).

2. Do you favor busing of school children within a school district to achieve racial balance?

Yes, 2,295 (20%); No, 8,863 (80%).

Mr. Speaker, never in the 8 years that I have sent out questionnaires have I received such an overwhelming and strong endorsement of my position on an issue as in the case of my actions on the Education and Labor Committee and here on the floor of the House, in opposition to busing for the purpose of overcoming racial imbalance. You will remember that Congressman O'Hara and I worked to place in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 a prohibition against the use of Federal funds for school busing to achieve racial balance. The first time that this House, and finally the Congress, enacted legislation affecting the power of a Federal court to put a busing plan into operation came as a result of the bill introduced by me and six other suburban Detroit Congressmen from both political parties, in October of 1971, which finally became law when we attached it to the Higher Education Act, as the so-called Broomfield amendment. You will recall that we also at that time passed several other amendments to the act prohibiting busing of school children, which go beyond the Broomfield amendment, and are consistent with it. I read this overwhelming statement of position by my constituents which the Congress has gone in supporting our efforts, and urge you to consider as an endorsement of the direction in it as a reason for continuing to support our efforts to restrict and prohibit busing of children to achieve racial balance.

3. Do you favor the Nixon proposal for a "value-added" tax, i.e., a national sales tax?

Yes, 1,782 (16%); No, 9,137 (84%).

I wholeheartedly concur in my district's five-to-one opposition to President Nixon's proposed "value-added" tax, which is nothing more than a national sales tax. One thing this Nation does not need is another tax. The present tax system is so riddled with loopholes that the average middle-income taxpayer is already carrying far more than his share of the burden. The money needed by the Federal Government for existing and new programs can be raised by closing these loopholes, by reducing our swollen military budget, and by ending the war in Southeast Asia, into which we have poured over $150 billion in the last decade.

4. Do you believe the present wage-price controls have been successful in halting inflation?

Yes, 2,279, (21%); no, 8,384, (79%).

The large majority of my constituents indicate that the President has not applied wage-price controls effectively, and they have not succeeded in the fight against inflation. Wages have been held down, it is true, but the Nation's giant corporations are enjoying a spiral of record high profits, while interest rates remain at an all-time high, and soaring food prices continue to cut into the housewives' market basket. In short, as I stated to this House when I voted against continuing the power of the President to impose his wage-price freeze orders, they have done nothing to check inflationary pressures on the low- and middle-income wage earner, who continues to bear the brunt of mismanagement of the economy.

5. Do you favor a general amnesty for young men who left the country or went to prison rather than serve in Vietnam?

Yes, 2,950, (27%); no, 8,371, (73%).

While I do not presently feel that the question of amnesty should be considered by this Congress under any circumstances until the war in Vietnam is totally ended, our prisoners are all returned safely, and the President, who has the principal responsibility in such matters, makes his recommendations, I call attention to the fact that the majority of the people responding to my questionnaire are in agreement with what I believe to be the present sentiment of this house.

6. Do you think the Federal Government should substantially increase its contribution to the cost of education?

Yes, 6,600, (65 %); no, 2,739, (35%).

I was pleased to see the overwhelming support for the concept of more Federal aid toward the cost of education. I have sponsored legislation to increase the Federal Government's contribution to local school districts from the present 7 percent to a total of 35 percent over the next 5 years. I think this step is vital if we are to guarantee American children both quality and equality in education.

7. Do you favor a National Health Insurance plan modeled on the Social Security System?

Yes, 6,489, (63%); no, 3,856, (37%).

As a cosponsor of the Kennedy-Griffiths national health insurance plan, I want the House to note that the vast majority of my constituents believe that such a plan is necessary if we are to guarantee the American people adequate health care when and where they need it, and I hope that the Members of this House will agree, and pass this needed legislation before the end of this session.

8. Do you approve of the overall record of the Nixon Administration?

Yes, 4,542 (41%); no, 6,472 (59%).

In regard to the overall record of the Nixon administration, I agree with the majority of my constituents that it is a poor and disappointing record. The President's "secret plan" to end the war is still a secret; unemployment and inflation remain unchecked; we still have no answers for the problems of health care, education, crime, pollution and unfair taxes.

9. Do you approve of the present United States policy in Vietnam?

Yes, 4,403 (42%); no, 6,023 (58%).

If not, what course of action do you suggest? (The following were the most common suggestions:)

a. Immediate withdrawal	2,683
b. Win the war or get out	699
c. Secure release of prisoners, then get out	639
d. Declare total war	181
e. Increase the bombing	165

This question regarding U.S. policy in Vietnam was asked this year in exactly the same form as I asked it on my questionnaire early in 1968. Those who indicated that they did not favor the then apparent U.S. policy in Vietnam were 72 percent in 1968.

10. What do you think are the three most important problems facing our nation today?

The response to this question establishes clearly that my constituents regard the war in Vietnam, the question of forced busing, and the state of the economy as the most important problems. I wholeheartedly agree with this analysis.

Mr. Speaker, this annual questionnaire survey is most valuable to me in getting the "grassroots" opinion of my constituents, and I am most pleased to share the results with my colleagues here in Congress.

A. E. ALBERTONI, LONGTIME CALIFORNIAN AND INTERNATIONAL FIREFIGHTER UNION OFFICIAL, ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the imminent retirement of one of my constituents, an outstanding labor union official, Albert E. Albertoni, secretary-treasurer of the International Association of Fire Fighters, caps a distinguished career in unionism which began in my district some 42 years ago. Mr. Albertoni has served for the past 8 years here in Washington, D.C., as secretary-treasurer of the IAFF, a post to which he was elected four times by the rank and file of the 53-year-old Fire Fighters Union, which has local affiliates in all the States of the Union and in all the Provinces of Canada.

I have known Al Albertoni for the past 25 years, and I am proud of his achievements as an individual, as a firefighter, as a veteran of the U.S. Navy, and as an official of one of the great unions of the AFL-CIO, CLC.

I include herewith a biographical statement which details the career of this distinguished and patriotic citizen:

ALBERT E. ALBERTONI

Albert E. Albertoni, Secretary-Treasurer of the International Association of Fire Fighters, AFL-CIO, CLC, since 1964, has announced his retirement and his intention to resume residence in the Oakland, California, area.

Elected for four terms as IAFF Secretary-Treasurer, his eight-year tenure spanned a period when the International grew some fifty per cent in membership and became increasingly prominent in the American and Canadian trade union movements. During Albertoni's stewardship, the International headquarters greatly increased its assistance and services to their local, state and regional affiliates.

Albertoni has been active in Fire Fighter Union affairs since his appointment to the Oakland, California, Fire Department on July, 1939. While rising to the rank of Captain in the Fire Department, he was elected an officer of the Oakland IAFF Local 55, of which he is now a life member, and became prominent in California-wide union affairs.

For 12 years, he was an officer of the Federated Fire Fighters of California, serving as Vice President, President, Chairman of the Executive Board, and, for nearly eight years, as the organization's Legislative Representative. His services on behalf of California Fire Fighters were commemorated by a surprise testimonial dinner sponsored for him by the State Association last year, at which time the California State Legislature adopted a Resolution commending him for his outstanding contributions. Several other states and provinces have officially recognized Albertoni's leadership and achievements in the fields of fire fighting and unionism by bestowing upon him honorary citizenships.

Before his election as IAFF Secretary-Treasurer, Albertoni served for four years as an International Vice President of the 10th District, which includes the states of California, Arizona, Hawaii and New Mexico.

Albertoni's union career actually spanned 42 years, including nine years as a member of the Structural Iron Workers Union in Oakland before he became a Fire Fighter. During four years in the Navy in World War II, Albertoni rose to the post of Officer in Charge of Navy Fire Fighting Schools. He also saw duty as Fire Marshal at the Guam Naval Operating Base, where he received four commendations. He presently holds the rank of Commander, USNR-R, and is an active, life member of the VFW.

For many years, he represented the IAFF on the Board of the AFL-CIO Maritime Trades Department. He also is a member of the National Fire Council and the AFL-CIO Secretary-Treasurers' Council. In March, 1972, President Nixon appointed him a member of the Board of Vocational Education, the governing body of the Washington, D.C., Technical Institute.

Al Albertoni now lives with his wife, Kaye, in Chevy Chase, Maryland. After his retirement, they plan to do extensive traveling and then return to their native Oakland, California, for mostly rest and relaxation; however, continuing to serve his Brother Fire Fighters in any way that he can.

NORTH VIETNAM'S OFFENSIVE WAS NOT WORTH THE PRICE

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, while many publications in the United States lament the fact that the South Vietnamese have allegedly shown little willingness to defend themselves, the real fact is that the military offensive of the North Vietnamese has thus far failed to make any significant advances. The South Vietnamese have fought bravely and have shown a courageous commitment to protect their country from aggression.

Although many in our own country seem unaware of the failure of the North Vietnamese to succeed in defeating our allies in the field, observers abroad have been more perceptive.

The German newspaper, Der Tagesspiegel, in its issue of June 10, 1972, states that:

> Assuming North Vietnam thinks in similar military terms to other, less aggressive, countries General Giap ought by rights rather to regret having launched the offensive two months ago that was intended to make life more difficult for President Nixon.

Der Tagesspiegel makes a point which, for reasons of their own, antiwar critics within the United States have refused to make. That is the fact that:

> Following tough and chequered fighting the resistance of the South Vietnamese army, which has had to fight without U.S. ground support for the first time ever, has not been broken after all. At some points Saigon has even regained the initiative.

Beyond this, many Americans fail to understand that what has occurred in recent months in South Vietnam is a renewed aggressive offensive by the North Vietnamese. Here, again, Der Tagesspiegel has little difficulty in understanding that "Hanoi's first strike attack" was "not occasioned by prior moves by the other side." The German paper declares clearly that "Hanoi has been the aggressor."

I wish to share with my colleagues this important and thoughtful analysis of recent events in South Vietnam and place this article from Der Tagesspiegel of June 10, 1972, in the RECORD at this time:

NORTH VIETNAM'S OFFENSIVE WAS NOT WORTH THE PRICE

Assuming North Vietnam thinks in similar military terms to other, less aggressive countries General Giap ought by rights rather to regret having launched the offensive two months ago that was intended to make life more difficult for President Nixon in talking with Moscow and Peking and to shoot South Vietnam into a state in which it was ready to be taken by storm.

Following tough and chequered fighting

the resistance of the South Vietnamese army, which has had to fight without US ground support for the first time ever, has not been broken after all. At some points Saigon has even regained the initiative.

What is more, the non-stop deployment of US air and marine support against Hanoi's conventionally massed ground troops has taken a terrible toll in terms of blood shed.

The targets of the North Vietnamese offensive were undoubtedly further-reaching yet so far the contested towns of Hué, Kontum and An Loc have not fallen and the approaching rainy season will put an end to further plans for major military operations. Thus far Hanoi has failed to score a crucial success and local successes have been offset by an unexpected worsening in the prevailing international climate as far as North Vietnam is concerned.

Hanoi's first strike attack, not occasioned by prior moves by the other side, was countered by President Nixon with an intensification of aerial bombardment to a degree none of his predecessors would have dared to consider, a degree that took Hanoi too by surprise in a US Presidential election year.

This aerial bombardment is bringing home to the North Vietnamese the horrors of war, is destroying the country's economy and infra-structure and ought to bring home the message that it is likely to prove impossible to stage a military take-over of South Vietnam once the Americans are out of the picture.

Hanoi officials have presumably been expecting a wave of protest to sweep the United States and make life difficult for the President. This has not been the case.

It was too apparent that Hanoi has been the aggressor and that President Nixon would have been only too happy to come to terms. This time at least there could be little doubt as to who had unleased the fury of warfare again and who was merely fighting back.

Haiphong harbour is still mined and even the protests by Peking and Moscow have declined in volume, which must come as a particular disappointment to Hanoi.

One can but imagine that President Nixon has outlined his plans for a neutral South Vietnam in Peking and Moscow in such a way that Hanoi's military campaign has assumed the proportions of a thorn in the flesh.

ENVIRONMENTAL LITIGATION

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, last month I had the opportunity to testify before the House Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee in support of H.R. 8331 and H.R. 49. This legislation introduced by Congressmen DINGELL of Michigan and KARTH of Minnesota in the form of an amendment to the National Environmental Policy Act would for the first time grant every citizen a federally guaranteed right to a pollution-free environment and access to the Federal courts to protect that right.

Legislation similar to H.R. 8331 has been passed on the State level by Michigan, Connecticut, Minnesota, and Indiana among others, and bills are now pending in over 20 other States.

During the committee hearings on H.R. 8331 there was much interest in how the act has been made use of in Michigan, the first State to pass such a law. Thus, I would like to call attention to an article that appeared in the Washington Post on July 7, 1972, which describes a recent air pollution suit against the Ford Motor Co. filed under the Michigan Environmental Protection Act of 1970. This suit represents the most far-reaching environmental protection action ever filed in Michigan.

The article follows:

FORD IS CHARGED IN POLLUTION SUIT

DETROIT, July 6.—Ford Motor Co. has been charged with "obnoxious, offensive, damaging and harmful" air pollution of heavily populated metropolitan Detroit in the most far-reaching environmental protection suit ever filed in Michigan, it was announced today.

The suit, disclosed by the Wayne County Air Pollution Control Division, charged Ford's giant River Rouge complex with "at least 143" violations of the county's pollution control regulations.

The River Rouge plant—one of the largest in the world—sprawls over 1,200 acres and is the heart of heavily populated, heavily industrialized downriver Detroit.

The suit, filed in Wayne County Circuit Court under Michigan's Environmental Protection Act of 1970, is an unprecedented action by local officials against Ford, the founder of the Motor City's homegrown industry.

Herbert L. Misch, Ford vice president for environmental and safety matters, said the company was "surprised and shocked" by the suit. He accused Wayne County of disregarding Ford's efforts to lick pollution.

Misch said Ford has spent $25 million on pollution controls at Rouge since 1963 and built a new foundry at Flat Rock, Mich., to remove the air-fouling operation by the end of the year.

Morton Sterling, director of the air pollution agency, said the court action was taken against Ford because "we've been seeing a tightening in resistance" in the company's willingness to solve pollution problems.

"We hope that Ford will start to listen better now," Sterling said, paraphrasing the company's advertising slogan.

The air pollutants from the Rouge, the suit charges, are "obnoxious, offensive, damaging and harmful . . . and the source of dirt and filth."

The suit alleges that Ford's control systems are "either inadequate, unreliable, or operated or maintained by the company in such a manner to be inadequate to protect the public health, safety and welfare."

The suit charges that the fallout from Ford's complex exceeds the maximum federal emission standards by 3.3 times on a daily basis, and 2.5 times on yearly standards.

Some tests show that dust and dirt and corrosive gas levels are as high as 5.7 times the permissible level.

CHANGES PROPOSED IN OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STANDARDS

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a disproportionate number of comments I have received on the Williams-Steiger Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 have revolved around the standards relating to the ice in drinking water, eating areas, change rooms, and toilet facilities. In the March 9, 1972 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I shared with my colleagues the announcement by the Department of Labor outlining up-coming revisions in the standards. Again I am pleased to share a summary of the changes proposed by Assistant Secretary George C. Guenther in the Federal Register for Saturday, July 15, 1972:

The changes proposed are summarized as follows:

(1) Clarifying definitions for several terms would be provided.

(2) False floors, platforms, mats, or other dry standing places or appropriate waterproof footgear would be required where wet processes are used.

(3) Where vermin are detected an extermination program would be required.

(4) Drinking water would be required within 200 feet of regular workplaces.

(5) A requirement of the sewage disposal method would be that it not endanger the health of employees.

(6) Toilet facilities would be required wthin 200 feet of a place where employees regularly work.

(7) Cleansing agents would be required to be supplied with lavatories.

(8) Warm air blower would be recognized as acceptable drying means in washrooms.

(9) The ratio of showers per affected employees would be set. The actual requirement to have showers would be contained in specific standards with respect to employees who are exposed to toxic substances and physical stresses. These standards will be established at a future time.

(10) If employees are permitted to bring lunches into the premises, and vermin are a problem, then a sanitary repository for lunches would be required.

(11) Specific limitations to the scope of the section would be eliminated. However, in accordance with § 1910.267 the application of the section would continue to be confined to nonagricultural operations.

(12) Clean ice would be permitted in drinking water. The present ANSI (American National Standards Institute) standard Z4.1 had justification for prohibiting ice in drinking water when the original standard was established, since much ice was then cut from rivers and lakes. Today most ice is machine made, and sanitation in its manufacture is practicable.

(13) Nonpotable water would be permitted for cleaning the premises, bathing or laundering provided that it has been treated so that chemicals or organisms harmful to employees are eliminated. The present standard is too restrictive in the uses of nonpotable water. In many places the availability of potable water is limited and the use of treated nonpotable water for cleaning premises or washing any portion of person or clothing presents no health problem.

(14) The requirement for adequate washing facilities in or adjacent to each toilet room would be changed to require one lavatory for each toilet facility. The present requirement for adequate washing facilities is too vague.

(15) All provisions relating to separate facilities based on sex are eliminated. Separate facilities for each sex have no basis in sanitation standards.

(16) The requirement for split toilet seats would be changed to apply only to seats in-

stalled or replaced after the effective date of this change.

(17) The number of lavatories in office occupancies would be reduced to the number of toilet facilities. Not all office workers need or do wash at the end of the working day. The number of lavatories required in the present standard and ANSI Z4.1 is based more on industrial occupancies, where the load on washing facilities is likely to be heavier, and concentrated at specific periods of the working day.

(18) The present language regarding change rooms would be replaced by a requirement to have change rooms only when employees are required to wear protective clothing pursuant to standards issued under this Part relating to exposure to toxic materials. Separate storage facilities (both for each employee and for street and work clothing) would be required. The present standard is vague, speaking of "practice" and "necessity" for reasons of "excessive dirt, heat, vapors, moisture."

(19) The specific area requirement for lunchrooms required on account of toxic materials exposures or potential exposures in work areas would be deleted. It appears that the specification of a precise number of square feet is not relevant.

Written data, views, and arguments concerning the proposal may be mailed to the Office of Standards, Room 305, 400 First Street NW., Washington, DC 20210, within 30 days after the publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER. The data, views, and arguments will be available for public inspection and copying at the Office of Standards at the above address.

HONORARY DEGREE AWARDED BY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, NOTRE DAME, IND., TO HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was most pleased to be present on May 20, 1972, at the 125th annual commencement of St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Ind., at which time our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, was awarded by St. Mary's College the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa.

Mr. Speaker, her colleagues in the House of Representatives are aware of the outstanding achievements of Mrs. HANSEN.

I believe, however, that the citation that accompanied the honorary degree to which I have just referred sets forth in greater detail the record of public service of Mrs. HANSEN, and I, therefore, insert that citation at this point in the RECORD:

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

Pioneering is the legacy of Julia Butler Hansen, United States Congresswoman for the Third Congressional District of the State of Washington. Born in Portland, Oregon, of parents who had settled in the Washington Territory in 1877, Julia Butler Hansen has literally paved the way for women's rights through the scores of elective positions she has held in the thirty-five years that she has dedicated to public service. Countless public tributes and awards have been bestowed on her for the high standards and effective results she has accomplished through the courage, perseverance, knowledge and leadership she has brought to high policy-making positions.

As early as 1937, Mrs. Hansen was the first woman to be elected to the Cathlamet City Council, Cathlamet, Washington, an office which she held for eight years. In 1939, she was elected to the Washington State House of Representatives, serving continuously until November 9, 1960. She was the first woman to be elected Speaker Pro Tem of the Washington State House of Representatives, serving in that capacity from 1955 to 1960. During this period she also chaired the important State Education Committee. From 1949 to 1960, she served as the Chairman of the Roads and Bridges Committee of the Washington State House of Representatives, the first woman in the history of the United States to serve in such a position. While in the state legislature, she also chaired for ten years the Western Interstate Committee on Highway Policy Problems for eleven western states.

In 1960, Mrs. Hansen was elected to the 86th Congress of the United States and has been re-elected each succeeding Congress. As Chairman of the House Appropriations Sub-committee on Interior and Related Agencies, she is the first woman to act in this capacity in the House or in the Senate and is also the first woman Democratic member in the history of the House Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. Hansen's work has been notable particularly for her dedication to environmental protection. She has pioneered in ecological planning and resource and energy management. She has received public acknowledgment for her work in historic preservation, for expanding and improving Indian health and education programs, and for advancing the Arts and Humanities.

In recognition of her exemplification of the challenging new role of women in today's society, through her outstanding and varied achievements as a wife and mother, as a legislator, and as an author who has written many articles and periodicals as well as a prize-winning historical juvenile novel, Saint Mary's College takes pride in bestowing upon Julia Butler Hansen, this gentlewoman and graduate of the University of Washington, the Degree of Doctor of Laws, *honoris causa.*

HARRY J. KELLER

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pittsburgh and the county of Allegheny in Pennsylvania recently lost a man who exemplified the highest standards and traditions of a profession which demands courage and character above and beyond the normal call of duty.

The death of Harry J. Keller on June 11 will be felt not only by his family and many friends but by his contemporaries and comrades across the Nation, for "Chief" Keller was a firemen's fireman. He was a man who ranked at the top of his chosen field and whose career dated back to boyhood days. Most of us, I suppose, wanted to be firemen at one time in our young lives but it is a desire that fades and disappears with time. Not so with "Chief" Keller.

He used to say proudly:

I always wanted to be a fireman . . . never wanted to do anything else. Although I couldn't join a fire company until I was 21, I've been chasing fires from the time I learned to walk. I can remember riding on a horse to a fire when I was young. That's when the engines were horse drawn. My father was a fireman at that time. He was assistant engineer on the fire engine. It was his job to stoke the boiler on the way to the fire.

Harry Keller never strayed far from that early desire. He launched a 35-year career with the Pittsburgh Bureau of Fire on January 2, 1936, a career interrupted only by military service during World War II and by his retirement in late 1970. During his tour of duty with the Navy, Chief Keller served as a crash firefighter at the Brooklyn Naval Shipyard and later as an instructor at Bainbridge, Md. He returned to the fire department in 1946 and was promoted to captain later in the year. In 1950, he was named battalion chief and in 1966 he became fire chief, a position he held until his retirement.

A few months after leaving the Pittsburgh Fire Bureau, Chief Keller was picked by the Allegheny County Commissioners to head a new multimillion-dollar county fire academy which would serve as a model to the Nation. Their choice was an excellent one and Chief Keller, who had conducted fire schools for thousands of volunteer firemen over a score of years, termed his new job the fulfillment "of a 26-year dream for me to have a permanent fire school for the teaching of modern firefighting techniques under actual fire conditions."

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the formal resolution adopted by the Allegheny County Commissioners honoring Harry Keller for his many accomplishments over the past years and joining with the citizens of the county in mourning his passing:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the untimely passing of Allegheny County Fire Training Academy Director Harry J. Keller has left our community bereft of a citizen with a long and distinguished career; and

Whereas, during his more than 36 years as a firefighter in Pittsburgh and in Allegheny County he exemplified the highest traditions of a dedicated and selfless profession; and

Whereas, he joined the Pittsburgh Bureau of Fire on January 2, 1936 and rose to become City Fire Chief, a post from which he came to become the first director of the county's new Fire Training Academy; and

Whereas, Director Keller was one of the founders and served as an instructor for annual fire training schools in North and South Parks where thousands of firemen throughout the County received life-saving training; and

Whereas, "Chief Keller" as he was affectionately known to thousands of persons, was summoned to address firemen's seminars throughout the United States because of his vast knowledge of firefighting; and

Whereas, he always concerned himself with the cause of fire prevention, working tirelessly with all firemen's organizations in the county; and

Whereas, his dedication to his profession serves as an example of public service to which all could aspire,

Now, therefore, be it resolved, that this Board of Commissioners of Allegheny County does hereby join with the citizens of the county and the many friends of Harry J. Keller in mourning his passing and expressing condolences to the surviving members of his family.

DRUG DEPENDENCE TREATMENT CENTER

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, recently I visited the Drug Dependence Treatment Center of the Veterans' Administration Hospital, at University and Woodland Avenues in my city, Philadelphia.

This clinic, under the direction of Dr. Charles P. O'Brien, is the type of facility which must be available to every addict if we are going to solve the problem of drug addiction in our country. It offers the addict treatment on an individual basis. No man is forced into one type of treatment just because that is what is available at the clinic. This center offers the addict the program which is most likely to help cure him of his addiction.

Unfortunately, this center cannot come close to meeting the demands of the veterans in Philadelphia. At least one more clinic and possibly more are needed in the city.

These veterans are addicts today because they were sent by their country into a situation where drugs were cheap and readily available and the social climate put great pressures on each man to experiment with drugs.

This clinic in Philadelphia should be used as a model for similar facilities all over the Nation. It is an excellent example of what must be done to help men who become incapacitated while serving their country.

At this time I enter into the RECORD a description of the drug treatment program at the VA hospital in Philadelphia:

PHILADELPHIA VA DRUG DEPENDENCE TREATMENT CENTER

This program was begun in July 1971 and transferred to its present quarters in November 1971. The currently active treatment options are 1—inpatient detoxification using methadone, 2—outpatient detoxification using methadone, 3—long-term therapeutic community at the nearby Coatesville VAH, 4—day-hospitalization with intensive group therapy, family therapy, psychodrama and vocational counseling and either no medication or only tranquilizers or anti-depressant medication, 5—short-term methadone maintenance in combination with partial day-hospitalization and intensive counseling support, 6—long-term high-dose methadone maintenance obtained through the Phila. General Hospital Methadone Maintenance Program located across the street from the D.D.T.C., and 7—a graduate program consisting of group therapy and counseling on evenings and Saturdays for individuals who have already obtained jobs. Treatment options planned but not in actual operation at this time include an experimental therapy program consisting of formal behavior therapy and the use of non-narcotic blocking agents such as cyclozazine.

Patients are evaluated at the time of admission and a treatment option is selected. Patients are generally admitted for detoxification. Ten beds are set aside for detoxification at the Phila. VAH. Patients may also be transferred to the detoxification unit at Coatesville VAH. Only rarely are patients put directly on long-term methadone maintenance without first a trial on another treatment method. During the inpatient detoxification, evaluation is continued by means of interviews with counselors, psychiatrists and group therapy sessions. With occasional patients, psychological testing is used. The patients considered appropriate for long-term inpatient therapeutic community are discussed with the staff at the Coatesville Rehab. Unit and then sent to Coatesville for evaluation by the patient-staff committee there. Patients admitted to either the Coatesville Detoxification Unit or the Coatesville Rehab. Unit are given follow-up outpatient care at the Phila. VA Drug Center.

Following discharge from an inpatient detoxification patients are seen in the day treatment center usually daily at first. Efforts are made to place the patients in a vocational training program or in a suitable job. Currently a teacher conducts courses and GED testing in the center. A pre-vocational training course is also being started in the day-hospital. Progress after hospitalization is monitored by urine testing as well as by frequent interviews. Family therapy is heavily emphasized. As can be expected there is a high relapse rate and repeated detoxifications are permitted. Selected patients are given repeated detoxifications on an outpatient basis using methadone and monitored by urine testing. Occasionally patients who come in initially and are already engaged in a job will be detoxified on an outpatient basis so that they do not have to stop work.

If repeated attempts at "clean" treatment fail the patient is then considered for methadone maintenance. Short-term relatively low dose methadone maintenance (approximately 6 months and approximately 40 to 80 mg) is conducted as part of the day treatment center. Patients selected for long-term high dose methadone maintenance are treated on a contract basis at Phila. General Hospital and are seen less frequently at the VA Hospital.

Research activity is given a high priority in this treatment program. Currently work is underway on a follow-up program of the first 500 patients who presented themselves for treatment at this center. Efforts will be made to follow up not only those patients who remain for some form of treatment but also those who dropped out after the initial contacts. Double blind controlled studies of methadone maintenance are also under way. Attempts to demonstrate the conditioned abstinence syndrome in post-detox patients are also in progress and it is anticipated that behavior therapy and work with non-narcotic agents will also begin shortly. Basic research is being conducted by members of the VA staff who hold joint appointments at the University of Pennsylvania. These studies include the phenomenon of tolerance as manifiested in the isolated rat brain preparation and the effects of methadone and morphine on hypothalamic function in rats and monkeys.

NECESSITY FOR NATIONAL PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, every convention reinforces my belief concerning the desirability, and now the necessity, for a national Presidential primary. As a first-time delegate to the Democratic National Convention in Miami last week, I saw the enormous complexities of housing, security, and communications—and the process as it has come to be is something less than democratic. I know personally that many delegates who attended the convention were not representative of the area from which they came.

In April of 1971, Mr. William H. Gerlach, an associate professor of political science at Columbus College, Columbus, Ga., developed a constitutional amendment which suggests a national primary for the election of the President and Vice President of the United States. His thoughtful proposal includes a provision for a national Presidential primary and commends itself to our careful study in moving toward an improved method for filling the highest offices in the land.

Professor Gerlach's proposal reads:

OBJECTIVES OF THIS SUGGESTED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

1. To compromise between the proponents and opponents of election of the President by popular vote.

2. To compromise between the proponents and opponents of unrestricted grants in aid to the States.

3. To abolish the possibilities of fraud and the effect on voting behavior from news releases and projections by the mass media as presidential elections move westward.

4. To return the office of Vice-President to the status the constitutional convention intended it should have.

5. To increase the probabilities of electing Presidents by a majority.

6. To decrease the probabilities of all candidates failing to win a majority of electoral votes.

1. For the purposes of this amendment only, the word "State" includes the District of Columbia. "Party" means political party. "Party members" are those qualified voters of State who are identified with a party on the voter registry of a State.

This avoids repetition of the phase "a State or the District of Columbia." It provides for closed primaries to prevent "party raiding," which can deny the electorate of its right to choose from among the best candidates that all parties can offer.

2. In each year immediately preceding a year in which a President's term expires, on days to be determined by the Congress, presidential primary elections and presidential general elections will be held. The Congress shall determine the voting hours by local time in all time zones, providing for all polls in the United States to open and close simultaneously. The Congress shall determine the maximum compensations and rentals to be paid to conduct presidential primary elections, presidential general elections, and all other primary and general elections for the nomination and election of members of the House of Representatives and the Senate, including special elections when vacancies occur; and the United States shall reimburse each State for all expenditures incident to conducting any such election, exclusive of the cost of capital investments, although candidates for other offices may be nominated and elected at any such election.

If States schedule all elections concurrently with those named, they will be relieved of all election expenses now borne by them. Each State will know how much money will be freed for general unrestricted use. The need for grants in aid will be less crucial. The uncertainties of new Congresses reducing appropriations for grants and questions as to whether States are using grants for other purposes than the national general welfare will be eliminated. Equality in aid will exist because election expenses are in ratio to population. There will be no justification for high filing fees which limit candidacies to the affluent. The fact that expenses may now be paid by counties and municipalities is irrelevant. They are agencies of the States and it is mostly for their needs that the States seek grants. The State problem of making equitable allocations to its subdivisions would also be solved.

Capital investments are excluded to prevent States from periodically purchasing new voting machines or expensive computor systems at national expense. Control of voting hours will decrease the possibility of fraud and influence on voting behavior from the news releases and projections of the mass media as presidential elections move westward.

3. Any person constitutionally qualified to be elected President may become a candidate for a party's nomination for President by filing, in each of any combination of States which together have a majority of the total electoral vote of the United States, a petition signed by himself and by a number, to be determined by the Congress, of that party's members in the State. The names of persons so qualifying shall appear on the ballots of the presidential primary election in all States as candidates for the nominations of such parties for President.

The signature of candidates is required to prevent groups from qualifying candidates without their consent. Petitions are to be filed in the States because the States will have the voter registry lists to validate signatures. Validation expenses would be reimbursable as expenses incident to the election. The requirement for voters' signatures is minimal and will be no problem for recognized candidates. It will hamper publicity seekers who attempt to use elections as a vehicle. Serious candidates can concentrate in areas of strength. If urban-oriented, they can file petitions in a relatively small number of largely populated States. If rural-oriented, they can file petitions in more States with smaller populations.

4. In presidential primary elections, every citizen of the United States, qualified to vote in any State election, shall be qualified to vote in that State for two candidates for his party's nomination for president. The candidate in each party receiving the plurality of the total vote cast for each party's nomination shall be that party's nominee for president. The candidate in each party receiving the second highest number of votes shall be that party's nominee for vice-president, and shall become the party's nominee for president if the presidential nominee dies or withdraws before the date of the presidential general election. The candidate in each party receiving the third highest number of votes shall become that party's nominee for vice-president if the vice-presidential nominee dies, withdraws, or succeeds to the presidential nomination before the date of the presidential general election. Additional substitutions for party nominations made necessary by other deaths or withdrawals shall be made by parties as Congress shall provide.

The nomination of candidates by popular vote is more likely to be accepted by States than the forfeiture of the electoral power they now hold with electoral votes. It certainly gives the people a louder voice than they now have. Voting for two candidates is a return to the original Constitution which provided in Article II that ". . . The electors shall . . . vote by ballot for two persons (for President) . . . ." This amendment makes every voter an elector in the primary. The nominees for both offices will be persons who party members believe are qualified for the Presidency. It embodies Alexander Hamilton's thought when he wrote in Federalist Essay No. 68: ". . . as the Vice-President may occasionly become a substitute for the President, in the supreme executive magistracy, all the reasons which recommend the mode of election prescribed for the one apply with equal force to the other." Such substitutions have been more than "occasional" and the 25th amendment increases the possibility of their frequency. Vice-Presidents have completed terms of 8 of the 31 men who have been elected President. That is more than 25%. Since 1900, in 18 presidential elections, 29 men have had major party vice-presidential nominations. Only five of them, and some of those may be doubted, were serious contenders for the presidential nomination at the convention that nominated them. They were Garner, Bricker, Warren, Kefauver, and Johnson. The constitutional convention rejected the proposal that the Congress elect the President because the concept of separation of powers demanded that he not be subservient to the Congress. The same concept demands that the presiding officer of the Senate not be subservient to the President. It will be argued that parties will have two candidates with different political philosophies. It is more likely that each voter will vote for two candidates with similar philosophies. How many Republicans entitled to two votes in a primary in 1964 would have voted for Rockefeller and Goldwater? How many Democrates entitled to two votes in a 1960 primary would have voted for both Kennedy and Johnson for President?

5. In presidential general elections, every citizen of the United States, qualified to vote in any election in a State shall be qualified to vote in that State for one candidate for President and for one candidate for Vice-President, from among the nominees of all political parties whose candidates for nomination received no less than ten percent of the total vote cast for all candidates for nominations in the presidential primary election in each of any combination of States which together have a majority of the total electoral vote of the United States. Nominees for the office of President and Vice-President respectively who receive a plurality of the total vote in any State shall receive the total electoral vote of that State.

It will be easy for any party with a national appeal to qualify its candidates for the ballots of the Presidential General Election. It will be more difficult for ideological and regional parties. Such parties will not be discriminated against. All parties have equal opportunity, with the very small requirement of polling approximately 5% of the popular vote distributed in a way that indicates some national appeal, to qualify their candidates for the ballots in the Presidential General Election. The people are given the opportunity to reject the ideological and regional parties by denying the vote distribution that would indicate a national appeal. The possibility of electing a President by a majority is increased. The danger of crises from elections by the House of Representatives is decreased. Voting by electors is abolished but electoral votes are retained.

6. Each State shall have the number electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in Congress. The District of Columbia shall have the same number of electoral votes as the State with the least number.

This makes no change in the status quo in the foreseeable future.

7. Nominees for the Office of President and Vice-President respectively who receive a majority of the total of electoral votes shall be the President and Vice-President. If no nominee for President have such majority, the House of Representatives, immediately following its organization in the January next following the Presidential general election, by ballot will choose the President from among the nominees, not exceeding three, having the highest number of electoral votes. But in choosing the President, the votes shall be taken by State, the Representation from each State having one vote: a quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States and a majority of all States shall be necessary to a choice. And if the House of Representatives shall not choose a President, whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon it, before the 20th day of that month, then the Vice-President shall be the President. If no nominee for Vice-President have such majority, the Senate, immediately following its organization in the January next following the Presidential general election, by ballot will choose the Vice-President from among the nominees, not exceeding two, having the highest number of electoral votes. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice.

The only change made here is the imposition of a time limit on the power of the House of Representatives to elect a President. It is possible under the 12th amendment, as amended by the 20th amendment, for the House to elect a President at anytime in a four year period to replace a Vice-President who is "acting" as President and whenever the House was in session he would never know how long he would so act.

8. The Congress shall have power to put this article in effect by appropriate legislation.

AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, plans for the 1976 American Revolution Bicentennial observance are proceeding in all parts of the Nation. The following article, written by Donald V. Lowe of Davenport, Iowa, describes the goals and purposes of the observance.

Mr. Lowe is a member of the Scott County Bicentennial Commission in conjunction with the national commission. He is also the research and heritage chairman-designate for the bicentennial's Black Hawk region which will include counties in Iowa and Illinois when it is organized.

The article follows:

[From the Times-Democrat, July 1, 1972]

REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following on the American Revolution Bicentennial observance scheduled for 1976 is by Donald V. Lowe, Davenport. A retired teacher, he is a member of the Scott County Bicentennial Commission in conjunction with the national commission and is the research and heritage chairman-designate for the bicentennial's Black Hawk region which will include counties in Iowa and Illinois when it is organized. Lowe taught 25 years in the Davenport school system and six years at Palmer Junior College, Davenport. His special subject is American history and one of his special interests is Abraham Lincoln. He received a bachelor's degree at Northern Illinois University, DeKalb. He has received two master of arts degrees from the University of Iowa—in American history and secondary education. Lowe stresses that all data relative to the bicentennial or correlated events will be appreciated and may be directed to him or to Dr. R. W. Slack, chairman, in care of the Scott County Bicentennial Commission, Post Office Box 1976, Davenport, Iowa 52805.)

The American Revolution Bicentennial

Commission was established by act of Congress July 4, 1966. Its mandate is to prepare an over all nationwide program commemorating the bicentennial of the American Revolution and of the nation's birth.

Congress specifically instructed the commission to plan, encourage, develop and coordinate activities commemorating the historic events that preceded and are associated with the revolution. This national commission is to give due consideration to related plans and programs developed by state, local and private groups. State commissions have been established and county organizations are evolving.

GOAL

The goal of the American bicentennial is to forge a new national commitment, a new "Spirit of '76" which would vitalize the ideals for which the revolution was fought; a spirit which will unite the nation in purpose and dedication to the advancement of human welfare as it moves into its third century.

GUIDELINES

Some aspects of the bicentennial should be solemn and others festive. The 200th birthday of the country should evoke both a solemn rededication and a joyous celebration. To promote the realization of these objectives three guidelines were adopted.

First, the bicentennial should be national in scope. It should appeal in such a way as to make every American and all friends of America eager to participate.

Second, the bicentennial is a period for commemorating events which led to and through the revolution and to the formal founding of the nation in 1787. The focal year is 1976 and the focal date is July 4.

Third, the bicentennial will be a time for Americans to review and reaffirm the basic principles on which the nation was founded. The principles of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" and the concept of man's equality are (or should be) as valid today, and will be for tomorrow, as they were when the nation was founded.

THEMES

The commission envisions that observances and other activities related to the bicentennial will embrace three themes. They are:

Heritage '76.—To recall our heritage and place it in its historical perspective so that all groups within our society can reexamine our origins and values and the meaning of America and take pride in our accomplishments and dramatize our development.

Open House USA.—To develop nationwide activities and events which stimulate travel and thus encourage our citizens to expand their knowledge of our country and to extend a particular welcome to visitors.

Horizons '76.—To challenge every American, individually or with others, to undertake at least one principal project which manifests the pride, priorities and hopes of the community. Groups are encouraged to pool their resources and talents in a constructive effort to demonstrate concern for human welfare, happiness and freedom.

ACTIVITIES

The over-all program of the bicentennial is to be implemented through many activities. Some may be feasible in one community but not in another, and the suggestions are not limited to those named. The recommendations are:

The production, publication and distribution of books, pamphlets, films and other educational materials focusing on the history, culture and political thought of the revolutionary period.

The development of bibliographical and documentary projects and publications.

The presentation of programs, conferences, convocations, lectures and seminars.

The development of libraries, museums, historic sites and exhibits.

The observance of ceremonies and celebrations commemorating specific events.

The presentation of programs and other activities focusing on the national and international significance of the American Revolution and its implications for present and future generations.

The issuance of commemorative coins, medals, certificates of recognition and stamps.

PROJECTIONS

The heritage of America is the substance of our collective memory, and our heritage is rich. It has led to improvement in our way of life so that we have and do things that our forebears never dreamed of. Open House USA will bring these things into focus.

In the area of Horizons, although violence seems to be all around us, there are hopeful signs as well. Little publicized and yet truly significant is the fact that the men of the Apollo 11 mission were the first explorers in history who carried no weapons.

REDEDICATION

On the threshhold of our nation's 200th birthday it is an appropriate time to assess the condition of the republic. Although Greece and Rome ruled the civilized world successively for nearly 1,400 years, the average life span of an empire or major nation, according to historian Alfred Toynbee, is about 200 years. Americans are asked to reflect upon, review and rededicate themselves to the principles on which the nation was founded.

"We must not forget our hard beginnings," Carl Sandburg asserted, "or we deserve no better future."

Apathy should be countered by commitment and decadence by revitalization. Accomplishment requires action, and action requires involvement.

The men who gained independence for the 13 colonies did not restrain themselves from involvement, although involvement meant great risk. The signers of the Declaration of Independence knew they were virtually signing their own "death warrants" if the revolution did not succeed. To support their commitment they risked their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the Comprehensive Older Americans Services Amendments of 1972 by the House of Representatives today was of particular personal satisfaction to me. I coauthored this legislation which contains all of the major provisions I have worked since my arrival in Congress to see included.

One of the major themes of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging was the need for comprehensive legislation in the areas of nutrition, transportation, education, and health services for America's older citizens. This bill, in conjunction with the recently enacted Public Law 92-258, which amended the Older Americans Act to provide comprehensive nutrition services, meets those needs and in addition contains provisions which: First, strengthen the role of the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; second, expand services under the Older Americans Act; third, establish a National Advisory Council on the Aging; fourth, expand work service opportunities, including strengthening the retired senior volunteer program and the foster grandparents programs; fifth, provide more effective coordination of Federal aging programs; sixth, improve delivery services to older citizens; seventh, provide meaningful employment opportunities; and eighth, provide for the creation of Gerontological centers to study the aging process and senior citizen community centers to deliver centralized services to elderly citizens.

