

Dopler, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ely, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fisher, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garwood, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gary, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Girard, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Gschwendtner, Joseph G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hardwick, Danny G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Harvey, Paul E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hendrickson, Allen W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jones, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kay, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kenison, Artha L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Knight J. Baxter, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Krals, Lennart G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kulhavy, Billy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Larkin, Jude O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Larsen, Frank E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McArthur, Kathleen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McIntire, Jon C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mitrook, Ronald, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Motes, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Moyer, Raymond, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Nelson, Martin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Norris, Roger H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Offineer, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Olson, Mary K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Oylo, Myron C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Peduzzi, Lawrence P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Perkins, Andrew M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Poole, Lonnie R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Rago, Louis B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riddle, Stephen S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Riley, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ritchie, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Robertson, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sears, George B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaltry, Mary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shooner, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shooner, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stokes, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Marcia E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Torovsky, Richard H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Townsend, Steven N., xxx-xx-xxxx

Velte, Lawrence R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Floyd, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Williams, Hugh N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Yuhas, Steven L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Zerull, Dietmar, W. L., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be second lieutenant

Baker, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bald, James F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berchak, Henry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bisol, Gene L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brotnov, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cannaday, Gerald D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Carey, William F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Clausi, Enrico A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cloney, Leroy V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Cofer, Duane D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Coleman, Jack R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Conrad, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davidson, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Davis, Edmund L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Demby, Joe H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dodge, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dominy, Matthew, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Douglas, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Dudash, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Engelberger, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ettner, Edward R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Fisher, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Frey, Karen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Garland, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Grant, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Griffith, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Griggs, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Halliburton, Nick B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Hayes, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Herrick, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Huston, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ihrke, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Jaylock, Anthony L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Johnson, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Keehan, Mark P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kelly Chris P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Kind, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Livingston, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 McClinton, Nathaniel, xxx-xx-xxxx
 McKnight Calvin C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx

McLean, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Massey, Raymon E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Mendis, Douglas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morgan, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Morrison, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Paris, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Parker, Sarah H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Reichert, Lawrence W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ricketts, Roger A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Samples, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Sciba, Dennis G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shaffer, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Shuffler, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Slesinger, Victor E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stephens, Dorothy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stiller, Roberta P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Stronach, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Swanson, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Thompson, Jerome C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tsuneta, Jerrold Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Tuttle, Larry F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Underwood, Timothy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Walzak, Lawrence T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Washington, Alvin, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Wolthuis, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army of the United States, under provisions of Title 10, sections 591, 593 and 594:

To be lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps

Mikhail, Samir F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Taylor, William J. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate July 20, 1972:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
 July 20, 1972.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Otto F. Otepka, of Maryland, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term expiring August 9, 1975, which was sent to the Senate on January 24, 1972.

RICHARD NIXON.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RETIREMENT OF "GUS" ROBINSON

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I was saddened to hear recently that a good friend of mine, Mr. G. O. "Gus" Robinson was retiring as assistant to the manager of the Atomic Energy Commission's Savannah River plant. As an editorial in the Aiken Standard and Review points out, Mr. Robinson was one of the "original small nucleus of men who kept the secret of plans for the AEC to build the plant here (Aiken)."

During the period of his involvement with the Savannah River plant, Mr. Robinson witnessed all of the several variations of the intent of the project: The construction involving over 36,000 workers, the emphasis on defense production and its present development of peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

As a resident of Aiken, Mr. Robinson has made a host of friends and has performed many public services. Speaking of his retirement plans, the editorial reads:

We are confident that, in retirement, his considerable energies merely will be differently channeled.

Perhaps sadness at this retirement is not in order but rather encouragement, for now that Mr. Robinson has served his State and country in his capacity with the AEC, he may now direct his abilities to other fields where they can be equally productive.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the Aiken Standard and Review of June 29, 1972, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

"GUS" ROBINSON RETIRING

Recent announcement of the retirement of G. O. (Gus) Robinson, assistant to the manager of the Atomic Energy Commission's Savannah River Plant, represents something of a milestone. He was one of the original small nucleus of men who kept the secret of plans for the AEC to build the huge facility here.

Mr. Robinson also was among the first of the AEC staff to come to Aiken before construction of the awesome plant started. He thus qualifies as one of the "plank owners" of the Savannah River Plant.