I am extremely pleased with the transportation section of the bill which incorporates provisions for meeting the transportation needs of our older citizens which I have long advocated. Included are grants for: First, establishment of special transportation subsystems for older persons; second, portal to portal transportation services; third, subsidies to transportation systems to provide for reduced rates for older persons; and fourth, direct payments to older persons for necessary transportation services. In addition, I was successful in having three amendments included in this bill which provides for the participation of older persons and voluntary groups, particularly youth groups, in the planning and operation of programs provided for by the act.

Passage of this legislation reaffirms our commitment to older Americans to provide at their point of need the comprehensive services to which they are entitled.

DEBORAH KAYE WEST, WINNER OF MARSHALL SCHOLARSHIP

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a singular honor which has been awarded to the daughter of one of our trusted and well-known employees of the House. I refer to the recent award given to Deborah Kaye West, daughter of Ben West, Superintendent of the House Press Gallery, by the British Ambassador, the Earl of Cromer.

Deborah is the first graduate of the University of Maryland to win a coveted Marshall Scholarship. The Marshall Scholarship was established in 1953 by the British Government as a thank-you for American aid sent them right after the war. It was named for Gen. George C. Marshall who instituted the European Recovery program when he was Secretary of State in 1946. This prestigious British Government award will entitle Deborah to 2 years of study at the university of her choice, and includes transportation, books, tuition, and the living allowance.

Mr. and Mrs. Ben West have further reason to be proud of their beautiful and talented daughter. She had some impressive choices to make in planning her next

2 years of study. She was accepted at both Harvard and Yale law schools and plans to study law after her 2 years of study at the University of Edinburgh.

Deborah was chosen as one of 24 Americans this year from a list of 860 screened applicants. Selections for the Marshall Scholarship are made on the basis of "distinction in intellect and character." Candidates must be graduates of U.S. colleges and universities with high academic ability and with a capacity to play an active part in the life of the United Kingdom university to which they go. Deborah, in choosing Edinburgh University wishes to pursue political thought from its earliest beginnings. She plans to study the 18th century British theorist, John Locke. Her interest in politics is deep—she is concerned with the philosophy of politics. Deborah's honors thesis was on Plato and at a speech association meeting in Boston, she also presented a paper on "John Adams as a Rhetorician."

The strength of character of this highly successful student and her involvement with the political discipline can possibly be traced to her father, Ben. Ben West came to the Press Gallery in November of 1942. He has been on the Hill 30 years and has moved up through each position of the Gallery staff, starting as a messenger, to become Superintendent in 1969—the only man to have served on each of the positions on the staff.

We congratulate Deborah and her parents on her brilliant accomplishments.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the Army's 26th Chief of Staff, retired from active military service on June 30, 1972.

"Westy" prepared to meet the challenges of later life during his early years among the hard working, honest, patriotic, and God-loving people of South Carolina.

His distinguished career spanning over 36 years saw many changes in Army technology from horse-drawn artillery to the age of helicopters. In recognition of his outstanding combat record, he has received 17 American decorations, 17 campaign stars, and 23 foreign decorations; indeed an appropriate tribute to a real fighting man.

During his tenure as Chief of Staff, the Army started its transition from a Vietnam orientation to a more global and complete outlook.

General Westmoreland initiated many innovative programs to enhance and upgrade the leadership and professionalism in the Army. Accompanying actions included: An advanced noncommissioned officer corps educational program; a return to soldiering through the elimination of nonproductive practices; an emphasis on dynamic and challenging training; an emphasis on self-discipline, pride and motivation for every soldier; and an expanded and improved use of the Women's Army Corps with the appointment of a brigadier general as its chief.

Under his aegis—to list just a few of the accomplishments—the modernization of equipment continued forward; improved procedures were developed to streamline weapons acquisition and program management procedures; a new divisional concept was formulated—combining capabilities of an armored brigade, an airmobile brigade and an air cavalry combat brigade, tri-capability—and management improvements were made in post operations.

Our South Carolina son, General Westmoreland, is now returning to civilian life after a brilliant military career in which he displayed the epitome of leadership and selfless dedication to duty.

So that my colleagues may have the opportunity to consider the general's record more fully, I insert certain excerpts from his biography, along with the text of his Distinguished Service Medal, third Oak Leaf Cluster, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND

The President of the United States of America, authorized by Act of Congress, July 9, 1918, has awarded the Distinguished Service Medal (Third Oak Leaf Cluster) to General William C. Westmoreland, United States Army, for exceptionally meritorious service in a position of great responsibility:

General William C. Westmoreland distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service as Chief of Staff, United States Army, from July 1968 to July 1972. During a period marked by significant changes in national strategy and priorities, General Westmoreland's outstanding professional ability, personal integrity, and untiring leadership efforts were an inspiration to all the Army. Under his guidance, the Army began the complex transition from a force of one and a half million men, shouldering the major burden of our prolonged national commitment in Southeast Asia, to a smaller, highly professional force, qualitatively structured to support the national strategy requirements of the Seventies. General Westmoreland initiated programs to provide for the restructuring, realignment and modernization of Army forces in order to improve force capabilities and best meet our global national commitments. He instituted measures to revitalize leadership and professionalism throughout the ranks, to include the design of a new Officer Personnel Management System, a Noncommissioned Officer Education System, and an Enlisted Qualitative Management Program. General Westmoreland was particularly concerned with the men and women of the Army, and devoted himself unsparingly to improving service life and providing the soldier with an unprecedented sense of personal choice, dignity, and self-discipline. He insisted on meaningful and challenging training for every person in the Army and the effective utilization of skills in tasks directly related to unit missions. He directed that the responsibilities for designing unit training programs be returned to the unit commanders, and urged leaders at all levels to make use of mission type orders and permit their subordinates maximum initiative in accomplishing assigned tasks. In adjusting the priorities for future military spending, General Westmoreland resolutely defended programs aimed at improving the working environment and living standards of American soldiers worldwide. His imaginative and unrelenting efforts to improve service attractiveness job satisfaction, and public understanding have been instrumental in moving the Army toward the President's goal of an all-volunteer force. His exceptional leadership and selfless dedication to duty throughout this period are the hallmarks of his brilliant career. A grateful Nation recognizes that General Westmoreland's long and distinguished service, covering three wars and more than thirty-six years of devoted duty, has been in the finest traditions of the military profession. His loyal and illustrious service to the United States, in successive positions of the greatest responsibility, reflects the highest credit upon himself, the Army, and the Nation.

GEN. WILLIAM CHILDS WESTMORELAND

William Childs Westmoreland was born in Spartanburg County, South Carolina, March 26, 1914, and graduated from Spartanburg High School in 1931. He attended the Citadel Military College of South Carolina for one year, and was then appointed to the United States Military Academy, West Point, New York. At the United States Military Academy he was first captain and regimental commander and was commissioned as a Second Lieutenant in the Field Artillery upon graduation on June 12, 1936.

His initial assignment was with a regiment of horse-drawn 75mm guns, the 18th Field Artillery, at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. In March 1939, he joined the Eighth Field Artillery of the Hawaiian Division at Schofield Barracks, Hawaii. Here he served as a battery officer, battalion staff officer, and battery commander. In May 1941, as a captain, he was assigned to the just organized Ninth Infantry Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, as operations officer of the 34th Field Artillery Battalion (155mm Howitzer).

In April 1942 he assumed command of the 34th Field Artillery Battalion and moved with it later that year to Morocco, North Africa. He commanded the battalion in combat in Tunisia and Sicily. During combat in Tunisia, his battalion was awarded the Presidential Unit Citation.

During the campaign in Sicily, General Westmoreland's battalion was successively attached to the 82d Airborne Division, and the 1st Infantry Division before returning to its parent division. In March 1944 he was named executive of the Ninth Infantry Division Artillery while the division was staging in Southern England preparatory to the invasion of the Continent. Following D-Day, he fought with the Ninth Infantry Division through France, Belgium and into Germany. In October 1944 he was named chief of staff of the division, serving in that capacity in continuous combat from the German border to the Elbe River.

In June 1945 General Westmoreland assumed command of the 60th Infantry Regiment in Germany and in January 1946 was transferred to the 71st Infantry Division and as commander of that division returned it to the United States for inactivation.

Following training at Fort Benning, Georgia, he earned the Parachute and Glider Badges and assumed command of the 504th Parachute Infantry of the 82d Airborne Division at Fort Bragg, North Carolina in July 1946. In August 1947 he was named chief of staff of the 82d Airborne Division.

He was appointed an instructor at the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, in August 1950. Later that year he was designated an instructor at the newly organized Army War College, also at Fort Leavenworth, and in June 1951 moved to the Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania, with the Army War College, serving as a member of the faculty until July 1952.

On August 1, 1952, he assumed command of the 187th Airborne Regiment Combat Team in Korea. While under his command, the unit was twice committed to combat and during the interim was deployed to Japan as theater reserve. The Republic of Korea awarded his unit the Distinguished Unit citation. During this period he was promoted to brigadier general at the age of 38. In August 1953 he was awarded the Master Parachute Badge.

In November 1953 he reported for duty as Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, G1, for Manpower Control. In 1954 he attended the Advanced Management Program of the Harvard Business School in Boston, Massachusetts. He was named to the Secretary of the Army General Staff in July 1955.

On December 1, 1957, the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Maxwell D. Taylor, pinned a second star on General Westmoreland, making him at that time, the youngest Major General in the Army.

General Westmoreland assumed command of the 101st Airborne Division "Screaming Eagles" at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, on April 2, 1958.

In July 1960, General Westmoreland was appointed Superintendent of the US Military Academy at West Point. He was transferred to Fort Bragg, North Carolina in July 1963 at which time he became Commanding General, STAC and XVIII Airborne Corps.

In January 1964, he reported to duty at the US Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. He was assigned first as Deputy Commander, then Acting Commander and finally, in August 1964, was made Commander, US Military Assistance Command, Vietnam and Commanding General, US Army, Vietnam.

On 3 July 1968, General Westmoreland became the Chief of Staff, United States Army. From this assignment, he leaves the active ranks.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT NO. 4

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting, for the information of Members, their staff, and others who may be interested a few excerpts from the most recent "budget scorekeeping" report for the session, prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures. The report reflects the impact of congressional actions on the President's budget requests through June 30, and presents us with a picture of our position as we return from the July recess. The report has been sent to all Members, and it contains considerable information for those who have need for details.

This is the 5th year these scorekeeping reports have been issued. They are the most comprehensive current source of information on what is happening legislatively to the President's budgetary recommendations. They are authoritative, being carefully prepared by an experienced staff dedicated to complete objectivity, reporting the facts as best they can ascertain them. Some estimating is necessary, especially in respect to legislative actions affecting outlays—expenditures.

FISCAL 1973

The report shows that, as of June 30, the impact of completed congressional actions on legislation affecting fiscal 1973 has the estimated effect of increasing the deficit by some $4.8 billion. This reflects estimated outlay increases of about $3.2 billion above amounts requested by the President, including nearly $1 billion for black lung benefits and $2.1 billion for social security benefits. Also reflected is recent action which has the effect of reducing proposed social security revenue by about $1.6 billion under budgeted requests.

Action is incomplete on seven of the 10 regular 1973 appropriation bills pending as of June 30, but House and Senate action on these bills so far indicates probable significant net increase primarily due to additions made to the Labor-HEW bill by both Houses. Three regular 1973 appropriation bills remain to be reported, and there will be a large supplemental required before the end of the session.

In addition, there is incomplete action on a number of legislative bills which could have significant scorekeeping impact, including the multibillion-dollar Water Pollution Control Act now in conference and the pending general revenue sharing legislation.

Projecting the possible effect on fiscal 1973 of all reasonably potential congressional action indicated at this time, together with administration amendments to the budget increasing outlays for Vietnam war costs and disaster relief, it would appear that the fiscal 1973 unified budget deficit could be about $35 billion. Further, this does not reflect other possible program increases and continuing uncertainty regarding revenue collections and refunds resulting from overwithholding of individual income taxes.

FISCAL 1972

For fiscal 1972 which ended June 30 last, the report shows that the impact of congressional action and inaction—that is, actions during the current session affecting the last half of fiscal 1972—has had the effect of lowering the unified budget deficit by about $2.7 billion under the revised estimates transmitted last January. Congressional actions during the previous session—affecting fiscal 1972—were reported on in scorekeeping reports last year.

The current unofficial administration estimate of the unified budget deficit for fiscal 1972, just ended, is about $23 billion—down $3 billion from the June revisions shown in the report and nearly $16 billion below the January projection. After many months of fluctuating projections and uncertainties regarding revenue collections, we are now awaiting announcement of the final figures for the year.

HIGHLIGHTS OF LATEST SCOREKEEPING REPORT

The following highlights are from Scorekeeping Report No. 4, as of June 30, 1972:

HIGHLIGHTS—FISCAL YEAR 1973

The President's Revised Budget Estimates

The Mid-Session Budget Review for fiscal 1973, transmitted on June 5, 1972, estimated budget authority at $276 billion, budget outlays at $250 billion and budget receipts at $223 billion, and projected the unified budget deficit at $27 billion (reflecting a $37.8 billion deficit in federal funds partially offset by a $10.8 billion trust fund surplus).

The Review incorporated a number of major revisions in outlay and revenue estimates, but it did not represent significant change in the President's program as set forth in his January Budget Message. However, certain budget amendments and requests transmitted subsequent to the June 5 revisions have had the effect of further revising the budget estimates by increasing budget authority by $2.3 billion, and outlays by $1.3 billion. (These include amendments for increased Vietnam war costs and disaster relief.)

The revised estimates included the impact of certain major congressional actions and delay amounting to approximately $3.4 billion in budget authority and $3.1 billion in outlays. Deducting these amounts for the scorekeeping purposes of this report, and adjusting to incorporate recent budget amendments, the revised 1973 budget reflects estimates for budget authority at $274.9 billion, budget outlays at $248.2 billion, budget receipts at $223 billion, and the projected deficit at $25.2 billion, exclusive of congressional action.

Scorekeeping to date—Fiscal 1973

Scorekeeping for the session to date, June 30, 1972, reflects the estimated outlay impact of *completed* congressional actions totaling a net increase of $3,213 million over Administration requests. Action on appropriation bills to date reflects a net outlay increase of approximately $21 million, and action on six legislative bills reflects an estimated net outlay increase of $3,192 million (including $969 million for black lung benefits and $2.1 billion for social security benefits).

Ten regular 1973 appropriation bills have been considered. House action on these bills indicates a net outlay increase of $368 million, Senate action on nine of the bills indicates a net outlay increase of $1,260 million, and for the three bills on which congressional consideration is complete a net outlay decrease of $69 million is indicated.

Also pending are several legislative bills containing "backdoor" or mandatory spending authorizations. One major bill, the multi-billion dollar Water Pollution Control Act, is still in conference. House action on general revenue sharing legislation reflects the shift of retroactive fiscal 1972 costs into fiscal 1973 due to delay. Other significant pending legislative measures relate to federal employee health insurance, veterans benefits and water and sewer grants. These and other actions are shown in scorekeeping table No. 1.

Completed congressional action to date has the effect of reducing anticipated budget receipts by about $1.6 billion, due mainly to a 1-year delay in the effective date of the proposed wage base increase. This is reflected in scorekeeping table No. 2.

HIGHLIGHTS—FISCAL YEAR 1972

The revised fiscal 1972 budget estimates reflect budget authority at $247 billion, outlays at $233 billion, receipts at $207 billion, and the deficit at $26 billion (reflecting a $32.2 billion federal funds deficit and a $6.2 billion trust fund surplus).

The June 5 Review revised the budget estimates most substantially for receipts, reflecting an increase of about $8 billion in individual income tax collections (due largely to unanticipated over-withholding) and about $1.5 billion in corporate income taxes. Considerable uncertainty was indicated with respect to receipts.

With the fiscal year practically over, the 1972 outlay revisions are assumed to represent best tentative estimates of the outcome for the year. The Review specifically identifies one item of congressional inaction ($2.2 billion for general revenue sharing), and it is also assumed that it reflects adjustment for all other unenacted proposals, together with updated outlay estimated for other program purposes.

This scorekeeping report shows that congressional action and inaction to date, with respect to the fiscal 1972 estimates in the January budget, has the effect of decreasing budget authority by $3.8 billion ($2.7 billion by inaction), decreasing outlays by $2.9 billion ($2.5 billion by inaction), decreasing receipts by inaction of about $200 million, and decreasing the deficit by $2.7 from the January revised estimates.

SCOREKEEPING TABLES

TABLE NO. 1.—ESTIMATED EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS DURING THE 2D SESSION OF THE 92D CONGRESS ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF JUNE 30, 1972)

[In thousands of dollars]

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House (1)	Senate (2)	Enacted (3)	House (4)	Senate (5)	Enacted (6)
Fiscal year 1973:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the 1973 budget):						
1972 Foreign assistance and related agencies (Public Law 92-242)				[1] −105,000	[1] −105,000	−105,000
Legislative Branch (H.R. 13955)	−6,022	−4,625	††−5,560	−5,500	−4,300	††−5,200
Second Supplemental, 1972 (Public Law 92-306)				−100,000	+550,000	+95,000
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies (H.R. 14989)	−100,884	+116,391	(‡)	−74,000	+42,000	(‡)
Housing and Urban Development, Space, Science and related agencies (H.R. 15093)	−454,695	+325,187	(‡)	−30,500	+39,000	(‡)
Transportation and related agencies (H.R. 15097)	−117,567	−2,187	(‡)	−75,000	−39,000	(‡)
District of Columbia (H.R. 15259)	−11,000	−29,600	††−26,913	−11,000	−29,600	††−26,913
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies (H.R. 15417)	+1,275,856	+2,578,297	(‡)	+550,000	+1,225,000	(‡)
Interior and related agencies (H.R. 15418)	+9,218	+23,769	(‡)	−7,100	+14,800	(‡)
Treasury, Postal Service and General Government (H.R. 15585)	−9,458	−9,417	††−8,776	−37,000	−37,000	††−36,500
Public Works and Atomic Energy (H.R. 15586)	−51,331	+82,638	(‡)	−20,000	+49,000	(‡)
Agriculture and Environmental and Consumer Protection (H.R. 15690)	−55,167			+78,000		
Supplemental, 1972, disaster relief (H. J. Res. 1238)				+100,000	+100,000	††+100,000
Subtotal, appropriation bills	+478,950	+3,080,453	−41,249	+262,900	+1,804,900	+21,387
Legislative bills with "backdoor" spending authorizations (changes from the 1973 budget):						
Higher education—student loans (borrowing authority) (Public Law 92-318)	Indefinite	Indefinite	Indefinite	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Housing Act of 1972 (contract authority) (S. 3248)		+300,000			N.A.	
Water and sewer grants (contract authority) (H.R. 13853)	† +5,000,000			† +3,333,000		
General revenue sharing (H.R. 14370)	[2] +2,800,000			[2] +2,550,000		
State bond subsidy (permanent) (S. 3215)		† +29,000			† +29,000	
Water pollution control (contract authority) (S. 2770, H.R. 11896)	[3] +11,000,000	+3,000,000	(‡)	+550,000	+150,000	(‡)
Subtotal, "backdoor"	+18,800,000	+3,329,000		+6,433,000	+179,000	
Legislative bills with mandatory spending authorizations (changes from the 1973 budget):						
Wage board pay (H.R. 9092)	(+76,800)	N.A.	(‡)	(+76,800)	N.A.	(‡)
Full District of Columbia Congressional representation (H.J. Res. 253)	†+960			†+960		
Federal employee health insurance (H.R. 12202)	+267,900	+39,600	(‡)	+267,900	+39,600	(‡)
Grain reserves and price support (H.R. 1163)				(+2,276,000)		
School lunch (H.R. 14896)				+90,000		
National Guard retirement (S. 855)		+7,900			+7,900	
Additional military travel allowance (H.R. 3542)	†+2,414			†+2,414		
POW and MIA leave (H.R. 14911)	†+13,400			†+13,400		
National Foundation for Higher Education (Public Law 92-318)	[1] −90,000		−90,000	[1] −27,000		−27,000
Black lung benefits (Public Law 92-303)	[1] +968,712	+968,712	+968,712	[1] +968,712	+968,712	+968,712
Social security tax and benefit amendments (H.R. 15390)		[4] −1,600,000	††[4] −1,600,000		+2,100,000	††+2,100,000
Revenue sharing, HUD (S. 3248)		−490,000			−490,000	
Air traffic controller retirement (Public Law 92-297)	[1] +31,500	+31,500	+31,500	[1] +31,500	+31,500	+31,500
Early retirement—customs inspectors (H.R. 440)	†+3,200			†+3,200		
Veterans advance educational allowance (H.R. 12828)	+128,700			+124,700		
Veterans medical care (H.R. 10880)	(+29,658)	+150,850	(‡)	(+29,658)	+150,850	(‡)
Veterans nursing home care (H.R. 460)	(+6,900)			(+6,900)		
Veterans paraplegic housing (S. 3343)	+3,500	+5,000	††+3,500	+3,500	+5,000	††+3,500
Veterans national cemeteries (H.R. 12674)	+39,600			+39,600		
Veterans compensation increase (S. 3338)	+114,900	+169,000	††+114,900	+114,900	+169,000	††+114,900
Civil Service retirement—firemen (H.R. 7060)	†+6,700	+6,330		†+6,700	+6,330	
Subtotal, "mandatory"	+1,491,486	−711,108	−571,388	+1,640,486	+2,988,892	+3,191,612
Subtotal, legislative bills[5]	+20,291,486	+2,617,892	−571,388	+8,073,486	+3,167,892	+3,191,612
Total, fiscal year 1973	+20,770,436	+5,698,345	−612,637	+8,336,386	+4,972,792	+3,212,999
Fiscal year 1972:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the revised 1972 budget):						
Foreign assistance and related agencies, 1972 (Public Law 92-242)	[1] −353,230	[1] −353,230	−353,230	[1] −50,000	[1] −50,000	−50,000
Second Supplemental, 1972 (Public Law 92-306)	−820,808	+197,574	−518,245	−365,000	−230,000	−265,000
Supplemental, 1972, disaster relief (H.J. Res. 1238)	+100,000	+100,000	††+100,000			
Legislative bills (changes from the revised 1972 budget):						
Black lung benefits (Public Law 92-303)	[1] +5,000	[1] +5,000	+5,000	[1] +5,000	[1] +5,000	+5,000
Emergency school assistance (Public Law 92-318)			−500,000			−80,665
National Foundation for Higher Education (Public Law 92-318)	−3,000		−3,000	−1,000		−1,000
National Institute of Education (Public Law 92-318)			−3,000			−2,500
Housing Act of 1972 (contract authority) (S. 3248)		+15,000			N.A.	
AMTRAK (borrowing authority) (Public Law 92-316)	+100,000	+250,000	+150,000	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Legislative inaction on proposals included in the 1972 budget (see tables 4 and 5 for details):						
General revenue sharing	−2,500,000	−2,500,000	−2,500,000	−2,250,000	−2,250,000	−2,250,000
Other	−117,011	−371,111	−208,017	−52,483	−210,583	−210,583
Total, fiscal year 1972	−3,589,049	−2,656,767	−3,830,492	−2,713,483	−2,735,583	−2,854,748

[1] Enacted figure used for comparability.

[2] Due to delayed action, includes effect of shift into fiscal 1973 of $2.5 billion in authority and $2.2 billion in outlays, together with increases of $150 million in authority and outlays for both fiscal years 1972 and 1973.

[3] Consists of $5 billion provided for fiscal 1973 and advance availability of $6 billion provided for fiscal 1974. Action on Administration request of $2 billion in direct appropriations for similar programs may result in some offset.

[4] Decrease in budget authority for social security reflects less than anticipated tax revenues for trust fund.

[5] Excludes actions taken in 1st Session of 92d Congress, shown in parentheses above.

‡Subject to or in conference.

N.A.—Not available.

†Committee action.

††Pending signature.

NEW LOCKHEED BAILOUT

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration may be using its special $2.2 billion budget request to pay for the Vietnam war as a coverup for a new $120 million bailout for the Lockheed Corp. of Marietta, Ga.

As my colleagues know, on June 30, President Nixon submitted to the Congress a $2.2 billion supplemental defense budget which the Congress has not yet considered. Included in that budget is $120 million for 30 cargo planes built by Lockheed. Lockheed hopes to build the 30 C-130 jet cargo aircraft at its Marietta, Ga., facility which produced the C-5A that suffered more than $2 billion in cost overruns.

For some unexplained reason the administration hopes to award the Lockheed Corp. with a new contract for unneeded planes despite its past failures. The administration's claim that the 30 new cargo jets are needed to replace planes lost during the current North Vietnamese offensive is simply wrong. I have been told by officials of the Department of Defense that only seven C-130 jet cargo craft have actually been lost during the offensive.

Why is it necessary to build 30 planes in order to replace seven?

Why are these planes, which will not be available until 1973 or 1974, included in a budget linked to the present offensive in Vietnam?

For some reason the administration is hiding new funds for Lockheed in this budget. When officials of the Department of Defense appear before the House Armed Services Committee to justify this new Lockheed bailout, I plan to question them about the real reason the Defense Department wants to give Lockheed an additional $120 million in airplane contracts. Although the C-130 is a good plane the Nixon administration has offered no justification for this new deal with Lockheed.

Possibly the $250 million bailout loan may not be enough to put Lockheed back on its feet.

I have also learned from the Pentagon that the Government is providing more money to Lockheed this year than last year. During the first 11 months of the last fiscal year which ended June 30, Lockheed received $43 million more than the year before. Despite Lockheed's failure on the C-5A and other programs, the Government is still pouring more than a billion and a half dollars into this giant corporation this year.

Mr. Speaker, the House Armed Services Committee and the House must give serious consideration to whether these planes are actually needed. Furthermore, we should find out why this $120 million potential bailout was placed into a special Vietnam budget when the money can do little, if anything, to fight the war for at least a year.

THE NEW "CHILD DEVELOPMENT" BILL

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, the U.S. Senate passed by a vote of 73 to 12 the 1972 version of the "child development" bill passed by Congress last year—see my newsletters 71-28, 71-41 and 71-50—but vetoed by the President in a remarkable concession to a thoroughly aroused public opinion. The differences between the 1971 and 1972 bills are minimal, involving no more than incidental details of administration and financing and the deletion of some of the more provocative language. The essential purpose and nature of the legislation remain the same.

This year's bill number is S. 3617. The time to begin the all-out fight against it—through letters to Members of the House of Representatives where it will now go, and to the President—is now. Such a fight succeeded last year. It can be won again. The American people are no more ready now than they were 6 months ago to accept massive government invasion of the home, and government assumption of responsibility for children of preschool age. Once they are convinced that the new bill would bring this about just as much as the old one, they will reject it just as firmly.

The essential fact about this legislation, which needs to be stressed over and over again, is that it goes far beyond simple custodial day care for children whose mothers by absolute economic necessity must work. Many people still have the erroneous impression that this is just a "day care" bill—and by "day care" they mean custodial care, supervising small children at play without trying to change or "develop" them. But the Senate committee report on S. 3617 specifically says:

> The central requirement is that child development programs must, in fact, be developmental . . . and not custodial in nature.

To understand what the idea of developing preschool children really means in the current condition of our country, we may refer to the report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children presented to Congress in 1969, which states:

> Schools originally were intent on the development of the mind as a primary mission. The body and spirit were the responsibility of the home and the church. As the home and the church decline in influence, the schools are required to assume more responsibility for the education of the whole child. Schools must begin to provide adequately for the emotional and moral development of children as well as for their development in thinking. The school as the major socializing agency in the community must assume a direct responsibility for the attitudes and values of child development. The child advocate, psychologist, social technician and medical technician should all reach aggressively into the community, send workers out to children's homes, recreational facilities and schools. They should assume full responsibility for all education, including pre-primary education.

As sociologist Prof. Ernest van den Haag of New York University said in testifying against this bill before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee:

> It would lead to the progressive bureaucratization and depersonalization of child raising . . . on the assumption that the government knows how to provide "healthful and stimulating development" of children. If the government has such knowledge it is a well kept secret.

The committee report points out that today one out of every three mothers of preschool children works, as compared to one out of eight in 1948. While everyone knows of cases of such mothers who actually have no choice but to work, it is very difficult to believe that this really is the plight of one-third of all the mothers of preschool children in America. Even as a vountary program, Federal "child development" is a homewrecker precisely because it encourages even more mothers of very young children to surrender responsibility for their care to a government agency in order to increase their income—which is to sell their child's birthright for a mess of pottage.

ECONOMY GETS BOOST FROM GRAIN DEAL

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's recently announced agreement to sell surplus American grain to the Soviet Union is good news for the people of Kansas. This transaction will provide a needed economic boost for those involved in the production of wheat, and it is indicative of a new era of cooperation between the United States and Russia.

The following editorials express very well my feelings concerning this agreement. The first, from the Wichita Eagle, and the second, from the Newton Kansan, outline some very good reasons for supporting the sale of grain to the Soviet Union.

The editorials follow:

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, July 12, 1972]

WELCOME NEWS FOR KANSAS FARMERS

Kansans should find encouraging news in the historical grain deal between Russia and the U.S. announced the other day by President Nixon.

The Soviet Union has agreed to purchase $750 million in American-grown grain during the next three years. An average of $250 million in wheat, corn, barley, sorghum, rye, and oats would be sold each year, with Agriculture Secretary Earl L. Butz anticipating an even higher total before the deal is completed. It is the biggest grain transaction in history between two countries.

The impact of the deal can be seen in an anticipated 17 per cent increase in exports during the three years. Under the agreement, the Soviet Union will purchase grain on the commercial market from private grain dealers in the U.S.

For Kansas, it should bring higher prices for wheat as the nation's surplus of grain is diminished by the Russians' purchases. Most of the agricultural economists in this area agree that the sale can only help Kansas' situation.

In addition to the improved market here, the transaction also will provide jobs for Americans involved in shipping the grain, including longshoremen, seamen, exporters, and railroad and barge line workers.

And Nixon's presidential adviser, Henry Kissinger, said it would advance relations between the U.S. and Russia throughout the commercial field.

Although the agreement will not completely solve the Kansas farmer's price problems, it certainly can be welcomed. It demonstrates for Midwesterners, on an economic basis, the implications of lessened tensions on the political level throughout the world.

[From the Newton (Kans.) Kansan, July 11, 1972]

ECONOMY GETS BOOOST FROM GRAIN DEAL

That deal through which the United States will sell some $750 million in grain to the Soviet Union during the next three years is a welcome one in the farm belt.

For it will mean that some of the surpluses that have been piling up in this country over the years will be cut.

Whether or not this will hike grain prices can only be told when the grain starts moving. But the deal is a step toward opening foreign markets for the American farmer. And as these markets are opened, surpluses will disappear, and if enough such deals can be consumated, the surplus problem could become of minor importance.

But it won't be only the farmers who prosper by such a program.

It will mean more money in the pockets of many American working men including rail workers, dock hands, and others who will be charged with getting the grain to the new customer.

These in turn will have more money to spend with the butcher, the baker, the automobile dealer, the tailor and the dressmaker.

Certainly the sum of $750 million in grain over a 3-year period won't solve all of our farm and economic problems.

But it can help ease some of them, and if the sales can increase in time it will make an even bigger dent in these problems.

ALL-ALASKA SOAP BOX DERBY

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the efforts of Alaskan schoolchildren I would like to call attention to the following proclamation by Gov. William A. Egan declaring Soap Box Derby Day:

PROCLAMTAION

SOAP BOX DERBY DAY

The All-Alaska Soap Box Derby will be run July 15, 1972, under the auspices of our outstanding newspaper and broadcast media, civic and fraternal groups, and public-spirited businesses.

School boys of Alaska for many months now have devoted their time and energies to the design and construction of coasting racers in preparation for a competition to be run according to good sportsmanship, fair play, and other stipulations set by a national ruling body.

This program prompts the adult citizenry to join together in a united effort for the sole purpose of establishing and perpetuating a civic program with the benefit of youth its salient goal.

The inherent result of such program is to bring about a lasting appreciation for ingenuity and enterprise by the young people of this community and the Nation.

Therefore, I, William A. Egan, Governor of Alaska, proclaim July 15, 1972, as

ALL-ALASKA SOAP BOX DERBY DAY

and encourage all citizens to attend this event and join me in extending best wishes and congratulations to all participating boys.

JUNE IN LITHUANIA

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, we in the United States too often take our precious right of freedom of religion for granted. The obstacles confronted by peoples less fortunate than ourselves in this respect were made very clear to me when I traveled to the Soviet Union earlier this year with the Select Subcommittee on Education.

While I did not visit the Soviet Socialist Republic of Lithuania during my trip, I feel very strongly about the recent tragic events there that have received appropriately deserved attention in the American press.

Another poignant and informative account of the Lithuanians' struggle for religious and national freedom appeared on June 16 in a newspaper with a more limited circulation—the Tidings. The article not only recounts all the trials and adversities that the people of Lithuania have experienced, but also presents a slightly different viewpoint from that of the national media.

I, therefore, urge thoughtful consideration of its contents, as follows:

LITHUANIA

The month of June has special significance for the Lithuanian people. Thirty-two years ago this month, in June of 1940, the Soviet Union invaded the States of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and seized them by force of arms. This was the beginning of many sorrows.

One year later, in June of 1941, the Communist invaders started mass deportations of the Baltic people; and over 150,000 of these people were immediately swallowed up in Siberian slave and labor camps. In the period between 1941 and 1952, it is estimated that over 150,000 others have followed the same pathway to exile and death.

In addition: About 75,000 others were able to escape to the West, and about 30,000 Lithuanian freedom-fighters were killed in guerrilla warfare resisting the Soviet occupation. Thereafter, the history of Lithuania follows a familiar pattern of repression and tyranny.

Lithuania in 1940 was 85 per cent Catholic, with Jewish, Protestant and Orthodox minorities. There were twelve Bishops, 1640 priests. Today there are only two active Bishops left; and less than 850 priests, most of them old and infirm. In 1940, Catholic organizations counted 800,000 members. There were 32 religious publications; with a combined circulation of seven million copies. Convents and monasteries, engaged in education and hospital work, numbered 118. Today, there are no Catholic organizations, religious publications, monasteries or convents.

The Cathedral Church of the city of Vilna has been converted into an art gallery. St. Casimir's Church in the same city is now used as a museum of atheism. Resurrection Church in Kaunas has been made into a radio factory. Students are punished for attending church services. The few priests are forbidden to teach religion; any lay person presuming to instruct children in Christian doctrine is liable to a sentence in Siberia for 10 to 25 years.

Yet Communist pressure has not succeeded in destroying Lithuania's faith and love of freedom. And this proud, brave nation, one of the oldest in Europe, is still fighting largely on its own. True, the United States Congress in its 89th session in 1967 unanimously passed Concurent Resolution 416, calling for freedom from Soviet domination of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. But that is as far as diplomatic pressure has been applied.

A few months ago, 17,000 Lithuanians signed a petition of protest against repression of religion and sent it to the United Nations. It was to be forwarded to Soviet Communist Party secretary Brezhnev in Moscow. Earlier protests sent directly to Soviet leadership has resulted only in intensified repression of the Lithuanian church. No result has yet been reported from this latest attempt.

But the Lithuanian quest for independence will not die. Last month, in the city of Kuanas, rioting broke out, dramatized by the self-immolation of a 20-year-old student. This week it is reported that another student has used the same method of protest. These events are evidence of a smouldering flame of resistance which will not be squelched, and have fastened international attention on the plight of the Lithuanian people.

There are two million Lithuanian-Americans in our nation. This Sunday they are asking us all to join them in a day of prayer for the land of their ancestors. This is a real and practical way in which we can proclaim our fellowship with them in devotion to freedom, allegiance to the faith and a dependence on God's grace. And it may remind us of the continued need of those qualities of the spirit in our own time and place.

SECRETARY ROGERS CELEBRATES DICTATORSHIP ON FOURTH OF JULY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to the attention of my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on July 6 which some may have missed because of the recess. The article points out that Secretary of State William Rogers spent the Fourth of July in Greece, whose present government represents the antipathy of the hopes and freedoms which give meaning to the Fourth of July.

I think that it is unfortunate, indeed, that Secretary Rogers chose this day, which means so much to freedom-loving people everywhere, to visit this oppressive military government in Greece. This is just one more gesture of support for this repressive and antidemocratic government. And, while this gesture is not as significant as our continued military support of the regime, symbolically it must certainly have been a source of distress and dismay for those true Greek patriots who hope to again establish democracy and liberty in Greece just as we established our own freedom on July 4, 1776.

IDEAL—LYNWOOD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PROGRAM TO ATTRACT MORE BUSINESS

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, most business communities provide a wealth of goods and services to the citizens in their areas. However, often those who seek a particular product or service do not know where it can be found and at what price.

In many instances, the company that has the perfect item in stock—and at a competitive price—is overlooked simply because the buyer was not aware of the company's existence.

In order to correct this problem and serve both the business community and the general public, the Lynwood, Calif., Chamber of Commerce has instituted a program known as IDEAL—Industrial Development and Economic Action for Lynwood.

The program consists of contact and weekly liaison with prime contractors in the Los Angeles area for the purpose of having the local Lynwood businessmen placed on their "request for quota" lists and, thus, enable Lynwood entrepreneurs to participate in subcontract work.

Through personal contacts and efforts, a steady communication with prime contractors is maintained and reported at the weekly IDEAL committee meetings.

I have firsthand knowledge of their efforts to contact prime contractors in other cities in the area. Through these meetings, the prime contractors are made aware of the attributes and skills of Lynwood business with the hope of creating additional jobs and enlarging the tax base of the community.

The IDEAL Committee, a collective effort coordinated by the Lynwood Chamber of Commerce, consists of members of the chamber, the city of Lynwood realtors, the Lynwood Unified School District, Compton Junior College, various community agencies, and local citizens.

The program, which has established both short- and long-range realistic goals, has four primary objectives:

First, they are to achieve desired results through a united community-city chamber of commerce effort.

Second, the IDEAL program, through location and growth, aims to secure additional business within the city of Lynwood by capitalizing on the present and future capabilities of Lynwood industries and services. Close working arrangements have been made with the National Small Business Administration and the Defense Contract Administration Services.

Third, they seek to obtain additional business for the community through subcontract work from major sources and suppliers.

Fourth, the IDEAL program is striving to assist in pinpointing community and business weaknesses while capitalizing on the strengths and correcting the weaknesses. Constant contact with business and its evaluation has been of great assistance in meeting this objective.

In addition, for the particular benefit of local small businessmen, IDEAL will conduct educational seminars dealing with administrative and financial aspects of small business.

Though this program is quite new and unique, results—in terms of new dollars being spent in Lynwood—are beginning to show.

Mr. Speaker, their motto "To do it the IDEAL way is to do it the profitable way," I am sure will prove accurate, especially as the program continues to grow and as its success becomes more apparent.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend the city of Lynwood, the Lynwood Chamber of Commerce, the Lynwood Realtors, the Unified School District, Compton Junior College, and the other various groups and citizens who are working to make the IDEAL program succeed. I would like to especially commend Mr. Norman Wasserman, the executive manager of the Lynwood Chamber, for his contribution to this community project.

I feel that this type of program can be used in other cities, and I am confident that they will find it equally successful in attracting new business to their respective areas.

STANDARDIZATION OF FIRE HOSE COUPLINGS BILL SIGNED

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, San Diego Assistant Fire Chief Robert Ely, the chairman of the International Association of Fire Chiefs Committee on Standardization of Fire Hose Screw Threads, has worked tirelessly for many years to alert citizens and legislators alike to the urgent need for the standardization of fire hose screw threads. I ask that my House colleagues carefully read the following letter by Chief Ely to the President and request their strong support for the passage of this long-overdue legislation:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIRE CHIEFS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., June 26, 1972.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Your signing of H.R. 13034—*Fire Research & Safety Act,* followed by the appointment of your Commission on Fire Prevention and Control to vitalize this measure, is the first comprehensive Government financed program and plan to reduce the shocking loss of life and property by fire this Nation has known. It comes at a propitious time, in an election year when the citizens of our country are weighing all humanities and economies and their political proponents.

A high point of your fire control program unquestionably is the research into cause and affect of fire as related to those who must pay for the losses to life and property, and for the fire fighting and prevention forces trying desperately to contain those losses within a regrettably growing minimum, *now costing the nation well over four billion dollars per year!* Statisticians could make some interesting comparisons between this material cost and the fact that fire is presently taking the lives of some 12,000 and more persons annually in this country!

For a century the lack of uniformity in fire hose threads has been recognized as an unnecessary evil, contributing to the spread of many of our most disastrous fires. The World Wars taught other bitter lessons. The Germans and the British waited until they were bombed before standardizing their fire hose couplings. The palatial home of the Crown Prince of Norway caught fire and was almost a total loss because fire equipment from the next town could not be used, due to nonconformity of fire hose couplings. Result? Norway soon instituted national standardization.

The International Association of Fire Chiefs has besought the highest authorities of this nation to help convert non-conforming fire hose couplings and fittings to the universally recognized national standard screw threads agreed upon by all National Fire Associations. These requests and appeals are well documented in Federal archives (see the Congressional Record, October 21, 1965, page 26889; October 14, 1971, page 36267 and April 25, 1972, 14217).

Certain areas of the National Government have evinced interest in the evils of nonstandard fire hose couplings and fittings, but action died aborning. Few citizens know how, when or where the non-uniformity of fire hose couplings and threads fit into the nation's fire loss and fire suppression pictures.

With the fire chiefs' assistance and the help of some of our progressive legislatures, some states have passed laws that require National Standard Fire Hose Screw Threads. Much progress has been made but there is still a long way to go. The Fire Chiefs in this country have been trying to get all of our fire hose screw threads standardized since 1873. After 99 years we must all admit that it is taking too long, and the Fire Chiefs can no longer be held responsible for the loss of life, property and the added expense caused by the use of so many nonstandard Fire Hose Threads.

We are not going to give up nor quit working until all fire hose screw threads are standardized, but with this letter here and now we are shifting the responsibility of getting the job done nationally to government where it rightly belongs. We need your help.

We have facts, figures and a slide program showing the need for standardizing fire hose screw threads and how it can be accomplished. We would like to show the program on how we helped to accomplish the job in California, Washington and Alaska to you, your Commission and the Congress.

Mr. President, we sincerely hope that you and your Commission on Fire Prevention and Control will recommend that the necessary funds be provided and legislation adopted to require all non-standard fire hose couplings, fittings and fire hydrants in the United States be converted to the National Standard Fire Hose Screw Threads.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT ELY,
Chairman, International Association of Fire Chiefs, Committee on Standardization of Fire Hose Screw Threads.

IN SUPPORT OF THE 3-YEAR GRAIN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SOVIET UNION AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from the State of Illinois—the State which leads the Nation in agricultural exports—I congratulate the administration for concluding the recent 3-year grain agreement with the Soviet Union.

In recent years, Illinois has exported nearly 50 percent of all soybeans and wheat in the United States, approximately 12 percent of all corn, and about 20 percent of the sorghum grains. Last year alone, Illinois exported $655 million in agricultural products. Also, the State of Illinois has had to idle over 40 million acres of cropland each year to avoid producing more grains than could be disposed through existing market channels.

The record $750 million grain deal with Russia is indeed good news to Illinois farmers, and in fact good news to all U.S. farmers. Last year, over 5.5 billion bushels of corn were produced. Even though exports equaled previous records, production exceeded domestic use and exports by nearly 600 bushels.

Further, in spite of the widespread participation in the feed-grain, set-aside program, it is probable that this year's corn production will again be excessive in relation to available market outlets if favorable weather continues for the balance of this growing season.

Against this background, the new agreement with the Soviet Union provides additional export outlets for perhaps 100 million bushels of corn. Illinois farmers alone export 100 to 200 million bushels of corn each year, so the new agreement will increase their exports by 15 to 20 percent. The agreement surely improves the longer run market position of U.S. grain producers. It brings total market outlets into a better balance with our production capacity and will reduce the amount of cropland which will need to be idled under the feed-grain, set-aside program.

It is clear that the Soviet Union is embarking on a program to increase livestock production. As Secretary of Agriculture Butz explained:

> The Russian people want more animal protein in the'r diets. To get it, they must increase their livestock production beyond the capacity of their farms and climate to provide feed grain.

Particularly in light of the winterkill. Soviet harvests will not fill the quotas set in their current 5-year plan. Therefore, in order to meet their goal, it is necessary for the Soviet Government to import feed grain. This 3-year agreement with the United States to purchase $250 million of feed grains annually, is certainly the first step in a long-term expansion of trade relations between the two countries. Their import needs for wheat, feed grains, and soybeans are likely to increase for a number of years, and U.S. farmers will definitely benefit. U.S. farmers will be able to sell more products, plant more acreage, and receive more income from the market.

I am confident this 3-year grain agreement with the Soviet Union lays the groundwork for a new era for East-West trade, and I commend the administration for its bold initiative. It is certainly conceivable that if Soviet diners take a liking to cornfed beef, the United States will be able to further expand its agricultural trade with considerable satisfaction to both our country and Russia.

ECHO OF THE KOREAN WAR

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago, I had the distinct pleasure of meeting Mr. Edward Hunter, author of numerous books on brainwashing. It is of this man that Dr. Fred Schwarz, executive director of the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade stated:

> One of the best informed anti-communists in the Free World.

In 1938 that same Edward Hunter predicted the Russo-German alliance. Before that, in 1934, he was freezing in the wilds of Manchuria feeding news to the United States that we could read at our breakfast or dinner table. Mr. Hunter has a distinguished record of writing on the evil of totalitarianism from whatever source and I think one of the more accurate and brief tributes to him was by George Sokolsky in the New York Herald Tribune on October 2, 1958:

> My old colleague in China, Edward Hunter. He writes with passion and zest and assurance of knowledge. He also has the advantage of using original source material which seems to be a dying act.

Edward Hunter has rendered invaluable service to the Office of Strategic Services—OSS, the U.S. Air Force, the CIA, and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, and is now editor and publisher of Tactics the only professional "psywar" journal. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN told him:

> I am sure your books and your writing and your experience will be very valuable if we can get all that before the American people.

In that connection, Mr. Hunter has written extensively on what he calls "the most contemptible character in the Korean war," namely Wilfred Burchett. In view of the extensive attempt to lend respectability to this Red agent propagandist of some 20 years, and the fact that at the insistence of Dr. Henry Kissinger, Red Agent Burchett was actually invited to the White House to meet the President, his history should come under examination by the American people. Edward Hunter has done extensive research on the subject of Burchett. The first article that Mr. Hunter presented on "the most contemptible character in the Korean war," from the May 20, 1964 issue of Tactics follows:

[From Tactics, May 20, 1964]

ECHO OF THE KOREAN WAR

If one were asked to pick the most contemptible character in the Korean War, one would be hard put to find anyone lower or more despicable than Wilfred Burchett, except perhaps Alan Winnington. Burchett was more effective in tricking Americans and Britons into treasonable acts in the prisoner-of-war camps in North Korea. As an Australian red agent posing as a newspaper correspondent, he was a bit slicker than his slimy English compatriot in red deceit. He was more successful in seducing the honor of the bewildered and frequently very sick captives.

Burchett has authored many a red book that sought to give credence to every communist lie and smear against either the United States or Great Britain. He used every lure to help in the subtle brainwashing of the American prisoners, to induce them to confess to engaging in germ warfare, and to engage in treason against their own country. Nothing was too vile for him. In "Plain Perfidy", published in the red capital at Peking, he gave this description of Chinese p.o.w.'s being returned to the reds:

"Haggard, with faces dank and moist like corpses, bearing the hideous mutilations of experimental surgery, some vacant-eyed, girls driven mad by attempted rapes, the stumbling parade of prisoners passed before the stony eyes of Americans in natty "pinks" who checked off their victims and even managed to grin."

One might think up vague generalities to make communists respectable as part of a co-existence effort, although this is a dangerously blind effort. But nobody could think up an excuse to make Burchett respectable in an American magazine of national circulation. One would expect that his name would never be presented to an American readership as merely "a 52-year-old Australian newsman who has been working for the Communists since 1951." Just to state this is tantamount to a despicable lie imposed on the American people, and a brazen cover-up for a vicious red agent.

But Newsweek has done just this in its issue of May 4, 1964, in its "South Vietnam" section. The Worker and Pravda could do no more on behalf of their side. Although Newsweek was a liberal publication before its purchase by the Washington Post, it never descended to this.

This is part of a larger picture. The National Guardian, a red rag put out in New York City, has been running a series of red propaganda dispatches from Viet Nam by Burchett. The New Republic collaborated in this deceit by running an advertisement in its May 9 issue that identified Burchett as only a "correspondent". This is fronting for the reds. There can be no excuse for such a hoax. The red network has as its aim the distribution of Burchett's writings in pamphlet and book form in the U.S. In order to put this across, the help of non-communist organs is required.

Indeed, a concerted softening-up campaign is taking place in the United States to condition Americans into acceptance of defeat in Viet Nam through the same device of a coalition government as was put across in Laos and earlier on the Chinese mainland. The Kennedy Administration, after describing Laos as a most vital strategic point accepted the communist demands and laid it open to creeping communist domination. But we would never abandon Viet Nam, President Kennedy then said. Almost at once, the campaign began to find a means to circumvent this clear-cut pledge. First, Diem had to be liquidated, for he insisted on opposing the red aggressors. Now, the tactic is to present the area as one that doesn't deserve our further help. "We tried, didn't we?" the fake liberals will be writing, and Secretary of Defense McNamara's frequent trips there will be pointed to as proof.

The American Congress and public must be on particular guard against this new betrayal.

[From Tactics, Dec. 20, 1968]

LAW BROKEN TO LET IN BURCHETT: TREASON IN U.S. GOVERNMENT

The State Department in early December put over a reprehensible, quickie operation to let Wilfred Burchett, a semi-official, roving propaganda ambassador for international communism, come into the United States on behalf of North Viet Nam. The State Department collaborated in recognizing Burchett's cover as an United Nations correspondent. In addition, it violated the law to help slip him into the country.

Burchett ceased being a legitimate, working newspaperman before the Korean War, when he became a Moscow agent. He is an Australian traitor who is traveling on a Red Cuban passport because his native country will not give him a passport, and if he enters Australia, he is likely to face charges because of his efforts to seduce British p.o.w.'s into treason during the Korean War. He operated similarly against American captives of the reds, particularly in obtaining fake confessions of a germ warfare by the United States, that never happened.

He is now engaged in propaganda warfare for North Viet Nam, in connection with the Paris negotiations for an end to the warfare. Use of a base on U.S. soil is a big aid to propaganda for America's acceptance of what, in effect, would be a betrayal and surrender terms.

BURCHETT'S ENEMY ACTIVITIES WELL DOCUMENTED

The State Department had no excuse for not knowing how exhaustively documented is his sorry record. Its connivance in giving him an even more helpful platform, inside the United States, indicates that communist infiltration still exists inside the State Department, and will constitute one of the major problems of the incoming, Nixon Administration.

Burchett's role as a red operative in North Korea was described in Congressional testimony, the text of which appears in the U.S. Government Printing Office publication, "Communist Interrogation, Indoctrination and Exploitation of American Military and Civilian Prisoners," hearings of June 19, 20, 26 and 27 of 1956, before the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, Senate. This 210-page document, only a comparatively few of which were published, was accompanied by a 24-page "Report," under the same title, fewer copies of which were distributed.

This was a period when the State Department was trying to hush up all references to brainwashing, and endeavored to prevent the hearings from going deeply into this subject. In a surprise move, Robert F. Kennedy was assigned to the subcommittee as chief counsel, and the persevering official who had prepared the hearings was precipitously shoved aside. Even so, the details that came out were harrowing. Unfortunately, they were simply ignored by the so-called prestige or fake "liberal" press.

Capt. Bert Cumby, then an Army man for 14 years, one of the American interrogators at the prisoner exchange at Panmunjom, identified Burchett along with Allen Winnington, of England, as part of the red apparatus in the p.o.w. camps that reported to a special military propaganda and indoctrination—brainwashing—office, with Soviet Russian liaison. Cumby declared (page 40):

"Burchett had a very important hand in slanting, in writing, in drafting, in making the propaganda appealing to the western prisoners, the Americans and all other United States prisoners. That is where Burchett came in. He served more or less as a consultant."

PART OF THE ENEMY'S "COMMAND STRUCTURE"

Burchett was connected, Cumby went on to say, with what generally was "the command structure. The implementation of the program flowed from that point."

The so-called "peace" movement, exactly as we find it fighting for the foe in the United States, operated in the p.o.w. camps, with a Russian officer "running the show." Cumby said:

"If we had an organizational chart you would find a line from the commanding general out to a central committee. This central committee was designed as the Central Committee for World Peace. It was the organization through which indoctrination, interrogation, and propaganda were implemented."

Orders came from headquarters in Pyongyang, the North Korean capital, "the communist government." Cumby described the creation of the committee as a front with two sections, one for indoctrination and the other for propaganda. An American prisoner was put nominally in charge of each. They received their instructions from a Chinese, who received his from a Russian. Robert Kennedy asked:

"Then the advice as to how the propaganda so it would be more interesting to the West was given by the Australian newspaperman and the English newspaperman, is that correct?"

"Yes, sir," the captain replied. He gave a significant description of the propaganda structure, showing the closely knit channels by which orders would go from the top, communist headquarters, to "the front, the Central Committee for World Peace," composed of prisoners and headed by Americans. Cumby said:

"It directed the activities, and it was more effective because they knew the minds and the attitudes and the mores and the culture. The stuff would come from the GHQ to the central committee. The central committee would work it over, would give it the Western slant with the assistance of Burchett. From the central committee it would go down to the camp committee, which is another level. That camp committee would further modify that stuff to make it appealing to those in the camp. Leaving the camp committee it would go down to the company committee, which would further modify it to appeal to the people in the company. In the case of the early days of it, all prisoners were segregated, so they tailored their material to appeal to that particular national group, racial group, or what have you.

"When it left the company committee it was further broken down. It was broken down and forwarded to the squad committee. So what you had, Sen. McClellan [John L. D-Ark., chairman of the parent committee and subcommittee], was one committee superimposed on another right on up to the top. It even went further than that."

Capt. Cumby made the role of the two Britons as red agents using newspaperwork as a cover, incontrovertible. Later on, for instance, this exchange took place:

"THEY CONDUCTED INTERROGATIONS"

Mr. KENNEDY. Captain, during the period of time when these two newspapermen, one from Great Britain and the other from Australia, were present were they seen frequently around the prison camps lecturing to the prisoners?

Capt. CUMBY. They were part of the command, Mr. Kennedy. They had free run of the camp. They even interrogated Americans.

Mr. KENNEDY. They did some of the interrogation themselves?

Capt. CUMBY. They did some of the interrogation.

Mr. KENNEDY. They were there as newspapermen from other countries, is that correct?

Capt. CUMBY. They were there as newpapermen allegedly, but I don't think there is any question as to what ideology either one of them embraced. They were part of the command. They were part and parcel of it. They conducted interrogations. In many instances they talked to Americans, and westerners could talk much better than the Chinese. They assumed that responsibility. They were VIPs, as one prisoner told me. They were VIPs. They were treated as such. They had houses near the headquarters. One was married to a Chinese and he had his family living right there within the area of the GHQ.

Mr. KENNEDY. You reached the conclusion that this was a system which was directed from Russia; implemented by the Chinese, but directed from Russia?

Capt. CUMBY. Yes, sir.

NONE OF THIS TOLD TO AMERICAN PEOPLE

Such newspapers as the Washington Post and the N.Y. Times had no space available for any of this enlightening material; All available space on such matters evidently was being reserved for ridicule and harassment of Congressional committees that exposed tactics of this sort, such as the House Committee on Un-American Activities and the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. So far as radio-television is concerned, never a whisper appears regarding this psychological warfare format. The same channel of organization is used in the United States for communist control of the so-called "peace" groups here.

Burchet was the subject of a personality study in the U.S. News & World Report of Feb. 27, 1967, which said:

"Mr. Burchett is described as personable, charming, skilled—and a highly dedicated communist propagandist. He has been working at it for more than 20 years. His goals are consistent: to make America and its allies look evil, and to make the communists look good. He has a knack for getting his views widely distributed in the non-communist world."

American law does not permit entree to be given in such cavalier fashion to a red agent with undoubted KGB links. The law specifies that the Justice Department must act on such a case. Of course, with Ramsey Clark at its helm, this is no obstacle to a Burchett. A time period is routinely required, too, for protests or a hearing against the granting of a visa. This customary procedure was characteristically evaded.

A highly complex maneuver had to be undertaken to permit into the United States this dangerous enemy operative, who was using his early journalistic career as a screen. Advantage was taken of the corrosion of Congressional powers, and the attrition of our Constitutional system of checks and balances. The admission added a subtle precedent, too, to the premise that United Nations sovereignty supersedes that of the United States. American law had to be ignored and evaded for this maneuver to succeed, as it did. Before we can undo the damage inflicted, and prevent its recurrence, we have to understand precisely what transpired. Then it is up to the incoming Administration to act accordingly.

A number of points must be realized. Firstly, that we have the Immigration and Nationality Act of June 27, 1952, Public Law 414 (82d Congress), Sec. 212 (27) (28) (29), which was violated, at least evaded. Burchett is patently excluded under it. Nothing could be more specific. The act forbids, in plain language, the entry of communists, or anyone whose presence imperils the security of the nation. Burchett, through his links to powerful, international networks at war with the United States, unquestioningly fits into this framework. The law was devised to keep out people of his kind.

The attorney general is required to determine such cases, in accordance with the law. The State Department is required to pass all such cases to the Justice Department for decision. The attorney general has the right to waive restrictions, when for good reason, and to let the applicant enter for a specified period. The President has this power, too. Customarily, a time element is allowed to elapse, to allow for protests and for a hearing. This is law. It simply was brushed aside, as if non-existent.

STATE DEPARTMENT RECOGNIZES THE U.N. OVER THE CONGRESS

The State Department took the position that it had no alternative but to grant Burchett a visa once the United Nations had accredited him as a foreign correspondent. Whether he was friend or foe, a bona fide correspondent or a hoax, or not newspaperman at all, had nothing to do with the case. Once the U.N. accredited him as a correspondent, we were obliged to admit him under the terms of the Headquarters Agreement between the U.N. and the U.S. This was the State Department's contention. It is a fake premise.

Under it, though, the U.N. agreement is observed by the State Department ahead of American law on the case, as if we were dealing with a treaty. The State Department, in the Burchett case, recognized the U.N. version of law as superseding that of the United States. The State Department was violating American law by doing so, and insofar as it has been able to get away with this crass maneuver, has created a precedent that U.N. jurisdiction on American soil exceeds that of the United States.

This attitude is so brazen and subversive that Americans generally have been unable to believe that it really existed. The almost invariable reaction has been to consider anyone raising such an alarm as just a crackpot. But the State Department's procedure in the Burchett case shows that so far as they can get away with it, we have elements in important areas of our government who are working toward this end.

Actually, there is no U.N. headquarters agreement, and there never has been. There are two drafts of a United Nations headquarters agreement with the U.S., one approved by the U.N., and the other approved by the U.S. There has been no agreement which of these two should prevail. Hence, by accepting the U.N. version, the State Department is subtly recognizing United Nations law as superseding that of the United States. Insofar as the Justice Department accedes to this, it is collaborating in this breach of law, but this is nothing new for our present attorney general, or our last couple of attorneys general.

"NO VALID ACCEPTANCE ON EITHER SIDE"

A hearing was held on March 15, 1967 on this subject by the subcommittee to investigate the administration of the internal security act and other internal security laws, of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The hearing was secret, but its text was released on Nov. 29, 1967 in a 126-page document, including appendices, and with a two-page index, entitled, "U.N. Headquarters Site Status of Agreement Resolutions." Julien G. Sourwine, chief counsel, who had been instructed to investigate this whole question, gave his report. He declared:

"The so-called United Nations Headquarters Agreement which was purportedly brought into effect in November of 1947, and which is ostensibly operative as an executive agreement, to amend or suspend U.S. immigration laws, and grant various rights of an extraterritorial nature to the United Nations and its personnel, is not, in fact, an agreement at all because there was no meeting of the minds. Amendments and reservations to the agreement made by the U.S. Congress were not adequately reported to the General Assembly by the U.N. secretariat. Interpretations or conditions set out by the sixth committee of the U.N. General Assembly were not officially reported back to the U.S. Congress. The agreement authorized by the U.S. Congress was not the same agreement authorized by the U.N. General Assembly. In legal contemplation, this is a clear case of offer, counteroffer, and counter-counteroffer with no valid acceptance on either side. There was, therefor, no valid agreement."

The disagreement between the U.S. and U.N. on the legal agreement under which the international organization operates inside the United States simply was being ignored, as if not to talk about it would resolve it. Indeed, this is the intent of both the U.N. and the State Department, but with the reservation by the U.N. that the agreement is the one recognized by the U.N. secretariat, and not the one recognized by the American Congress. The State Department officially recognizes the agreement including the provisions of Public Law 357 of the 80th Congress, embodying the agreement. But, Sourwine pointed out:

"References to the U.N. Headquarters Agreement in published State Department material, in published U.N. material, in published material of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and in the Congressional Record are misleading upon cursory examination. I am not attempting to say there are direct misstatements, but omissions and failures to make clear have led to a very mushy understanding of this, even by some of the people who deal with it."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY, IN EFFECT, IS MISLED

Further on, Sourwine testified:

"The Congress had authorized the President, through the secretary of state, to cause to be brought into effect the agreement the Congress had approved, necessarily subject to the reservations Congress had added by way of amendment. The fact that these two agreements were divergent and not identical was not brought squarely to the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations. As a matter of fact, the language of its committee normally would have led, I think, to the conclusion that they were the same agreement: that there was only one agreement and that it was the same as the agreement the General Assembly had authorized to be brought into effect."

The impression given that the so-called agreement actually is a treaty is an erroneous one, as was clarified in Sourwine's findings, as follows:

"The U.N. Headquarters agreement was never negotiated, or submitted for ratification as a treaty. There is some confusion here, because there has been some evidence of what appears to be a tendency in the Department of State to regard it, or at least to treat it, as though it were a treaty. But it was never negotiated as a treaty; it was never submitted for ratification as a treaty, and if, therefore, the agreement is to be regarded as valid for the purpose of amending or suspending the immigration laws of the U.S., or of preventing or impeding any steps necessary for the protection of our national security, it must be shown that it was a valid executive agreement, having the force of a treaty. But an executive agreement, like any other contract, to be valid, must constitute a meeting of the minds.

"Here, there was no meeting of the minds, but only an offer—that is, the draft agreement of June 29, 1947—a counteroffer, Public Law 357, the agreement to which the U.S. Congress assented, and perhaps a counter-counteroffer: that is, the draft agreement of June 26, 1947, as conditioned by the report of the Sixth Committee of the U.N. General Assembly . . . it is impossible to point to one single document constituting a U.N. Headquarters Agreement which has been legally assented to by vote of the U.N. General Assembly and the Congress of the U.S., or by any other effective and fully authorized action of representatives of both parties. The only possible conclusion is that there is no U.N. Headquarters Agreement."

BURCHETT AS SORT OF COVERT HANOI ENVOY

Actually, the virtual smuggling of Burchett into the nation with the help of the fake "liberal" press that referred to him falsely as merely "an Australian newsman who often has reported Hanoi's views" (Robert H. Estabrook, Washington Post Foreign Service, Dec. 4), was part of a sly, long-enduring effort to provide Ho Chi-minh with a secret emissary in the U.S. Sen. Thurmond helped pull the rug out of one such effort on Dec. 11, 1967, simultaneous with his disclosure on the Senate floor, "The Headquarters Site Agreement does not exist."

Thurmond pointed out that "the Administration has seen fit to encourage the Vietcong desire (to come to the U.N. in New York to plead its case), and has all but invited the Vietcong to come on American soil."

He refuted "the State Department position . . . that we are obliged by law to allow the Vietcong to come."

PRICE COMMISSION LOOKS DIRECTLY AT FARMERS

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I was genuinely distressed when the administration announced the lifting of meat quotas in an effort to hold down prices to consumers. I am distressed because it is not the price of the raw materials that results in high over-the-counter prices, but rather it is the add-on between the producer and the consumer and this same add-on will prevail on imported meats.

I have an editorial on this matter written by Gordon E. Duenow, editor of the St. Cloud Daily Times in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District, which with your permission, I insert into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I hope each one of my colleagues reads this editorial. It contains a great deal of commonsense and grassroots agricultural economy reality:

PRICE COMMISSION LOOKS DIRECTLY AT FARMERS

It seems almost unbelievable to those of us residing in the rural section of America to realize that the first place the Price Commission looked when seeking to control prices of food is raw agricultural products. After a meeting of the Council, a spokesman was quoted as saying that he felt the problem (high cost of food) exists because of lack of control of raw agricultural products.

Raw agricultural products, which by government definition includes both live animals and vegetables, have been exempt from controls since the start of the price control program last Aug. 15. The spokesman listed removal of exemptions as one of the main options. He also said the commission is not currently recommending a freeze on food prices, another principal option.

While the Cost of Living Council is not bound by the Price Commission's action, it will weigh heavily on any decision. It was indicated that a quick action by the council on the recommendation could be expected. There was general agreement that firm and immediate action was necessary, a news report stated.

The commission also discussed allowing only a limited pass-through of costs at the wholesale level, using government persuasion to try to talk down the rise in prices, and increasing meat imports.

No mention was made of "firm and immediate action" when the wholesale trade was mentioned. Only "persuasion and talk."

Those of us who live in rural America, especially the farmers, are fully aware of a situation which finds many farm prices at a comparable level with those of 20 years or more ago. In fact, some prices the farmer receives are less than 20 years ago.

This cannot be said of prices the consumer pays for food, yet the first place the commission looks is directly at the farmer. How can he be expected to produce food cheaper than he could 20 years ago. A Price Commission spokesman mentioned that profit margins in the food industry appear to be lower than normal. If profit margins in the food industry are lower than normal at 1972 prices, think what the profit margin of farmers must be when selling at World War II and Korean War price levels.

A cut of a dollar or more in meat prices at the farm level will have little effect on the price the consumer pays. Somewhere along the line the price keeps vaulting higher and higher. Even if all the farmers went broke producing food at give-away prices, we'd find the price to the consumer still would be high. In fact, if the farmer gave away his raw agricultural products, we suspect we'd still find only a small difference in the price of food.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. EARL L. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, freedom and justice are two words heard and spoken frequently by Americans. They are much more than just words, however. They represent two of the most precious elements of our American society. Often these basic components of our country's founding are taken for granted. Our forefathers fought and many of them died to win for us the freedoms and opportunities we are privileged to enjoy. We should continually be aware of and grateful for their sacrifices.

Other countries, however, are less fortunate. They remain in the hands of foreign powers, ruled and restricted against their will. During Captive Nations Week, attention is focused on these nations and their imprisoned inhabitants.

My personal experiences in the U.S.S.R. heightened dramatically my appreciation for my homeland. I have always dedicated myself to preserving our freedom and liberty and helping our neighbors to achieve and enjoy the same.

Even though our country has attempted to negotiate with Communist countries in many areas of common concern, Americans and all freedom-loving people should be on guard and cautious when dealing with these powers. To my knowledge Moscow has yet to rescind its commitment to "complete world conquest." To my knowledge the statement "we will bury you" still stands.

Let all Americans join in a renewed and lasting effort to thwart communism and free all captive nations from oppression and slavery.

AGRICULTURE COLLEGES AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, as is the case with many of our institutions today, the land grant colleges of the United States are coming in for some penetrating scrutiny.

Though critical studies may be painful for the subjects of observation, the process gives us all a chance to think about the workings of our institutions, building on their strong points, correcting whatever weaknesses may be revealed.

Reporter James Kiser of the Arizona Daily Star, Tucson, recently did a two-part series on land grant colleges, including the local University of Arizona. Mr. Kiser has provided us with some needed dialog and I commend his articles to my colleagues:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, June 24, 1972]

UA AGRICULTURE RESEARCH STIRRING CONTROVERSY

(By James Kiser)

(First of a two-part series)

A battle is ricocheting throughout the halls of the University of Arizona's College of Agriculture as critics charge it with ignoring social responsibilities while pursuing research that makes big farmers bigger.

Frank Appleton, president of the Research Ranch, a non-profit ranch near Elgin, and former head of the Peace Corps in Costa Rica, asserts the college is disregarding many of today's problems in Arizona. The college needs a "100 per cent commitment to join the world," says Appleton.

On the other hand, Dr. Harold E. Myers, dean of the agricultural college, believes it has never left the world. "We are getting out and working with the people," he says. Land grant colleges, including the UA, have been so successful that other countries are copying them, says Myers.

Underlying this debate is the fact that farms in Arizona (including ranches) dropped in number from the 1935 peak of 18,824 to 5,800 in 1970. At the same time, the remaining farms grew bigger and bigger. In fact, in 1970, on the average, Arizona's farms were the largest, the most valuable and the most profitable in the nation, according to U.S. Department of Agriculture statistics.

The agriculture college is not solely responsible for the rise of the corporate farm, or agri-business as it is often called, but it has certainly contributed.

Though land grant colleges were created by the Morrill Act of 1862, they were directed by the Hatch Act of March 2, 1887, to undertake research that would create an agricultural industry and improve rural life.

A Star study of spending within the agriculture college reveals that the emphasis at the UA has been on the first goal—creating and developing the agricultural industry—and that relatively little monetary attention has been paid to the second goal of developing the quality of rural life.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the agricultural college spent $4.3 million of budgeted state funds for research, according to the UA Comptroller.

Of that, most went to departments where the aim is to make the growing, harvesting and marketing of major crops more efficient.

The six largest spenders of budgeted research money were, in order: the university farms; agronomy (crop production); animal science; plant pathology (plant diseases); agricultural chemistry and soils; and horticulture (the growing of fruits, flowers and vegetables.)

The two departments which could be most expected to deal with problems of rural life, agricultural economics and home economics, were eighth and sixteenth, respectively, within the 20 sections in the college.

A partial survey of projects revealed that researchers within the departments emphasized efficiency in producing crops, many of which are grown mainly by large, agri-business, corporations.

In agronomy during 1971, for instance, there were 34 research projects, according to records compiled by Dr. Richard Frevert, head of the agriculture experiment station. At least eight of those were concerned with cotton, the state's largest crop, which is primarily produced by big growers and no small farmers. Other research concentrated on alfalfa and other forage crops.

An analysis of research projects in seven departments—entomology (study of insects), home economics, agricultural economics, agricultural chemistry and soils, and agronomy and plants genetics—showed them to be heavily weighted in favor of more efficient crop production.

The seven departments, except for home economics, were chosen because they are heavily funded by the state. Fourteen projects in the seven departments dealt primarily with cotton. Other studies included:

Seven on mechanizing the production of lettuce, cotton and cantaloupes and the application of insecticides.

Five on irrigation.

The search for a pollution-free chemical production of copper.

A pollen substitute for honeybees.

The economic structure of the horse-racing industry.

An analysis of consumer attitudes toward filled milk, which is made by adding vegetable oils to skim milk. (The results were used by the American Dairy Assn. in developing advertisements.)

Cooled environments to get better production from beef and dairy cattle.

On the other hand, only fifteen projects clearly related to "rural homes and rural life." They included:

Five studies on nutrition.

Two on permanent press fabrics, with one research studying the durability of men's white dress shirts and the other studying color retention of fabrics.

One on middle-income and lower-income mothers' attitude toward clothing.

One on color preferances of people over 60.

A study of regional needs of a community expected to stop outmigration.

Industrial development in rural communities.

Collecting of groundwater data in the Santa Cruz Basin.

Which pesticides affected mosquitoes in sewage oxidation ponds.

Eight of the fifteen studies were in the home economics department, which spent only $84,000 for research. The seven departments spent $1.6 million out of a total $4.3 million of state funds earmarked for research by the agriculture college. That is roughly an average of $1,000 of research for each commercial farm in Arizona.

There were no studies on the problems of migrant workers. or of farm laborers even though more have become unemployed as farms have grown larger and more mechanized.

Accompanying the college's emphasis on producing crops more and more efficiently has been a decrease in the number of farms with the remaining farms getting bigger and more valuable.

In 1940, 18,468 farms throughout the state averaged 1,388.9 acres in size and had land and buildings valued at an average of $8,321. By 1969, there were only 5,890 farms (only 4,252 were commercial farms). They averaged 6,486 acres in size and had land and buildings worth an average of $452,241. No profit figures were available for either year, but in 1970, the 5,800 farms remaining in Arizona had an average profit of $26,803, which made them the most profitable in the nation. Hawaii was second with $18,604 profit per farm.

Though critics praise this enormous success at creating an agricultural industry that has made food the cheapest it has even been, they now are insisting that colleges need also help the people who are hurt by this success. In addition, they claim the once-revolutionary agricultural colleges are now often used to protect and preserve the interests of a few.

[From the Arizona Daily Star, June 25, 1972]

AGRICULTURAL COLLEGES UNDER SHARP CRITICISM

(By James Kiser)

(Second of a two-part series)

Agricultural colleges throughout the nation are faced with a chafing paradox: farms are more productive and food is cheaper than ever before, yet the colleges are coming under increasing fire from critics and reformers.

The criticism itself is paradoxical: agricultural experiment stations were set up at land grant colleges to help create an agricultural industry, but now that the industry exists, critics accuse the colleges of helping big agricultural business, which they say doesn't need help.

There is another paradox: the American ideal of the farmer has been of a man close to nature, of a man with the earth, yet some modern critics accuse farmers and agricultural colleges of disregarding crucial ecological principles.

May 31 a private Washington, D.C., research group called the Agribusiness Accountability Project leveled the most recent criticism at land grant colleges and their colleges of agriculture.

Titled "Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times" in reference to the University of Florida's development of a thick-walled, hard tomato that could be mechanically harvested, the group's report criticized the colleges for "diverting millions of tax dollars annually to the service of large, agricultural corporations while ignoring the pressing concerns of consumers, environmentalists, American farmers, farm workers, small town businessmen and other rural residents."

Though the land grant colleges cannot be blamed entirely for driving workers off the farm and creating the urban crisis, no single institution—private or public—has played a more crucial role than the colleges, the report concluded.

At the University of Arizona College of Agriculture, Dean Harold E. Myers says the charges are not true, not for other land grant colleges and definitely not for the UA. Dr. George E. Hull, director of the agricultural extension service, and Dr. Richard Frevert, director of the agricultural experiment station, agree with Myers.

However, other highly reliable sources in the college, while criticizing aspects of the report assert it is generally true for the UA. In addition, a brief study by the Star showed research spending and research projects were aimed at efficiently growing, harvesting and marketing crops grown largely by large farmers. Relatively little research was aimed at helping consumers or farm workers.

Other charges in the report were:

—Land grant colleges "serve an elite of private, corporate interests in rural America, while ignoring those who have the most urgent needs and the most legitimate claims for assistance."

—Land grant colleges have wandered far from their origins, abandoning their historic mission to serve rural people and American consumers.

State agricultural experiment stations allocate less than five per cent of their total research to "people-oriented" research.

Colleges have created machines for farmers, but have done little or nothing to help those displaced by the machines.

Small farms are hurt by the mechanization research carried on by the colleges.

Much of the people-oriented research is frivolous or aimed at "selling" the consumer on inferior products.

Critics of the UA Agricultural College as well as of other land grant colleges argue for research that is more socially relevant. In addition, they raise questions about the economics and ecology of reclaiming desert lands for agricultural use.

Frank Appleton, president of the Research Ranch near Elgin and a former Peace Corps director in Costa Rica, advocates the "non-use" of Arizona's land, which he says is often used for marginal farming and ranching.

Speaking to the UA Agricultural Faculty Club on May 11, 1971, Appleton chastised the college for continuing its range cattle program in spite of the fact that "the semi-arid Southwest can no longer compete with the Southeast's greater rainfall . . . and the Southwest may be virtually out of the range cow-and-calf business in 25 years."

The need is for land grant colleges and public officials to "recognize the new Western resident who immigrates westward to open space, cleaner air and milder climate, and is therefore more concerned with the non-disruptive, non-consumptive land uses, and favors water used for people rather than surplus or marginal products of agriculture," Appleton wrote recently. Agriculture uses 90 per cent of Arizona's water.

He has not been alone in those criticisms.

On a national level, Lauren Soth, two-time Pulitzer Prize winner from the Des Moines Register and Tribune, has criticized the reclaiming of desert land.

In the American Journal of Agricultural Economics for December 1970, Soth argued that the public pays twice for putting desert land into farm production: once for irrigation subsidies, and secondly for the added cost of land diversion and farm programs in nonirrigated areas made necessary by the extra output on the irrigated lands. In addition, Soth claimed, the development of desert land reduced income of farmers who grow crops not under the commodity support programs in nonirrigated areas.

The criticisms go on.

James T. Bonnen of Michigan State University charges "many colleges of agriculture are living on past organizational capital, the memory of old glories and former successes, while they continue to play out increasingly obsolete roles."

Earl O. Heady of Iowa State University, on Nov. 11, 1968, said, "Those who reap the tremendous gains of our efforts (in agriculture) are not those who bear the costs and sacrifices." He argued agricultural colleges need to expand their programs to meet the needs of the groups who suffer by agriculture's rapid progress.

Throughout much of the criticism runs a central theme expressed by Frank Appleton when he spoke to the agricultural faculty at the UA.

"I believe that what I've been suggesting for your college is, quite simply, a 100 per cent commitment to join the world."

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES ACT

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes the difference between the life and death of a person is determined on whether or not htere is available prompt and professional ambulance care, or in the availability of good services in the hospital emergency room. It is therefore imperative that emergency medical care be of the highest quality, in every single community across this country. Any less can have a devastating effect.

Unfortunately, the fact is that emergency medical services are very uneven and the assistance you receive varies from one community to another, like the difference between night and day. In some, skilled ambulance corps are available with well-equipped ambulances—but, in other communities, you are lucky if prompt taxi service is provided to the hospital.

Quick, good emergency treatment can be critical; but the cutting down of services too often becomes part of the normal operation when communities or small businesses delegated to operate the services, try to cut back on expenses. The burden is heavy—and I believe that the Federal Government should step in to assist and insure that top-quality emergency medical services are available across-the-board.

Presently, there are 25 different Federal agencies and departments which provide some assistance. But these scattered programs do not have a uniform system of requirements, or of assistance; and it is easy to see how they can work at cross purposes when one arm of the Federal Government does not know what the other is doing.

The bill which I am introducing today would centralize responsibility for Federal Government support of local ambulance corps and emergency receiving facilities under HEW in an Emergency Medical Services Administration. The act would provide for minimum national standards, and provide for Federal assistance. Licensing would be required of drivers, attendants, as well as of the service itself. Ambulance vehicles and equipment would have to meet standards and inspections, and adequate liability insurance would be required to cover ambulance operations. In short, emergency medical care would be regulated and assistance provided to provide for top-quality emergency services.

Financial assistance would be made available to the local and regional communities through the States which qualify according to need. To qualify the States would have to establish a fully comprehensive ambulance program for a year, to assist local communities. Federal assistance would be available for the development and operation of existing ambulance services, and, in addition, grants would be available on a matching basis—50-50—for the initial purchase of ambulance equipment, vehicles, and communications system.

Any public or private agency or organization engaged in furnishing ambulance services will have to comply with standards in order to qualify for any form of Federal assistance.

A number of my colleageus have already realized the significance of this legislation.

The full House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee I understand is to meet in executive session on this legislation in the near future. I watch with anticipation and hope that it will be reported out favorably and passed by this House with speed.

I urge your consideration and full support of this measure.

GADSDEN FAMILY REPRESENTED IN FOUR BRANCHES OF MILITARY

HON. TOM BEVILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have residing in my congressional district one of the most patriotic families in the Nation.

Mr. and Mrs. Harry K. Whorton, who reside in Gadsden, Ala., have four sons in the military service. Each son chose to serve in a different branch of the service.

We are all very proud of these young men, and at this point, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a recent article telling of this unusual occurrence:

GADSDEN FAMILY REPRESENTED IN FOUR BRANCHES OF MILITARY

(By George Butler)

A Gadsden family, one of the most patriotic in the nation, is represented in four branches of military service—Navy, Air Force, Marines and Army.

Mr. and Mrs. Henry K. Whorton, who reside at 1015 Seventh Ave., have four sons in service and each chose a different branch. This record might be unequalled anywhere in the nation.

Last October, The Times ran an article about three of the sons representing the Navy, Air Force and Marines. Since then, 17-year-old David Whorton joined the Army. He is currently taking basic training at Fort Knox, Ky.

The oldest son is 24-year-old Airman 1-C Cam Whorton, who is stationed at Maxwell Air Force Base in Montgomery. He entered service in February, 1971, and was previously assigned to Biloxi, Miss. He worked with educational television for the county school system before entering service and attended Gadsden State Junior College.

Next oldest is 23-year-old Donald L. Whorton, radioman 3-C with the Navy. He is currently stationed at Jacksonville, Fla. He was formerly aboard the aircraft crarier, USS America, in the Mediterranean.

Lance Corporal Joe Whorton, 22, is with the Marines and stationed at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii with a Military Police unit. He has been in Hawaii nearly two years.

The four brothers all attended Gadsden High School.

Cam is the only one of the brothers who is married. His wife is the former Mary Wells of Glencoe.

They have two married sisters—Mrs. Johnny (Sandra) Duncan of Hokes Bluff and Mrs. James (Betty Kay) Beddingfield of Shelbyville, Tenn. Two of the eight Whorton children are still at home. They are Lurae, 19, and Harry Jr., 11.

COL. ROBERT H. CHENEY

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, there are times when one rises on the floor of this distinguished House of Representatives to speak words of praise about a fellow human being, and when it is difficult to find the words with which to say adequately the thoughts which race through one's mind.

This is such a moment, and the man of whom I am thinking today is Col. Robert A. Cheney, commanding officer of the Tobyhanna Army Depot in Pennsylvania.

In the disaster which was visited upon the people of Pennsylvania by Hurricane Agnes, this man served the people of that stricken area with a devotion far beyond the call of duty. That he is a great soldier we all knew through the magnificent work he did at Tobyhanna Depot, and through his recent nomination to the rank of brigadier general. I wish to tell you today that he is also a great human being.

When the possible magnitude of the flood first became apparent on the morning of Thursday, June 22, Colonel Cheney began the preparations to meet the approaching crisis. Within 2 hours the depot communications center brought a helicopter from New Cumberland to evacuate 30 people from Catawissa. Shortly after that the depot's military affiliate radio station brought a National Guard helicopter to evacuate 19 people trapped by the flood waters south of Catawissa. As the Susquehanna River continued to rise, the depot called for and obtained 100,000 sandbags in a desperate effort to control the flood at Wilkes-Barre. And on Friday, as the first 2,000 refugees from the flood were evacuated, Tobyhanna established facilities to house them, and provided the trucks to transport them.

By Saturday, the destruction had become horrendous. Not only was there loss of life and property, but there was an almost total elimination of communications throughout much of the stricken area. Colonel Cheney, who is an expert in the field of communications, spent hours with me, touring the disaster areas in my congressional district, and offering his own expertise and advice in reestablishing the telephone network throughout the area. And in the meantime he set up a radio communications network that operated out of my congressional office that handled many requirements in the stricken area.

In a letter to me which, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will append to these remarks, Colonel Cheney sums up the work which was done by his command at Tobyhanna. It is precise, correct, and brief, because the Colonel does not waste words in official communications. But it does not sum up the tremendous human devotion he put into this work, nor the devotion of the men under his charge at Tobyhanna. You would have to have been there, as I was, to see a brilliant man putting all his talents to use, to relieve the pain caused by the awful ravages of this flood, and to see him do it willingly and enthusiastically with no counting of hours, nor sparing of effort.