Over this period of time, Mr. Robinson has witnessed wide variations of activity. First, the construction stage when the area was literally over-run by about 36,000 workers; next the emphasis on defense production, and currently the emphasis on peaceful uses of nuclear energy and on research.

A former newspaperman, Mr. Robinson headed up the formidable public relations task of the AEC throughout this area, an undertaking that brought him a number of citations and awards. He has written three books, two of them relating to nuclear energy.

Mr. Robinson is widely known in the community and has a host of friends. We are confident that, in retirement, his considerable energies merely will be differently channeled. On whatever course he has plotted for himself, we wish him well.

SAFEGUARD OUR FREEDOMS

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago Mrs. Paul J. Tunkis was installed as president of the California Federation of Women's Clubs. One of those present at this ceremony, a longtime friend, Vonnie Eastham, who is chairman of status of women section, the Chico Women's Club, has called to my attention the inaugural address given by Mrs. Tunkis on this occasion.

As Mrs. Eastham commented her ad-

dress contains many worthwhile suggestions which if followed by the individual citizens of this great Nation will help us safeguard our freedoms. These remarks were of such significance that I felt it appropriate to share them with my colleagues here in the Congress of the United States. Accordingly I insert in the RECORD at this point the inaugural address of Mrs. Paul J. Tunkis, president, California Federation of Women's Clubs:

SAFEGUARD OUR FREEDOMS

As I undertake the responsibilities of the office of president of the CFWC, I call for a reaffirmation of faith in our constitutional form of government, a kindling of the fire of faith in spiritual values, and a revitalization of our interest in community and public affairs.

I call on all federated clubwomen to bring to the attention of every American the privileges and accompanying responsibilities of living under a democracy. Being foreign born, and an American by choice, I did not—and I cannot—take for granted the many freedoms and privileges which the native born so often take for granted as their birthright. Today, we must be aware of the threats to this great country from the outside, and more tragically the attacks on our republic from within, by irresponsible persons who disregard human and divine love, mock a good day's work, and burn a beautiful flag.

The people of the United States of America have been one of the most generous on this earth. The founders were kind and loving, so we have in us a mixture of all the love a land can hold, and all the quarrels of a creative family. But we are fanatic about the word "freedom." We cherish the freedom to volunteer; freedom to live without fear; freedom from hunger; freedom to cast our ballot for representative or issue, without fear of reprisal. But if we do not safeguard our freedoms, we are not likely to enjoy them for long!

Today, our overindulgence and permissiveness have brought additional threats to our freedoms. Pollution, for example, is people made—innocently started, but deadly perilous if ignored. To combat these threats, our work is to alert, educate and act.

Let us put teeth into our resolutions to conserve our natural resources (without losing sight of the cost) and protect our historical landmarks and museums—the repositories of our cultural and spiritual past.

Some of our educational programs and facilities have become purposeless facades behind which our youth are not adequately prepared for the social responsibilities which lie ahead. As women, and especially in our dual roles as mothers and wives, we want our children prepared for a profession, trade, or vocation. As clubwomen, let us see that all schools have a cafeteria where children may get a hot meal for a nominal amount. You cannot teach a child to spell "apple" when he is hungry.

In public communication we must be ever alert to the dangers of thought control through the psychological effects of television, radio, as well as motion pictures and junk mail.

Family life must be strengthened to make the American home once again a haven of security, free from external strife. Especially important are consumer affairs, now the brunt of many bad jokes, inflation, short weight, and "gobbledegook" labels which must come under our study and scrutiny. No less important are care and respect for our aged, if we are to uphold the fifth commandment. "Meals for the Elderly," a pilot government program, is an ideal one for our clubwomen to administer. Already I am in contact with our legislators to find out how we can be of help.

In our international affairs, we should encourage our American youth to study foreign

languages so that they can bridge the people-to-people gap of communication throughout the world.

Effective legislation for the physical and mental health problems of our people has never been more necessary. And, let us spur on and support researchers in their quest to conquer cancer, which claims so many women in their prime of life.

The upsurge of drug addiction and crime has shocked us all. Women's rights become of secondary importance when a whole generation of youth is being destroyed by drugs. By the same token we must work to assure the victims of criminal action that we will not tolerate mockery of justice and failure to punish offenders; justice for the victim is equally important!

As a result of our work in highway safety many lives have already been saved, but the danger is ever present, so the demand for constant vigilance continues.

In the fine arts, alienation of the average citizen from the artists must be eliminated, for no matter what the school or medium, the artist must again reach the human heart, which is starving for aesthetic nourishment.

One does not have to be a visionary to see the warning signs piling up all about us. Our job is to hold fast our ideals and muster the courage to see reality. Because of our love for humanity, we women can—and will—be successful. And remember, we represent fifty-three percent of our nation's electorate!

For twenty-three years, ever since I became an American citizen, I have tried to say "thank you" through volunteer service. To do this effectively, I chose the medium of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, whose constructive and effective volunteer programs stood firm on basic democratic principles. Irrespective of the attempt of many new women's organizations to re-examine the value of what is, and is not, important in women's work, the GFWC's worldwide program has never lost its relevance.

Since the progress of our home life is inextricably tied to the cost of living, I recommend that one state project be a scholarship for a girl or woman to study consumer affairs, the details to be set by the incoming executive board.

Also, within all three divisions of our conservation department, let us promote a "Pennies for Poppies" project to plant our State flower as one of our contributions to the Bicentennial Celebration of 1976—and wherever this bright little flower blooms each spring, it will remind us of our many blessings, of our good fortune to live in this bountiful, beautiful land.

And so, tonight, let us re-dedicate ourselves to the objectives and responsibilities of our Federation; let us thrill to the excitement of the work ahead; let us anticipate the rewards and joys of achievement through volunteer service; and above all, let us safeguard our freedoms!

NEWSPAPER TAKES LEAD IN CAMPAIGN TO CLEAN RIVER BANKS

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, a month ago, the Charleston, W. Va., Daily Mail began the publishing of significant and timely articles calling public attention to the deplorable condition of river banks in the Charleston area.

Rivers are important to the Charleston area. They were the means by which the first settlers entered the region more than two centuries ago. They were a

stimulus to the development of the great industrial complex of the Kanawha Valley. They remain today a vital transportation link and are among West Virginia's foremost scenic assets.

The reports by the Daily Mail revealed that there has been widespread carelessness by the individuals and business firms in the river valleys around Charleston. Day after day, photographs showed that trash and junk of all sorts are haphazardly strewn along the banks of the Kanawha, Elk, Coal, and other rivers.

Mr. President, I have long believed and have encouraged concerned citizenry to act for the creation and maintenance of a clean environment. The Daily Mail has performed a commendable public service in bringing to the attention of its readers the degradation of river banks in the densely populated and highly industrialized Charleston area. I hope that the stimulus of this revelation will result in a massive and sustained effort to return river banks in the Charleston area to their natural beauty.

We have this problem in scores of streams in West Virginia, and it is a nationwide problem. In my hometown of Elkins, the banks of the Tygart River were littered, within the city limits, until the community was alerted to the unsatisfactory situation by schoolchildren who took snapshots of the ugly conditions along the Tygart. The Elkins Inter-Mountain, through the leadership of Editor Eldora Nuzum, commended the children and published their pictures. A cleanup of the stream banks was the result. It is important to keep that stream, and all bodies of water, clean.

The task apparently will not be easy in the Charleston area for a variety of reasons. Reporter John Hendrickson, of the Mail, has discussed some of the reactions to the newspaper's stories and the prospects for corrective action.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, July 14, 1972]

NEW LAWS MAY MAKE CLEANING RIVERBANKS EASIER

(By John Hendrickson)

Almost a month has passed since the Daily Mail brought to the attention of its readers the deplorable condition of the riverbanks in this area.

Since that time, only two organizations—the State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) and the St. Albans Flotilla of the U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary—have indicated an interest in initiating action to clean up the mess.

Meanwhile, a second cruise along the rivers shows that private citizens and land owners have done little or nothing to eradicate the rubbish that litters the riverbanks.

Recent days of hard rain have not washed the debris into the river.

The junked automobiles, refrigerators, washing machines, and other trash continues to rest undisturbed.

There is one exception.

Except for mud deposited on leaves of trees along the banks of the Coal River during recent high water, there was less evidence

of rubbish there than several days ago, although some spots still need attention.

During the second cruise, Daily Mail staffers met K. L. Painter of St. Albans, one of two DNR conservation officers assigned to Kanawha County.

Painter said several arrests have been made during the past five years for littering the river banks.