Col. Bob Cheney is leaving Tobyhanna for a new assignment in the U.S. Army. In due course, he will receive the star of a brigadier general. He has served with distinction, and Tobyhanna has continued to be an outstanding military installation under his command. We will certainly remember him for this; but I think we will remember Bob most for what he did in those last days of his assignment to Tobyhanna, when he rose to the challenge of the worst natural disaster in the history of this Nation, and did so with magnificent distinction. Every citizen of the 10th Congressional District wishes him well in his new assignment. He certainly served all of us well in his former one.

The letter follows:

JUNE 30, 1972.

Hon. JOSEPH M. MCDADE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCDADE: The following will provide you with some information as to when and how Tobyhanna Army Depot became involved with the flood disaster and what we have provided for support. Please be assured that we continue to provide priority assistance to the areas in need, and we will continue to do so as long as the Civil Defense, National Guard, and various state and federal agencies need our help.

We activated our Emergency Operations Center here at the depot on Thursday morning, 22 June, and have manned the center on a 24-hour basis since that time. We have rendered assistance to Wilkes Barre, Pittston, Kingston, Bloomsburg, Danville, Harrisburg, Catawissa, Athens, Sayre, and many other communities that have been stricken by flood waters. We have loaned out more than $2,000,000 of equipment, such as radio and telephone communication equipment, power generators, searchlights, water tankers, pumps, water purification equipment, medical supplies and fuel. We have arranged helicopter evacuation of flood victims and airlift delivery of needed equipment. Our depot communications center has continued to serve vital needs in the relay of messages, requests for sandbags, where the depot could not meet the needs from our own inventory. As you know, too, we have offered the use of our facilities for avacuees. We have not, however, been asked to house any flood victims to date.

In addition to the Emergency Operations Center here at the depot which has involved approximately 170 military and civilian depot personnel, we continue to man similar posts at the Naval Reserve Center in Avoca, the Wilkes Barre Reserve Center and another in the Scranton area. We want to provide all possible assistance to the Civil Defense, Red Cross, National Guard and the officials who carry the burden of assisting the inundated communities.

I am inclosing two fact sheets listing some highlights and examples of the support rendered by Tobyhanna. Inclosure 2 shows the magnitude of equipment we now have loaned to the flood stricken areas.

Please be assured our assistance will continue as long as valid needs exist throughout the region. If you know of any support we might provide, please continue to call on us.

Sincerely yours,

Col. ROBERT A. CHENEY.

A NEW WORLD POSTURE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the distinct honor of hosting in part the visit to our Nation's Capital of a distinguished representative of the Government of the Republic of Korea—the Honorable Youngsun Kim, Minister of the National Unification Board.

One of our endeavors during the Minister's visit was to develop a reliable and meaningful dialogue on the future relationship between the United States and the Republic of Korea. In the context of these meetings, a paper prepared by Minister Kim was made available to me and others giving his analysis and projections on this relationship.

It should now be abundantly clear to all concerned that it is past the time when we should restructure our international policies toward economic and social relationships with a decreasing reliance on mere military might. We must, to progress constructively in the coming world configuration, shift our emphasis from confrontations involving violence and military arm, and toward meeting effectively and responsibly the human needs and demonstrably serving the advancement of all our peoples.

I therefore take this opportunity to present to my colleagues the thoughts of my friend, Minister Kim, and commend the perspective he provides us.

KOREA AND THE UNITED STATES: A PROPOSAL FOR ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP

Conceptually, the United States seems to be determined to define the world order in multipolar rather than bipolar terms. Although the international system remains militarily bipolar, that it is politically multipolar cannot be denied. The only problem is how to define the American national interest in accordance with the reality of political multipolarity without sacrificing the structure of deterrence which is after all the most concrete guarantee for stability of the world order.

In this sense, the United States can be seen as engaged in two parallel efforts; one to restructure the political order of the world in multipolar terms and the other to maintain the essential foundations of defense commitments and alliance systems. The former has led to recent efforts to bring Communist China into the international system, while the latter meant that Washington had to reiterate its continuing commitments to the security of East Asian countries.

Undeniably, there is bound to be some conflict between these two efforts. It is conceivable that the tension might have been lessened, had the rise of Japan led to fulfill the earlier expectation regarding the role of Japan as simply sharing some of the burdens for the defense of non-Communist East Asia. But as has been pointed out, the emergence of Japan as a major factor in the international politics of the region has more profound and complex implications than the simplistic predictions had assumed in the 1960's.

For one thing, it is not at all certain that the assumption by Japan of a military role would contribute toward stability in East Asia, even if Japan could be expected to orient her policy simply with the existing framework of obligations. Inevitably, perceptions would differ as to the meaning of Japan's military power as producing additional tensions among the powers in East Asia. Communist China is not alone in having a deep concern about the implications of Japan as a military power. It is a concern shared by most countries in the East Asian Pacific region.

It is, therefore, imperative that the tension between two parallel efforts which we have noted on the part of the United States must be resolved without the comfortable but unrealistic assumption that Japan is going to provide the answer. A key to the problem of how to maintain stability while making necessary readjustments in an increasingly multipolar world must be found in the conception of the American role as implied by the Nixon doctrine.

With American presence gradually reduced, the structure of peace in East Asia can be still maintained through the increasing capability of individual non-Communist countries to defend themselves against limited military challenges.

It is clear that after Vietnam most Asian nations would have to deal with internal strife without direct American involvement. It is also clear that limited Communist offensives which do not involve direct intervention by either Communist China or the Soviet Union must be met by the nations involved themselves. The growth of free nations in Asia, a fact noted above, is a factor which makes it increasingly possible for us to meet this requirement.

But it is equally clear that the self-defense posture of small Asian nations makes sense only within the over-all context of the U.S. deterrence against the expansionism of the Communist powers. In the absence of such deterrence, it is idle and dangerous to pretend that the Communists could be persuaded to restrain their revolutionary orientations either through a rational dialogue alone or with the strength of small free nations.

This is most acutely true of Korea. While the political stability and economic progress of the Republic of Korea assure us of Korea's increasing capability to defend itself against a possible Communist attack, it is totally unrealistic to think that stability on the Korean peninsula could be maintained without the American deterrence. What the growth of the Republic of Korea means is that the American deterrence could be readjusted in its form, but it certainly cannot mean that the U.S. deterrence can be dispensed with.

The major problem, then, in future Korean-American relations is how to adapt the deterrent posture of the United States in Korea to the changing international environment without lessening the deterrent effect of that posture. If it is inconsistent with the conception of the American national interest to maintain the American posture in Korea without making necessary adjustments, to change it without regard to its effect on the deterrent effect can only be counterproductive in the sense that it will defeat the major goal of the U.S. policy, i.e. maintenance of stability in the international order.

The withdrawal from Korea in 1971 of one U.S. combat division must be seen in this light. On the one hand, it was obviously an effort to readjust the U.S. presence in Korea in accordance with the Nixon doctrine, although in fact it was undeniably motivated by budgetary considerations, and on the other hand, the timing and the manner in which the withdrawal took place left many of us in doubt as to the possible effect of the withdrawal on deterrence. The removal of the division came in the heat of North Korean pressure as evidenced by the increased number of armed guerrillas infiltrating south, while the ROK government publicly took the position that the withdrawal of one division significantly weakened our defense posture. It would have been far wiser, had the removal been made dependent on a less belligerent behavior on the part of North Korean Communists, while the U.S. government persuaded the ROK government that the partial withdrawal did not weaken the deterrence. It is important for the Korean government to take a positive stance, if the removal is not to weaken the deterrence, because the North Korean Communists are certain to take into consideration the ROK interpretation of the U.S. attitude in predicting a possible U.S. response in the event of Communist attack. Deterrence, after all, is essentially psychological as well as physical.

The problem confronting us now is how to persuade Seoul as well as Pyongyang that the reduction of the American military presence on Korea does not mean weakening of the U.S. commitment. On a successful answer to this question hinges the viability of the emergent multipolar international order, as far as the Far East is concerned. To sacrifice stability on the Korean peninsula in order to redefine the international system in multipolar terms is to court the risk of a Communist hegemony in the region or risk a revival of Sino-Japanese rivalry on the peninsula which is no less fatal to the objectives the United States seeks in the world.

To maintain deterrence while applying the Nixon doctrine, it is proposed here that the economic and cultural ties be strengthened and deepened to offset the effect of reduced military presence. Increased military assistance in connection with the ROK's modernization program is certainly helpful in this regard. But what is proposed here is a far more profound and extensive relationship between the two countries.

In the past, the U.S.-Korean economic relations were one of total dependence. What is proposed for the future is a relationship of interdependence in which both sides can derive economic benefit, not only political and strategic advantages. Although the proposal is made primarily with the maintenance of security in view, it is based on the assumption which is supported by an entirely economic analysis in the appendix, that both the United States and Korea have much to gain from an interdependent economic partnership.

In essence, the proposal is simple. It envisages the joining together of American capital and technology with Korean labour force to produce products that can compete in the international economy both in terms of price and quality. It means a large-scale American direct investment in Korea and a willingness on the part of ROK government to help with the maximum utilization of the joint economic ventures. Psychologically, investment of American capital in Korea would go a long way to convince both South and North Koreans alike of the U.S. commitment, thereby compensating for the reduction in American military presence.

Economically, Korea has shown a remarkable progress in the 1960's, which has made it possible for the United States to move from direct grants and short term assistance programs of 1950's to long term loans and limited investments in the 1960's. For the 1970's, it is necessary to move on to a new era of economic partnership based on direct equity investment, going beyond the stage of direct assistance.

From the Korean side, the advantages of an economic partnership with the United States are rather obvious. While the growth in the 60's was impressive, Korea still suffers from shortage of capital investment. With political stability now firmly achieved and the bureaucracy greatly modernized, the Korean economy is ready to move forward at an ever rising pace, provided that the vast need for investment can be met in time. The role of American capital, therefore, is crucial for the continuing growth of Korean economy.

From the American perspective, the following points can be suggested as relevant in demonstrating the feasibility of the proposal.

First of all, the political culture of South Korea offers us one of the most favourable environments for American investment anywhere in the world today. The commitment for the cause of freedom is deep and firm, while the Korean people are uniquely free from any historical memories of Western imperialism. Futhermore, it is a well known fact that Korea is the most faithful ally of the United States which has closely and consistantly identified with the U.S. global strategy. Political stability is now quite genuine, and even if there is short-run instabilities, there remains the wider national consensus which can be only conducive to healthy Korean-American relations. Secondly, Korea has the well educated and skilled labour at one of the lowest wage levels in the world today. As many sociologists noted, economic progress is to a very large extent a function of motivation, and the latter is related to education. In this regard, Korea has one of the highest literacy rates in the world, and its skilled manpower is most impressive both qualitatively and quantitatively. Furthermore, it is a labour that is highly motivated and also disciplined. It can compare favourably with its counterpart in Japan.

Thirdly, it is plain that there is a huge and growing market for us, if the U.S.-Korean partnership becomes a reality. Japan with a GNP of about 240 billion dollars (1971), and Communist China with a population of 800 million, and the rest of Asia as well offer us a vast and expanding market. Futhermore, culturally the Asian countries are certain to be more receptive to Korean-American products than products from any other competing economy. While Korea ensures the absence of danger in terms of aggressive economic penetration, the U.S. guarantees quality of technology which even Japan cannot seriously rival.

Finally, a combination of American capital investment and Korean manpower can produce at a price level that could favourably compete with the Japanese economy even within Japan. As the Peterson Report made clear, one of the most serious problems facing the United States is the continued worsening of its balance of payments situation, and one of the most critical factors responsible for the situation is the widening imbalance in the Japanese-American trade. The U.S. runs about 1.5 billion dollars in deficit at its annual trade balance with Japan alone. An economic partnership with Korea can go a long way to overcoming this imbalance and solving the balance of payments problem for the United States.

Incidentally, it is not unreasonable to suggest that alternatives the United States can choose in stead of the proposed Korean-American economic partnership are fraught with ramifications that are politically undesirable and economically unsound. Conceivably, Washington could strengthen measures to protect domestic industries against foreign, particularly Japanese competition. But such a protectionist posture cannot fail to provoke counter-measures from other countries, leading eventually to a trade war among the nations of the free world and thereby creating new tensions in the international relations. On the other hand, should the United States demand a voluntary restraint on the part of the Japanese, it is doubtful if the Japanese, given the dynamism inherent in their economic system, can actually exercise selfrestraint even if they wanted to. Finding it impossible to satisfy the American demand, the Japanese are likely to resent such U.S. attitude as a form of undue pressure.

Our suggestions, therefore, is that a solution to the balance of payments problem for the United States should be an economic one, not a political device. Fundamentally, it should have an economic rationality within the framework of free economic system. And the proposed Korean-American partnership is precisely such an answer to the problem of trade imbalance facing the United States today.

For the reasons suggested, the proposed Korean-American economic partnership is not only necessary for the purpose of maintaining the stability in East Asia as the U.S. adjusts its diplomatic posture, but also condusive to solving one of the most serious economic problems facing the United States today. And precisely because it is consistent with the American national interest, it is a more realistic concept than the simplistic cold war notions that dominated the past relations between the United States and Korea.

* * * * *

It has been suggested that the proposed economic partnership is consistent with the American national interest. This is true not only in the economic sense but perhaps more importantly in the strategic sense as well.

The American interest in East Asia can be defined in terms of maintaining stability while preventing hegemony. Korea is critically important on both accounts.

On the one hand, Korea could become a significant and perhaps crucial factor in possible emergence of a hegemonic power in the area. Should the Korean peninsula be permitted to fall into an exclusive sphere of influence under a single power, it is obvious that control of Korea could serve as a bridge to hegemonic influence in the entire Far East and possibly the East Asian-Pacific region.

On the other hand, Korea could also become a cause of uncontrollable instability in the Far East. In the absence of U.S. deterrence Korea could not avoid creating a power vacuum, which would inevitably tempt the powers surrounding the peninsula to take advantage of the situation to gain a bridge to hegemonic influence. As a result, a wild scramble for influence and control is likely to ensue, eventually leading to a violent confrontation.

To ask which of the two possibilities suggested above is preferable from the American point of view is of course to make clear how utterly important it is for the U.S. not to underestimate the strategic significance of the Korean peninsula. If hegemony means a direct threat to the American security itself, instability implies heightened probability of a war in which the U.S. may have no choice but to take part. For the failure of the U.S. to affect the outcome of such conflict could mean emergence of hegemonic dominance by a single power in East Asia.

These are of course no mere theoretical speculations. At the turn of the century, the willingness on the part of the United States to let Korean peninsula fall under the Japanese eventually led to the emergence of Japanese hegemony in East Asia and the inevitable conflict to deal with the problem of hegemony in the region. Had Korea been kept from becoming an element of a hegemonic system, the history of international relations in East Asia might very well have taken a different turn than it did.

That is why it is so important for us not to repeat the mistakes of the past and ensure stability in the Far East by guaranteeing security of the Korean peninsula.

In the future, should a power vacuum be permitted to develop in Korea either by default or design, the whole concept of the Nixon doctrine, namely the idea that a world order could be ensured within a politically multipolar framework, is likely to prove counterproductive in that instability on the Korean peninsula is bound to provoke a hegemonic drive.

In fact, as the international system becomes multipolar, the strategic importance of Korea increases, for control of the peninsula cannot but give a margin of influence that could prove decisive in a multipolar system.

To be sure, from a strictly military point of view, it is understandable if some have doubts about the strategic importance of the Korean peninsula. After all, that is how Washington seemed to have viewed Korea in the period immediately following the Second World War.

The trouble with a strictly military point of view is that it is strictly military while reality is always more complex and varied. Particularly in a multipolar world, strategic considerations cannot be confined to narrowly military factors in a technical sense alone. A strategic conception must embrace both political and military dimensions.

It is in this larger strategic sense that the importance of the Korean peninsula becomes apparent. For what happens in Korea can have decisive implications for balance of power in the entire Far East and East Asia.

That is also the reason for our suggestion that the security of Korea is very much in the interest of the United States.

If Washington wishes to maintain balance of power in East Asia, the United States cannot afford to let Korea become a pawn in the struggle for hegemony in the area.

The only real problem for the United States is how to ensure security in the Korean peninsula without exceeding the limits beyond which it is unreasonable to carry a greater burden. With budgetary pressure and increasing shortage of man power, Washington must inevitably seek to reduce its direct responsibilities for Korea's security as the withdrawal of one combat division demonstrated a year ago. How to meet this need for reduction of America's burden without endangering stability of the Korean situation is indeed the crux of the problem facing us today.

As has been already made clear, it is our conviction that the most realistic solution to the above problem is an economic partnership between Korea and the United States, which will hopefully compensate for the effect of reduction in direct responsibilities on the effectiveness of U.S. deterrence. A large scale capital investment in Korea will demonstrate the continuity of U.S. resolve and the strength of American commitment. That is why we propose Korean-U.S. economic partnership for the ultimate purpose of maintaining balance of power in the East Asian-Pacific region.

* * * * *

Concretely, to carry out the proposal, it will be necessary to take the following steps.

For the United States, those in a position to invest in Korea should become, first of all, convinced that investment in Korea is economically sound. To that end joint economic conference between the United States and Korea would be helpful to exchange information and map out a strategy of investment. Both private business representatives and public officials must take part in such a conference. If successful, the conference can develop into regular consultative meeting on an annual basis.

Secondly, American business representatives have to be assured that investment in Korea is not only economically sound but also politically safe as well. There are a number of ways to help persuade American business representatives that Korea is politically stable and completely reliable. But also it is important that the U.S. government should make clear its own attitude on this. It can do so most effectively through broadening the scope of its risk-guarantee system. There is already in existence U.S. equity investment in Korea based on risk-guarantee system. What is needed is a willingness on the part of U.S. government to extend such successful application of risk-guarantee system to a much greater range of investment areas.

Thirdly, it will be necessary for the Korean government to show maximum feasible flexibility in responding to American investment in Korea. Bureaucracy must be made more responsive to policy considerations, while a legal and administrative infrastructure must be carefully built to utilize American investment to the fullest possible extent. Neither should cultural and social dimensions be neglected. For a social and cultural environment conducive to healthy Korean-America relations is essential to the success of an economic partnership.

Fortunately, all of these requirements are clearly within the realm of possibility. The Korean government is already prepared to carry out its responsibilities, while the Korean people cannot be any more positively oriented toward Korea-American partnership. The United States government too has already shown a willingness to apply risk-guarantee system in Korea and has actually done so in the past, while American business has also shown an increasing interest in possibilities of investment in Korea. It is no exaggeration to suggest that conditions are now ripe for an economic partnership between Korea and the United States.

All that is required now is a clear conception of what the partnership means economically and politically. For without such a conception, only piecemeal and hesitant efforts can be made, while with the necessary vision we will be able to push ahead with vigor and determination.

Ultimately, the proposed partnership should be conceived as an instrument for peace as well as prosperity. For the latter goal, it should contribute to overcoming the balance of payments problem for the United States and stimulating the growth of Korean economy. For the former, it is indispensible in maintaining the credibility of American commitment abroad and securing stability in East Asia by preventing emergence of a hegemonic power.

It will be, therefore, an historic decision to accept the challenge to create a partnership between the United States and Korea. To fail to do so, of course, will be no less an historical decision, for it will surely lead to instability in the future international relations. To move ahead in the direction proposed is the only realistic way to ensure peace while realizing prosperity.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, it has now been 13 years since the 86th Congress of the United States first authorized the observance of Captive Nations Week. It is my hope that, with the passage of time, we have not allowed ourselves to become less fervent in our desire to see the people of Eastern Europe released from their bondage.

The basic freedoms that we as Americans hold so dear are virtually unknown to those who are enslaved by communism. I believe that unless we continue our moral support, the people of Eastern Europe will never have the opportunity to live in a democratic society.

Through cooperation and understanding, the nations of the world have taken many great steps forward in the past quarter century. Technological and social changes have become the order of the day, with the betterment of mankind as the stated goal. Changes that encourage harmony and brotherly love between nations are always welcome, and progress has been made, but until every man, woman and child is free to determine his or her own destiny, we cannot afford to relax our efforts.

Recently President Nixon has journied to Mainland China and to the Soviet Union in an attempt to better our relations with these two powerful nations. The President's efforts have opened new avenues of diplomacy which can only further the cause of world-wide peace. Perhaps as we cultivate these new relationships we will be able to show the rest of the world that good government does not necessitate the oppression of those who are governed.

It is disturbing to realize that we who are blessed with the greatest amount of personal freedom often seem to appreciate it least. The result is that while we are in the best position to lend a helping hand to those less fortunate, we sometimes accomplish the least.

I sincerely hope that during this week which has been set aside to express concern for those in captivity, free-thinking men and women everywhere will take time to contemplate the plight of their brothers and sisters who are laboring under the yoke of communism.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 13th annual observance of Captive Nations Week. It is a time set aside for Americans to remember those mutions of people in the captive nations of Eastern Europe and Asia. In a world that is increasingly becoming imbued with the spirit of freedom and indepedence, it is indeed tragic that so many people should be cut off from the human right of freedom by the restrictive ideology of communism.

A penetrating look by all Americans at the plight of these captive people can only lead to a saddening but hopeful reaction.

We are sad that these people do not enjoy the individual liberties that are taken for granted in the United States and much of the rest of the free world. We are sad that these people are frustrated in their search for lives which are free from state control by the Communist Party. We are sad that these people are cut off from any extensive contact with the West by the physical and spiritual barriers that have been erected by the Communists, the reasons for which are obvious.

However, one can also be hopeful, even though the enslavement of these captive nations may seem permanent to some. There is an increasing amount of evidence that these nations are rebelling against the stranglehold which the Communists are trying to keep on them. Intellectuals especially are refusing to succumb.to the Communist ideology. Some of these nations are bravely demonstrating that they are not mere submissive satellites, but nations seeking to express their identity. Some are showing that they are definitely interested in establishing meaningful ties to the West.

We must not let these overtures go unnoticed. Instead, let us look forward to the day when these nations will no longer be captive.

FHA 231 PROJECTS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I include in the RECORD a letter written to me by Mr. Josh L. Wilson, president of Eskaton, a nonprofit Oakland, Calif., corporation. Mr. Wilson has very ably expressed his concern over a recent FHA administrative ruling which adversely affects the opportunities of nonprofit corporations to invest in projects under the section 231 program for elderly housing.

The letter follows:

JUNE 26, 1972.

Hon. JEROME R. WALDIE,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALDIE: Eskaton is a non-profit Oakland, California corporation concerned with today's crisis in healthcare, housing and education, and is actively involved in creative programs in these areas. A non-profit firm, as you know, reinvests its "profits" in the performance of the corporation's services, as opposed to paying these benefits to stockholders for their personal financial gain. In return for this, the law, under certain conditions, frequently allows a non-profit enterprise to be excused from the payment of taxes.

In the conviction that the above principle can be put to work as a valid and vital force in solving America's social ills, Eskaton, and many other like-minded corporations, have invested heavily in socially beneficial projects which depend completely on tax abatement for their economic survival. Specifically, we are concerned about an administrative ruling from FHA which is having the effect of virtually eliminating non-profit corporations from participating in housing programs such as the Section 231 program of elderly housing. In projects where exemption from real estate taxes is received, FHA requires the sponsor to sign FHA Form No. 1708, copy enclosed. This document is blatantly discriminatory against non-profit corporations. Inasmuch as no non-profit corporation would have the reserve funds to be able to comply with the requirements of Section 2, it would mean total financial disaster if it were ever necessary to enforce it. We view this as an administrative ruse to completely nullify the intent of the housing legislation and eliminate non-profit corporations from participation in the programs.

Eskaton presently has in the development stage several FHA 231 projects which, if built with tax abatement can serve an urgent social need. Under the present conditions, however, we must, of necessity, pass up these opportunities. We therefore most urgently request that you bring pressure to bear upon the officials at FHA to administer their programs with relation to non-profit corporations in accordance with the intent of the housing legislation.

Very truly yours,

JOSH L. WILSON, JR.,
President.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS: THE BEST AND THE WORST OF TIMES

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have all been hearing a great deal recently about the financial difficulties being encountered by nonpublic schools. I am sure my colleagues will profit from an article on this subject which appeared in the November-December 1971 issue of the School Foodservice Journal entitled, "Catholic Schools: The Best and the Worst of Times." The article was written by Dr. Edward R. D'Alessio, director of the Elementary and Secondary Education Division, U.S. Catholic Conference, and Mr. Russell B. Shaw, director of the USCC's Office for Information. I insert it in the RECORD at this point:

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS: THE BEST AND THE WORST OF TIMES

Charles Dickens said it well, "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times."

Dickens was not talking about Catholic schools. But in that Dickensian paradox—"the best of times, the worst of times"—lies the story of the present and future of the U.S. Catholic school system.

It is a commonplace to say that this country's Catholic schools are facing a crisis. Less often acknowledged is that the "crisis" is a highly complex phenomenon that cannot be reduced to one simple cause. And even more frequently ignored is the fact that, the crisis notwithstanding, Catholic schools today are in many important respects stronger than they have ever been before.

The roots of the "crisis" go deep. In part the problems of the schools reflect the problems of the Catholic Church—and indeed of just about all organized religious bodies—in America today. These problems are expressed in declining contributions and church attendance figures and in the polarization of liberal and conservative church members. This situation is, furthermore, not confined to the church-related sphere. The anti-"establishment" attitude applies to virtually all institutions in our society today.

The problems of the Catholic schools also reflect the problems of all American schools. Schools have become focal points for social change and social controversy—battlegrounds on which such issues as minority rights and community control, the generation gap and changing manners and mores are fought out. This lends excitement to the educator's life but it also places burdens on him—and his school—that did not exist in quieter, more stable times.

The "crisis" syndrome in Catholic education also has some special aspects all its own. Enrollments are down, costs are up, schools are closing, religious vocations (for years, the main source of a low-cost teaching force) are off.

Anyone who cares to concentrate exclusively on the problems of Catholic schools can easily paint a picture of unrelieved gloom and doom. In fact, some people are busy doing just that. But a different observer (not necessarily more optimistic, but possibly more farsighted) can also find persuasive evidence for the conclusion that Catholic schools *do* have a future—and a bright one at that.

There are more teachers in Catholic schools than ever before, and they are better qualified than in the past. Teacher-pupil ratios have declined dramatically. In a number of places imaginative new approaches—in instructional methods or organization or policy-making, or all three—are either underway or on the drawing boards. Catholic schools are moving more and more into the mainstream of American education, stressing their civil responsibilities and opportunities. Catholic educators are taking a fresh look at their role and the role of the schools, and evolving ways to maximize their service to the Church and the community.

A closer look at the Catholic schools bears out the contention that these are indeed the best and worst of times. Let's start with the bad news first and see the "worst".

Although there are many elements in the current Catholic school crisis, one stands out—money. A December, 1970, meeting of some 40 Roman Catholic bishops—metropolitans (heads of ecclesiastical provinces) and members of the Education Committee of the U.S. Catholic Conference—concluded that Catholic schools "now are in fact in a severe financial crisis." This was only official confirmation of what had been apparent for some time.

Reasons for the crisis are many. American education costs generally have leaped in recent years, because of inflation, parental demand for quality education, increased teacher salaries and other factors. All of these influences have been at work in the Catholic schools.

But Catholic schools also face special problems. Chief among these is the fact that the proportion of religious teachers has fallen off in recent years, while the proportion of relatively high-salaried lay teachers has risen steeply. In 1958 there were 112,201 religious teachers and 35,129 lay teachers in Catholic elementary and secondary schools. In 1970 there were 101,467 religious teachers and 98,001 lay teachers. Thus between 1958 and 1970, lay teachers almost tripled while religious teachers annually declined by 11,000. It should be noted, too, that salaries of both lay and religious teachers in Catholic schools have risen dramatically in recent years.

Almost all of the cost of operating the Catholic school system in the United States is borne by Catholics themselves. Some limited funds do reach Catholic education under various federal and state programs. But without dismissing the significance of this aid, one must conclude that it represents only a minimal contribution. And of course, while supporting their own increasingly expensive school system, Catholics as citizens also pay their fair share to support the also increasingly expensive public school system.

The tensions in this situation are obvious. Their most dramatic expression is the drop-off in Catholic school enrollment that has occurred since the peak years of the mid-1960's, together with an accompanying decline in number of schools.

In the 1967-68 school year there were 12,814 Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the United States; in 1970-71 there were 11,351. In 1967-68 there were 5,215,598 students enrolled in Catholic elementary and secondary schools; in 1970-71 there were 4,367,323. Thus from 1967-68 to 1970-71, schools declined by 1463 and students by 848,275.

It is not this article's purpose to make a case for state and federal aid to Catholic schools (although the authors happen to believe such aid is needed and justified). Even in this context, however, it is fair to note that these figures have implications—serious ones—for public schools.

Some people argue that the 4367 million students enrolled in Catholic schools in 1970-71 could, if the crunch came, be accommodated without too much strain in public schools. This might be true if the Catholic school population were spread evenly across the country. But Catholic school enrollment is heavily concentrated in large urban areas, and extensive Catholic school closings would have a major impact on public schools in these places. In Philadelphia, for example, 34 percent of the total school population is in Catholic schools; in Chicago-Gary, 32 percent; in Pittsburgh, 29 percent; in St. Louis, 29 percent, and in New York-Newark-Jersey City, 28 percent.

Many public school officials have recognized the implications of these facts for their school systems and, as a result, supported public aid for nonpublic schools. In a brief filed with the U.S. Supreme Court defending Pennsylvania's purchase-of-services program of assistance to nonpublic education, the Philadelphia public school district said it "does not have unused excess capacity with which to absorb these potential transferees" from the church-sponsored schools. It added that the legislation in question was "preserving definite educational advantages for all Philadelphia school children and preventing catastrophe for all by promoting excellence in secular education in the private and parochial schools."

President Nixon made much the same point in his March 3, 1970 Educational Reform Message. "Up to now," he said, "we have failed to consider the consequences of declining enrollments in *private* elementary and secondary schools, most of them church supported . . . In the past two years, close to a 1000 non-public elementary and secondary schools closed and most of their displaced students enrolled in local public schools. If most or all private schools were to close or turn public, the added burden on public funds by the end of the 1970's would exceed $4 billion per year in operations, with an estimated $5 billion more needed for facilities."

So much—in hasty overview—for the "worst of times". That Catholic schools have grave, even critical, problems, no one can doubt. But in other respects these are the "best of times" for them. How so?

One curious aspect of the current situation is that many problems are, viewed from a different perspective, indicators of progress. Take the decline in number of schools. While many have been forced to close because of lower enrollments and higher costs, other closings in fact represent the successful consolidation of smaller, less adequate schools into larger and more effective units.

Much the same is true of the increase in number and percentage of lay teachers in Catholic schools. While more lay teachers certainly mean higher costs, the enhanced role of lay people—growing out of the theology of the Second Vatican Council in the 1960's—makes it both proper and desirable that laymen assume a larger role in church-sponsored education. It is worth noting, too, that there are not simply more lay *teachers* in Catholic education today. There are also far more lay principals and administrators, including several lay diocesan school superintendents.

Again, changes in Catholic schools over the last decade have laid permanently to rest one of the old stereotypes about them—the complaint that their classrooms were habitually overcrowded, that the pupil-teacher ratio was excessively high, and that thus the quality of education suffered. Number of teachers has risen steadily in recent years (despite the drop-off in religious teachers) and in 1970–71 stood at 111,908 on the elementary level and 54,580 on the secondary level. At the same time the number of students has dropped—partly, at least, because of school and diocesan policies designed to reduce class sizes. Thus in the past school year the ratio of staff to students in Catholic elementary schools was one to 28, while at the secondary level, it was one to 19.

Today's Catholic school teachers are also better qualified than their predecessors. In 1970–71, 63.5 percent of elementary school religious teachers and 52.2 percent of lay teachers were certified, and another 23.8 percent were certifiable. At the secondary level, 65.4 percent of religious teachers and 62.1 percent of lay teachers were certified and another 26 percent certifiable.

As the National Catholic Educational Association, which compiled these statistics, remarked: "In the matter of the professionalization of Catholic school teachers, these figures have reflected the current pattern in Catholic schools which can be described as constant progress toward improved quality, at least in reference to those measures which the educationists have traditionally cited as the marks of a 'quality school'."

The same NCEA statistics give some interesting insights into the way Catholic schools—like their public counterparts—are responding to the educational needs of minority group and disadvantaged pupils (the two terms are of course not necessarily synonymous, but do often overlap in fact). While enrollment of students of non-Caucasian ethnic background in Catholic elementary and secondary schools is not particularly high, neither is it as low as has sometimes been asserted; and it is also significant that the percentage of black students in Catholic schools is far higher than the percentage of blacks in the total Catholic population:

In the 1969–70 school year, black students made up 5.1 percent of the total enrollment in Catholic elementary schools, Spanish students, 5.7 percent, and Indian students, .3 percent (a cumulative total of 11.1 percent). On the secondary level, the figures were: black, 3.7 percent, Spanish, 3.8 percent and Indian .3 percent (cumulatively 7.8 percent). Furthermore, 38 percent of the black students in Catholic schools are non-Catholics. And, without meaning to enter into public-nonpublic comparisons (because, in this area, all American educators admittedly have much unfinished business to do), it is at least worth bearing in mind, that, while public schools have 44.6 percent of their minority group students in predominantly minority group schools, the Catholic schools have 40 percent.

Moving beyond the tale told by statistics, it is apparent that Catholic schools are making progress in other ways, too. Catholic educators have, for example, become increasingly aware of the value of research as a source of data for improving their performance. Since 1967 alone, 57 diocesan studies of Catholic education have been carried out (and a number of religious orders have also conducted studies of their educational efforts). The impact of this research is being felt in better organization, better planning and better education.

Catholic educators are laying increasing emphasis on what they refer to as the "total teaching mission" of the Church. The rather rigid compartmentalization that marked Catholic education in the past—the separation of Catholic schools from out-of-school religious education programs, and of both from adult education—is giving way to a new approach in which the educational task is seen as an integrated *whole*, resources are measured against this total picture, and planning and implementation are carried out in a comprehensive, rather than piecemeal, fashion.

The policy-making structure of Catholic education has also been radically revised in recent years. Once the exclusive preserve of the clergy and religious, educational policy has now become a responsibility—and a right—of the entire community as a result of a fast-growing movement to develop parish and diocesan boards of education, responsible for setting policy for schools and other educational programs.

Catholic schools have never been noted for a propensity to rush into educational innovations (or into educational fads, for that matter). But more and more Catholic educators are taking advantage of their relative freedom to explore new teaching approaches. Approximately 20 dioceses presently have extensive instructional television programs. Nine of these have their own low cost television channels. The archdiocese of Chicago has a new plan for "Individually Guided Education" that will get underway in 1972 and is developing a program for "Education by Appointment" to be launched later in the 70's. Other school systems and individual schools are experimenting with novel approaches to individualized and value-oriented teaching.

What it adds up to is that, for all the problems, this is indeed the "best of times" for U.S. Catholic schools.

And, in the area of ideas, perhaps most striking of all about the current scene is the new understanding that Catholic educators have about themselves and their schools in relation to the total American educational enterprise.

American education today is a whole—an integrated entity—and this can only become more apparent as time goes by. In the past there may have been some justification for thinking of American education in terms of isolated, relatively unrelated segments. But this is no longer true today.

The realities of American life no longer support a rigidly compartmentalized view of our society or of our educational system. Separateness and compartmentalization—geographic, ethnic, socioeconomic—are becoming less and less meaningful in our nation with every passing day. The educational process must respect uniqueness—of individuals and of groups—without at the same time enforcing separatism. The objective should be to cherish diversity within an integrated society.

This is not to suggest that our society or our educational system either is or will become a totally homogeneous, undifferentiated—and somewhat bland and colorless—mass. Differences of life-style, of vision, of commitment do and should exist. There are and will remain many different ways of being a citizen of this nation.

American education should reflect and accommodate these different ways, provided they are not inimical to society's fundamental purposes. And as America becomes less compartmentalized, more integrated racially, of course, but in other ways as well, American education also must reflect this fact. American Catholic educators intend to bear this in mind as they define their role in the future of American education.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Dr. Edward R. D'Alessio is Director, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, United States Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C. Dr. D'Alessio received his B.A. degree in 1954 from Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey. In 1955 he received his M.S. degree in Education and in 1967 his Ph. D. in the Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Education and Educational Psychology, both from Fordham University (1956–58) and as a teacher, Orange Public Schools, Orange, New Jersey (1957–58), Dr. D'Alessio joined Seton Hall University. At Seton Hall he was Assistant Professor of Education (1958–67), Assistant to the Dean of Graduate Studies (1962–63), Assistant Dean, School of Education (1963–67), Interim Director, Upward Bound (1966) and Associate Professor of Education (1967). From July, 1967 until September, 1970, he was Coordinator of Governmental Programs, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, United States Catholic Conference, and in October, 1970 became Director of the Division of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Author and numerous articles, Dr. D'Alessio has lectured widely, served on many committees and as a consultant, and appeared on radio and television.

Mr. Russell B. Shaw is Director, National Catholic Office for Information, United States Catholic Conference, Washington, D.C. He received his B.A. (summa cum laude, 1956) and M.A. (English literature, 1960) from Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. His work experience includes staff writer for The Catholic Standard, Washington, D.C. (1957) and for the National Catholic News Service, Washington, D.C. (1957–66). From 1966–69 he was Director of Publications and Public Information, National Catholic Educational Association, Washington, D.C. Since 1969 he has been with the National Catholic Office for Information.

Mr. Shaw is the author of the Dark Disciple, Abortion and Public Policy, Abortion on Trial and S.O.S. for Catholic Schools. He is also an editor of books on Catholic education, a contributor to various encyclopedias, magazines and journals, and the writer of several monthly columns.

WILLIAM F. PYPER

HON. GERALD R. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday night death took a very good friend of mine, William F. Pyper, recently retired chief of the Washington bureau of the Booth newspapers of Michigan.

I was very much saddened by Bill's death. I was always fond of Bill because he was a fine human being. When my wife, Betty, and I first came to Washington after I was newly elected to the Congress in 1948, it was Bill Pyper who welcomed us to the Capital City and took us to dinner. He shepherded us around and helped us learn the ropes. A man could not have had a better friend. In later years I was Bill's guest at many of the Gridiron Club dinners.

Bill Pyper was one of the finest individuals ever to serve in the Washington press corps. He was a newspaperman for more than 40 years and a Washington correspondent for 27 years, including 15 years as chief of Booth newspapers' Washington bureau. Bill worked hard at getting a good story. He was objective. He never sought to advance his own point of view. And he was never interested in hurting anyone. He loved newspaper work and was devoted to it. It was his whole life.

Those of us who knew Bill Pyper held him in highest esteem. My wife and I extend our deepest condolences to Mrs. Pyper and to the Pyper children.

RESULTS OF THIRD DISTRICT OPINION POLL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I mailed out approximately 140,000 opinion questionnaires to all households in the Third Congressional District of Tennessee. Response has been gratifying. My staff and I have tabulated some 20,000 replies expressing constituent views on issues of national and local importance.

Replies indicate strong support for a constitutional amendment to halt forced busing of schoolchildren. They also reflect a vote of confidence for President Nixon's initiatives to achieve "a generation of peace."

A total of 86 percent of those responding to my poll favor an amendment to prohibit assignment of any child to a particular school because of race, color, or creed. Of those returning questionnaires, over two-thirds—67 percent—approve of the manner in which President Nixon is ending U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia. And 72 percent favor the President's plan to relieve world tensions through visits to Red China and Russia.

At home, Third District residents favor maintaining a strong national Defense Establishment: 62 percent are willing to pay higher taxes, if necessary, to insure protection of the United States. A strong 81 percent majority opposes amnesty for young men "who chose to leave this country in order to avoid fulfilling their military obligation." Respondents oppose deficit spending, "even if deemed necessary to reduce unemployment," by a better than 2-to-1 margin. They are strongly against "closed shop" practices in hiring—87 percent disapprove of a system "which requires a person to join a labor union in order to hold a job."

I am pleased to share these poll results with my colleagues. I believe they reflect the basic sound thinking of most Americans on important issues facing our Nation today. Complete tabulations follow:

RESULTS OF OPINION POLL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you approve of my anti-busing amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would prohibit the assignment of any child to a particular school because of race, creed or color? Yes 86 percent, no 10 percent, undecided 4 percent.

2. Do you feel the present system of wage and price controls is working to end inflation? Yes 30 percent, no 47 percent, undecided 23 percent.

3. Do you favor a stronger military defense establishment for the protection of the United States even if it requires increased taxes? Yes 62 percent, no 25 percent, undecided 13 percent.

4. Do you feel any form of amnesty should be granted those young men who chose to leave this country in order to avoid fulfilling their military obligation? Yes 11 percent, no 81 percent, undecided 8 percent.

5. Do you favor continued deficit spending if it is necessary to reduce unemployment? Yes 25 percent, no 59 percent, undecided 16 percent.

6. Do you favor a system which requires a person to join a labor union in order to hold a job? Yes 9 percent, no 87 percent, undecided 4 percent.

7. Do you approve of the manner in which President Nixon is ending our involvement in Southeast Asia? Yes 67 percent, no 19 percent, undecided 14 percent.

8. Do you approve of President Nixon's plan to relieve world tensions through visits to Red China and Russia? Yes 72 percent, no 15 percent, undecided 13 percent.

9. Would you favor a "value added tax" (national sales tax) if it would serve to reduce your property taxes? Yes 39 percent, no 44 percent, undecided 17 percent.

10. Do you favor present plans to complete construction of Tellico Dam on the little Tennessee River? Yes, 43 percent, no 36 percent, undecided 21 percent.

HERE COMES PETER PETERSON

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, in February of this year, Peter George Peterson of Illinois was appointed Secretary of Commerce. Since his appointment, Secretary Peterson has begun to restore his office to its former role of centrality in domestic and international economic issues.

I have long advocated an international economic policy representing the national viewpoint rather than the interests of exclusive groups. Under Secretary Peterson, the Commerce Department has shown indications that it may return to this extended role and become more than simply the traditional voice of American business. Only in this way can we hope to achieve sane and stable economic policy.

I commend Secretary Peterson for his efforts in this direction and urge him to continue in evaluating and restructuring his Department.