With a sweep of his hand toward a pile of rubbish, he said the only way anti-littering laws can be successfully enforced is to have more conservation officers.

He said the conviction rate of those arrested is not very high because of the burden of proof, but he feels this will change with new laws.

One problem Painter outlined is that property owners, when confronted by officers, deny that they dumped the trash on their property and blame the act on someone else.

"But with new laws, we can now arrest property owners and they have to clean up the trash," Painter said.

"If the property owners cooperate with us, we will try to see that they get a light sentence," he said.

Painter said anyone convicted of stream littering must clean the area.

"Coal River looks pretty clean," Painter said, adding that several places have been investigated and cleaned in the past.

One of those areas was Elk River when several years ago Painter said several conservation officers and other employees of DNR worked on their own time to clear trash from the river.

"The best thing that can happen is to make the public aware of the situation," Painter said.

The Daily Mail has done that, and will continue to focus attention on the condition of the riverbanks until they are cleared of debris, thereby making this area one of the most scenic in West Virginia.

What is needed now is for citizens to roll up their sleeves, and with the donation of a barge and crane for the heavier pieces of junk, get rid of the garbage.

THE INDEPENDENT BUSINESSMAN IS LOSING A MARKET

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the General Services Administration is to facilitate the transport of goods, economize the need and cost of new materials, and to speed their procurement for the use of the Federal Government. It is a sharing program within the agencies of the Federal Government.

In 1969, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act passed, to provide GSA's facilities to grantees of Federal assistance; these grantees included State and local governments in certain cases. The General Service Administration reinterpreted the congressional intent of GSA's establishment and the act, by attempting to handle procurement of all goods for these governments beyond those necessary for the Federal assistance programs. Although the General Services Administration was halted then by the Congress, the wording of the acts that prescribed the duties and jurisdiction of GSA has been vague enough to allow the GSA to again attempt to procure for Federal grantees. The General Services Administration was to procure

and supply products for the Federal agencies only.

Congressman WYMAN's bill can correct this misinterpretation of GSA jurisdiction.

The General Services Administration acts just as a private business by distributing catalogs, and sending salesmen to their buyers. This is in direct competition with small, independent businessmen when those buyers are recipients of GSA benefits through the grantee program. State and local governments, which I have mentioned, and school systems—which continually receive Federal assistance through national programs—are grantees which form a major part of the trade for local, independent businessmen. If GSA begins trade with these concerns, the local businessmen lose.

The direct-cost price for the buyers will be lower through GSA. The markup for GSA goods is 8½ percent, covering transportation, and breakage. Their overhead is handled by the taxpayers, who include the local businessmen. The overhead for these businessmen is naturally much higher, eliminating the chance to compete fairly. Let me give you an example of the damage that will come to small businessmen, plus the damage that could come also to the buyers in the long run, reducing the cost-advantage.

The National Audio-Visual Association (NAVA) would lose 90 percent of its business if the school systems were to receive its goods from the General Services Administration. Films accompany many of the federally funded educational programs. Projectors, complained one member of the National Federation of Independent Businessmen, would be covered by the grantee program as necessary technical equipment for the program, and his business would fail.

The schools that will discontinue buying from this gentleman, however will lose also. The dealer provides more than just the product. He is the link between the manufacturer and the buyer, always available since he is local, to aid the teachers and users of the equipment. He guarantees the product and checks for default when the goods are delivered. Through GSA procurement, the buyer must hope that the goods he received in crates are in perfect condition.

Mr. Kenton Pattie, vice president and educational director for NAVA, exemplified the problem of long run damage to the teachers and school with these following four points, in a bulletin dated May 1, 1972:

1. The local school loses control of what it can buy since the power to make up the GSA supply schedules rests with the Federal Government in Washington.
2. The local school loses the availability of a nearby dealer who can rapidly provide service, replacement parts, in-service training, and consultation . . .
3. The local school would probably be forced, against its will, to hire its own service and maintenance employees, maintain its own repair shop, store its own complete inventory of parts for each piece of equipment in the school . . .
4. Teachers and administrators alike would lose the availability of local representatives of the A-V (Audio-Visual) industry who are today available on a daily basis for demonstrating and explaining the latest develop-

ments in this rapidly changing field of education communication.

I endorse H.R. 15562 in order to insure that the duties of the General Services Administration are clearly outlined to remain within the Federal Government and leave those recipients of the Federal assistance programs, Federal grantees, to deal with both the local businessmen and the Federal Government through fair competition to determine which would be the most profitable to both parties.

I include with my remarks the following letter to Commissioner Meeker of the General Services Administration from executive vice president Harry McGee of the National Audio-Visual Association. This letter, dated June 26, 1972, explains their endorsement of the OMB's actions of stopping the GSA procurement policy for the grantees and why not only would the independent businessmen suffer, but also the local communities.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL AUDIO-VISUAL
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Fairfax, Va., June 26, 1972.

Mr. M. S. MEEKER,
Commissioner, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MEEKER: This letter shall constitute the official response of the National Audio-Visual Association (NAVA) concerning the proposed change in regulations printed in the *Federal Register* of Thursday, June 1, 1972, with respect to GSA "Use of Government Supply Sources by Grantees."

As the trade association of the audio-visual industry in the United States, NAVA represents more than five hundred local dealers and over two hundred and fifty manufacturers, suppliers, and materials producers. This whole matter has been thoroughly discussed throughout our industry and by the NAVA Board of Directors and the position I present to you represents the views of all of our members.

1. We fully support your decision to change Part 101-26 and to delete Part 101-33, thus ending the program officially begun on April 17, 1971 (as amended and expanded December 15, 1971), and unofficially conducted for many months prior to April, 1971.

By offering GSA supply sources to Federal grantees, GSA is placing the Federal government in direct and indirect competition with the members of this Association. In that most local dealer members of NAVA do 90 percent of their business with grantees (schools and other institutions which receive some Federal grant funds), our firms are today bearing the heaviest burden imposed by the "Grantee Program." Continuing the "Grantee Program," which offers alternative sources of supply for local grantees, involving prices typically below the normal discount offered by supplier to dealer, will force most NAVA dealers out of business or, at best, dramatically injure them.

At the same time these small audio-visual firms are sustaining total disaster or irreparable damage, the Federal government is becoming the sole source or sole intermediary for almost every public institution, state and local government in the country. This development is contrary to the best interests of small businessmen, none of whom can ever expect to compete successfully with the Federal government. It is also contrary to the best interests of free enterprise, a system which should not be destroyed by government competition with the private sector. It flies in the face of the stated policy of the Nixon Administration which said:

The above authorizations are not con-

sistent with the purpose of the Administration's policy of reliance on the private enterprise system and is particularly objectionable in this sense because the burden of GSA competition falls more heavily on small businesses throughout the country. (Frank Carlucci, Associate Director, Office of Management and Budget, May 16, 1972)

Our NAVA projections show that by the end of the 1972-73 school year, virtually every grantee in America will be buying through the Federal government, unless the changes you propose in the *Federal Register* (June 1 1972) are begun immediately after the June 30 deadline.

We do not believe the Congress ever intended to allow GSA to offer its supply sources to the non-Government sector and certainly not to every grantee in the land. Our legal advisors have carefully researched the law and legal precedent on this problem and have concluded: There is no Congressional or legal authority for the "Grantee Program." Any program of this kind should be prohibited until specifically authorized by Congress. In fact, the law states clearly that GSA supply sources are to be available only to government departments, agencies and bureaus.

Small business would not suffer alone if the "Grantee Program" is allowed to continue. The losses to local communities under the "Grantee Program" will be immense:

Small firms, including hundreds of audio-visual dealers and suppliers, would close or shrink.

Local jobs would be lost.

Local tax revenues would dry up.

Leadership offered by local small businessmen would be diverted.

Local schools and other institutions would be denied the right to have local service from reputable dealers who devote extensive efforts to reliable service, warranty coverage, and product training. Instead, local grantees would be forced to secure alternative service and parts inventories. It is possible that GSA might have to offer this service, or that schools would be forced to institute their own service program at the cost of local taxpayers. We are certain that, with taxpayers' dollars, GSA itself would never be able to efficiently service what it sells or procure at anywhere near the real cost savings available through the competitive free enterprise system.

Local schools would be buying through the mall and would be cut-off from local industry representatives who are available at short notice to consult with schools on the latest developments in the field of educational technology. In the audio-visual field we have found that new ideas result from the direct local interchange of ideas and experience. Our dealers must have direct contact with the schools if our industry is to truly serve the real needs of education.