The July 1972 issue of Dun's magazine contained the following article about Secretary Peterson which I insert in the RECORD at this point for the edification of my colleagues:

HERE COMES PETER PETERSON

With his two aides in tow, the professorial-looking man in the blue, pin-striped suit strode through the fading elegance of Chicago's Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel onto the steaming sidewalks of Michigan Avenue. There he was met by a bevy of newsmen and the grinding of the television cameras. The interview over, the nation's twentieth Secretary of Commerce walked over to a policeman who was obviously pondering the identity of the celebrity. "I think," said Peter George Peterson, "that you had the beat a few blocks north of here when I was with McCann-Erickson."

That, it turned out, was fourteen years earlier. But nobody who knows the onetime adman who became Bell & Howell President at 34 and Richard Nixon's Commerce Secretary six months ago would have been surprised at his total recall. For Peter Peterson not only has a photographic memory for faces, but for facts and figures as well. Beyond that, his real forte is ideas. His bane is routine administration. "When Pete took over as Secretary," says James Lynn, the savvy Cleveland lawyer who serves as Under Secretary, "we decided that he would concentrate on policy, while I handled the everyday administration."

Peterson's penchant for ideas—and his advertising man's ability to sell them where it counts—was demonstrated during his eleven months in the White House in the newly created post of Assistant to the President for International Economic Affairs. His performance, which was enhanced by an elaborate briefing book with some seventy charts on everything from productivity growth to world auto output, gave him such clout with Richard Nixon that he was dubbed "the economic Kissinger." Says Democratic Senator Warren Magnuson, the Chairman of the Commerce Committee: "Unlike some other Presidential assistants who spend most of their time trying to get their ideas through to the top, Peterson's advice was actively sought by the President. And when the President sent him to Commerce," continues Magnuson, "his orders were to make it a stronger department."

That could be quite a challenge. For Commerce, which encompasses a raft of agencies including the Maritime Administration, the Patent Office and the Bureau of the Census, has become something of a bureaucratic backwater in recent years. Much to their consternation, Secretary after Secretary has discovered that powerful members of the White House staff tend to have far more muscle than the man who presides over the sprawling Commerce Department complex just three blocks away. But not with Peterson in the slot. Comments John T. Connor, the chairman of Allied Chemical Corp., who served as Commerce Secretary during the Johnson Administration: "As a veteran of the White House staff who has had considerable access to the President, Peterson is in a far different position than I was. I think he can break through any obstacles that might be put in his way by the palace guard."

Indeed, after only six months in office, 46-year old Pete Peterson, a droll, erudite man whose interests range from Aristotle to abstract art, has become the most powerful Commerce Secretary in a generation. And at the rate he is going, he could possibly restore that tarnished office to its status of the 1920s when Herbert Hoover used it as a launching pad for the Presidency. "I have a portrait of Hoover staring down at me in my office," quips Peterson with his ready humor, "to remind me of the hazards of undue ambition."

IN THE SPOTLIGHT

In sharp contrast to all the years Commerce has been in the shadows, this month the world spotlight will be on Peterson as he arrives in Moscow for delicate trade negotiations with the Soviet Union. An indication of how important President Nixon considers these negotiations was his telephone call to Peterson from Moscow in May to apprise him of the preliminary progress that had been achieved at the Summit. "Could you imagine Nixon taking time out from the Summit," asks a long-time Commerce Department aide, "to call [former Secretary Maurice] Stans, or Johnson taking the time to call [former Secretaries] Connor or [Alexander] Trowbridge?"

Before Peterson arrived on the scene, there is little doubt that such a delicate negotiation would have been run by the State Department. Yet State, the most powerful department in Washington in the days of John Foster Dulles and Dean Acheson, is today fast approaching the low level of bureaucratic esteem once reserved for Commerce. After losing control of the international monetary negotiations to John Connally's Treasury, State has now lost its sway over foreign economic policy to Commerce. Says Peterson, who clearly has little regard for State's negotiating ability: "The State Department is still thinking in terms of the days when the United States dominated the world. It doesn't understand that we now have to do some very hard bargaining in our own self-interest."

Political Washington has a keen eye for a rising power center. And it is always quick to respond accordingly. Thus it is not surprising that with Peterson at the head of the table, current breakfast guests in the Secretary of Commerce's private dining room read like a *Who's Who* of the Nixon Administration's power structure. They have included Federal Reserve Board Chairman Arthur Burns, Presidential Assistant Peter Flanigan and Henry Kissinger.

Peter Peterson has come a long way from his depression-scarred boyhood in the prairie town of Kearny, Nebraska. The son of a Greek immigrant who kept his restaurant open seven days a week to make ends meet. Peterson spent every weekend helping out his father from the age of eight until he went off on a scholarship to Northwestern University. "In Kearny," laughs Peterson who today is a collector of surrealist art as well as a trustee of both the Art Institute of Chicago and the University of Chicago, "our idea of a cultural experience was an annual trip to Omaha."

After graduating from Northwestern, Peterson went on to a master's degree in Business Administration at the University of Chicago. His professors considered him so brilliant that he was offered an assistant professorship upon graduation.

But Peterson opted for the business world. After four years with Market Facts, a market research firm, he joined McCann-Erickson, where he ultimately became manager of the Chicago office. As the account executive for Bell & Howell, Peterson became friendly with the company's boy-wonder chairman Charles Percy. Thus, he eventually found himself being consulted on all kinds of company problems that were far afield from advertising. "He became interested in Bell & Howell out of all proportion to the size of the account," recalls Percy, now a Republican Senator from Illinois.

A TOUGH CHOICE

Eventually, Percy asked the 32-year-old Peterson to join Bell & Howell as executive vice president. "When Pete told [McCann-Erickson chairman] Marion Harper about the offer," recalls Percy, "he not only got a counter offer but received a far more lucrative bid from a very aggressive businessman, [J. Peter Grace of W.R. Grace & Co.]. It was a tough decision for him to make," Percy continues. "We both lived in [Chicago suburb] Kenilworth in those days, and I distinctly remember one sunny Saturday morning when we walked around town for hours discussing the situation. I told Pete that I wasn't going to be at Bell & Howell forever and that there would eventually be room at the top."

Sharing Percy's deep interest in public affairs, Peterson felt that at Bell & Howell he would be able to pursue such causes as the emerging civil rights battle, garnering business support for free trade and mobilizing private efforts to assist education. My offer from J. Peter Grace was considerably higher than Chuck's," admits Peterson. "In fact, I could have become rich very quickly if I went with Peter, because W. R. Grace has a unique system of rewarding executives: They are given stock in a subsidiary company that is eventually sold off at a very handsome profit to the stockholders. But," continues Peterson, "I decided to go with Bell & Howell because, while it may sound corny, I really wanted to get involved in the public issues Chuck and I were so interested in. That would have been impossible at Grace."

Peterson's interest in public affairs came to the fore almost immediately at Bell & Howell. Convinced that medium-sized Bell & Howell needed a unique advertising approach to compete with behemoths Eastman Kodak and Polaroid, Peterson persuaded Percy that the company should sponsor the highly controversial "CBS Reports." "[CBS President] Frank Stanton and I closed the deal in a corridor at the Business Council," recalls Percy.

One of the first programs in the series was on the then almost taboo subject of birth control. And Peterson was immediately beset with pressures to cancel out. But he stood his ground, and Percy backed him to the hilt. Says Peterson: "Our public relations consultant Philip Lesly said that we would be committing suicide to get involved in such a controversial subject, and our co-sponsor, B.F. Goodrich, simply pulled out. But the public was far more sophisticated about this subject than they had figured. I got 500 letters on that program, most of them favorable. When we sponsored Wyatt Earp the previous year, I never got one."

When Percy left Bell & Howell to go into politics, Peterson was his chosen successor. But there were those who felt that Percy's shoes were too big for the 37-year old former advertising man. Indeed, when Percy's decision prevailed, the company's investment banker, the prestigious firm of Lazard Freres, severed all connection with Bell & Howell. But Peterson proved his detractors wrong. In his eight years at the helm, Bell & Howell's sales doubled while its earnings quadrupled.

(Peterson, however, is not a man to hold a grudge. When he entered the Nixon Administration last year, he selected none other than Lazard Freres to manage the "blind trust" in which he placed his financial holdings.)

Peterson had long felt that he would someday want a job in public service. But when the President, at the urging of Peterson's old Chicago friend George Shultz, offered him the job as Assistant for International Economic Policy, he was not really ready. Says Peterson: "I had sort of decided that I would get out of business at the age of 50. Beyond that, 1970 had not been a particularly good year for Bell & Howell, but I knew that we would have a sharp earnings turnaround in 1971. With five kids to educate, I was obviously not anxious to sell my stock when the White House call came in early 1971." (Bell & Howell stock has doubled in the year and a half since Peterson sold out. To add to his financial sacrifice, Peterson had to take a $40,000 loss on his palatial $150,000 home in Chicago's posh suburb of Winnetka.)

"When the President called me in," continues Peterson, "he mentioned the fact that many years before [John Foster] Dulles had told him that economics would eventually become the central ingredient in the nation's foreign policy. I told him that I agreed, but I was still not anxious to leave Bell & Howell at that point. He then asked me who the chairman of my executive committee was, and I told him that it was Charlie Mortimer [retired chairman of General Foods]. The President told me to get Charlie on the phone. After that, it became difficult to resist the inevitable."

THE WIDER SCOPE

Peterson's Commerce Department is fast becoming a very different place than it has been under recent predecessors. For, unlike most recent Secretaries, Peterson does not subscribe to the notion that Commerce is simply the "voice of business" in the Administration. "If we want to enlarge our influence," observes Peterson, "we must look at a problem as it is perceived from the White House rather than by a particular constituency. If we are only looked upon as the voice of business, we will not end up playing much of an overall role at all."

Peterson's position in this regard is not really surprising. For in his capacity as a White House Special Assistant, he had to perceive international economic policy from the point of view of the entire nation, not from the standpoint of any particular interest group.

Beyond that, the White House has submitted a plan to Congress to create a Department of Economic Affairs that would essentially combine most of the functions of Commerce, Labor and the Department of Transportation. If the new Secretary came from one of these Departments, he would most likely be a man who tended to look at things from a White House perspective rather than from the more parochial departmental view. If the Administration is returned to power, nobody would be surprised if that man were Peterson.

But given the slow workings of the Congressional machinery, the Department of Economic Affairs is at least a year away. In the meantime, Peterson's principal concern is this month's thorny trade negotiation in Moscow. While he concedes that the Soviets are tough bargainers, Peterson is convinced that they want an agreement.

This was brought home to him in May during his some thirty hours of negotiation in Washington with Soviet Trade Minister Nicolai Patolichev. Says Peterson: "I had invited Patolichev to my home for dinner and it turned out to be the evening that President Nixon announced the mining of Haiphong harbor. I was worried about the impact of the speech on the negotiations because Henry [Kissinger] had briefed me beforehand on what the President was going to say. I figured that the best thing to do was not to pussyfoot. So I suggested to the Minister that we turn on the television. It was a bit tense as we sat there with the dessert melting. But Patolichev was very polite and returned the next morning all set to negotiate. At that point, I knew that the Russians wanted a deal."

Peterson takes great pride in his negotiating ability, which he has been heard to describe as a middle course between the soft-hearted State Department stance and the hard-as-nails John Connally school. He is, of course, new to negotiating at the international level.

But he spent years in various negotiating sessions in industry. Peterson recalls one go-round he had with fast-talking former Senator William Benton, the chairman of Encyclopedia Britannica. Says Peterson: "Benton was trying to sell Bell & Howell an educational-film company for $25 million, which was probably twice what it was worth. When our reaction was negative, he pulled out what he thought was his trump card: the political personalities, such as Adlai Stevenson and Hubert Humphrey, whom he had on the payroll as consultants. I asked him whether he was telling me that the company was worth $25 million because these names went with it. Or whether he was telling me that it was worth that because I could reduce the payroll by $400,000."

While Bill Benton likes to mix with political personalities, most of Peterson's friends, with the exception of Chuck Permy, are either academic types or journalists. His two closest friends in the Administration are its two most celebrated eggheads: ex-professors Henry Kissinger and George Shultz. And although journalists are not exactly held in high favor in Richard Nixon's Washington, Peterson is constantly seen in the company of such close friends as Max Frankel, *New York Times* Washington bureau chief, and syndicated columnist Tom Braden.

Even if he serves throughout another Nixon Administration, Peterson would still be only fifty, the age at which he had originally planned to enter public service, when that is over. What will he do then? Says his good friend Tom Braden: "Pete once said that he might like to stay on in Washington and sit on the boards of, say, ten corporations. He fancies himself as a good balance-sheet man who can spot trouble, and he thinks that he could earn a pretty good living this way."

Don't bet on it. For Pete Peterson is clearly enjoying his current walk in the corridors of power. And many of his closest associates feel that he is only half kidding when he teases "Administration sex symbol" Henry Kissinger for saying that "power is the ultimate aphrodisiac."

OUR NATION'S POSITION IN WORLD AFFAIRS

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, a timely view on our Nation's position in world affairs was presented during our recess by a past National Commander of the American Legion, L. Eldon James, in a speech at Clarksburg, W. Va.

Mr. James is a constituent of mine and a friend of long standing. I appreciate having had the opportunity to benefit from his thoughts and I am anxious to share them with the Members.

Mr. James says "our dreams will go up in smoke unless we are willing to do something about them." He is certainly right.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS OF L. ELDON JAMES

Three days ago we commemorated Independence Day—July 4, 1972. How did you celebrate your Independence Day? Or did you?

What did you celebrate?

Did you eat hamburgers with the family and gripe about world conditions?

Did you go to the mountains or the lake and get too much sun?

Did you just take it easy cause you'd been working hard?

Did you fly your flag?

Did you sit a bit and think about July 4, 1776 or about 1789 or 1865 or 1918—or the hot summers of the late 60's and the street riots?

Did you think about the fact that this is an election year? Did you think about where we're headed in 1976?

Did you dream a little?

If you did—Good.

If you didn't—don't you think you ought to dream a little?

Did you ever stop to think about the dream that courageous men and women who through blood, sweat and hard-headed back-breaking work converted this into a great country—our America, yours and mine? Did you?

Well, it's *time* to slow down a bit and think about just such things. Many people since 1607 have. What have you done lately?

Katherine Lee Bates and Samuel A. Ward dreamed about our country. They felt deeply when they wrote about it. They put some pretty stirring thoughts and words to music when they wrote "America The Beautiful". Listen to the word picture they painted about the building of a dream they wrote about:

"A thoroughfare of freedom beat across the wilderness"

They foresaw the importance, in our dream, of orderliness and discipline when they admonished that this nation—

"Confirm thy soul in self control—*thy liberty in law.*"

Did you ever stop to dream—and think a little about the *image* of our country, the image that was conceived by your early leaders?

What was the prayer and hope for this nation in the heart of the first President?

Listen to the words of George Washington in his prayer when he was inaugurated in 1789:

". . . that Thou wilt keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government; to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens . . ."

That was a part of George Washington's prayer in 1789.

The courageous early builders of America dreamed of freedom—"A thoroughfare of freedom—beat across the wilderness"—but they knew that the dream of freedom unbridled would mean freedom destroyed—so their dream was tempered with petitions to God for self control—for liberty in law—and as Washington put it, "a spirit of subordination and obedience to government." This was their dream—of a land of freedom loving people bound together by a will to be governed in the best interests of all citizens—a citizenry with a will and determination to protect itself—these citizens won their freedom and bridled it with a constitution, because they understood the importance of strength.

Even before we became a nation, courageous dreamers about our liberty spoke of the importance of strength of Arms. On March 20, 1775 at the second Virginia Convention in Old St. John's Church in Richmond, Virginia, a raging debate took place on a resolution to raise and train a militia—Patrick Henry fighting hard for the adoption of the resolution he had proposed rose to his greatest hour. Listen to his words:

"I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided; and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging the future but by the past. And judging by the past, I wish to know what there has been in the conduct of the British ministry for the last ten years, to justify those hopes which have been pleased to solace themselves and the House? . . ."

The dreams of Patrick Henry and George Washington became realities because of strong men and women—men and women—not only with dreams and visions, but with hard-headed determination and the willingness to work and fight if necessary.

Please don't misunderstand what I'm trying to say. Work alone without dreams is not enough—you've got to have a dream—before Orville and Wilbur Wright flew at Kitty Hawk, North Carolina, somebody had to have a dream.

Before Allen Shepherd first went into space, somebody had to have a dream.

Before Neil Armstrong first stepped on the moon, somebody had to have a dream.

You've got to have a dream.

James Mischner dreamed—and wrote those wonderful Tales of the South Pacific and Oscar Hammerstein wrote the thoughtful lyrics set to Richard Roger's beautiful music in "South Pacific". In the catchy little song "Happy Talk" the basic philosophy comes through:

"You've got to have a dream
For if you don't have a dream
How you going to have a dream come true?"

To the extent that freedom and liberty under representative government in this country exists today it is so because dreamers had a dream—and those dreamers were more than dreamers—and they did something about their dreams—and they built a strong America—an America second to no land—in economic development, in the military strength, to protect itself and in—as George Washington put it, ". . . brotherly affection—for (our) fellow citizens . . ."

But my real message to you today—and I trust you will think seriously about it in this convention—is that our dreams will go up in smoke unless we are willing to do something about them—simply put, we might add to Oscar Hammerstein's words by saying:

How you going to have a dream come true
Unless somebody does something about it.
And that somebody better be you.

At this point, it would be real easy to talk about how our country is going to hell—anybody can tear something down—anybody can criticize and rant about what's wrong—but the productive man is the one that finds what's right and seeks to do something constructive.

Please pardon a personal reference—in September, 1965, I spoke of the growing disregard for law and order—and disrespect for the orderly processes of government. I suggested that "nothing is long maintained when respect for it is gone." Only a little while ago—just a few years—disrespect for our institutions of government was so rampant that we stood on the brink of chaos—I believe today we are turning the corner back to respectability.

At the same time, I also spoke of the importance of a strong America on whom freedom loving people could rely in the face of the communist onslaught in Southeast Asia. In the years that followed, evil forces have nearly won on the battlefield of molding public opinion in this country, what was being deprived to them on the fighting battlefields. And that battle seemed nearly lost until our courageous president stood up to the dreamers without determination who would sell our honor and our future down the river. When President Nixon—after untiring and ceaseless efforts at showing good faith by reducing our ground forces in Vietnam, simply said, "Allright, we go so far—but no further" and he told the world in language the Communists understand best—'Stop your aggression in Southeast Asia, or we will stop it for you.' And he has done just that.

I cannot speak for him—as you know so well—I opposed him vigorously in 1968—but I remember well his words to our Washington Convention in September, 1966. He made five points with respect to Vietnam. His third—if diplomatic actions are not effective "then. . . then the United States will have to consider what is necessary beyond that . . ." Mind you, he was not then President, he was a former Vice President and running for the presidency. He spoke of "mining" or possibly even the hitting of dock areas." He summarized this way, "It is to our advantage to fight it, as much as possible, in the air and on the sea and that is why I say that at the present time, as far as military targets in North Vietnam are concerned, no military target should be off limits to the air power of the United States of America. I rule our civilian targets. . ."

President Nixon was a wise man then. He was a wise President when he spoke and acted with great strength and determination a few weeks ago. I am convinced that if he persists in this course of action, he provides to the world the best opportunity for peace in the world in our times.

Public opinion polls clearly show that President Nixon has the support of the vast majority in this country in his firm position with respect to our National security. In fact, a recent Trendex Poll indicated that 80 per cent of the American people want the United States to be number one in military preparedness. That support must continue if the American dream for peace with freedom is to be established and preserved throughout the world, for there are those who attack him from every quarter.

His handling of the China and Russian visits has been outstanding. It is too early to knowledgeably judge the wisdom of the commitments made and sought.

There are those who hail the treaty he is asking the Congress to ratify as the millennium and the opportunity to cut our defense spending in half—on the theory that we can trust Russia so forget defense—there are those who say he has sold us down the river—and there are shades of opinion in between.

If we are to give our President and our country the best chance of gaining the most from his handling of this matter, we must listen to all of what the President has to say—I hope he will back up Secretary Laird and I hope you will back up Mr. Laird when he says to the Congress, give us the necessary funds to build the replacement of the

B-52 and to fully fund the Trident Submarine program—this is the only safe way we can proceed with the treaties—

The SALT Treaty—signed by President Nixon—if ratified by Congress—it is difficult for the American people to fully understand this—if we ratify the treaty, we freeze the United States into a position of strategic nuclear inferiority compared to the USSR and we reduce the long-term chances of peace by affecting the strategic balance—unless we follow the President's recommendation to strengthen our military posture in other areas not now under treaty limitations. Let me oversimplify with a few specifics:

I think these things deserve attention. We have spent One Trillion, Two Hundred Billion Dollars on defense since World War II. A Trillion Dollar subject deserves a little attention. As Frank Barrett of the National Strategy Information Center has said, "It's too important to leave to Jane Fonda and Dr. Spock."

I don't think you want to be a second class country by 1976 because of the Soviet's vast military superiority, but Russia has a problem—by then Japan will be a nuclear power. China will before then. Russia has grown from a continental power threat to Europe to an international power threat to the world. Her ships call at a hundred ports. Her fishing fleets clean our waters of fish three miles off our Atlantic Shores. She outspends us on submarine warfare development. She has opened a Research and Development gap of over three billion dollars per year in the field of strategic development. She will have a surprise assault compatability in the Caribbean by the end of 1973. By December, 1973, she will equal us in the polaris submarine field.

We counter this threat by moving our SAC planes inland away from coastal attack. Fourteen Million Russian high school boys train each year in war games with the Russian Army and are taught to revere Russian military heros. Why?

Use your own mind on these specifics. And listen to these—in 1962, at the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis, we had a five to one ICBM advantage. In 1967, we still had a 2½ to one ICBM advantage. We had 1054, Russia had 460.

The theory was let Russia catch up—she wouldn't have to worry then and would level off. Today we still have 1054. Russia has 1580. They caught up in late 1969. They didn't level off then, they increased the tempo.

In the face of this, let me tell you what the agreements will do:

White House officials have explained that President Nixon was terribly concerned about the great momentum of the Soviet military build-up. But, Senate leaders warned him that the anti-defense lobby was so powerful that the U.S. Senate simply would not vote enough money for the United States to keep up with the Soviets.

So, the President felt that the only alternative was to work out an agreement with the Russians to get them to stop their all-out military build-up.

The Russians were aware of this and insisted upon agreements which:

Freeze the United States at 1054 ICBMs but permit the Russians to complete 1618 ICBMs.

Limit the United States to 710 sub-launched ballistic missiles but permit the Russians to build 950 sub-launched ballistic missiles.

Permit the Russians to convert their 5-to-1 superiority in missile megatonnage to an equal superiority in numbers of warheads. (The numbers of warheads is the only category in which we are ahead today).

Waive on-site inspection, making it possible for the Russians to secretly violate the pacts. (The Russians have violated 24 of the 25 previous summit agreements).

Only yesterday Secretary Laird revealed that since Russia signed the agreements she has conducted SEVEN tests of new ICBMs and EIGHT of submarine launched missiles. These are offensive weapons and the tests are not within the range of the agreements. But they prove that the Soviet momentum and tempo goes on . . . and on . . . with a test every three or four days.

If you think this calls for action, let me suggest this:

Tell your U.S. Senators that you are for U.S. military superiority and that they should judge the SALT pacts against this standard and at least vote for a reservation permitting U.S. withdrawal from the SALT agreements if the Russians are found to be militarily superior. (The pacts already have a provision for withdrawal on the basis of "extraordinary events." This reservation would simply define the Russians' gaining superiority as an "extraordinary event.")

I could go on, but I think that's enough. Southeast Asia is not the only spot where the pressure is on. Lonely Greece is the only Baltic country not behind the iron curtain. Their strong and determined struggle against the communist onslaught deserves our full support. It is in our best national interest. The story with Israel in the Middle East is the same with different characters playing the roles, but always the communists threat of subjugation of freedom by force—all counter to the American Dream of peace with freedom and liberty.

Let me go back to Patrick Henry—who seeking strength for his nation implored his fellow countrymen—"Why stand we here idle?" Let the President and Congress know that we must remain strong. May I humbly suggest that we can trust those with whom we make treaties only so long as they respect our ability to see that the treaties are respected. And we will acquire and maintain peace only while the image this nation projects is an image that we match our dreams with strength—ability and actions to make those dreams come true.

MRS. MARY B. GEORGE, UNION CITY POSTMASTER, RETIRES

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in appreciation of Mrs. Mary B. George who has been postmaster for Union City, in my congressional district, for over 36 years. Appointed by President Roosevelt, Mrs. George has seen Union City grow from a small rural town called Decoto to the growing progressive city called Union City which it is today. She has seen postal service change from a friendly, one-woman, neighborly service to the modern and efficient operation it is today. When she was appointed, Mrs. George was the postal service in the area performing all the duties from hanging out the mail along the railroad tracks for pickup, to running the small post office in a corner of a grocery store. Today, the Union City Post Office is a modern 6,400 square-foot building with 40 employees and 18 mail delivery routes. Somehow, Mrs. George has managed to see that the post office retains the smalltown friendliness and good service of 36 years ago.

Mrs. George, after all these years of dedicated service to the community, retired on June 30. She will be sorely missed. She retires with the knowledge, however, that her service has been noted and appreciated by her friends and neighbors throughout Union City.

TVA'S GOOD RECORD HOLDS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the Tennessee Valley Authority came into existence in 1933 with a cloud of skepticism hanging over its head. Today, almost four decades later, TVA is recognized the world over as the administrative and technological model for transforming natural resources into sources of power and economic growth.

TVA's success is due in great part to the sound fiscal and managerial policies it has developed since its inception. These policies combine the best operational theories which government and private enterprise have to offer. The wisdom of these policies have been complimented by the selection of a well trained and highly motivated staff to implement their objectives.

I am enclosing an article from the Knoxville News-Sentinel which documents how TVA continues to pay its own way in this era of governmental misspending and administrative inefficiency.

The article follows:

TVA's GOOD RECORD HOLDS

The Tennessee Valley Authority is paying $47,905,195 to the Federal Treasury, making more than $1 billion TVA has paid back to the Government since the agency was established in the 1930s.

The payment is part of nearly $76 million TVA is paying the Treasury this year from power revenues.

TVA is not longer getting appropriated funds for construction and operation of power facilities. These are financed independently through bond issues. Thus, the money TVA is repaying now out of power revenues represents a net reduction of TVA's indebtedness to the Federal Government. In fact, TVA this fiscal year is paying back almost $9 million more than it is receiving in Federal appropriations for its other programs.

In addition to its payment this year on past appropriations, TVA is also paying a $55.8 million dividend to the Government on the remaining appropriation investment. By law, TVA pays an annual dividend on the remaining unrepaid appropriations invested in power programs.

To date TVA has paid nearly $1 billion to the Treasury from owner proceeds. The total includes $569 million in dividends and $350 million in repayments on appropriations.

This is a pretty good repayment record for a Government agency that is always being attacked by its enemies as a drain on the taxpayers.

It's hard to think of any other agency that furnished such a valuable service to the taxpayers as TVA does, while it is expected to pay all of its own expenses, repay the appropriations with which it was established and show enough profit to pay the Government a return on its investment.

Most revenue-producing Government agencies don't even make expenses, to say nothing of returning any part of their appropriation or paying a dividend.

TVA has been able to do this because it has retained its independence and has not had to operate like a political spoils system—to become a dumping ground for appointees being rewarded for poltical service. It is hoped the agency can keep on in this vein and remain the taxpayers' best investment.

MY EYES ARE OPENING

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a recent newsletter prepared by the Nevada County Resource Conservation District of Grass Valley, Calif., printed an article on its front page entitled, "My Eyes Are Opening." I was extremely impressed by this article and when I inquired as to the author I learned it was written by David Pompei, a senior class student at Nevada Union High School in Grass Valley.

I had the opportunity of meeting David Pompei when he came to Washington earlier this year as one of the district's delegates to the National Association of Conservation Districts. This is a very fine young man and I was very happy to meet and talk with him.

His article is centered around the problem of pollution and our environment, and he points out how the young people of our Nation, as well as the old, can contribute to correcting the problems related thereto.

Mr. Speaker, I think this article, "My Eyes Are Opening," written by David Pompei, is of such value that it should be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that others may have the opportunity to read it. The article follows:

MY EYES ARE OPENING

I grew up in a world full of pollution, full of land abuse, and full of "I don't cares." As I grew up I found that this little world wasn't what it seemed to be. I am a responsible young person at the threshold of adulthood . . . Recently, I have been having inner conflicts. Not knowing where the world is headed is a hard thing for a young person to think about. I looked around and saw disregard and disrespect and I felt disgust. Trash, washed away mountainsides, and the worst thing I saw were people—people of my own age—just throwing stuff on the roads and lawns and not caring. I looked at all this and got very sick. Then I looked and saw industries making the air bad, in some places it's so bad it's not even fit for animals to live, let alone humans. Still another place that got my attention was the water. I've never seen it done, but I've read about industries and households dumping their refuse out in the river, lakes, and streams. I have had the misfortune of seeing the results of these terrible acts.

Perhaps the worst shock I got from all this was that I realized that I was as much to blame as anyone else. I found myself throwing cans out and dropping paper on the ground. When I saw this I was very disappointed and tried to stop.

I found that I was asking myself questions such as: What can I do about this and how do I go about doing it? I started by not throwing things on the ground but in a trash can. Then I started talking to kids my own age about pollution and ecology. I found that I *could* do something about it. I also found that there were plenty of people who were doing something about the pollution problems in the United States. I was privileged to be present in Washington, D.C., during the recent annual convention of the National Association of Conservation Districts. I never realized that so many people could get together voluntarily and actually work together in cleaning up the land. I was never so inspired in all my life, to know that all these people (over 2,500) had volunteered their services to their counties. I met and talked with young people from all over the country. I found that they too were interested in the future of the world.

I understand now that youth plays a vital role in our nation's welfare. The young people are to inherit the nation. We have to understand about our pollution problems. We have to know what we can do.

The main problem about young people and ecology is getting them involved. I have talked to several young people about pollution and our environment. Most of them are interested in helping. We want to help and we know that we can. Our nation has too much pride to die of pollution. There are many adults who backs us all the way and we are most thankful for them.

I have decided to be seriously involved in my community—to *do* all I can to improve conditions, not just say something about it. If you would like to share this experience, join me at our next Resource Conservation District meeting.

POLLUTION

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial was broadcast by WLWI-TV in Indianapolis.

They say much, and it deserves careful consideration by every Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

AVCO BROADCASTING CORP.,
Indianapolis, Ind.

Editorial: "Pollution"
Date: Friday, June 23, 1972, 6:00 p.m.
Delivered by: William E. Wuerch, Vice President & General Manager, WLWI-TV.

The cry of the ecologist has been softer lately. The placard-waving protester condemning big business for the ruination of the world seems to have disappeared.

Is the ecology fad all over? Maybe everyone decided that their voice had been heard and the job was done. Maybe everyone decided to move on to other causes—drugs, Vietnam, poverty, etc. Whatever the reason for the seeming lack of interest, pollution is still with us. Our environment is still vitally important to each and every one of us. We must continue to be concerned.

TV-13's documentary, "Pollution Solution," reveals that some of the "first steps" in the right direction have been taken. Our air, water and land pollution are not as bad as even a couple of years ago. But the facts show that we continue to pollute our world. Autos pollute, utilities pollute and you and I and other ordinary people defile our environment. Unfortunately, we have not yet found the pollution solution.

Ecology is still important. After all, *it is our world*, and our lives depend on it!

CAREER IN LAW GOAL OF FORMER FIREFIGHTER

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, instances of true courage and spirit come to us in small quiet ways.

I refer in this case to Ray E. Cahill of Taunton, Mass., in my congressional district. Retired from the Taunton Fire Department with a serious back injury, Mr. Cahill is nevertheless well on his way to completing his education and looking forward to a whole new career.

He sums up the personal philosophy that led him down this path in his own words:

I don't want to stagnate, I'm still too young to lie down and die.

This is an attitude we can all applaud, Mr. Speaker, and take inspiration from.

I submit an article from the Taunton Daily Gazette of June 9, 1972, so that all those who read it can take sustenance from it:

CAREER IN LAW GOAL OF FORMER FIREFIGHTER

(By Larry Laughlin)

Roy E. Cahill, a 51-year-old retired firefighter and a father of five, believes that a man in his fifties still has plenty of time to start a second career.

And that is exactly what he has been doing, beginning his college education shortly after an injury forced him to leave the fire department two years ago.

Attending classes through the summer, Cahill finished his courses at Bristol Community College at mid-year and was graduated with honors this month. He is now majoring in political science at Southeastern Mass. University and, after graduation next year, plans to go on to law school.

Cahill was appointed to the department in 1943 while still in the Marine Corps. On his return from the service in 1946, he began work as a fireman, continuing until he crushed two discs in the lower lumbar region of his back while battling an Adams St. mill fire in 1970.

As he thought about what lay before him Cahill concluded he was not cut out for pensioned retirement but knew job hunting would also present obstacles.

"Who would want to hire a 50-year-old with only a fire department background?" he asked.

Cahill also realized that what is now a comfortable pension would be eaten into by the rising cost of living over the years.

"I figured if I went to college I could get a degree and do something on my own while my pension is still adequate."

Aside from financial considerations, Cahill had personal reasons for choosing to go on with his education and pursue a second career.

"I don't want to stagnate. I'm still too young to lie down and die."

Looking ahead, Cahill noted that he will be 55 when he finishes law school and "that's young enough to start again."

The student who served as president of the firemen's union until last year, admitted that he has always been interested in politics but thinks he will wait until he gets into law school before making any decisions about entering the political forum.

Cahill lives with his wife Marjorie and three of their children; Roy Jr., 11, Rolanne, 17, and Donna, 19, at 666 Bay St. On their own are the two oldest, Kathy, 23, and Sandy, now Mrs. Paul Beaulieu.

JAMES J. McMAHON

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I inform the House of the passing of a great newspaperman, James J. McMahon, chairman of the board of the Hudson Dispatch.

Mr. McMahon was in the great tradition of journalism in America. He made the Hudson Dispatch a servant of the people in Hudson County, N.J., which I have the privilege of representing.

The Hudson Dispatch has never been a "big" newspaper by the circulation standards of some of the major papers in the world. But the Dispatch has always been a "home newspaper" as Mr. McMahon viewed it. It has stressed the political and social events of the community and served as a matrix of Hudson County, bringing its citizens together. Every community needs a newspaper that pays special attention to local problems; these are the problems that affect each citizen most directly and Mr. McMahon understood this.

Mr. Speaker, James McMahon was a good friend, a good citizen in public, private and religious life, and we shall all miss him very much. I attach a copy of the editorial which appeared in the Hudson Dispatch memoralizing James J. McMahon and with which I concur:

A MAN WHO WAS GENUINE

In the death of James J. McMahon, chairman of the board of Hudson Dispatch and for 13 years its publisher, this newspaper and the entire North Jersey community has lost a leader who gave completely and unstintingly of himself for his fellow man.

For Mr. McMahon, service was a watchword that he continually espoused. For 45 years, his was one of the firm hands at the helm of this newspaper. Through his efforts, the Dispatch of today is a publication of which all of us on the paper may well be proud.

But, while Mr. McMahon gave untold hours to the Dispatch, he was equally concerned with the welfare of his church and his political party. It could not be otherwise for a man of Mr. McMahon's deep interest in the things in which he firmly believed.

It was no mere outward show of religion on the part of Mr. McMahon. It was a genuine belief and adherence to the highest principles and tenets of the Roman Catholic church. He served his church well over his entire life and for this he held the rank of knight in the Order of St. Gregory the Great.

As for the Democratic Party, Mr. McMahon was certainly one who, there, to, followed the highest precepts. He was a concerned Democrat, he showed it in his service as a county chairman, as a commissioner in his home community of Montclair. It was no surface thing, it was real.

Few men have ever had the grasp that he did of things politic. A conversation with Mr. McMahon would bring out a wealth of information about the Democratic Party in New Jersey over the years that was fantastic. His keen insight and intellect went right to the heart of questions and issues.

But, while Mr. McMahon appeared to some as gruff and rather impersonal as a politician, this was really not the actual man. This was, to those who knew him better, a veneer—a necessary one for a person who had to deal with the public in so many ways. It's not easy.

The real person was a man who was concerned with others, with their families, with their well-being. It was shown over his lifetime in so many ways, in so many things he did, many unheralded, for that was the way he wanted it.

At Christmas, Mr. McMahon years ago oftentimes played Santa Claus for the poor and needy children of Montclair. And, one of his deep concerns while he was active as a Knights of Columbus leader, was the betterment of youngsters and how to keep them out of trouble.

But, let no one make a mistake. Mr. McMahon, when the time and circumstances called for it, could be extremely firm. He was a strong proponent of the democratic processes in government; he was a firm believer in the idea of law and order; he was an unswering supporter of these United States.

He intensely disliked hypocrisy. He derided those in politics whom he felt were of the "holier than thou" cast. He had no use for "phonies" and he could swiftly see through someone who was trying to "fake it out." To those people he could be tough.

Mr. McMahon came from humble beginnings; his was part of the Irish-American tradition of the early 1900s as he was growing up. Those days the Irish had to go out and fight for what they got, and Mr. McMahon had plenty of determination to make good.

Through his association early in the 1920s with John F. Boyle Sr., who in 1927 acquired ownership of the Dispatch, Mr. McMahon began the path upward to a distinguished career in the newspaper field, the church and politics. They were all "natural" to him.

An excellent mixer and one who was a forceful and articulate speaker, Mr. McMahon, from the beginning, was one who could succeed in whatever field he chose. At one time he was mentioned for state Democratic chairman and he was the type who could have run for governor.

However, Mr. McMahon concerned himself primarily with the Dispatch, for in the depression and for some time thereafter, this newspaper's financial picture was not encouraging. Strong hands were needed and they were there in Mr. McMahon and William Rubel, his predecessor as publisher.

Mr. McMahon always felt that the primary purpose of a newspaper was to inform and to guide the people. He was concerned with fairness, with objectivity and a sensitivity to an area's needs. As long as these were maintained, he was satisfied with the running of the newspaper by its editors.

Over the years, Mr. McMahon was a dominant figure in Hudson County circles as well as in his home Essex. In Union City, in particular, he served 18 years as chairman of the parking authority and was always keenly concerned with the betterment of the community for its people.

He was not afraid to speak out and did so numerous times over the years before service clubs and other organizations when he felt things were not going well. He was scrupulously honest and had a deep antipathy for anything that went on "under the table" in business or in politics.

This all was the stuff of which Mr. McMahon was made. He was a man who believed in fair play, in honesty, his country and his God. He would say, often, that "God has been good to me." He had an unswerving faith in things that are good, that are right.

To those who were lucky just to have met him, and even more fortunate to have really known him, Mr. McMahon was a man whom you were proud to call friend or associate. He led the way for so many, for so long. In doing so, he showed those who were to follow the right path. May we all stay on it, in the spirit of him who has gone before.

HAROLD P. EASTWOOD, AN ACT OF HEROISM

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend one of my constituents, Mr. Harold P. Eastwood, Somers, Conn., for his act of heroism on March 17, 1972.

On that date, Mr. Eastwood, who has been trained in Red Cross first aid, was driving with his family when he noticed a small boy, who was crying, on the side of the road. Mr. Eastwood stopped his car and upon questioning the child, learned that the boy's 7-year-old sister had fallen into an open culvert and disappeared. Instructing his family to remain with the boy and to call the police, Mr. Eastwood proceeded to search for the missing girl.

In a pond not far away, he saw a pair of red boots sticking up out of the water. The young girl had been washed 25 feet through an 18-inch culvert to the other side of the road, then another 55 feet out into the pond. Mr. Eastwood brought the child to the shore unconscious and not breathing. immediately, he began administering mouth-to-mouth resuscitation until the victim began breathing again. She was then taken to a nearby hospital and was later released, pronounced as fully recovered. The attending physician stated that had it not been for Mr. Eastwood's immediate and correct actions, the child would not have lived.

For this courageous deed, Mr. Eastwood was awarded the Red Cross Certificate of Merit. This represents the highest award given by the American Red Cross to a person who saves a life using skills learned in a Red Cross first aid, small craft or water safety course.

In view of this example of man's humanity toward man, of one human being's concern for another who is in distress, I know that my colleagues will be happy to join me in recognizing Mr. Eastwood's praiseworthy actions and in extending to him our sincere congratulations.

A letter to me from the American Red Cross follows:

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1972.

Hon. ROBERT H. STEELE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STEELE: I wish to bring to your attention a noteworthy act of mercy undertaken by one of your constituents, Mr. Harold P. Eastwood, Four Bridge Road, Somers, Connecticut 06071, who has been named to receive the Red Cross Certificate of Merit. This is the highest award given by the American Red Cross to a person who saves a life by using skills learned in a Red Cross first aid, small craft, or water safety course. The

Certificate bears the signatures of the President of the United States, Honorary Chairman, and E. Roland Harriman, Chairman of the American National Red Cross. Presentation will be made by the Greater Hartford Chapter, Hartford.

On March 17, 1972, Mr. Eastwood who has been trained in Red Cross first aid, was driving with his family when he noticed a small boy on the side of the road who was crying. Mr. Eastwood stopped and learned that the child's seven-year-old sister had fallen into a culvert and disappeared. Mr. Eastwood directed his mother to call the police, his wife to stay with the little boy, and he went in search of the missing girl. He saw a pair of red boots sticking up out of the water. The child had been washed twenty-five feet through an eighteen inch culvert to the other side of the road, then another fifty-five feet out into the pond. He brought her to shore, unconscious and not breathing, and immediately administered mouth-to-mouth resuscitation until the victim began breathing again. She was taken to a hospital and was later released as fully recovered. The attending physician stated that had it not been for Mr. Eastwood's immediate and correct actions the child would not have lived.

This action exemplifies the highest ideal of the concern of one human being for another who is in distress.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. ELSEY.

NO PRESIDENT SHOULD DO LESS

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial I commend to all the Members of Congress. It was recently published in the Daily Jefferson County Union and it articulately points out that as much as anybody, the President desires peace in Southeast Asia. Mr. Robert L. Angus is the editor of this fine newspaper published in Fort Atkinson, Wis.

The editorial follows:

NO PRESIDENT SHOULD DO LESS

A candidate can promise miracles and propose programs that may or may not be in the best interests of the country . . . but which sound good to voters.

In this election year, for instance, there are almost as many views on the best policies to adopt toward the Vietnamese war as there are candidates. That word "peace" has a strong ring to it.

Yet, would the people of the United States really tolerate anything less than a stern decision to achieve that peace with honor and, if not the friendship, at least the respect of other nations? How could any President follow a lesser course?

President Richard M. Nixon is in precisely that position. There are those who have been critical about his decision to use American air and naval power against targets in North Vietnam as well as in South Vietnam, but he has carefully spelled out his reasons for doing so . . . the last time at last week's press conference.

Primarily, he said, the air assaults were aimed at protecting the American service personnel still on duty in South Vietnam, few as they might be. Also important, he said, was to prevent a North Vietnamese takeover in South Vietnam that might well lead to a Communist bloodbath there to rival that of 1954 when an estimated 500,000 people who opposed the Communist movement were either murdered or starved to death in slave-labor camps. "It would be a bloodbath that would stain the hands of the U.S. for time immemorial," Nixon has said.

The President also has stressed that, from experience, he had learned that the only way to gain concessions from the Communists was to have something they wanted. What they want is the bombing to stop . . . and that could be a point of trade at the peace talks.

In explaining his policies, the President also said:

"I know there are some who say we have done enough; they say what happens to the South Vietnamese at this particular time is something that should not be our concern. So let's put it in terms of the U.S. alone, and then we really see why the only decision that any man in the position of President of the U.S. can make is to authorize the necessary air and naval strikes that will prevent a Communist takeover.

"In the event that one country like North Vietnam, massively assisted with the most modern technical weapons by two Communist superpowers—in the event that that country is able to invade another country and conquer it, you can see how that pattern would be repeated in other countries throughout the world, in the Mideast, in Europe, and in others as well. If, on the other hand, that kind of aggression is stopped in Vietnam, and fails there, then it will be discouraged in other parts of the world.

"I want and all America wants to end the war in Vietnam. I want and all Americans want to bring our men home from Vietnam. But I want and I believe all Americans want to bring our men home and to end this war in a way that the younger brothers and the sons of the men who have fought and died in Vietnam won't be fighting in another Vietnam five or 10 years from now. That is what this is all about.

"I believe that the heart of America is still strong. I believe that the character of America is still strong. But I think now is the time when we must stand up against the trend toward permissiveness, the trend toward weakness, the trend toward something for nothing, and, if we do that, this country is going to regain its self-confidence. I believe that is what is going to happen."

The first requisite of any U.S. President is that he have faith in his fellow citizens. Mr. Nixon has that faith, and he is putting it to the acid test. No President could do more—nor should he do less.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

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

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

How long?

OUR CHERISHED EDUCATIONAL FREEDOM AT STAKE

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to participate in the special order on the plight of our private schools and their needs for immediate fiscal relief.

Mr. Speaker, for generations one of this Nation's proudest boasts has been that it was a land of religious freedom. Fundamental to our Constitution and enshrined in the Bill of Rights is the principle of religious freedom. Over the years, succeeding courts have made it a principle close to dogma that nothing, but nothing, is constitutional that in any way could impinge upon this sacred freedom.

That was not to say that there was no room for religion in American society. Our Founding Fathers' own life styles were proof of this. Simply put, the American Government did not take any steps which would encourage or discourage institutional religion in this country.

Over the years, this Nation has enjoyed the fruits of a genuinely pluralistic society with maximum choice available to its citizens. Nowhere was this more clearly exemplified than in our educational system where parents had the choice of public or private schools. In a real sense, this Nation has gained an additional degree of freedom insofar as there was genuine freedom of choice in education. In fact, this choice can be viewed as a genuine bulwark against the always present danger of a monolithic bureaucratic, statist system of education where American children could conceivably be in danger of growing up parroting whatever philosophies are currently in vogue in a national or State-level educational department.

In other words, we have seen developed in this country something which our Founding Fathers probably never conceived, an educational system which has at its root the choice between public or private education. It seems to me that we should not lose sight of this additional measure of freedom of education by an unreasonably strict interpretation to freedom of religion. It would be a pity if the American people were asked to choose between two such basic freedoms. I, for one, must confess I would not want to be in a position of choosing between these two freedoms. Fortunately, the fact is I do not think we are being requested today to choose between two freedoms which are mutually contradictory. It seems to me there is plenty of room to take immediate measures to preserve and continue the existence of our plural education without involving the Government in supporting religious institutions or religious education.

The fact of the matter is that we are not dealing any longer in this country with an academic discussion of the merits or demerits of public or private education. On the contrary, this Nation is at the crossroads where it is clear that unless something is done and done immediately, private education will be a thing of the past. Fiscal pressures on local communities and institutions supporting private education has grown to the extent that we are in a genuine crisis situation as far as the future of education as we know it in this country is concerned.

Private schools are being closed at an alarming rate. Hardly a month goes by that additional schools have not been forced to close. All of this at a time when the local property taxpayers and local communities are themselves confronted with staggering financial burdens. The last thing these communities need is to be faced with the prospect of providing more education to more children. Yet, a moment's reflection would indicate that this is just what is happening. Children formerly attending private schools that are forced to close are now the direct responsibility of the local communities to educate.

At this point, it would probably be wise to examine what we are talking about when we are talking about private schools. The term private schools probably immediately conjures up visions of very exclusive, expensive, eastern preparatory schools which the average person in this country could not possibly begin to afford. Of unquestionably greater impact, however, is the fact that included in the term private schools are church-affiliated or parochial schools. It is the threat of millions of parochial schools students around this Nation being forced onto the public school rolls across the Nation that has generated shock waves of concern at every level of local and State government.

Over the years, numerous plans have been discussed, mostly in a rather refined academic environment—something akin to a high school debate topic atmosphere. Many of these plans have been struck down as unworkable and/or involving the Federal Government too directly in the support of these private schools.

In the past few months, however, there has been a growing body of support for the concept of a tax credit plan as the manner in which the Government can best and least directly assist private school education, without violating the spirit or the letter of the first amendment.

The tax credit plan would provide relief to American citizens directly, those who are currently supporting private schools, as opposed to providing direct relief to the institutions themselves. The tax credit plan addresses itself too, to the longstanding resentment among parents whose children attend private schools, who for years have felt they have been victims of double taxation. Nor would the tax credit plan in any manner jeopardize revenues now earmarked for educational costs of the public school system.

What it would do is have a braking effect on the rise of such costs. Make no mistake about it, at the rate the private schools in this country have been closing down the costs of public education have nowhere to go but up and up sharply, on both the national and local level. In other words, another way of looking at the tax credit plan is that it represents a substantial savings on both the national and local level in the cost of educating our children. None of the tax credit plans would results in as much lost revenue as would the cost to the taxpayer in duplicating this education.

The tax credit plan has received the endorsement of the President. The fundamental framework of this plan has the support of the Office of Management and Budget. A number of variations on the basic format are now before committee as individual bills. Congress can best serve the interests of the Nation and enhance the healthy atmosphere of diversity that is part of our cultural tradition by making all haste in taking action on this plan. My own bill, H.R. 13495, cosponsored by Mr. MILLS, provides the necessary amendments to the Internal Revenue Code to make this plan available to low- and middle-income families hard pressed to meet tuition payments and with no recourse to tax loopholes.

In closing, I am attaching a copy of a recent article in the Washington Sunday Star by nationally syndicated columnist James J. Kilpatrick, discussing the importance and merits of my proposal.

[From the Sunday Star, May 7, 1972]

SOMETHING MUST BE DONE TO SAVE PRIVATE SCHOOLS

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

More than 5 million children now are attending private elementary and secondary schools across the nation. With relatively few exceptions, these schools are in grave financial trouble. The question must be faced: Is there any way, under the Constitution, to preserve so valuable a part of our total educational system?

The problem arises, of course, because the great bulk of the private schools are church-related. An estimated 83 percent of the private enrollment is in Catholic parochial schools; other denominations also maintain elementary and secondary institutions. Thus far, every effort toward public relief of their plight has foundered on the rock-like principle which demands separation of the church and state.

This was the objection raised a month ago by a three-judge Federal court in nullifying Pennsylvania's latest effort to get around the church-state barrier. In earlier litigation, upheld by the Supreme Court last year in the case of Lemon v. Kurtzman, the courts voided a Pennsylvania plan by which the state contracted directly with the private schools to provide certain non-religious educational services. The courts said no to that.

Pennsylvania tried again, with an approach that appeared to hold great promise. The state undertook to provide financial grants not to the schools, but to the parents. In this fashion, it was hoped, the state could avoid the "entanglement" with religion that had drawn the courts' fire before. But on April 6, speaking through Chief Judge Joseph S. Lord III, a District Court again said no.

It was immaterial, in the court's view, that the state funds were intended to aid the parents. The effect, nonetheless, is "to aid the schools." And even if this were not so, Judge Lord continued, "it would still be found that the Act supports religion because it aids parents in providing a religious education for their children."

From every standpoint, in my own view, the court's decision was highly regrettable. Pennsylvania was attempting, after all, to apply roughly the same system long approved by the Congress for veterans. Under the G.I. Bill of Rights, a veteran receives direct grants toward his college education, and if he takes that education at Fordham or Notre Dame, so what?

If the states are to be prevented from providing relief, a rescue operation might be attempted at the federal level. On April 12, Congressman James A. Burke of Massachusetts introduced a bill proposing income tax credits for the parents of children attending private schools. Significantly, Burke's cosponsor is Wilbur Mills of Arkansas, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Under the Burke-Mills plan, an eligible parent would continue to pay his child's tuition fees directly to the school. These might amount to, say, \$300 for the year. In computing his federal income tax, he then would be permitted to deduct half the sum, or \$150, from his tax payment. The Burke-Mills bill would limit the tax credit to \$400 per year per child. Taxpayers with adjusted gross incomes in excess of \$25,000 would receive smaller benefits on a declining scale.

As Burke concedes, the revenue loss to the U.S. Treasury would be substantial—some \$500 million a year—but he makes this point: If the private schools collapse altogether, their 5 million children will be transferred to public schools at an average national per pupil cost of \$858.

Burke also argues, with much soundness, that the private schools "contribute the indispensable element of diversity to our educational culture." They provide some competition, however modest, to the monopoly the state maintains upon shaping the minds of children. They help to preserve "fundamental parental rights in education." Finally, he contends, government itself has contributed to the crisis in private education through the mounting tax burden imposed at every level.

The Burke-Mills approach may not provide the best possible answer, but at first glance it offers great appeal. In any event, some workable solution must be found—and swiftly—or private education is done for. Burke describes that prospect as a "catastrophe." The word is not too strong.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the 13th observance of Captive Nations Week once again brings us together to extol the virtues of independence and to protest the enslavement of untold millions. It is with the hope that the future will allow each individual to be truly free to choose his life's course that I join my colleagues in commemorating this event.

We in America are constantly being reminded of our fellow human beings who do not share with us the fundamental rights that serve as the foundation of our country. Millions of people are deprived of human dignity and individual liberty. Freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of religion is the exception rather than the rule. One year ago we read of the Polish food riots and the struggle of the people of Czechoslovakia. Today we read of the Jewish peoples' attempts to emigrate from the Soviet Union, and of cultural repressions in Ukraine. People all over the world must learn of such injustices and unite in a public outcry for the restoration of freedom.

The people of the captive nations must not be forgotten. Today is the time to renew our commitment and pledge to work for liberty and freedom for all human beings.

PARISH OBSERVES 75TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Recently, Mr. Speaker, St. Joseph's parish in Taunton, Mass., in my congressional district, celebrated its 75th anniversary.

Distinguished members of the clergy, State, and city officials, parishioners and friends gathered to commemorate the occasion. The Reverend John J. Murphy, pastor of St. Joseph's climaxed the affair by cutting the diamond jubilee cake.

I would like to add my congratulations to St. Joseph's, to Father Murphy and to all the parishioners on three-quarters of a century of service and solace.

For a recounting of the parish history and celebration, I submit an article that appeared in the Taunton Daily Gazette on June 5, 1972:

PARISH OBSERVES 75TH ANNIVERSARY

The 75th anniversary of St. Joseph's Parish was celebrated by more than 350 guests Friday night at the Stone Bridge Inn, Tiverton, R.I. Guests included Mayor Rudolph H. DeSilva, Superior Court Justice Frank E. Smith, former pastor at St. Joseph's Rev. Ambrose Bowen, and Rev. James J. Gerrard, auxiliary bishop.

Associate pastor Rev. Bento Fraga delivered the invocation and a toast was offered by F. Hamilton Lane, chairman of the parish council.

For several years after the establishment of the parish in November of 1896 services were held in St. Charles' Hall and then in an old nail factory on Myrtle St. The first St. Joseph's Church was built at the corner of Sheridan and Lowell Sts. but it soon became too small for the needs of the parish.

The present church was constructed in 1910. Rev. John W. Quirk celebrated the first mass in the church on Christmas morning of that year.

Rev. John J. Murphy came to St. Joseph's in October, 1969, after the retirement of Father Bowen. Father Murphy delivered the welcoming address to the guests at the celebration.

Former associate pastors attending the anniversary were Msgr. Hugh Gallagher, Msgr. James E. Gleason, Msgr. Arthur G. Considine, Rev. Joseph L. Powers, Rev. Leo M. Curry, Rev. Leo Sullivan, Rev. Howard Waldron, Rev. Norman J. Ferris, Rev. Cornelius J. O'Neill, Rev. William H. O'Reilly, Rev. Arthur K. Wingate, Rev. John F. Moore, Rev. James F. Greene, Rev. Robert Laughlin, Rev. George E. Harrison, Rev. Thomas L. Rita.

Members of the anniversary committee were Father Murphy, honorary chairman; Mr. and Mrs. Alfred A. Cormier, chairmen; Mr. and Mrs. F. Hamilton Lane, co-chairmen; Mrs. Estella R. Margarido, treasurer; and Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Oliveira, ticket chairmen.

Mrs. Jephine Phillippino, Mrs. Angelina Annunziato, Mrs. Harriet Martin, Mrs. Mabel Trucchi, and Mrs. Margaret Mucahey served as hostesses for the dinner.

THE ULTIMATE HIGHRISE: SAN FRANCISCO'S MAD RUSH TOWARD THE SKY

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully commend to my colleagues the accompanying review of "The Ultimate Highrise: San Francisco's Mad Rush Toward the Sky," by Bruce Brugmann and others.

The review appeared in the spring issue of City, published by the National Urban Coalition, and details an account of one city's problems with the economic, environmental, and esthetic consequences of highrise development. Bruce Brugmann has been a challenging, disputative seeker of truth in urban problems for many years, and his controversial views will hopefully provoke vigorous and enlightened debate on an issue which is beginning to face many of our most scenic cities. The article follows:

Would you believe a Ralph Nader—and a team of Raiders—who can write? His name is Bruce Brugmann, and the writers he has gathered together in "The Ultimate Highrise" have been contributors to the San Francisco Bay Guardian, considered one of the finest newspapers of its kind in America. What kind is that? A hard-hitting, honest, professionally researched and written paper with a motto: "We print the news and raise hell."

And raise hell they have in the best tradition of Ralph Nader and in the finest traditions of adversary journalism—the kind we might associate with Nicholas Von Hoffman, James Ridgeway, and Kenneth Rexroth, to name only three people who have sung the praises of the Bay Guardian or have contributed to it.

About five years ago, in the first issue of the Bay Guardian, there was a cartoon of a young boy listening to a man surrounded by highways and high-rises saying: "It used to be that we could see the Bay from here." And the boy's response: "How quaint." At the time the cartoon appeared it seemed to many a little stringent and overly pessimistic. Its prophetic quality is obvious to any visitors to San Francisco today, and whether the whole dangerous growth process can be stopped is doubtful. The first major test against high-rises at the polls led by Alvin Duskin, who wrote the foreword to this collection, was defeated in the past November elections in San Francisco.

It may not be too late, however, if enough concerned citizens familiarize themselves with a book like this, which is actually a continuing case study against the high-rise. It can be read by people in *all* cities as a guide to and a handbook on all the development groups and political subgroups that would prey on the land for a fast deal and a quick buck.

In an opening chapter, Greggar Sletteland quotes well-known columnist Herb Caen: "The old city grew beautiful by accident, the new one is growing ugly by design," and goes on to give "38 Manhattanization Clues," based on a persistent theme throughout the book that San Francisco is in danger of becoming another New York City. He also challenges the conventional wisdom of the economic benefits of skyscrapers widely circulated by those who benefit most from them: businessmen, architects, politicians, etc. He disputes the notion that the more you build the more revenues the city will receive—and that there will be lower taxes for residents, more jobs and ergo less crime in the streets, less welfare, and so on.

As part of a Bay Guardian team of experienced investigative reporters and urban affairs experts headed by Tom Lehner of Berkeley's School of Public Policy and 30 volunteer researchers. Sletteland spent six months examining city, state, and federal records. Their findings are so enlightening they need to be stated in full:

1. Far from "subsidizing" the municipal budget, as claimed by real estate interests, the downtown high-rise district in 1970 actually contributed $5 million *less* than it cost.

2. Property tax payments from the downtown, instead of providing relief for homeowners through assessments on expensive new high-rises, actually *declined* by 16 percent as a proportion of the city total over the decade of the skyscraper boom.

3. Head-spinning growth in downtown land values "rippled out" to all San Francisco neighborhoods, causing assessment increases as high as 380 percent and leading, in many cases, to destruction of a neighborhood's original character.

4. Changing patterns of land use and other high-rise-related phenomena drove 100,000 middle-income San Franciscans to the outlying suburbs and mauled the city's delicate demographic balance.

5. High-rises not only failed to provide new white-collar jobs for San Franciscans, but caused the loss of 14,000 blue-collar jobs.

6. High-rises were the prime villians in tripling the city's welfare costs over the decade.

7. Transportation facilities to service skyscrapers cost taxpayers a staggering $5 *billion* over a 10-year period.

8. Police costs for protecting the downtown high-rise district averaged at least 10 times the cost for protecting the rest of the city.

9. High-rises caused vast amounts of air and water pollution which will cost the city close to $1 billion to clean up.

He furthermore charts how per capita crime rates and municipal costs increase with city density, how blue-collar industries are driven out of town, and how redevelopment schemes ultimately consume the taxpayer's dollar. His facts are legion, and his presentation is strikingly clear.

Bruce Brugmann, who has been cited nationally for his journalistic skills, is equally clear and hard-hitting in his expose of "The Politics of High-rise." Brugmann's journalistic courage is legendary and his interest here is in an area he knows best of all, the relationship between backroom and boardroom politics. He knows firsthand of the intimacy between city hall, development commissioners, assessors, campaign contributors, and the Chamber of Commerce with its "operating principle for years in San Francisco. When the Chamber of Commerce spits, City Hall swims." Using charts prepared by his investigators, Brugmann shows who approves high-rise buildings and who invests (in a political sense) in high-rise supervisors, assessors, and mayors by listing the 244 top contributors to recent winning San Francisco campaigns. The results are not surprising: The highway sweepstakes are on, and the huge private utilities and their corporate friends know how to play the profit-political game. As Brugmann describes it, the gold rush is still on in the West and everything is up for grabs. The loser, as always, is the private citizen.

The famous waterfront of San Francisco is examined in detail by Richard Reinhart. For people unfamiliar with the city, the detail here may be a bit much and, generally speaking, it is the only chapter in the book that requires a knowledge of the Bay Area. The general reader will find a section titled "High-rise Miscellany" more interesting. Subjects covered include what will happen when the earthquake hits, the fire hazard potential of high-rises (e.g., inaccessible to firefighters, the highly combustible plastic furnishings, etc.) and, among other essays, a stinging, devastating architectural critique of high-rise building by John Kenyon.

In conclusion, the book covers ways to "sniff out, then snuff out high-rises" by giving practical pointers that could serve as guidelines in any large U.S. city. A citizen's guide to land power structure research tells you how to find out who owns what in a city, and where to get information on the sale of property, loans, corporations, and other useful details. It is the kind of grand finale that makes you want to join the Bay Guardian team and take up the slingshot against the Goliaths of industry.

I don't know who is getting the Pulitzer Prizes in journalism these days, but if Bruce Brugmann and his team of writers who put together "The Ultimate Highrise" do not get one, it will be the ultimate insult. For "The Ultimate Highrise" may be the last word in an attempt to save a great city. The last word.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 14th annual observance of Captive Nations Week, not only in America, but throughout the world. During this week the attention of all free nations will be directed to the plight of those peoples who have been held under the domination of ruthless powers, particularly the U.S.S.R.

It is time for all Americans—including those who have seen fit to condemn "the system"—to reflect upon the struggle of the captive peoples of Europe and Asia, who have lived for a generation or more under Communist oppression, yet continue to look to the United States for courage and support. As we approach our bicentennial year, it is important that we who enjoy the freedoms of speech and assembly speak out in support of the cause of freedom and independence on behalf of those who have had their voices stilled and their hopes frustrated by Communist rulers.

During Captive Nations Week it would be well to recall the gallantry of those Hungarians who fought for their freedom in 1956 and the fearless spirit of resistance shown by Czechoslovak citizens during the 1968 invasion of their country. We should also recognize the continuing struggle on the part of Soviet Jews for their religious freedom and self-determination, and by the people of South Vietnam for their independence and solidarity with other free peoples of Asia.

In an age when the threat of Communist expansion remains, it is imperative that America's channels of free speech and free thought remain open to all nations of the world. The Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Liberty must be allowed to continue their missions of hope for those whose own media are not free. I know the efforts of freedom-loving people throughout the world are helping build the courage needed to resist the yoke of oppression.

Perhaps it would be wise to recall the words of the late Sir Winston Churchill:

Democracy is the worst system of government, except for all the others.

AFL-CIO TESTIFIES ON JOB SAFETY

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 28, Mr. Jacob Clayman, administrative director of the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO testified before the Joint Committee on Small Business concerning the enforcement and implementation of the Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1970.

As my colleagues know, recently this House passed an amendment to the Labor Department's appropriation for the fiscal year 1973 exempting some businesses from coverage under the Occupational Health and Safety Act. Mr. Clayman, believes this is a serious error.

The AFL-CIO has made a series of proposals to assist small businesses in complying with the Occupational Health and Safety Act. They have suggested rules that would make it easier for small businesses to obtain loans to comply with the act and special programs of technical information and assistance for small businesses.

Rather than weakening the act by eliminating the coverage of 30 percent of the nonfarm workers in this country, labor and small business should work together so that each and every American worker is employed in a decent environment that does not endanger his health.

Mr. Clayman's testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF JACOB CLAYMAN

Mr. Chairman, my name is Jacob Clayman and I speak on behalf of the more than six million men and women in the Industrial Union Department of the AFL-CIO.

I am accompanied this morning by Mr. Philip Daugherty, Legislative Representative, and Mr. Sheldon Samuels, Director of our department of Occupational Health, Safety and Environmental Affairs.

We were pleased with the suggestion of Mr. Conte that we appear before you. He is well aware of our deep distress with the mismanaged implementation of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970. Our presence this morning is an opportunity to augment the record on some critical issues.

Much of the apprehension and anger being expressed on the manner in which small business is being treated under the Act is justified. Much is based on misinformation. Some relates to willful scofflaws, for whom we have little sympathy. None of the legitimate complaints would be remedied by a change in the Act. The ire of the Congress is misplaced.

The reaction of the House, the Findley amendment, solves no problems. It punishes the employees of small business by regarding their lives and health as less sacred and important than those who work in larger establishments. It does nothing to assist small businessmen reduce death and suffering in their shops. It forces no real changes in administration policies that must be changed if the Act is to work.

The amendment eliminates from coverage about 30 percent of the nonfarm workers in this country. As a point of fact, it eliminates all of the employees of the approximately 250 manufacturing establishments in Mr. Findley's congressional district who employ less than 25 workers.

It has been observed that most of the complaints about the Act and its administration seem to be concentrated in the Far and Midwest. Perhaps this is because both small business and hazardous industries (who have higher proportions of small businesses) tend to be concentrated in those states.

An occupational health survey of the Chicago metropolitan area completed by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1970 demonstrates what can be found in small plants: the highest concentration of health hazards, the fewest safeguards, and the least awareness, on the part of management, of the threat to life that exists in these workplaces.

The problem of physical hazards are equally horrifying. Greater than 96 percent of the more than 16,000 logging camps in this country have 20 or fewer employees. Their disabling injury rate in 1970 was about three times the rate among all manufacturing employees: nine injured employees for each 100. In Wyoming, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it was 24 injured workers per hundred in this industry.

What has been the response of the Secretary of Labor to this situation?

The Act empowers him to set standards. To educate. To consult. To enforce.

The budget proposal generated by the Secretary of Labor not only specifies how much money the Congress is asked to appropriate, but how it is to be spent. It is a plan of action, or inaction. The Labor Department proposed a continuation of their prior, unsatisfactory program pattern. There were no adjustments to the needs of workers or the managers of small businesses.

Doesn't it seem strange to you that the workers, by means of the Industrial Union Department, not the government, have sought—

Easier rules for loans to small businesses who need funds to comply with the Act?

Special programs of technical information and assistance for small business?

Standards that can be read without reference to the so-called consensus standard-setting organizations?

We recognized the problems of small business, in which millions of our members work, very early. We pleaded for action on the part of the Labor Department and got none. We have brought the problems to the attention of the Congress, sometimes with success.

For example, on April 19 of this year, Mr. Daniels of New Jersey pointed to the incomprehensibility and unavailability of standards promulgated by the Secretary of Labor. Mr. Aspin of Wisconsin has placed a summary of our in-depth analysis of the OSHA budget in the Record. Mr. Flood listened with understanding to our plea before his committee. Let me quote from the first page of our statement to the House Appropriations Committee on May 3:

"Some of the small employers whose businesses are affected know little or nothing about the Act or standards that apply to them. While OSHA clearly collaborates with the National Association of Manufacturers, Chamber of Commerce and other large associations of businessmen, there is no special effort to coach the small employer. Nor is there any serious effort to inform unorganized workers—who make up the majority of the workers covered—of their rights under the Act.

At least one million dollars ought to be appropriated for an educational effort among small businessmen and an equal amount for unorganized workers. It is clear that the budget of OSHA does not contemplate expenditures in these critical areas."

Small businessmen indeed have something to complain about.

The standards that are creating the greatest problems for small business were developed by the representatives of the major industries who dominate the consensus standard-setting organizations. They did a great job in requiring ice for drinking water. They do little to reduce the exposure of workers—and management—to carcinogenic agents.

Only one original standard, for asbestos, has been promulgated by the Labor Department. This was initiated at the request of the Industrial Union Department. But they followed few of our recommendations.

We pressed for a new asbestos standard that would not be difficult to understand, that would be self-enforcing, that would provide for the major share of recordkeeping to be borne by the government, not by the employer.

The standard issued requires access to an industrial hygienist; it is not textually complete (it refers to standards issued by ANSI); it requires medical recordkeeping that pleases neither labor (because of problems of confidentiality and continuity) nor small businessmen (because of the problems of record maintenance and storage).

The standard was written by big business for big business.

In part because of our perceptions of the problem of employers who cannot afford a staff of safety specialists, we pressed for $5 million to be added to the training program of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health in HEW, with emphasis on expenditures in the audio-visual field. HEW has the authority, the will and the ability to provide training and technical assistance programs for management and labor.

HEW needs money to do the job. We asked for this money. The request was—in effect—turned down by the House. This is partially because of erroneous information being disseminated by the Labor Department.

Didn't you think it strange that the Labor Department, in its testimony last week, obscured these responsibilities of HEW? These responsibilities can be carried out under the Act by government personnel in the workplace who are not required to issue a citation on finding a violation. In fact they are prohibited by law from doing so. Thus, in seeking their assistance, the employer does not trigger a citation. If by chance (and this is very unlikely) he is inspected by the Department of Labor, his efforts are taken into account.

What you heard in this regard from the Department of Labor was a blatant attempt at empire building on one hand, and, on the other hand, an attempt to evade enforcement responsibilities. Rather than point to the flexibility and wisdom of the existing legislation, they asked for changes in the Act that will permit them to pick and choose their targets.

Don't you think it it strange that the Labor Department spends government time and money on closed-circuit television for the NAM, but won't provide in its budget the means of breaking out technical information on the basis of which a farm equipment dealer could comply with the law? Anyone familiar with information systems knows that this kind of need is met every day by other government programs. Yet at your hearing last week the response of the Secretary of Labor was that this is too expensive. To be charitable, this may be a result of the fact that the question referred to pamphlets. But these are not the preferred media. We asked for funds for an information system that can do the job.

The Department of Labor is not wrong all the time. But it could make a better case for its own employees. Green though they may be, the field force in the Department of Labor has been doing a good job. They have made themselves unwelcome in many places of business. But we forget that they are policemen. They are doing a difficult task that has never been done before. They are few in number, without even adequate equipment.

In a single week in April, OSHA compliance officers made 819 inspections. Two hundred and twenty-one were in workplaces with 25 or fewer employees. (This is twice the usual number of small employers investigated.) Of these 221, 33 were in response to complaints, 20 were investigations of fatalities (11) or catastrophes (9), 85 were of target industries, and 83 were scheduled by random selection.

As good as this record appears to be, it should be noted that the rate of inspection is roughly one-third that of the Labor Department's effort under the Walsh-Healey Act. Currently the compliance officers are making one inspection every four days or 78 per year per inspector. The rate under Walsh-Healey was 200 per year per inspector. This is hardly the record of an "eager beaver" effort as characterized by some members of Congress.

Is the Congress saying that complaints should not be answered? Very few complaints are ever made. They are usually the last hope for the correction of extremely serious situations. For example, in the whole State of Virginia, in the last six months of 1971, OSHA received only 17 complaints.

Should the Labor Department be prohibited from investigating and acting upon deaths and catastrophes?

Should the Labor Department ignore the most hazardous workplaces, in the most hazardous industries?

This is what the Findley amendment really says.

Let me summarize. The assistance and information services required by small business are authorized and mandated under the Act. Standards can be written which are textually complete, understandable and met without continuous engineering and medical services. Recordkeeping is not burdensome if it is understood and if the government provides adequate services.

Then why the uproar? The Congress is being overwhelmed by a campaign that aims not at the relief of small employers but at denying us work without fear. Organized business simply does not want to spend the monies and make the efforts necessary to a safe workplace. They are aided by administrative ineptness. They are cheered by the assault from state programs that wish to weaken the federal program, against which they will be measured.

LETTER-WRITING TO GENEVA CONVENTION SIGNATORY NATIONS ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN POW/MIA'S

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, within the last few weeks many Members of Congress have received correspondence from the families of American POW/MIA's in Southeast Asia requesting them to write to the leaders of each nation that signed the Geneva Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War.

The objective of the program, sponsored by the National League of POW/MIA Families, is that of urging the signatory nation to take action by encouraging all participants in the Vietnam conflict to adhere to the humanitarian concepts of that convention.

With the assistance of the State Department, the league has prepared a list of the heads of state of each national involved with appropriate salutations.

As a service to the families and loved ones, and as a means of assisting my colleagues who are complying with this reqeust, I am pleased to place the list in the RECORD at this point.

The list follows:

SIGNATORIES TO THE GENEVA CONVENTION WITH APPROPRIATION SALUTATIONS

Afghanistan: His Majesty Mohammed Zaher Shah, King of Afghanistan, Kabul, Afghanistan; Your Majesty.

Albania: H. E. Haxhi Lleshi, Chairman of the Presidium of the Albanian Peoples Republic, Tirana, Albania; Dear Mr. Chairman.

Algeria: H. E. Colonel Houari Boumediene, President of the National Council of the Revolution and President of the Council of Ministers of the Democratic Republic of Algeria, Alger, Algeria; Dear Mr. President.

Argentina: H. E. Alejandro A. Lanusse, President of the Argentine Nation, Buenos Aires, Argentina; Dear Mr. President.

Australia: The Right Honorable William McMahon, P.C., M.P., Prime Minister of Australia, Canberra, Australia; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Austria: H. E. Franz Jonas, President of the Republic of Austria, Vienna, Austria; Dear Mr. President.

Barbados: The Right Honorable Errol Walton Barrow, P.C., Prime Minister of Barbados, St. Michael, Barbados; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Belgium: H. E. Gaston Eyskens, Prime Minister of Belgium, Brussels, Belgium; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Bolivia: H. E. Colonel Hugo Banger Suarez, President of the Republic of Bolivia, La Paz, Bolivia; Dear Mr. President.

Botswana: H. E. Sir Seretse Khama, K.B.E., President of the Republic of Botswana, Gaberones, Botswana; Dear Mr. President.

Brazil: H. E. Emilio Garrastrazu Medici, President of the Federative of Brazil, Brasilia, Brazil; Dear Mr. President.

Bulgaria: H. E. Todor Zhivkov, Chairman of the Council of State of the Peoples Republic of Bulgaria, Sofia, Bulgaria; Dear Mr. Chairman.

Burma: H. E. U Ne Win, Prime Minister of the Union of Burma, Rangoon, Burma; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Burundi: H. E. Colonel Michel Micombero, President of the Republic of Burundi, Bujumbura, Burundi; Dear Mr. President.

Byelorussian: No separate listing—now a member state of U.S.S.R.

Cambodia: See Khmer Republic.

Cameroon: H. E. El Hadj Ahmadou Ahidjo, President of the Federal Republic of Cameroon, Yaounde, Cameroon; Dear Mr. President.

Canada: The Right Honorable Pierre Elliot Trudeau, P.C., Prime Minister of Canada, Ottowa, Canada; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Central African Republic: H. E. General of the Army Jean Bedel Bokassa, President of the Central African Republic, Bangui, Central African Republic; Dear General Bokassa.

Ceylon: See Ski Lanka.

Chad: H.E. Francois Tombalbaye, President of the Republic of Chad, Port Lamy, Chad; Dear Mr. President.

Chile: H.E. Dr. Salvador Allende Gossens, President of the Republic of Chile, Santiago, Chile; Dear Mr. President.

China (Peoples' Republic of), H.E. Chou En-Lai, Premier of the State Council of the Peoples' Republic of China, Peking, China; Dear Mr. Premier.

Colombia: H.E. Dr. Misael Pastrana-Borrero, President of the Republic of Colombia, Bogota, Colombia; Dear Mr. President.

Congo (Brazzaville), H.E. Major Marien N'Gouabi, President of the Peoples' Republic of the Congo, Brazzaville, Congo; Dear Mr. President.

Congo (Kinshasa), See Zaire.

Costa Rica: H.E. Jose Figueres Ferrer, President of the Republic of Costa Rica, San Jose, Costa Rica; Dear Mr. President.

Cuba: H.E. Dr. Osvaldo Porticos Torrado, President of the Republic of Cuba, Havana, Cuba; Dear Mr. President.

H.E. Dr. Fidel Castro Ruz, Prime Minister of Cuba, Havana, Cuba; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Cyprus: His Beatitude, Archbishop Makarios III, President of the Republic of Cyprus, Nicosia, Cyprus; Your Beatitude.

Czechoslovakia: H.E. Ludvik Svoboda, President of the Czechoslovakian Socialist Republic, Prague, Czechoslovakia; Dear Mr. President.

Dahomey: H.E. Justin Ahomadegbe, President of the Presidential Council, Cotonou, Dahomey; Dear Mr. President.

Denmark: H.E. Jens Otto Krag, Prime Minister of Denmark, Copenhagen, Denmark; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Dominican Republic: H.E. Dr. Joaquin Balaguer, President of the Dominican Republic, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic; Dear Mr. President.

Ecuador: H.E. General Guillermo Rodrigeuz Lara, President of the Republic of Ecuador, Quito, Ecuador; Dear Mr. President.

El Salvador: H.E. Colonel Arturo Armando Molina, President of the Republic of El Salvador, San Salvador, El Salvador; Dear Mr. President.

Estonia: No separate listing—now a member state of USSR.

Ethiopia: His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; Your Imperial Majesty.

Finland: H.E. Urho Kekkonen, President of Finland, Helsinki, Finland; Dear Mr. President.

France: H.E. Georges Pompidou, President of the French Republic, Paris, France; Dear Mr. President.

Gabon: H.E. Albert Bernard Bongo, President of the Gabon Republic, Libreville, Gabon; Dear Mr. President.

Gambia: H.E. Sir Dawda Kairaba Jawara, President of the Republic of Gambia, Bathurst, Gambia; Dear Mr. President.

Germany: H.E. Dr. Gustav Heinemann, President of the Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn, Germany; Dear Mr. President.

German Democratic Republic: H.E. Walter Ulbricht, Chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, Berlin-Mitte, German Democratic Republic; Dear Mr. Chairman.

Ghana: H.E. Colonel Ignatius Kuto Acheampong, Chairman, National Redemption Council of Ghana, Accra, Ghana; Dear Mr. Chairman.

Greece: H.E. George Papadopoulos, Prime Minister of Greece, Athens, Greece; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Guatemala: H.E. Brigadier General Carlos Arana Osorio, President of the Republic of Guatemala, Guatemala City, Guatemala; Dear Mr. President.

Guyana: H.E. Arthur Robert Chung, President of Guyana, Georgetown, Guyana; Dear Mr. President.

Haiti: H.E. Jean-Claude Duvalier, President of the Republic of Haiti, Port-au-Prince, Haiti; Dear Mr. President.

Holy See: His Holiness Pope Paul VI, The Vatican, Rome, Italy; Your Holiness.

Honduras: H.E. Dr. Ramon E. Cruz, President of the Republic of Honduras, Tegucigalpa, Honduras; Dear Mr. President.

Hungary: H.E. Pal Losonczi, President of the Presidential Council of Hungarian Peoples' Republic, Budapest, Hungary; Dear Mr. President.

Iceland: H. E. Dr. Kristjan Eldjarn, President of the Republic of Iceland, Reykjavik, Iceland; Dear Mr. President.

India: H. E. Indira Ghandi, Prime Minister of India, New Delhi, India; Dear Madam Prime Minister.

Indonesia: H. E. General Seoharto, President of the Republic of Indonesia, Djakarta, Indonesia, Dear Mr. President.

Iran: His Imperial Majesty Mohammed Reza Shah Pahlavi Shananshah of Iran, Tehran, Iran, Your Imperial Majesty.

Iraq: H. E. Major General Ahmed Hasan Al-Bakr, President of the Republic of Iraq, Baghdad, Iraq, Dear Mr. President.

Ireland: H. E. Eamon de Valera, President of the Irish Republic, Dublin, Ireland; Dear Mr. President.

Israel: H. E. Golda Meir, Prime Minister of Israel, Tel-Aviv, Israel; Dear Madam Prime Minister.

Italy: H. E. Giovanni Leon, President of the Italian Republic, Rome, Italy; Dear Mr. President.

Ivory Coast: H. E. Felix Houphouet-Boigny, President of the Republic of the Ivory Coast, Abidjan, Ivory Coast; Dear Mr. President.

Jamaica: The Honorable Michael Norman Manley, M.P., Prime Minister of Jamaica, Kingston, Jamaica; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Japan: H. E. Kakuei Tanaka, Prime Minister of Japan, Tokyo, Japan; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Jordan: His Majesty Hussein I, King of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, Amman, Jordan; Your Majesty.

Kenya: H. E. Jomo Kenyatta, President of the Republic of Kenya, Nairobi, Kenya; Dear Mr. President.

Khmer (formerly Cambodia): H. E. Marshal of the Khmer Armies Lon Nol, President of the Khmer Republic, Phnom-Phenh, Khmer Republic; Dear Mr. President.

Korea: H. E. Chung Hee Park, President of the Republic of Korea, Seoul, South Korea; Dear Mr. President.

North Korea: H. E. Kim Il-Sung, Premier and General Secretary of the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea, Pyongyang, North Korea; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Kuwait: His Highness Sheikh Sabah al-Salim al-Sabah, Emir of the State of Kuwait, Kuwait; Your Highness.

Laos: His Highness Prince Souvanna Phouma, Prime Minister of Laos, Vientiane, Laos; Your Highness.

Latvia: No separate listing—now a member state of USSR.

Lebanon: H. E. Sleiman Frangie, President of the Republic of Lebanon, Beirut, Lebanon; Dear Mr. President.

Lesotho: H. E. Chief Leabua Jonathan, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Lesotho, Maseru, Lesotho; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Liberia: H. E. William R. Tolbert Jr., President of the Republic of Liberia, Monrovia, Liberia; Dear Mr. President.

Libya: H. E. Colonel Maummar Muhammad Qadhaafi, President of the Revolutionary Command Council, Tripoli, Libyan Arab Republic; Dear Mr. President.

Liechtenstein: His Serene Highness, Franz Josef II, Prince of Liechtenstein, Vaduz, Liechtenstein; Your Serene Highness.

Lithuania: No separate listing—now a member state of USSR.

Luxembourg: His Royal Highness Jean Grand Duke of Luxembourg, The Grand Duchy of Luxembourg; Your Royal Highness.

Madagascar: H. E. Philibert Tsiranana, President of Malagasy Republic, Tananarive, Madagascar; Dear Mr. President.

Malawi: H. E. Dr. H. Kamuzu Banda, P. C., President of the Republic of Malawi, Blantyre, Malawi; Dear Mr. President.

Malta: The Honorable Dom Mintoff, Prime Minister of Malta, Valletta, Malta; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Malasia: H. E. Sultan Abdul Halim Mu'Adzam Shah ibi Al-Marhum, Sultan Badlishah Duk, DK, SPMK, DMN, Yang di-Pertuan Agong of Malasia, Kuala Lumpur, Malasia; Your Majesty.

Mali: H. E. Moussa Traore, President of the Military Command of National Liberation, Bamako, Mali; Dear Mr. President.

Mauritania: M. E. Moktar ould Daddah, President of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania, Nouakchott, Mauritania; Dear Mr. President.

Mauritius: The Honorable Sir Seewoosagur Ramgoolam, Prime Minister of Mauritius, Port Louis, Mauritius; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Mexico: H. E. Luis Echeverria Alvarez, President of the United Mexican States, Mexico DF, Mexico; Dear Mr. President.

Monaco: His Serene Highness Ranier III, Sovereign Prince of Monaco, Monte Carlo, Monaco; Your Serene Highness.