Cut off from the availability of a local A-V expert from industry, such as the NAVA member, teachers would have no way of communicating their real needs to the industry's producers and manufacturers. Thus the "Grantee Program" could freeze the audio-visual field in mid-stream, by cutting off the all-important two-way chain of communication. Such a development would destroy the goals of the very grants the "Grantee Program" is supposed to help.

Finally, we must state that the GSA prices in no way represent the real costs to the U.S. taxpayer. GSA is a subsidized government agency and the agency's total overhead is not figured into the "prices" charged to grantees. The old adage applies: "You can't get something for nothing." While the grantee gets totally unrealistic prices, the American taxpayer will be getting the bill in the form of Federal, state and local taxes for the unaccounted overhead.

No matter what price the government is able to offer, when all the real costs are in-

talled, it is extremely doubtful that the government could ever reach the level of efficiency offered by the private enterprise system. Why?

The government does not operate on a profit-and-loss basis and thus the expenses of the "Grantee Program" could not be under the pressure of competition.

Whereas NAVA dealers must bid against their competitors for all local school orders—thus being forced to keep real costs low—the government has none of the pressure applied by the open bidding process. We have witnessed some extremely high cost-overruns on federally funded programs where business competition was non-existent. Might not the same thing happen in the "Grantee Program?"

2. We have previously offered no comment on the proposals in the *Federal Register* with respect to Part 101-43, concerning surplus and excess property. We are concerned that a number of the public comments you have received from grantees do not properly distinguish between Parts 101-26 and 101-33, (the "Grantee Program" which threatens small business) and Part 101-43 (the surplus and excess property program). The comments you receive under 101-43 should be considered as entirely separate from comments on the "Grantee Program." We would be deeply concerned if you delay a decision with respect to 101-26 and 101-33 because of problems you face with 101-43.

Instead, we urge you to announce at the earliest possible time that you have in fact changed 101-26 as proposed and that you are deleting 101-33. Any delay in acting on provisions in 101-26 and 101-33 will result in continued economic losses for thousands of small businesses, including most NAVA members. The audio-visual industry is small and delicate and is being seriously harmed by the continuation of the "Grantee Program."

3. With respect to implementation of closing down the "Grantee Program" we must stress the need for rapid—

Rescinding of all authorizations, on a retroactive basis.

Notification to all Federal granting agencies which issue letters of authorization.

Cut-off of all grantee orders in the pipeline, with instructions that they be referred to attention of local dealers and that all vestiges of the "Grantee Program" be removed from GSA supplied contracts and computer systems.

Prohibition issued to all GSA Regional Offices directing that GSA shall not buy with Federal funds for a grantee. We frequently found GSA Regional Offices abusing the power of a Federal agency by buying for grantees and then having the goods shipped to the grantee. This practice must be stopped immediately.

Again we fully endorse the position to the Office of Management and Budget and subscribe entirely to the position of Frank Carlucci, as presented in his May 16, 1972 letter to former Acting Administrator, Rod Kreger.

May I just close by quoting from the Small Business Act of 1953:

It is the declared policy of the Congress that the government should aid, counsel, assist and protect, insofar as possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise . . . (15 U.S.C. par. 631, 1964)

This is essentially our view: that the government should help small businessmen whenever possible. You would help more than 40,000 small businessmen if you immediately move to stop the "Grantee Program" as proposed in the June 1, 1972 *Federal Register*.

Sincerely,

HARRY R. MCGEE,
Executive Vice President.

TRY JANE FONDA FOR TREASON

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I never cease to be amazed how people who grow up in a land of freedom and opportunity, such as the United States, can turn upon this their own country blindly taking the side of a totalitarian enemy. Actress Jane Fonda has made a trip to North Vietnam and has broadcast one or more times over Radio Hanoi directing her remarks to American servicemen. Obviously she is trying to demoralize them and attempting to get them to disobey orders. On July 17, 1972, she spoke over Hanoi radio and said in part:

This is Jane Fonda speaking from Hanoi, and I'm speaking particularly to the U.S. servicemen who are stationed on the aircraft carriers in the Gulf of Tonkin, in the 7th Fleet, in the Anglico Corps in the south of Vietnam.