Mongolian Peoples' Republic: H. E. Yumjaagiin Tsedenbal, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian Peoples' Republic, Ulan Bator, Mongolian Peoples' Republic; Dear Mr. Chairman.

Morocco: His Majesty Hassan II, King of Morocco, Rabat, Morocco; Your Majesty.

Nepal: His Majesty Birendra Bir Bikram Shah Deva, King of Nepal, Kathmandu, Nepal; Your Majesty.

Netherlands: H. E. Barend W. Biesheuvel, Prime Minister of the Netherlands, The Hague, Netherlands; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

New Zealand: The Right Honorable John Ross Marshall, M.P., Prime Minister of New Zealand, Wellington, New Zealand; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Nicaragua: The National Governing Council of the Republic of Nicaragua, Managua, Nicaragua; Excellencies.

Niger: H. E. Hamani Diori, President of the Republic of Niger, Niamey, Niger; Dear Mr. President.

Nigeria: H. E. Major General Yakubu Gowon, Head of the Federal Military Government and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, Lagos, Nigeria; Dear General Gowon.

Norway: His Majesty Olav IV, King of Norway, Oslo, Norway; Your Majesty.

Pakistan: H. E. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, President of the Ismalic Republic of Pakistan, Islamabad, Pakistan; Dear Mr. President.

Panama: H. E. Demetrio B. Lakas, President of the Provisional Junta of Government of the Republic of Panama, Republic of Panama; Dear Mr. President.

Paraguay: H. E. General of the Army Alfredo Stroessner, President of the Republic of Paraguay, Asuncion, Paraguay; Dear Mr. President.

Peru: H. E. General Juan Velasco Alvarado, President of the Republic of Peru, Lima, Peru; Dear Mr. President.

Philippines: H. E. Ferdinand E. Marcos, President of the Philippines, Manila, Philippines; Dear Mr. President.

Poland: H.E. Henryk Jablonski, President of the Council of State of the Polish Peoples' Republic, Warsaw, Poland; Dear Mr. President.

Portugal: H.E. Admiral Americo Deus Rodrigues Thomaz, President of the Republic of Portugal, Lisbon, Portugal; Dear Mr. President.

Romania: H.E. Nicolae Ceausescu, President of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Bucharest, Romania; Dear Mr. President.

Rwanda: H.E. Gregoire Kayibanda, President of the Republic of Rwanda, Kigali, Rwanda; Dear Mr. President.

San Marino: Their Excellencies, Regents of the Republic of San Marino, Republic of San Marino; Excellencies.

Saudi Arabia: H.E. Faisal ibn Abdal-Aziz Al-Sa'ud, King of Saudi Arabia, Jidda, Saudi Arabia; Your Majesty.

Senegal: H.E. Leopold Seder Senghor, President of the Republic of Senegal, Dakar, Senegal; Dear Mr. President.

Sierra Leone: H.E. Dr. Siaka Stevens, President of the Republic of Sierra Leone, Freetown, Sierra Leone; Dear Mr. President.

Singapore: The President, Istana Negara, Republic of Singapore; Dear Mr. President.

Somali: H.E. Major General Mohamed Siad Barre, President of the Supreme Revolutionary Council of the Somali Democratic Republic, Mogadishu, Somali Democratic Republic; Dear Mr. President.

South Africa: H.E. Jacobus Johannes Fouche, State President of the Republic of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa; Dear Mr. President.

South Yemen: H.E. Salim Ali Rubayya, Chairman of the Presidential Council of the Peoples' Democratic Republic of Yemen, Aden, South Yemen; Dear Mr. Chairman.

Spain: H.E. General Francisco Franco Bahamonde, Chief of the Spanish State, Madrid, Spain; Dear General Franco.

Eri Lanka (formerly Ceylon), H.E. Sirimavo Bandaranaike, Prime Minister of the Republic of Sri Lanka, Colombo, Sri Lanka; Dear Madam Prime Minister.

Sudan: H.E. Jafir Muhammad Nineri, President of the Republic of the Sudan, Khartoum, Sudan; Dear Mr. President.

Swaziland: His Majesty Sobhuza II, KBE, The King of Swaziland, Mbabane, The Kingdom of Swaziland; Your Majesty.

Sweden: His Majesty Gustaf VI Adolf, King of Sweden, Stockholm, Sweden; Your Majesty.

Switzerland: H.E. Nello Celio, President of the Swiss Confederation, Berne, Switzerland; Dear Mr. President.

Syrian Arab Republic: H.E. Lieutenant General Hafiz Al-Asad, President of the Syrian Arab Republic, Damascus, Syria; Dear Mr. President.

Tanzania: H.E. Julius K. Nyerere Mwalimu, President of the United Republic of Tanzania, Dar-es-Salam, Tanzania; Dear Mr. President.

Thailand: His Majesty Bhumibol Adul Yadej, King of Thailand, Bangkok, Thailand; Your Majesty.

Togo: H.E. Major General Etienne Eyadema, President of the Republic of Togo, Lome, Togo; Dear Mr. President.

Trinidad and Tobago: H.E. Dr The Right Honorable Eric E. Williams P.C., Prime Minister of Trinidad and Tobago, Port of Spain, Trinidad; Dear Mr. Prime Minister.

Tunisia: H.E. Habib Bourguiba, President of the Republic of Tunisia, Tunis, Republic of Tunisia; Dear Mr. President.

Turkey: H.E. Cevedet Sunay, President of the Republic of Turkey, Ankara, Turkey; Dear Mr. President.

Uganda: H.E. General Idi Amin Dada, President of the Republic of Uganda, Kampala, Uganda; Dear Mr. President.

Ukrain: No separate listing—now a member state of USSR.

United Socialist Soviet Republics: H.E. Nikolai V. Podgorny, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, Moscow, USSR Dear Mr. Chairman.

United Arab Republic of Egypt: H.E. Anwar Al-Sadat, President of the Arab Republic of Egypt, Cairo, United Arab Republic of Egypt; Dear Mr. President.

United Kingdom: The Right Honorable Edward Heath, MBE, MP, Prime Minister, London, England; Dear Prime Minister.

Upper Volta: H.E. Sangoule Lamizana, President of the Republic of Upper Volta, Ouagadougou, Upper Volta; Dear Mr. President.

Uruguay: H.E. Juan M. Bordaberry Arocena, President of the Oriental Republic of Uruguay, Montevideo, Uruguay; Dear Mr. President.

Venezuela: H.E. Dr. Rafael Caldera, President of the Republic of Venezuela, Caracas, Venezuela; Dear Mr. President.

Vietnam (South): H.E. Nguyen van Thieu, President of the Republic of Vietnam, Saigon, Republic of Vietnam; Dear Mr. President.

Viet Nam (North): H.E. Ton Doc Thang, President of the Democratic Republic of Viet Nam, Hanoi, Viet Nam; Dear Mr. President.

Yemen: H.E. Abd Al-Rahman Iryani, Chairman of the Republican Council of the Yemen Arab Republic, Sana'a, Yemen; Dear Mr. Chairman.

Yugoslavia: H.E. Marshal Josip Broz-Tito, President of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Belgrade, Yugoslavia; Dear Mr. President.

Zaire (formerly Conga (Kinshasa)): H.E. Lieutenant General Joseph Mobutu Sese Seko, President of the Republic of Zaire, Kinshasa, Zaire; Dear Mr. President.

Zambia: H.E. Dr. Kenneth D. Kaunda, President of the Republic of Zambia, Kasaka, Zambia; Dear Mr. President.

HUBERT HUMPHREY—AN APPRAISAL

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in the heat of the recently concluded campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination, the more enduring virtues of some of the candidates may have become blurred.

The splendid record, over many years, of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY has been given fresh perspective in an article by Ernest B. Furgurson published yesterday in the Los Angeles Times.

Regardless of their personal preference for President, all of our colleagues should be able to find much to admire in the long and distinguished career of Senator HUMPHREY.

Mr. Furgurson's timely and well-balanced account follows:

FIGHTING THE GOOD FIGHT—FOR THE LAST TIME

(By Ernest B. Furgurson)

How many times, before Tuesday noon, must Muriel Humphrey have seen her husband stand in front of a microphone with tears welling in his eyes and heard him concede defeat but vow to keep up the good fight anyway, and said to herself as she tried to smile, "Thank God, it's the last time."

This time, at long last, it is, and a great many Americans besides Mrs. Humphrey are grateful for that fact. Many of those, of course, are the senator's opponents, who jeered him when he was too young and radical and sneered at him when he was too old and "conservative" by bombthrowers' standards.

But even more of them are his friends, who through all these years have felt tears well up themselves every time Humphrey bore up under defeat again.

He was, it is true, the easiest politician in recent time to deride and make fun of. He was also the easiest to love, for the simple reason that he himself was so full of love. You might say he based his whole political career on it.

That is why it was so hard for his friends that night in May 1960, in Charleston, when he acknowledged that John Kennedy had won not only the West Virginia primary but was on his way to the nomination.

That was the night the hillbilly singer kept doing "I'm Gonna Vote for Hubert Humphrey" over and over to the tune of "That Old Time Religion," and, of course, the whole thing could not have had the poignancy anywhere else that it did in a seedy hotel room at the end of a poverty-stricken campaign in those poor and rainy hills.

That is why it hurt them again to see him on the stage in the Leamington Hotel in Minneapolis the morning after election day in 1968, when he had to wait overnight to be sure that his courageous campaign against Richard Nixon, starting from disaster, had fallen just 500,000 votes short. That time, many of us wrote, surely was the end of his quest, the burial of the dream he had chased for a quarter-century even then.

But that was before he was reinspired by reelection to the Senate by such an overwhelming vote. In the short intermission when he was teaching at Macalester College, he already was anticipating 1972.

That also was before Chappaquiddick. It was before he devised his strategy of staying out of this year's primaries unless the front-runner faltered, and then scrapped it. It was before the new Humphrey with the double-knit wide lapels and mod hairdo came back into presidential politics.

Many of his old admirers wished he had not. Then he and they picked up hope when he ran strongly in early tests. But as it turned out, many of them came to be sorry he had done so well, because when he smelled the prospect of nomination again, it overcame his better judgment.

He wavered on busing. He said anybody who challenged the unit rule in California after it was over would be a spoilsport, and then he did just that. These past weeks have been the only time I ever knew his friends to feel it necessary to apologize for him.

Yet, now that it is done for the last time, those moments of tawdriness are hardly sub-footnotes in a long and rich biography. After he faced his staff and then the public and cameras, when he put his right arm about his wife's shoulders, pulled her to him and almost literally leaned on her, what he had said and done finally got through even to the young McGovernites in their hair and acid-rock outfits, and they applauded him without an ugly word.

The obvious thing, seeing that, was to reflect on what their own hero had been threatening to do to the party if he were the one who lost.

Hubert Humphrey never walked away from a fight, but when he had fought, he never turned away from the Democratic Party—nor even, I am certain, had a fleeting thought of doing so.

He defended his party against Communist infiltration after the war and labored to purge it of the shrugging attitude to racism that had traditionally assured it of the solid South. He led it to leadership on civil rights, the test-ban treaty, voting rights, Medicare. He was totally loyal under the most painful circumstances.

This sounds like an obituary, although if the country is lucky, he will be in the Senate another 20 years. Whether he is living or dead, when his party convenes again, it will honor itself if it puts his giant portrait on the wall along with Jackson, Roosevelt, Stevenson and the rest.

In fact, it would honor itself even more if it put up a picture of them both, Hubert and Muriel, with his arm tight about her shoulders.

THE CHANNELS OF TRUTH

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the American tradition of a free press, virtually unequaled anywhere else in the world has proven many times the virtues that it is an indispensable companion to a truly democratic government. Because the press is unhindered by Government censorship at all levels, journalists have probed both Government and society for the soft spots of which self-destruction are borne. Investigative reporting brought our attention to unfair labor practices and impure food products at the turn of the century. Seventy years later, the tragedy of Mylai made us fully cognizant of the power of the press.

The 1972 Pulitzer Prize for local spot reporting was awarded to reporters Richard Cooper and John Machacek of the daily afternoon paper in my district, the Rochester Times-Union. It was their story which set the record straight as to how the hostages held by Attica inmates actually died during the prison uprising last September.

Their story revealed for the first time that the hostages' necks had not been cut but that they had died from gunfire wounds, contrary to earlier reports.

It is unfortunate that the country did not know the truth from the beginning. But all of us should be deeply grateful that these reporters did not allow the false story to become more firmly planted in the minds of our citizens. First impressions, as we all know are difficult to allay particularly when they are compounded by a stream of "confirming stories." The correct story came just in time to avoid irreparable damage to all concerned.

Unfortunately, society seems to have become immune to tragedy. We hear the word so often that it seldom brings to mind the full scope of human misery which it describes. But we cannot close ourselves off from the burden which Attica places on all of us, particularly lawmakers on both the Federal and State level. Prison reform, a necessity which we have recognized for a long time but we have shamefully left untouched, which we could make the Attica agony a little less bitter.

Two reporters did their job. When are we going to get on with ours?

I have joined with many members of the House in sponsoring the Omnibus Correctional Reform Act which, to my mind, would go a long way in stopping the revolving doors of our prisons. At this point I am inserting a summary of the act's provisions for your careful consideration. It is my judgment that we can no longer put aside the problems of our prisons until another Attica prompts us to pay more attention to the demands of our citizens for meaningful change.

The summary follows:

SUMMARY OF OMNIBUS CORRECTIONAL REFORM ACT OF 1972

This bill provides a new comprehensive approach to prison reform on the state and local level. It provides substantial federal support for a program of creating a new, modern correctional system built around smaller institutions, located in or near the urban communities they serve. At the same time, it takes account of the major effort needed to redirect the nation's penal effort by requiring the development of certain short range programs which will make present penitentiaries more effective.

TITLE I—COMMUNITY-BASED CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

Title I outlines the basic long range program which will result in a new penal strategy. It consists of several amendments to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration provisions of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968:

(1) Require that after two years from passage no state plan for LEAA assistance will be approved as comprehensive (a necessary prerequisite to receiving Federal funds) unless it allocates at least 40% of the requested funds to the improvement of correctional practices and programs. (Part E of the LEAA Act presently requires a 20% allocation.) The actual allocation of LEAA funds is also changed accordingly. In terms of present Congressional authorization this would authorize $700 million for this new program in fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

(2) Require that any such correctional plan contain a 20 year program developed in detail by five year segments for the gradual phasing out of large country prisons located a substantial distance from major urban areas whose community they serve (regardless of whether they be classified as low, medium, or high security) and their replacement with small, community-based corrections facilities designed to apply modern corrections theory.

TITLE II—REHABILITATION AND RELATED PROGRAMS

Title II is the first of several programs designed to provide immediate improvement while the states develop their long range programs. It authorizes the expenditure of $400 million over the next four years to develop and fund projects providing programs for rehabilitation, job placement, on-the-job counseling and correctional education for criminal offenders, youth offenders, and juvenile delinquents. Heavy emphasis is placed on the rehabilitation of those who have committed no more than one serious offense on the theory that these are the most easily helped.

To be eligible to receive a grant under this title a state must appoint a planning and administration council which would develop a plan and submit it to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. The plan would be required to allocate at least 40 percent of all Federal funds granted to local government bodies and nonprofit organizations and 15 percent of all Federal funds to private, profit making individuals, businesses and organizations. This would result in the involvement of many segments of the community in the corrections process.

Grants to the states will be determined by the number of persons detained in correctional institutions and by the total population of the state. However, in no case will such grants amount to more than 75 percent of the total cost of such programs in any given year. The title also provides means for the Secretary to determine that funds are actually expended in accordance with the provisions of this title, and for a method of judicial review should a state not be satisfied with the Secretary's ruling.

TITLE III—EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

This title is intended to provide special funding for the development of specialized school curricula, for the training of educational personnel and, for research and demonstration projects. These programs and projects would be especially tailored to the needs of persons detained in state and local correctional institutions with the intention of improving their vocational and academic education so as to enhance the possibility of rehabilitation of such persons.

Section 301 of title III would amend section 511(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Presently the authorized funding is $80 million per year, but in unrestricted form. Under the proposed amendment the authorized funding would be increased to $100 million for each of the next five years. Additionally the amended bill would require that $110 million be spent on projects under Section 1103(a)(6) of title 20 of the United States Code which authorizes the development of special educational programs for criminal offenders.

Section 302 of title III would authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants to state and local governments, educational agencies, public and nonprofit private institutions of higher learning, and other public and nonprofit private education or research agencies. Such grants would fund research and demonstration projects to the academic and vocational education of antisocial, aggressive, or delinquent persons including juvenile delinquents, youth offenders, and adult criminal offenders.

To advise on the creation of general policy with regard to the education of persons covered by this title, the Commissioner is authorized to appoint special technical advisory committees. Members of such committees who are not already full time employees of the United States are entitled to receive compensation as shall be determined by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare but not in excess of $75 a day. $13 million is authorized to be spent on this title over the next three fiscal years.

TITLE IV—SPECIAL PROBATION PROGRAMS

Title IV authorizes the expenditure of $40 million during each of the next five fiscal years for the creation of special probation supervision programs. These programs will be designed to accommodate juvenile delinquents and young offenders under 25 who have not yet become repeated offenders and who have not been found guilty of capital crimes. Such programs must be structured so as to reduce the need for the commitment of such offenders to state correctional institutions.

Any state desiring assistance must submit a state plan to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The plan must establish suitable controls to insure that the appropriate state agency exercises proper supervision, qualified probations personnel are employed, and incentives for local participation in programs designed to reduce the need for commitment to correctional institutions are provided.

Funds will be provided for the states on the basis of a formula which takes into account the number of persons under the age of 25 within the states and the number of youthful offenders who have not been committed to state correctional institutions. Provision is also made to insure that the federal share of such programs will not exceed 75% and that the funds provided under this program will not be in lieu of funds coming from other sources and already being spent on such programs. Additionally, each state involved shall develop programs to monitor the effectiveness of the special probations programs developed. Provision will be made for the collection and utilization of such information by the Federal Corrections Institute.

TITLE V—FEDERAL CORRECTIONS INSTITUTE

Title V amends title 18 of the United States Code by adding at the end thereof a new chapter creating a Federal Corrections Institute. The Institute would serve several functions related to the short range improvement of present corrections systems and the long range development of a new corrections system as foreseen in title I. It would collect and disseminate useful data relating to efforts to improve the present corrections system and develop a new, community based system as provided in title I. It would also provide training for Federal, State and local personnel involved in the judicial system and corrections field so as to facilitate the acceptance and development of a new corrections systems.

The Institute's overall policy and operations would be under the supervision of an Advisory Commission including personnel from the judicial, probations and corrections fields and including private, concerned citizens and persons who have actually served in prisons. Also included on the Advisory Commission will be the Director of the Institute, the Attorney General (or his designee), and the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (or his designee).

The Director of the Institute with the approval of the Advisory Commission shall acquire property and shall make the necessary arrangements for the Institute's construction and equipment. The advisory Commission shall supervise the design of a training curriculum for enrollees from the judicial and corrections fields. Candidates for admission to the Institute shall be selected by the State planning agencies created under LEAA, subject to final selection by the Director of the Institute. While studying with the Institute each enrollee shall be allowed travel expenses and a per diem allowance in the same manner as prescribed for persons intermittently employed in government service under section 5703(b) of title 5, United States Code. Such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title are authorized.

IN SUPPORT OF THE JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION ACT

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, of paramount concern to every citizen today is the spiraling crime rate in our country. The most distressing aspect of this problem is the involvement of America's youth. In the last decade, violent crime by persons under 18 jumped 167 percent. Over the same period, property crimes such as burglary, larceny, and auto thefts by youths under 18 increased by 89 percent. Although young people between the ages of 10 and 17 comprise only 16 percent of the Nation's population, they account for nearly 50 percent of all arrests. In short, juveniles are responsible for a substantial and disproportionate share of our country's crime problem.

Clearly, we cannot hope to reduce the overall rate of crime in this country without first reducing juvenile delinquency and youth crime. Yet, as our ever-increasing crime rates indicate, we have made very little headway in accomplishing this goal. By and large, our preventive and rehabilitative efforts have met with failure. We have failed to divert potentially delinquent youths from commencing a life of crime. As the latest FBI statistics reveal, recidivism rates are higher for youths under 20 than for any other age group. Seventy-four percent of juvenile offenders who have once been institutionalized wind up back in youth or adult correctional facilities.

In the wake of our failure to control America's critical youth crime problem, there has been a good deal of congressional deliberation as to how juvenile delinquency can be combatted at the Federal level. For my part, I drafted a bill to create an Institute for the Continuing Studies of Juvenile Justice. Congressmen PETE BIESTER, ABNER MIKVA, and over 100 other House Members joined me in sponsoring the legislation. The institute will have as its prime functions: One, collection and dissemination of information on youth crime; two, research and analysis of model laws in this area; and three, training of persons involved with young people who have run afoul of the law. The bill, which overwhelmingly passed the House of Representatives on April 18, is now pending before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Twenty-four Senators have sponsored companion legislation and I am hopeful affirmative action soon will be forthcoming.

Today, I am pleased that we have before us a bill that will place primary emphasis on the prevention of delinquency at the local level. H.R. 15365, the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act, will replace the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, which expired June 30 of this year.

Briefly stated, the purpose of the legislation is to assist States and local communities, including elementary and secondary schools, in providing community-based preventive services to youths who are in danger of becoming delinquent.

Over 5 years ago the President's Crime Commission pointed out:

> Once a juvenile is apprehended by the police and referred to the Juvenile Court, the community has already failed; subsequent rehabilitation services, no matter how skilled, have far less potential for success than if they had been applied before the youth's overt defiance of the law.

Therefore, as its prime emphasis, the bill stresses preventive youth services, including diagnostic treatment, counseling, education, vocational training, job placement, health services, and cultural and recreational activities. These are all located inside the community and outside the traditional juvenile justice system.

H.R. 15365 emphasizes the school as a primary preventive agent. Of all the public institutions, the school plays the most important role in a child's life—in shaping his attitudes and developing his potential to become a contributing, worthwhile member of society. The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act will provide funds to schools in order to develop a wide range of delinquency prevention programs, such as remedial education, tutoring, and alternative educational programs for youths conducted outside the traditional school system.

A second—and very important—feature of this legislation is its strong emphasis on coordination. For too long delinquency prevention has been marked by fragmentation of effort and a lack of coordination. This failure has contributed to our inability to make any measurable progress in solving our juvenile delinquency problem. H.R. 15365 provides that each applicant agency must coordinate its operations on a continuing basis with the operations of other agencies furnishing welfare, education, health, recreation, job training, or job placement services in the community for youths. In particular, each applicant must consult the schools in its area to make sure the proposed programs are coordinated with on-going educational efforts.

A third key ingredient of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act is the provision of funds for the training of personnel employed or preparing for employment in fields related to the diagnosis and treatment of potentially delinquent youth. In addition, emphasis is placed on the counseling or instruction of parents so that they can more effectively deal with troubled youths. To achieve success with our antidelinquency efforts, we must have competent and dedicated individuals—parents, teachers, and other professionals—who are willing to devote their time and energies toward helping young people.

Mr. Speaker, we have failed too long to respond in any meaningful way to the crisis of delinquency. The Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act will arm us with some of the vital tools to enable us to reduce delinquency, and thus the overall crime rate. We must act immediately to conserve America's most important natural resource: Her youth.

ASSONET PROJECT AIDS RETARDED

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, hope has been incorporated in Assonet, Mass., in my 10th Congressional District.

It is called Vanward, Inc., and it has been formed by a group of people interested in easing the path of retarded children from the Crystal Springs Nursery in Assonet to life in foster homes and to jobs.

The group includes Frederick Pansera, Jr., Lawrence Murphy, Hilda Hoxie, Ilene Fairhurst, Betsy Eldridge, and Nancy Shutt. They have help from Mr. and Mrs. Dana Brayton and Richard Eldridge. All are dedicated to the proposition that retarded children require more than the programs at the nursery.

Their plan is to fill the gap between the time a child is ready to be taught work habits and the time he is old enough to go into vocational training, a sheltered workshop or the community itself.

I salute these people for the work they are doing and I pay them tribute for their unselfish interest and concern.

For the full story of Vanward, Inc., I submit an article in the Taunton Daily Gazette of June 17, 1972:

ASSONET PROJECT AIDS RETARDED

(By Sandy Buttermore)

FREETOWN.—Vanward, Inc., held its "grand opening' 'today on Narrows Rd. in Assonet.

This isn't your usual type of business because the purpose of Vanward is to offer further training to the retarded children now living at Crystal Springs Nursery in Assonet.

A unique program has been developed by a group of employees from Crystal Springs as a step beyond the rehabilitative programs provided at that facility. Work habits training, intermediary community residences and training for foster parents in the care of the retarded, are the aims of Vanward.

Frederick Pansera Jr., president of Vanward, explained that the project came into being because of the need to fill the gap between the age when a child is ready to be taught work habits and the age when he is allowed to enter either a vocational training program or to be employed in existing sheltered workshops or the community.

The program will also prepare a child for future life in the community through foster home placement.

"The Vanward program would not have been possible," Pansera said, "without the cooperation of Mr. and Mrs. Dana Brayton, administrator and director of Crystal Springs, which is a nationally-known multi-disciplined residential center for some 100 mentally retarded children."

Vanward's board of directors are Pansera, president; Lawrence Murphy, treasurer and clerk; Hilda Hoxie, assistant treasurer; and Ilene Fairhurst, Betsy Eldridge, and Nancy Shutt—have planned a sophisticated arts and crafts program to simulate work routines commonly found in employment.

A barn, which the group leases, has been remodeled to provide a workshop for the children and a gift shop has been set up in a separate area of the building. The sale of commercial merchandise in the gift shop will supplement the operating budget of Vanward.

It has been hoped that the articles made by the children could be displayed in the gift shop for sale by donation, but a decision to allow this must be made by the state labor board.

If the board rules that the articles cannot be sold, Pansera said, it will not affect the program because the training provided by the craft projects is vital to the growth of the children.

Intermediary community residences have been planned to help the children make an adjustment from an institutional environment to future foster homes. It is hoped that eventually many children will be able to move on to the community in foster homes.

A farmhouse, adjacent to the workshop and a gift shop, is being enlarged to provide adequate space for eight children and will become the first community residence, hopefully in September.

Larry Murphy, a member of the board of directors and academic co-ordinator at Crystal Springs, and his wife, Betty, an LPN, are to be the foster parents for this first "family."

The first Vanward residence is to be called Eldridge House, in honor of Richard Eldridge of River Bend, Taunton. A long time friend of the retarded child, Eldridge has been directly responsible for the designing and construction of many projects at both Crystal Springs and Vanward.

Training for foster parents is also an aim of Vanward, so that as the children are ready to leave the intermediary home and enter a foster home in the community, parents trained in the care of the retarded will be available. The Vanward staff will provide help with the particular problems of each child and will be available for guidance in the event of future problems.

Vanward has an impressive list of members on his advisory board, with Dr. Alan Crocker, director of the Developmental Evaluation Clinic at Children's Hospital Medical Center in Boston, serving as chairman. Dr. Crocker's entire staff serves on the board, along with other notables such as Dr. Gunnar Dubward, dean of the Florence Hellar Institute of Social Science at Brandeis University, who is an authority on mental retardation.

Pansera sums up the hopes for Vanward by saying, "We envision this pilot project to be a beacon in salvaging many exceptional students from otherwise unfulfilled, barren lives."

A visitor to Vanward's bright, new workshop would feel that these hopes will be realized as he watches the children work to master new skills. A smile, usually accompanied by a delighted cry of "I did it!" shows the progress made with each new accomplishment in their lives.

Since Vanward is a non-profit organization, it will be funded mainly through voluntary contributions, and Mrs. Hilda Hoxie, program director, has accepted the task of fund-raising chairman. It is her hope that area churches and charitable organizations will sponsor a supper or similar money raising event to aid the Vanward treasury.

Volunteers prepared game booths, refreshments, grabs, pony rides and a flea market, all a part of the grand opening celebration which will end at 6 p.m. at the Vanward site.

ALASKAN COMMAND SILVER ANNIVERSARY

HON. NICK BEGICH

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. Speaker, this year is the 25th anniversary of the Alaskan Command, a group dedicated to protection of the North American Continent. In recognition of this milestone, I am including the proclamation issued by Gov. William Egan in appreciation of the superb job done by the Alaskan Command:

PROCLAMATION

ALASKAN COMMAND SILVER ANNIVERSARY

The year of 1972 is the 25th Anniversary of the Alaskan Command. A quarter of a century ago, the Joint Chiefs of Staff established the Alaskan Command to maintain constant vigil over the land, sea, and air approaches to the strategic Arctic region of the North American continent. This difficult yet paramount mission has the devotion and dedication of the component commands of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, patrolling and monitoring the strategic Arctic regions to insure the North American continent against potential aggressors.

The State of Alaska is highly proud of the Alaskan Command and of its many achievements in behalf of all Americans over the past 25 years. In the interest of Alaskans themselves, it is difficult to adequately express gratitude for the tremendous support all members of the Command, and their families too, have rendered to the civilian sector of Alaska's population.

On numerous occasions of natural disaster, such as the 1964 earthquake and seismic sea waves, the 1967 Fairbanks flood, and river floods in far-flung village areas, the commanders, officers, enlisted personnel, and military families at all stations have come through with effective, all-out efforts, allowing Alaskans to enjoy a close relationship and warm admiration of the fine people who wear our military uniforms.

Countless unsung and heroic search-and-rescue activities are accomplished each year in behalf of civilians throughout Alaska, oftentimes performed at great personal risk by members of the Alaskan Command. Many Alaskans are alive and in good health today only because of selfless humanitarian efforts of past and present personnel of the Alaskan Command. Our fellow citizens in uniform here in Alaska have performed these frequently hazardous search-and-rescue missions in foul and dangerous weather. Such sacrifices have been performed as a matter of routine duty by the highly capable personnel of ALASCOM.

Members of the Alaskan Command and their families have also made a great contribution in the arena of community civic endeavor. We are grateful for their vital role in Alaskan life and for their good citizenship.

Therefore, as Governor of Alaska, I, William A. Egan, proclaim the week of June 27–30, 1972, to be Alaskan Command Silver Anniversary Week in Alaska and urge all Alaskans to give deserving thanks and recognition to the Alaskan Command for their outstanding quarter century of service to our Nation and our State, and to extend commendation for a job well done to protect the interests of all Americans.

Dated this 22nd of June, 1972.

WILLIAM A. EAGAN,
Governor.

SOVIETS SHOW RESPECT FOR SALT

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the results of the President's historic trip to the Soviet Union deserve great praise. I have on many occasions expressed my belief that the SALT agreements mark a critical breakthrough in this country's foreign relations. A major step was taken at the summit meeting in Moscow and it would be a very sad thing indeed if something were in any way to retard the progress made at the talks. It is my feeling that appropriating the $110 million requested by Secretary of Defense Laird to build up strategic arms not limited by the agreement would have just that injurious effect.

I therefore on June 27 proposed to amend the military procurement authorization in order to delete those funds. Despite the amendment's defeat, I still feel very strongly that it would be a mistake for America to follow Secretary Laird's plan, thereby showing an onlooking world that we have no faith in the agreements reached with the Soviet Union. We must demonstrate our trust and confidence in the arms limitation accords, as they have done by suspending tests of the SS–9.

I include in the RECORD an article by George C. Wilson which appeared in the Washington Post on July 6, 1972 dealing with the Soviets' halting of the tests. I hope, by inserting the article, to keep my distinguished colleagues in Congress aware of the good faith demonstrated by the Soviet Union and would also hope that they can exercise that same good faith by deleting the additional $110 million to the Defense Department.

SOVIETS HALT BIG-MISSILE TESTS, APPARENTLY BECAUSE OF SALT

(By George C. Wilson)

The Soviet Union, in an apparent attempt to display restraint to the United States, has suspended space maneuvers with its fearsome SS–9 Scarp rocket.

Washington specialists link the suspension with the strategic arms limitation talks (SALT). Some of the SS–9 exercises in space last year and earlier appeared to be tests of a system for blinding American observation satellites that look down on the Soviet Union.

Under the SALT agreement recently negotiated, neither side is to interfere with methods of verifying how much weaponry the other is deploying. Spy satellites like the American Samos (Satellite and missile observation systems), are such a method.

Also, under an earlier agreement made through the United Nations, the United States and the Soviet Union announce the general characteristics of the vehicles they shoot up into space. Both sides also watch this space traffic with radars on the ground.

The international space log shows that the Soviet Union has desisted from SS-9 maneuvers in space so far this year, in contrast to earlier years.

Last year, for example, the SS-9 went into space maneuvers on six different occasions. Three of those shots appeared to be tests of a system to inspect and, on command, destroy foreign observation satellites.

Specifically, on Feb. 25, April 4 and Dec. 3 Soviet rocket troops sent SS-9s whooshing out of the space port at Tyuratam on satellite inspection drills. The launches were logged as Cosmos 397, 404 and 462. The Soviets did not detail the missions but Western space specialists interpreted them as satellite intercepts.

The SS-9 was flown a fourth time in 1971 in what appeared to be another test of its space bomb system—the so-called FOBS, for fractional orbital bombardment system.

Some Western space experts believe that launch was merely a drill for Red rocket troops, not a further refinement of FOBS. The SS-9 was launched Aug. 8 and labeled Cosmos 433 by the Soviets.

The FOBS would fly out low from the Soviet Union launch pad and go nearly around the world to hit the United States from the south, eluding the radars guarding our northern approaches.

Since the United States has not flight-tested any space systems comparable to the Soviets' satellite intercept or FOBS vehicles, the Russians might have reasoned it would have been impolitics of them to stage maneuvers this year when the SALT agreement appeared in reach.

While Pentagon civilians, including former Air Force Secretary Harold Brown have argued that the FOBS space bomb technique does not make enough sense technically for the United States to pursue, there is still considerable uneasiness in the Air Force about the lack of a system for inspecting satellites.

Within the last few weeks, several U.S. aerospace firms at the Air Force's request prepared new proposals for satellite inspection vehicles which could maneuver close enough to another nation's observation satellite to knock it out of commission with a non-nuclear explosive.

If the SALT treaty holds, no such systems would be deployed by either side. Article XII states that "each party undertakes not to interfere with the nations technical means of verification of the other party. . ."

However, research and development—including flight tests—seem to be allowed by the treaty as long as the vehicle does not have the ability to knock down missiles.

OPPOSITION TO ATLANTIC UNION

HON. PETER A. PEYSER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that the Yonkers City Council recently passed a resolution joining Congressman BIAGGI and myself in our opposition to the Atlantic Union. I think that this resolution will be of interest to the Members of the House and for this reason I am entering it in the RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION No. 216—1972

(By Miscellaneous Affairs Committee: Councilman Coppola, Chairman, Councilmen Cola and Iannacone and Councilman O'Rourke)

Whereas, H.R. 900 and S.R. 217, also known as the "Atlantic Union" Resolutions, are presently before the Congress of the United States, and

Whereas, the intent and implementation of said Resolutions will adversely effect the present status of citizenship in the United States and the State of New York, and

Whereas, there has never been a referendum in the State of New York to determine whether there is any real support of these Resolutions, and

Whereas, our elected representatives in the House of Representatives, Congressman Mario Biaggi and Congressman Peter Peyser have both effectively voiced their opposition to these Resolutions, now, therefore,

Be it resolved, that this Council, representing the people of the City of Yonkers, does now declare itself in opposition to H.R. 900 and S.R. 217, and be it

Further resolved, that this Council supports Congressman Mario Biaggi and Congressman Peter Peyser in their opposition to these Resolutions and commends them for their stand.

PROBLEMS OF SMALL TOWN MAYORS

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, recently one of the most conscientious mayors in my district, the Honorable Ed Ogletree of Union, had an opportunity to speak before a rural gathering which included Under Secretary of Agriculture William Erwin. He pointed out the many problems which face a city administration in a rural community. I think one of the most important points he made was the fact that there is such a proliferation of Federal programs that it is difficult to determine how to apply for Federal assistance programs. I join with Mayor Ogletree in calling for a consolidation of Federal assistance and commend his remarks to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE ED OGLETREE

I am Ed Ogletree, Mayor, Union, Mississippi (Population—1,856).

I have been assigned the impossible task of speaking for five minutes on "Problems in Rural Towns", but we'll give it a try.

Our most pressing problem is job opportunities for our young people. We educate them, and then they have to leave our town, and frequently our area and State, to find employment in urban areas. We have two industries in our town—one textile and one woodworking. We're very thankful for them; however, they pay near the minimum wage scale, and it is impossible for a young couple to buy a house and raise a family with this sort of income. Our per capita income is around $1,700 per year which is less than half the national average.

Our next most pressing problem is adequate housing. In the poverty areas, 92% of our housing is classified as dilapidated. In nonpoverty areas, 22% is dilapidated. We have at present practically a zero availability of rental housing.

Our next major problem is inadequate recreation facilities for all age groups. We have a lighted Little League baseball field. At present, we have around 45 young adults playing softball two nights a week at our Little League field. Home runs are quite frequent. Our theater closed a year ago, and there is no recreation in our town for our children.

Our next problem is in the area of community facilities. We need a new library as our present library is in one room of the City Hall and does not adequately serve our needs. We need recreational parks in our poverty areas. We need day care facilities for working mothers' children.

Jobs and housing would enable us to partially solve many of our problems as our tax base would improve, and we could use the increased revenue to better our community. It's sort of like the old question of which came first—the chicken or the egg. How can we attract industry unless we fix up our community? How can we improve our community unless we have people with jobs to build our revenue? There is no answer except aid from outside sources such as our State and Federal Governments to prime the pump and get us started.

I wish that I had thirty minutes to tell you why I had rather live in Union, Newton County, Mississippi, than any other place on earth. We have clean air and water, it's safe for our wives and children to walk our streets after dark, and people care about you when you're sick and attend funerals and offer their sympathy when someone dies.

We started three years ago to try to improve our town and comunity. We identified our problems with a 701 Comprehensive Plan financed by an 80% HUD grant. We passed a $400,000 bond issue last year which will provide sewer service to every use of town and a treatment plant which will keep our streams clean. This is being done with an EPA grant, an FHA loan, and possibly an ECA grant (if we can get a commitment from an industry). We are entering the Neighborhood Development Program with HUD.

PORTUGAL SETS THE RECORD STRAIGHT

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, it has become very apparent over the years that the United Nations often serves as a mouthpiece of the international Communist conspiracy. U.N. members which voted to expel Free China and seat the murderous regime of Mao Tse-tung have received U.S. aid to the tune of $79 billion. The latest insult from the ignominious body that is draining American tax dollars relates to the small and valiant nation of Portugal. It was Portugal and her overseas provinces which were accepted for membership in the U.N. Now the United Nations has taken it upon itself to sanction, without the sovereign consent to Portugal, an inspection of Portuguese Guinea by a U.N. team including representatives from Ecuador, Sweden, and Tunisia.

This "team" never set foot in Portuguese territory. Their alleged inspection took place while they were escorted through the neighboring and hostile nation of Guinea by representatives of its Maoist dictator, Sekou Toure, who on December 11, 1971, was a recipient of

$4,700,000 from the seemingly bottomless money bags of the U.S. State Department.

Portugal has seen fit to set the record straight on the U.N. "inspection" of its Guinean province in two articles, one from the April issue of Portugal, the other by Bruce Loudon in the London Daily Telegraph of May 2, 1972. The articles follow:

[From the London Daily Telegraph, May 2, 1972]

U.N. MISSION WITHOUT A PRECEDENT

(By Bruce Loudon)

By their own admission, they wore camouflage uniforms supplied by their Communist-backed guerrilla hosts. For seven days and seven nights, they say, they tramped through the mosquito-ridden and snake-infested areas of Portuguese Guinea under the firm "control" of the rebels—making "contact" with the local people, seeing the "programmes of reconstruction" being promoted by PAIGC—Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde—and the educational facilities it is developing.

This was a United Nations team of "special investigators" at work. In the camouflage knapsacks provided by PAIGC, team members carried insignia of the world body—presumably in case they should come across any Portuguese in those areas of "free" Guinea.

The three investigators were diplomats from Ecuador, Sweden and Tunisia. One, the leader, was of ambassadorial rank. They represent their countries in the United Nations Special Committee on Decolonisation. Their specific assignment was to go into Portuguese Guinea under the aegis of the guerrillas to see for themselves the degree of "control" which PAIGC says it has over three-quarters of the tiny territory—and to see for themselves the area which, they report, will soon be Africa's newest, independent State.

It was a strange mission, without precedent in the annals of the United Nations, for it was the result of a one-sided decision. The Portuguese were not consulted. And now comes news that similar investigating teams will be sent into "liberated" parts of Angola and Mozambique.

Portugal says that the mission was a violation of the United Nations charter and "illegal." After all, when Portugal was admitted to the United Nations, the constitution formally recognised by the world body included metropolitan Portugal and her overseas possessions. By sending the investigators to "free" Guinea without so much as a reference to Portugal, the United Nations was violating the recognised sovereignty of a member-State.

Be that as it may, the mission went ahead. And it is worth considering the result, for the report of the three uninvited diplomats will doubtless become something of a *cause celebre* for propagandists anxious to prove the Portuguese are on their knees in the tiniest and most exposed of their African territories. Much has already been said by PAIGC about what it "controls" and the initial report of the special investigators backs all this—on the surface.

However, the account of the investigators' seven days and seven nights in "free" Portuguese Guinea is vague. There may be more later. But one glaring omission right at the start is that the investigators fail to say that where they went after they crossed the frontier "clandestinely" from the neighbouring Republic of Guinea.

It may be argued that the investigators do not want to name villages they visited in "liberated" areas for fear of Portuguese bombing reprisals. However, fear of reprisals has never shown itself in the PAIGC before.

The very vagueness of the initial account of the investigators' adventures lead to other doubts. They speak of going everywhere secretly and on foot—a "secrecy" which is surprising in view of the "control" they say is exercised by their rebel hosts. And always on foot?? If PAIGC "controls" three quarters of Portuguese Guinea, surely it could have produced a bicycle or a horse, or something, to carry their VIP guests? What about details of the educational and reconstruction work they saw?

Perhaps there is a clue to all this in the seven-day beards the investigators say they had when they re-emerged in the safety of Sekou Toure's Guinea. It is surely reasonable to suppose that if such strides were being made in "free" Portuguese Guinea that PAIGC would have been able to provide the simple facilities needed for the diplomats to wash and shave.