I visited a hospital today, the Bach Mai hospital. I saw a huge bomb crater in the center of the hospital. It was obviously dropped there on purpose. With the kind of bombs, the kind of techniques that have been developed now, you know, particularly you pilots know, that accidents like that don't happen. This was no accident. It destroyed wards filled with patients. It destroyed hospital equipment. It killed some doctors. It is a terrible thing to see what has been done.

Why? Why do you do this? Why do you follow orders telling you to destroy a hospital or bomb the schools.

Miss Fonda knows that there are no orders to bomb hospitals but to the contrary every effort is made to avoid them.

The thrust of her statements truly appear to be designed to cause the American troops to disobey the orders of their country. Frankly, I am astounded that an American, even Miss Fonda, would so overtly side with an enemy who has an officially announced policy of causing terrorism in South Vietnam. An enemy who have assassinated more than 30,000 schoolteachers, policemen, and civic officials through brutal ambush in South Vietnam. An enemy who have bombed school buses, cafes, indiscriminately, and who at every opportunity will lob a rocket into a city, caring not where it hits, only that it creates destruction and terror.

Clearly Miss Fonda is giving aid and comfort to the enemy and clearly she is closing her eyes deliberately and intentionally against the terror of the enemy. She is closing her eyes to the brutal mass executions by the North Vietnamese during the Tet offensive when 4,000 South Vietnamese were executed at Hue and then buried in a common grave by bulldozers.

Clearly Miss Fonda has chosen the enemy's side, the side of an enemy so brutal that when they have taken towns in South Vietnam they have systematically gone about murdering and executing civic officials who believe in democ-

racy and the right of the South Vietnamese to determine their own destiny.

Some say Miss Fonda is making her statements to further her career as an actress, that publicity, good or bad, helps an actress' career. If this is her reason, her actions are all the more despicable. If her reason is to cry out against human suffering, why does she not decry the brutal terrorist tactics of the North Vietnamese. The fact that she only condemns her own country and not the enemy puts the lie to any statements she may make that she is concerned about human suffering. Jane Fonda by her failure to cry out against the terrorist tactics of the North Vietnamese is putting a lie to any statement she may make that her concern is for humanity.

It is obvious by her actions that Miss Fonda's concern lies in one of two realms. One, she desires to see a Communist dictator seize control over the people of South Vietnam by whatever means they desire to employ, or two, she is so cold and callous to human suffering that she would use the emotion of the Vietnam war as a vehicle by which she obtains publicity hoping that this will further her movie career and put green Yankee dollars in her bank account.

It is interesting that there has not been even one report in the press of any statement attributed to Miss Fonda where she has condemned the North Vietnamese for their massive land invasion against South Vietnam last spring. I wonder if she at any time mentioned to the North Vietnamese the slaughter of the thousands of South Vietnamese civilians, including children, women, and old men as they fled the ruthless North Vietnamese invader. I wonder if Jane Fonda ever asked the North Vietnamese why they had a deliberate policy of trying to cause terrorism through extremist actions in South Vietnam. I wonder if Jane Fonda ever brought up the question of American POW's and why the North Vietnamese will not adhere to the Geneva Convention regarding the treaty of POW's.

In my opinion Jane Fonda is a despicable individual not deserving of any of the fruits of this country. The actions of Jane Fonda, as reported over Radio Hanoi, I sincerely believe constitute treason against this country and I have requested the Attorney General to fully investigate the matter with the aim of bringing treason charges against Miss Fonda. For me to do any less would be to neglect the duty I owe to all loyal Americans.

The full text of Jane Fonda's reported speech over Radio Hanoi of July 17, 1972 follows:

HANOI RADIO CARRIES TALK ATTRIBUTED TO JANE FONDA

Last week, actress Jane Fonda visited Hanoi's Bach Mai hospital which was seriously damaged by U.S. bombs during a recent air raid. After the visit she had this to talk to American servicemen still involved in the Vietnam war. [Follows recorded female voice with American accent]

This is Jane Fonda speaking from Hanoi, and I'm speaking particularly to the U.S. servicemen who are stationed on the aircraft carriers in the Gulf of Tonkin, in the 7th Fleet, in the Anglico Corps in the south of Vietnam.

You are very far away, perhaps, and removed from the country that you're being

ordered to shoot shells at and bomb. And so it's perhaps very hard for you to, to understand in concrete human terms what the effects of, of these bombs and these shells are having.