There must, therefore, be grave suspicion about the accuracy of the conclusions reached by the three, although they will doubtless be accepted by the United Nations. This is not to say that there has been malfeasance on the part of the three hardworking diplomats, for the oldest of Africa hands know only too well how difficult it is to define frontiers. As the Lisbon Diario de Noticias has pointed out, "straw huts look the same on either side of the frontier."

The Portuguese Government has said it believes the three spent most of their seven days and seven nights "heroically" foot-slogging around the frontier areas within the neighbouring Republic of Guinea—blissfully believing they had been taken by the PAIGC into "free" Portuguese Guinea. Certainly, there was no sign of them having crossed the frontier, although much of Portugal's 30,000-man army in Guinea was deployed in the area during the reported visit, the Portuguese air force flew constant reconnaissances over the area, and Gen. Antonio Spinola, Governor and Commander-in-Chief, himself bivouacked in the frontier area to take immediate decisions in the event of the three being found.

Yet the conclusions of this mission will doubtless become United Nations lore and a major factor in the belief that Africa's "newest, independent State" is about to be born and the Portuguese hightailing it for home. The Scandinavian and Communist countries will distribute more of their largesse to the soon-to-be-victorious PAIGC.

"The world cannot possibly believe such lies," one high-ranking Portugese official said when he read, the first account of the mission's activities. Sad to say, the world probably will.

[From the Portugal magazine, April 1972]

UN'S "ALICE IN WONDERLAND" COMMITTEE WAS NEVER INSIDE PORTUGUESE GUINEA WITH PAIGC

The Portuguese Government has challenged a United Nations team of investigators to say precisely where it went in liberated areas of Portuguese Guinea.

This was announced in Lisbon after the three-man team, consisting of representatives from Ecuador, Sweden and Tunisia, reported it had been into liberated Portuguese Guinea in the company of terrorists of the Communist-backed African Party for the Independence of Guinea and Cape Verde (PAIGC).

A Government Note issued in Lisbon and distributed at the UN said Portugal was sure the three never entered Portuguese Guinea and that they were misled by their terrorist hosts into believing they were in Portuguese territory while, in fact, they were in the territory of the neighbouring Republic of Guinea (Conakry).

BACKING

Powerful backing for this assertion was contained in a UN press release issued after the three, all diplomats and named as Ambassador Horacio Sevilha-Borja, of Ecuador, Folke Loftren, of Sweden, and Kamel Belkhiria, of Tunisia, emerged from what they claimed were seven days and seven nights spent inside Portuguese Guinea making contact with the people, inspecting reconstruction work being undertaken by the PAIGC, and observing educational and administrative services within the liberated areas.

Two points, in particular, were taken up by commentators in Lisbon:

(1). The failure of the UN team to say precisely where it went in Portuguese Guinea—the failure to name names. This is a glaring omission, for though the investigators may say they wish to protect villages they visited against identification, this does not appear to be a valid answer.

In the past the PAIGC has frequently claimed it escorted foreigners, including journalists, into areas they say they control. They have never before placed any restriction on naming names. Usually, correspondents have emerged with reports date-lined some or other village in liberated Portuguese Guinea, though these have generally been false. Fear of reaction from the Portuguese has never before shown itself in the PAIGC's slick drive for propaganda advantage. It must be assumed, too, that the UN team was not anxious to name names and then find Lisbon taking independent witnesses there to put their assertions to the test.

(2). A giveaway line in the team's initial report was about the seven-day beards its members say they had when they emerged back to the safety of Sekou Touré's Guinea: it is surely legitimate to suppose that with so much administration going on in liberated Portuguese Guinea, the PAIGC would have been able to provide the simplest facilities needed for the VIP visitors to wish and shave?

VAGUE

Moreover, the very vagueness of the initial account of their adventures leads to other doubts about its authenticity: the three speak of going everywhere secretly and on foot—a secrecy which is surprising in view of the control they say is exercised by their terrorist hosts. And always on foot? If, as it says it does, the PAIGC controls three-quarters of Portuguese Guinea, surely they could have produced a bicycle or a horse or something to carry their eminent guests from New York.

PATROLS

Coinciding with the Lisbon Note, Gen. António Spínola, Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Portuguese Guinea, told correspondents in Bissau that he saw no way in which the much-publicised team could have crossed into Portuguese territory.

He personally bivouacked on the frontier during the duration of the alleged visit and had his men on permanent patrol duty while he overflew the area constantly in a helicopter. He says he sincerely believes that had there been any penetration across the frontier it would have been spotted.

UNIQUE

The investigation was, of course, unique in UN history. It was undertaken in contravention of the UN Charter, and in flagrant violation of Portugal's legitimate sovereignty recognized by the world body when Lisbon was admitted to membership. The whole mission was, in the words of one Lisbon commentator, eminently illegal.

More than that, it was a new form of debasement of the UN which could have far greater long-term effects on the world body than it does on Portuguese Guinea: these were three prominent members of the notorious Committee of 24 (the Decolonization Committee) toadying to a terrorist movement well-known for its indiscriminate murder of innocent civilians.

Moreover, these were UN officials dressed in the camouflage uniforms provided for them by the PAIGC—operating under the protection of a terrorist body in defiance of the integrity of a UN member. Where will this stop? a UN mission with the IRA terrorists, perhaps?

FARCE

All in all, the mission was a farce which did more harm to the reputation of the UN than anything else. After all, as the Lisbon *Diário de Notícias* pointed out, straw huts look the same on either side of the frontier. Even the least experienced of Africa hands knows that.

The final idiocy was, however, yet to come: when the three got back to Conakry from their wanderings, there awaited them a special meeting of the full Decolonization Committee.

After deliberating the report of what the three say they found during what they say was a visit to Portuguese Guinea covering seven days and seven nights, the committee decided to recognize the PAIGC as the sole representative of the people of Portuguese Guinea.

In fact, of course, the committee has no power to recognize anything. It is no more than an advisory body to the UN General Assembly. With so many Alice-in-Wonderland aspects to the wanderings of the three in darkest Africa, however, such a move was hardly surprising.

News that the 22-member Committee, with a supporting staff of 54, would spend some £70,000 on their tour, a sum far exceeding their entire annual budget voted by the General Assembly, was, according to the Sunday Telegraph, greeted with shock and indignation by Western diplomats in New York.

What remains now is a response to the Portuguese Government's request for precise information about the trip.

PLIGHT OF THE AMERICAN FARMER

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, during the just-completed recess of the Congress for the Democrat Convention, a touching, thoughtful letter arrived in my office. It was from Mr. Edward E. White, Route 2, Newville, Ala., which is located in Henry County. The heart of the wiregrass area of Alabama.

Mr. White made some very cogent observations about the plight of the American farmer, Mr. Speaker, and he puts into print some of the frustrations of those who, by the sweat of their brows, labor long hours for low pay to produce food for the rest of us. I would like to share this correspondence with other Members of the House particularly our colleagues who represent strictly urban districts who are so quick to criticize the American farmer for the high price of products on our grocery store shelves:

NEWVILLE, ALA.,
June 27, 1972.

Hon. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DICKINSON: I have just finished a very hard day's work and washed the sweat and dirt from my body; my muscles ache from throwing hay all day. I am sitting here too tired to move and wondering why I do this type of working and toil from before sunrise to after sunset. The pay is very unsure; when there is money, it is a meager amount when compared to the pay received by others who work much less both in time and quantity of work accomplished. For the first time in my lifetime I am able to realize a little profit from my cattle operation, but this will not last too long. President Nixon has lifted the import quota on meat in order to drive meat prices down. I hope he gets a few votes for doing this.

I would say that President Nixon's actions are in keeping with the attitude of most of urban America. Urban Americans want the highest wages and the most goods and services that they can have at a very cheap price. When urban people are buying cheap food, they should keep in mind that "cheap labor" is producing this cheap food. If it is a foreign product, especially meat, then some very cheap labor produced it. I guess it is human nature for people to want to live off the sweat and toil of others. It surely appears that way. What if all my farmer friends and I started buying foreign products exclusively? By doing this, we could put all those urban people who work in agricultural related jobs out of work. If we did this, they could not even afford cheap foreign meat. I don't guess this would work, because then they could start receiving food stamps; that would mean that I would have to help support them. It really tears me up for government and industry employees to always holler "gimme more" and then expect their food prices not to increase. Don't they realize that every time they get a raise that someone must provide this raise? When workers in a tractor factory get a raise, that means that I must pay more for my tractor. The only way that I am going to be able to pay more for that tractor is to become more efficient or get more for my goods. I can't work longer hours; there are not that many hours in a day.

Even if I am able to make a little money on my cattle and crops, taxes get the most of it one way or another. If I try to put my profit back into the land in the form of conservation practices or invest in new equipment to avoid excessive income tax and social security, the local property tax people will come out and reassess my property at a higher value. This is something that "bugs" me.

Why should other people profit from my long hours of sweat and toil? Government employees want more salary, nicer buildings, and more time for recreation. Those on welfare and social security want more and better of everything. I would like to have an air-conditioned cab on my tractor to ease the torture of the heat in the fields, but I can't because I have to pay taxes so that government employees can have air-conditioned offices and air-conditioned cars. I would like to have some machines to help me with my haywork, but I can't afford them. I must pay a high tax rate so that those in 235-houses can have electric dishwashers and other labor saving devices.

I can't quit this life, though. I can't leave the smell of a fresh dew on the grass, or the smell of fresh dug peanuts as they go over the shaker bars on a digger shaker. I can't leave the sound of quail whistling in the meadows and cows cropping grass in the pasture. I can't leave a love that only those who are close to the land can feel. I just hope that the greed of the people who want to get everything for nothing will not starve me to such a degree that I will be forced to stop providing the "cheap meat" and foods for the masses of Americans who take it all so very for granted.

Sincerely,

EDWARD E. WHITE.

SOCIALISM—ROYAL ROAD TO POWER FOR THE SUPER-RICH

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second chapter in Gary Allen's important book, "None Dare Call It Conspiracy," which I am presenting in serial fashion in the RECORD with a strong recommendation that—whatever your preconceived ideas about the conspiracy theory of history—you give its facts and arguments the most serious consideration.

Chapter 2 of "None Dare Call It Conspiracy," entitled, "Socialism—Royal Road to Power for the Super-Rich," follows:

CHAPTER 2—SOCIALISM—ROYAL ROAD TO POWER FOR THE SUPER-RICH

Everyone knows that Adolph Hitler existed. No one disputes that. The terror and destruction that this madman inflicted upon the world are universally recognized. Hitler came from a poor family which had absolutely no social position. He was a high school drop-out and nobody ever accused him of being cultured. Yet this man tried to conquer the world. During his early career he sat in a cold garret and poured onto paper his ambitions to rule the world. We know that.

Similarly, we know that a man named Vladimir Ilich Lenin also existed. Like Hitler, Lenin did not spring from a family of social lions. The son of a petty bureaucrat, Lenin, who spent most of his adult life in poverty, has been responsible for the deaths of tens of millions of your fellow human beings and the enslavement of nearly a billion more. Like Hitler, Lenin sat up nights in a dank garret scheming how he could conquer the world. We know that too.

Is it not theoretically possible that a billionaire could be sitting, not in a garret, but in a penthouse, in Manhattan, London or Paris and dream the same dream as Lenin and Hitler? You will have to admit it is theoretically possible. Julius Caesar, a wealthy aristocrat, did. And such a man might form an alliance of association with other like-minded men, might he not? Caesar did. These men would be superbly educated, command immense social prestige and be able to pool astonishing amounts of money to carry out their purposes. These are advantages that Hitler and Lenin did not have.

It is difficult for the average individual to fathom such perverted lust for power. The typical person, of whatever nationality, wants only to enjoy success in his job, to be able to afford a reasonably high standard of living complete with leisure and travel. He wants to provide for his family in sickness and in health and to give his children a sound education. His ambition stops there. He has no desire to exercise power over others, to conquer other lands or peoples, to be a king. He wants to mind his own business and enjoy life. Since he has no lust for power, it is difficult for him to imagine that there are others who have . . . others who march to a far different drum. But we must realize that there *have* been Hitlers and Lenins and Stalins and Caesars and Alexander the Greats throughout history. Why should we assume there are no such men today with perverted lusts for power? And if these men happen to be billionaires is it not possible that they would use men like Hitler and Lenin as pawns to seize power for themselves?

Indeed, difficult as this is to believe, such is the case. Like Columbus, we are faced with the task of convincing you that the world is not flat, as you have been led to believe all your life, but, instead, is round. We are going to present evidence that what you call "Communism" is not run from Moscow or Peking, but is an arm of a bigger conspiracy run from New York, London and Paris. The men at the apex of this movement are not Communists in the traditional sense of that term. They feel no loyalty to Moscow or Peking. They are loyal only to themselves and their undertaking. And these men certainly do not believe in the clap-trap pseudo-philosophy of Communism. They have no intention of dividing their wealth. Socialism is a philosophy which conspirators exploit, but in which only the naive believe. Just how finance capitalism is used as the anvil and Communism as the hammer to conquer the world will be explained in this book.

The concept that Communism is but an arm of a larger conspiracy has become increasingly apparent throughout the author's journalistic investigations. He has had the opportunity to interview privately four retired officers who spent their careers high in military intelligence. Much of what the author knows he learned from them. And the story is known to several thousand others. High military intelligence circles are well aware of this network. In addition, the author has interviewed six men who have spent considerable time as investigators for Congressional committees. In 1953, one of these men, Norman Dodd, headed the Reece Committee's investigation of tax-free foundations. When Mr. Dodd began delving into the role of international high finance in the world revolutionary movement, the investigation was killed on orders from the Eisenhower-occupied White House. According to Mr. Dodd, it is permissable to investigate the radical bomb throwers in the streets, but when you begin to trace their activities back to their origins in the "legitimate world," the political iron curtain slams down.

You can believe anything you want about Communism except that it is a conspiracy run by men from the respectable world. People will often say to an active anti-Communist: "I can understand your concern with Communism, but the idea that a Communist conspiracy is making great inroads in the United States is absurd. The American people are anti-Communist. They're not about to buy Communism. It's understandable to be concerned about Communism in Africa or Asia or South America with their tremendous poverty, ignorance and disease. But to be concerned about Communism in the United States where the vast majority of people have no sympathy with it whatsoever is a misspent concern."

On the face of it, that is a very logical and plausible argument. The American people are indeed anti-Communist. Suppose you were to lay this book down right now, pick up a clip board and head for the nearest shopping center to conduct a survey on Americans' attitudes about Communism. "Sir," you say to the first prospect you encounter, "we would like to know if you are for or against Communism?"

Most people would probably think you were putting them on. If we stick to our survey we would find that ninety-nine percent of the people are anti-Communist. We probably would be hard put to find anybody who would take an affirmative stand for Communism.

So, on the surface it appears that the charges made against anti-Communists concerned with the internal threat of Communism are valid. The American people are not pro-Communist. But before our imaginary interviewee walks away in disgust with what he believes is a hokey survey, you add: "Sir, before you leave there are a couple of other questions I would like to ask. You won't find these quite so insulting or ludicrous." Your next question is: "What is Communism? Will you define it, please?"

Immediately a whole new situation has developed. Rather than the near unanimity previously found, we now have an incredible diversity of ideas. There are a multitude of opinions on what Communism is. Some will say: "Oh, yes, Communism. Well that's a tyrannical brand of socialism." Others will maintain: "Communism as it was originally intended by Karl Marx was a good idea. But it has never been practiced and the Russians have loused it up." A more erudite type might proclaim: "Communism is simply a rebirth of Russian imperialism."

If perchance one of the men you ask to define Communism happened to be a political science professor from the local college, he might well reply: "'You can't ask 'what is Communism?' That is a a totally simplistic question about an extremely complex situation. Communism today, quite unlike the view held by the right wing extremists in America, is not an international monolithic movement. Rather, it is a polycentric, fragmented, nationalistic movement deriving its character through the charismas of its various national leaders. While, of course, there is the welding of Hegelian dialects with Feuerbachian materialism held in common by the Communist parties generally, it is a monumental oversimplification to ask 'what is Communism.' Instead you should ask: What is the Communism of Mao Tse-tung? What is the Communism of the late Ho Chi Minh, or Fidel Castro or Marshal Tito?"

If you think we are being facetious here, you haven't talked to a political science professor lately. For the above is the prevailing view on our campuses, not to mention in our State Department.

Whether you agree or disagree with any of these definitions, or, as may well be the case, you have one of your own, one thing is undeniable. No appreciable segment of the anti-Communist American public can agree on just what it is that they are against. Isn't that frightening? Here we have something that almost everybody agrees is bad, but we cannot agree on just what it is we are against.

How would this work in a football game, for example? Can you imagine how effective the defense of a football team would be if the front four could not agree with the linebackers who could not agree with the corner backs who could not agree with the safety men who could not agree with the assistant coaches who could not agree with the head coach as to what kind of defense they should put up against the offense being presented? The obvious result would be chaos. You could take a sand lot team and successfully pit them against the Green Bay Packers if the Packers couldn't agree on what it is they are opposing. That is academic. The first principle in any encounter, whether it be football or war (hot or cold), is: Know your enemy. The American people do not know their enemy. Consequently, it is not strange at all that for three decades we have been watching one country of the world after another fall behind the Communist curtain.

In keeping with the fact that almost everybody seems to have his own definition of Communism, we are going to give you ours, and then we will attempt to prove to you that it is the only valid one. Communism: An international, conspiratorial drive for power on the part of men in high places willing to use any means to bring about their desired aim—global conquest.

You will notice that we did not mention Marx, Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, bourgeois, proletariat or dialectical materialism. We said nothing of the pseudo-economics or political philosophy of the Communists. These are the techniques of Communism and should not be confused with the Communist conspiracy itself. We did call it an international conspiratorial drive for power. Unless we understand the conspiratorial nature of Communism, we don't understand it at all. We will be eternally fixated at the Gus Hall level of Communism. And that's not where it's at, baby!

The way to bring down the wrath of the Liberal press Establishment or the professional Liberals is simply to use the word *conspiracy* in relation to Communism. We are not supposed to believe that Communism is a political conspiracy. We can believe anything else we wish to about it. We can believe that is a brutal, tyranical, evil or even that it intends to bury us, and we will win the plaudits of the vast majority of American people. But don't ever, ever use the word *conspiracy* if you expect applause, for that is when the wrath of Liberaldom will be unleashed against you. We are not disallowed from believing in *all* types of conspiracy, just modern political conspiracy.

We know that down through the annals of history small groups of men have existed who have conspired to bring the reins of power into their hands. History books are full of their schemes. Even *Life* magazine believes in conspiracies like the Cosa Nostra where men conspire to make money through crime. You may recall that *Life* did a series of articles on the testimony of Joseph Valachi before the McClellan Committee several years ago. There are some aspects of those relevations which are worth noting.

Most of us did not know the organization was called Cosa Nostra. Until Valachi "sang" we all thought it named the Mafia. That is how little we knew about this group, despite the fact that it was a century old and had been operating in many countries with a self-perpetuating clique of leaders. We didn't even know it by its proper name. Is it not possible a political conspiracy might exist, waiting for a Joseph Valachi to testify? Is Dr. Carroll Quigley the Joseph Valachi of political conspiracies?

We see that everybody, even *Life* magazine, believes in some sort of conspiracy. The question is: Which is the more lethal form of conspiracy—criminal or political? And what is the difference between a member of the Cosa Nostra and a Communist, or more properly, an *Insider* conspirator? Men like Lucky Luciano who have scratched and clawed to the top of the heap in organized crime must, of necessity, be diabolically brilliant, cunning and absolutely ruthless. But, almost without exception, the men in the hierarchy of organized crime have had no formal education. They were born into poverty and learned their trade in the back alleys of Naples, New York or Chicago.

Now suppose someone with this same amoral grasping personality were born into a patrician family of great wealth and was educated at the best prep schools, then Harvard, Yale or Princeton, followed by graduate work possibly at Oxford. In these institutions he would become totally familiar with history, economics, psychology, sociology and political science. After having graduated from such illustrious establishments of higher learning, are we likely to find him out on the streets peddling fifty cent tickets to a numbers game? Would you find him pushing marijuana to high schoolers or running a string of houses of prostitution? Would he be getting involved in gangland killings? Not at all. For with that sort of education, this person would realize that if one wants power, real power, the lessons of history say, "Get into the government business." Become a politician and work for political power or, better yet, get some politicians to front for you. That is where the real power—and the real money—is.

Conspiracy to seize the power of government is as old as government itself. We can study the conspiracies surrounding Alcibiades in Greece or Julius Caesar in ancient Rome, but we are not supposed to think that men today scheme to achieve political power.

Every conspirator has two things in common with every other conspirator. He must be an accomplished liar and a far-seeing planner. Whether you are studying Hitler, Alcibiades, Julius Caesar or some of our contemporary conspirators, you will find that their patient planning is almost overwhelming. We repeat FDR's statement: "In politics, nothing happens by accident. If it happens, you can bet it was planned that way.

In reality, Communism is a tyranny planned by power seekers whose most effective weapon is the big lie. And if one takes all the lies of Communism and boils them down, you will find they distill into two major lies out of which all others spring. They are: (1) Communism is inevitable, and (2) Communism is a movement of the downtrodden masses rising up against exploiting bosses.

Let us go back to our imaginary survey and analyze our first big lie of Communism—that it is inevitable. You will recall that we asked our interviewee if he was for or against Communism and then we asked him to define it. Now we are going to ask him: "Sir, do you think Communism is inevitable in America?" And in almost every case the response will be something like this: "Oh, well, no. I don't think so. You know how Americans are. We are a little slow sometimes in reacting to danger. You remember Pearl Harbor. But the American people would never sit still for Communism."

Next we ask: "Well then, do you think socialism is inevitable in America?" The answer, in almost every case will be similar to this: "I'm no socialist, you understand, but I see what is going on in this country. Yeah, I'd have to say that socialism is inevitable."

Then we ask our interviewee: "Since you say you are not a socialist but you feel the country is being socialized, why don't you do something about it?" His response will run: "I'm only one person. Besides it's inevitable. You can't fight city hall, heh, heh, heh."

Don't you know that the boys down at city hall are doing everything they can to convince you of that? How effectively can you oppose anything if you feel your opposition is futile? Giving your opponent the idea that defending himself is futile is as old as warfare itself. In about 500 B. C. the Chinese war lord-philosopher Sun Tsu stated, "Supreme excellence in warfare lies in the destruction of your enemy's will to resist in advance of perceptible hostilities." We call it "psy war" or psychological warfare today. In poker, it is called "running a good bluff." The principle is the same.

Thus we have the American people: anti-Communist, but unable to define it and anti-socialist, but thinking it is inevitable. How did Marx view Communism? How important is "the inevitability of Communism" to the Communists? What do the Communists want you to believe is inevitable—Communism or socialism? If you study Marx' *Communist Manifesto* you will find that in essence Marx said the proletarian revolution would establish the Socialist dictatorship of the proletariat. To achieve the Socialist dictatorship of the proletariat, three things would have to be accomplished: (1) The elimination of all right to private property; (2) This dissolution of the family unit; and (3) Destruction of what Marx referred to as the "opiate of the people," religion.

Marx went on to state that when the dictatorship of the proletariat had accomplished these three things throughout the world, and after some undetermined length of time (as you can imagine, he was very vague on this point), the all powerful state would miraculously wither away and state socialism would give way to Communism. You wouldn't need any government at all. Everything would be peace, sweetness and light and everybody would live happily ever after. But first, all Communists must work to establish Socialism.

Can't you just see Karl Marx really believing that an omnipotent state would wither away? Or can you imagine that a Josef Stalin (or any other man with the cunning and ruthlessness necessary to rise to the top of the heap in an all-powerful dictatorship) would voluntarily dismantle the power he had built by fear and terror?*

Socialism would be the bait . . . the excuse to establish the dictatorship. Since dictatorship is hard to sell in idealistic terms, the idea had to be added that the dictatorship was just a temporary necessity and would soon dissolve of its own accord. You really have to be naive to swallow that, but millions do!

The drive to establish Socialism, not Communism, is at the core of everything the Communists and the *Insiders* do. Marx and all of his successors in the Communist movement have ordered their followers to work on building Socialism. If you go to hear an official Communist speaker, he never mentions Communism. He will speak only of the struggle to complete the socialization of America. If you go to a Communist bookstore you will find that all of their literature pushes this theme. It does *not* call for the establishment of Communism, but Socialism.

And many members of the Establishment push this same theme. The September 1970 issue of *New York* magazine contains an article by Harvard Professor John Kenneth Galbraith, himself a professed socialist, entitled "Richard Nixon and the Great Socialist Revival." In describing what he calls the "Nixon Game Plan," Galbraith states:

"Mr. Nixon is probably not a great reader of Marx, but [his advisors] Drs. Burns, Shultz and McCracken are excellent scholars who know him well and could have brought the President abreast and it is beyond denying that the crisis that aided the rush into socialism was engineered by the Administration. . . ."

Dr. Galbraith began his article by stating:

"Certainly the least predicted development under the Nixon Administration was this great new thrust to socialism. One encounters people who still aren't aware of it. Others must be rubbing their eyes, for certainly the portents seemed all to the contrary. As an opponent of socialism, Mr. Nixon seemed steadfast. . . ."

Galbraith then proceeds to list the giant steps toward socialism taken by the Nixon Administration. The conclusion one draws from the article is that socialism, whether it be from the Democrat or Republican Parties, is inevitable. Fellow Harvard socialist Dr. Arthur Schlesinger has said much the same thing:

"The chief liberal gains in the past generally remain on the statute books when the conservatives recover power . . . liberalism grows constantly more liberal, and by the same token, conservatism grows constantly less conservative. . . ."

Many extremely patriotic individuals have innocently fallen for the conspiracy's line. Walter Trohan, columnist emeritus for the *Chicago Tribune* and one of America's outstanding political commentators, has accurately noted:

"It is a known fact that the policies of the government today, whether Republican or Democratic, are closer to the 1932 platform of the Communist Party than they are to either of their own party platforms in that critical year. More than 100 years ago, in 1848 to be exact, Karl Marx promulgated his program for the socialized state in the Communist Manifesto. . . ."

And Mr. Trohan has also been led to believe that the trend is inevitable:

"Conservatives should be realistic enough to recognize that this country is going deeper into socialism and will see expansion of federal power, whether Republicans or Democrats are in power. The only comfort they may have is that the pace will be slower under Richard M. Nixon than it might have been under Hubert H. Humphrey . . .

Conservatives are going to have to recognize that the Nixon Administration will embrace most of the socialism of the Democratic administrations, while professing to improve it. . . ."

The Establishment promotes the idea of the inevitability of Communism through its perversion of terms used in describing the political spectrum. (See Chart 1) We are told that on the far Left of the political spectrum we find Communism, which is admittedly dictatorial. But, we are also told that equally to be feared is the opposite of the far Left, i.e., the far Right, which is labeled Fascism. We are constantly told that we should all try to stay in the middle of the road, which is termed democracy, but by which the Establishment means Fabian (or creeping) socialism. (The fact that the middle of the road has been moving inexorably leftward for forty years is ignored.) Here is an excellent example of the use of false alternatives. We are given the choice between Communism (*international* socialism) on one end of the spectrum, Naziism (*national* socialism) on the other end, or Fabian socialism in the middle. The whole spectrum is socialist.

This is absurd. Where would you put an anarchist on this spectrum? Where do you put a person who believes in a Constitutional Republic and the free enterprise system? He is not represented here, yet this spectrum is used for political definitions by a probable ninety percent of the people of the nation.

There is an accurate political spectrum. Communism is, by definition, total government. If you have total government it makes little difference whether you call it Communism, Fascism, Socialism, Caesarism or Pharaohism. It's all pretty much the same from the standpoint of the people who must live and suffer under it. If total government (by any of its pseudonyms) stands on the far Left, then by logic the far Right should represent anarchy, or no government.

Our Founding Fathers revolted against the near-total government of the English monarchy. But they knew that having no government at all would lead to chaos. So they set up a Constitutional Republic with a very limited government. They knew that men prospered in freedom. Although the free enterprise system is not mentioned specifically in the Constitution, it is the only one which can exist under a Constitutional Republic. All collectivist systems require power in government which the Constitution did not grant. Our Founding Fathers had no intention of allowing the government to become an instrument to steal the fruit of one man's labor and give it to another who

---

(*Karl Marx was hired by a mysterious group who called themselves the League of Just Men to write the *Communist Manifesto* as demogogic boob-bait to appeal to the mob. In actual fact that *Communist Manifesto* was in circulation for many years before Marx' name was widely enough recognized to establish his authorship for this revolutionary handbook. All Karl Marx really did was to update and codify the very same revolutionary plans and principles set down seventy years earlier by Adam Weishaupt, the founder of the Order of Illuminati in Bavaria. And, it is widely acknowledged by serious scholars of this subject that the League of Just Men was simply an extension of the Illuminati which was forced to go deep underground after it was exposed by a raid in 1786 conducted by the Bavarian authorities.)

had not earned it. Our government was to be one of severely limited powers. Thomas Jefferson said: "In questions of power then let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution." Jefferson knew that if the government were not enslaved, people soon would be.

It was Jefferson's view that government governs best which governs least. Our forefathers established this country with the very least possible amount of government. Although they lived in an age before automobiles, electric lights and television, they understood human nature and its relation to political systems far better than do most Americans today. Times change, technology changes, but principles are eternal. Primarily, government was to provide for national defense and to establish a court system. But we have burst the chains that Jefferson spoke of and for many years now we have been moving leftward across the political spectrum toward collectivist total government. Every proposal by our political leaders (including some which are supposed to have the very opposite effect, such as Nixon's revenue sharing proposal) carries us further leftward to centralized government. This is not because socialism is inevitable. It is no more inevitable than Pharaohism. It is largely the result of clever planning and patient gradualism.

Since all Communists and their *Insider* bosses are waging a constant struggle for Socialism, let us define that term. Socialism is usually defined as government ownership and/or control over the basic means of production and distribution of goods and services. When analyzed this means government control over everything, including you. All controls are "people" controls. If the government controls these areas it can eventually do just exactly as Marx set out to do—destroy the right to private property, eliminate the family and wipe out religion.

We are being socialized in America and everybody knows it. If we had a chance to sit down and have a cup of coffee with the man in the street that we have been interviewing, he might say: "You know, the one thing I can never figure out is why all these very, very wealthy people like the Kennedys, and Fords, the Rockefellers and others are for socialism. Why are the super-rich for socialism? Don't they have the most to lose? I take a look at my bank account and compare it with Nelson Rockefeller's and it seems funny that I'm against socialism and he's out promoting it." Or is it funny? In reality, there is a vast difference between what the promoters define as socialism and what it is in actual practice. The idea that socialism is a share-the-wealth program is strictly a confidence game to get the people to surrender their freedom to an all-powerful collectivist government. While the *Insiders* tell us we are building a paradise on earth, we are actually constructing a jail for ourselves.

Doesn't it strike you as strange that some of the individuals pushing hardest for socialism have their own personal wealth protected in family trusts and tax-free foundations? Men like Rockefeller, Ford and Kennedy are for every socialist program known to man which will increase your taxes. Yet they pay little, if anything, in taxes themselves. An article published by the North American Newspaper Alliance in August of 1967 tells how the Rockefellers pay practically no income taxes despite their vast wealth. The article reveals that one of the Rockefellers paid the grand total of $685 personal income tax during a recent year. The Kennedys have their Chicago Merchandise Mart, their mansions, yachts, planes, etc., all owned by their myriads of family foundations and trusts. Taxes are for peons! Yet hypocrites like Rockefeller, Ford and Kennedy pose as great champions of the "downtrodden." If they were really concerned about the poor, rather than using socialism as a means of achieving personal political power, they would divest themselves of their own fortunes. There is no law which prevents them from giving away their own fortunes to the poverty stricken. Shouldn't these men set an example? And practice what they preach? If they advocate sharing the wealth, shouldn't they start with their own instead of that of the middle class which pays almost all the taxes? Why don't Nelson Rockefeller and Henry Ford II give away all their wealth, retaining only enough to place themselves at the national average? Can't you imagine Teddy Kennedy giving up his mansion, airplane and yacht and moving into a $25,000 home with a $20,000 mortgage like the rest of us?

We are usually told that this clique of super-rich are socialists because they have a guilt complex over wealth they inherited and did not earn. Again, they could relieve these supposed guilt complexes simply by divesting themselves of their unearned wealth. There are doubtless many wealthy do-gooders who have been given a guilt complex by their college professors, but that doesn't expain the actions of *Insiders* like the Rockefellers, Fords or Kennedys. All their actions betray them as power seekers.

But the Kennedys, Rockefellers and their super-rich confederates are not being hypocrites in advocating socialism. It appears to be a contradiction for the super-rich to work for socialism and the destruction of free enterprise. In reality it is not.

Our problem is that most of us believe socialism is what the socialists want us to believe it is—a share-the-wealth program. That is the theory. But is that how it works? Let us examine the only Socialist countries—according to the Socialist definition of the word—extant in the world today. These are the Communist countries. The Communists themselves refer to these as Socialist countries, as in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Here in the reality of socialism you have a tiny oligarchial clique at the top, usually numbering no more than three percent of the total population, controlling the total wealth, total production and the very lives of the other ninety-seven percent. Certainly even the most naive observe that Mr. Brezhnev doesn't live like one of the poor peasants out on the great Russian steppes. But, according to socialist theory, he is supposed to do just that!

If one understands that socialism is not a share-the-wealth program, but is in reality a method to *consolidate* and *control* the wealth, then the seeming paradox of super-rich men promoting socialism becomes no paradox at all. Instead it becomes the logical, even the perfect tool of power-seeking megalomaniacs. Communism, or more accurately socialism, is not a movement of the downtrodden masses, but of the economic elite. The plan of the conspirator *Insiders* then is to socialize the United States, not to Communize it.

How is this to be accomplished? Chart 3 shows the structure of our government as established by our Founding Fathers. The Constitution fractionalized and subdivided governmental power in every way possible. The Founding Fathers believed that each branch of the government, whether at the federal, state or local level, would be jealous of its powers and would never surrender them to centralized control. Also, many phases of our lives (such as charity and education) were put totally, or almost totally, out of the grasp of politicans. *Under this system you could not have a dictatorship.* No segment of government could possibly amass enough power to form a dictatorship. In order to have a dictatorship one must have a single branch holding most of the reins of power. Once you have this, a dictatorship is inevitable.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XXIV

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I have recently reintroduced the telephone privacy bill with 48 cosponsors.

This bill would give individuals the right to indicate to the telephone company if they do not wish to be commercially solicited over the telephone. Commercial firms wanting to solicit business over the phone would then be required to obtain from the phone company a list of customers who opted for the commercial prohibition. The FCC would also be given the option of requiring the phone company, instead of supplying a list, to put an asterisk by the name of those individuals in the phone book who have chosen to invoke the commercial solicitation ban.

Those not covered by the legislation would be charities and other nonprofit groups, political candidates or organizations, and opinion polltakers. Also not covered would be debt collection agencies or any other individual or companies with whom the individual has an existing contract or debt.

I have received an enormous amount of correspondence on this legislation from all over the country. Today, I am placing a 22d sampling of these letters into the RECORD, since they describe far more vividly than I possibly could the need for this legislation.

These letters follow—the names have been omitted:

VILLA PARK, ILL.,
July 14, 1972.

Re bill H.R. 14884.
U.S. Representative LES ASPIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ASPIN: Regarding the above Bill, I would like you to know that I am very much in agreement with it and what it would do for us people that hate to answer the phone and interrupt an otherwise peaceful dinner.

Since my husband and I work all day, dinnertime is an especially important one to us for we talk of all the things that happened during the day and about our work. We like to enjoy this time by ourselves and not be bothered by all the "phone peddlers" that constantly call and irritate us. Not only do we receive phone calls for land, but also for subscriptions, charities and the most obnoxious caller was that of a florist nearby. When my picture and name was in the paper for the announcement of my marriage, this florist and many more called and hounded me day after day and night after night in regard to using their services for my wedding. One in particular even lied saying one of my friends had given my name and therefore, I won some flowers for my wedding. Needless to say, it was a very annoying and tactless way of getting business and these calls from this florist went on and on and on until I finally lost my patience.

I read about this bill in the Chicago Tribune Action Line column. They mentioned that a possible solution to this problem is that if the bill is adopted, a person could contact Ill. Bell and tell them you don't want to be bothered by solicitors and that then there might be a list your name would go on or they would put an asterisk beside your name in the phone book. I think both ideas are good ones and I am sure that a lot of other people feel this way as all my friends have the same feelings on this matter as I do.

I am hopeful that I will know if such a bill is adopted. If there is any information as to when the bill is put forth for adoption, or any information on the outcome of it, I would greatly like to have it.

Thank you for taking the time to read this and I sincerely hope that the public is kept aware of what will happen with this Bill.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

WADSWORTH, OHIO,
July 13, 1972.

Re telephone privacy bill, Les Aspin, Member of Congress

Representative HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, House Commerce Committee, Rayburn Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAGGERS: I am writing to you in regard to a matter of deep concern to myself and other Americans. It is simply this—in a society becoming more complex each passing day, I find myself increasingly the prey of others through the device of the telephone. I resent being treated without courtesy and dignity, and merely considered to be a "consumer" without any cognizance of the individual I really am.

You are aware that a concern of this country is the fostering of a healthy commercial climate. In the words of Calvin Coolidge, "The business of this country is business." HOWEVER, I will not be treated with contempt, nor can I stand by and allow my friends and neighbors to be so treated also. Something must be done to protect the sanctity of the home from the obnoxious, frequent and repetitive phone calls to the homes of our citizens from "business persons" too lazy to employ other more acceptable means of selling their wares and products.

It is a real shame of this country that our state lawmakers are not more responsive to their real constituents, the people. I had attempted to have a bill similar to that of Mr. Aspin's introduced into the Ohio legislature, but was treated disgracefully. It is deplorable that Congress must fill the vaccum our lobby-ridden statehouses create.

I strongly urge you to hold hearings on this Bill as soon as possible, and your efforts to ensure its passage.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

CHICAGO, ILL., *July 15, 1972.*

U.S. Representative LES ASPIN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Strongly support and urge passage of bill H.R. 14884.

——— ———.

BROOKFIELD, ILL.

HOLLYWOOD, FLA., *July 14, 1972.*

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is your article on which I'm commenting on. I certainly wish you luck in passing this bill. I want to tell you, my telephone is, "unlisted" and they manage to get through regardless!

This invasion is as bad as the TV commercials. I hope you win your fight.

Good luck!

Sincerely,

——— ———.

OAK PARK, ILL., *July 14, 1972.*

U.S. Representative LES ASPIN,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: I am writing to show my support of bill H.R. 14884 regarding businesses calling unsolicited on the phone.

I hope very much that this bill is adopted as I feel a person has a telephone for his own use and that of his friends, and should not be disturbed at home by advertisers.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 17, 1972

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the Calumet region of Indiana of Lithuanian descent, along with Lithuanians throughout the Nation, are to be commended for constantly keeping up the fight to have an independent and free government of Lithuania restored. The Soviet Communist Government has continued to inflict its tyranny, not only on Lithuania but other captive nations through central Europe.

As chairman of the special congressional committee to investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre in the 82d Congress, and also a member of the special committee to investigate Communist aggression in the 83d Congress, I am familiar with the barbaric Soviet tyranny inflicted on these captive nations. Both these congressional committees held hearings in this country and in Europe during the investigation made almost 20 years ago.

I wish to incorporate with my remarks a resolution adopted by the members of World Lithuanian Community, East Chicago, Ind., which was enacted in a mass meeting held July 11, 1972:

RESOLUTION

The members of World Lithuanian Community, East Chicago, Indiana chapter gathered at a mass meeting at 3903 Fir Street East Chicago, Indiana on June 11, 1972, during the commemeration of the brutal deportations by the Soviet secret police to slave labor camps in Siberia, adopted following resolution:

Whereas the sovereign and independent state of Lithuania was forcibly and illegaly seized in 1940 by the Soviet Union,

Whereas the Soviet Union secret police in June 1941 arrested and deported many thousands of Lithuanians from their native country to the slave labor camps in Siberia.

Whereas several thousand youths just recently battled police and Soviet soldiers after a young Roman Catholic, Romas Kalanta, publically burned himself to death "for political reasons" in the Lithuanian city of Kaunas,

Whereas last March over 17,000 Lithuanian-Catholics signed a bitterly-worded Petition to Communist Party leaders demanding an end to religious suppression and it went unheard until said petitions were sent to the U.N. Secretary-General, Kurt Waldheim,

Therefore, be it resolved to appeal to and request the President of the United States, Secretary-General of U.N. and Human Rights Commission in United Nations to insist on the restoration of sovereign rights, religious freedom and self-government to Lithuania and other Baltic States as a prerequisite for a lasting peace based on international justice.

Be it still further resolved to forward copies of this resolution to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America, to Honorable Kurt Waldheim, Secretary-General of the U.N., Human Rights Commission of United Nations, the Honorable Congressman Mr. Ray J. Madden from local district in Indiana and to the press.

VIKTORAS T. MAKIEJUS,
Chairman of the Meeting.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, July 18, 1972*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Ernest Andrews, Zion's Reformed United Church of Christ, Allentown, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, in whose service lies perfect freedom, we thank Thee for this "sweet land of liberty," our priceless heritage and habitation. In this veritable workshop of democracy, we ask Thy inspiration, guidance, and power for those privileged to labor here as representatives of a free people.

Enshrined in our hearts, as in our history, is the sublime, but partially fulfilled ideal symbolized by the Liberty Bell, "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof." May this day hold many opportunities to further that sacred mission. May no task seem trivial or routine, but rather a precious means of serving Thee and Thy people—and of helping to fashion a future closer to the perfection of Thy holy will.

In Jesus' name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1997. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Sullivan;

H.R. 3751. An act for the relief of Albert W. Reiser, Jr.;

H.R. 5237. An act to carry into effect a provision of the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property, as revised at Stockholm, Sweden, July 14, 1967;

H.R. 6739. An act for the relief of Cpl. Michael T. Kent, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve;

H.R. 7829. An act for the relief of Stephen H. Clarkson; and