I'm sure if you knew what was inside the shells that you're dropping, you would ask yourself as, as I have been doing for the last few days since I have seen the victims: What do the men who work for Honeywell and the other companies in the United States that invent and, and, and make these weapons—what do they think in the morning, at breakfast? What do they dream about when they sleep at night?

Yesterday, I went through the war museum in Hanoi, where there is a display of all the different kinds of antipersonnel weapons the different kinds of bombs, the guava bomb, the pineapple bomb, the spider bomb, different kinds of shells that contain toxic chemicals, the new kinds of napalm, combinations of napalm and phosphorus and thermite. The list is endless as are the, the victims from these weapons. And, it absolutely amazed me, the length to which man's mind—or at least some men in the United States—their minds have gone to create new ways of killing people. They must want to die very much themselves to think this much about new ways of killing people.

I don't know what your officers tell you that you are dropping on this country. I don't know what your officers tell you, you are loading, those of you who load the bombs on the planes. But, one thing that you should know is that these weapons are illegal and that's not, that's not just rhetoric. They are outlawed, these kind of weapons, by several conventions of which the United States was a signatory—two Hague conventions. And the use of these bombs or the condoning the use of these bombs makes one a war criminal.

The men who are ordering you to use these weapons are war criminals according to international law, and in, in the past, in Germany and in Japan, men who were guilty of these kind of crimes were tried and executed.

Now I know that you are not told these kind of things, but, you know, history changes. We've witnessed incredible changes for example in the United States in the last 5 years. The astounding victory that has just been won by George McGovern, for example, who, who was nominated by the Democratic Party, is an example of the kind of changes that are going on—an example of the overwhelming, overwhelming feeling in the United States among people to end the war. McGovern represents all that is good to these people. He represents an end to the war, an end to the bombing.

The women and the mothers in the United States are weeping for the damage and death and destruction that is being caused to the mothers of Vietnam. Very soon, very soon even the people in the United States who have not yet spoken out will be admitting that this war is the most terrible crime that has ever been created against humanity.

It may be very difficult for you who have been asked to fight it to, to think about the war in a new kind of way, to not think about it in an abstract way, to not think about it as some, sole land down there underneath your planes or beyond the sight of your guns, that is just sand or rubble or trees with a lot of gooks or Charlies or whatever you've been taught to call the people who live here.

This is a country that is 4,000 years old. It is a very rich country, it has a rich culture, it has a rich, a rich growth. The trees are lush, the flowers are beautiful. I've been in many countries around the world, I have traveled widely, I've been very fortunate. Never in my life have I been in a country of people that are so loving, and so non-alienated. They are truly at peace with their land and with each other. What do you see in the streets? You see people holding hands, arms around each other, helping each other, talking to each other, hugging each other,

working together in the fields. These are peasants. These are people who are used to being part of their land. Their clothes are stained with the land, their houses are made with land.

There's an expression that is used to describe Vietnamese women, which says: Feet in the dust and hands in the mud. And you see all these beautiful Vietnamese women leaning over in the rice fields, with their hands in the mud planting the rice. Their pagodas are made of mud.

And their land is being destroyed. Why? Certainly not for anything that is in your interests, the soldiers of the United States, or in the interests of any of the people in the United States except the very few people who are determined to prevent the nation of Vietnam from achieving freedom and independence.

How this came about is an astonishing thing. How it is that a country like the United States of America, which fought for its own freedom and independence, has become a nation which will deprive another nation of freedom and independence is something that we will all have to answer one day. We'll all have to find out how this came about. But right now, we must, we must stop, we must stop dropping these bombs on the people of Vietnam.

I visited a hospital today, the Bach Mai hospital. I saw a huge bomb crater in the center of the hospital. It was obviously dropped there on purpose. With the kind of bombs, the kind of techniques that have been developed now, you know, particularly you pilots know, that accidents like that don't happen. This was no accident. It destroyed wards filled with patients. It destroyed hospital equipment. It killed some doctors. It is a terrible thing to see what has been done.

Why? Why do you do this? Why do you follow orders telling you to destroy a hospital or bomb the schools. Do you know what happens to the women when the napalm that you're dropping lands on them? You have no idea. Deformed hands, necks twisted out of shape, women with five children who were working women are used to working with their hands, who were lovely and alive and graceful—the way Vietnamese women are with the long black hair—twisted out of shape, not dead, not spared the pain and the misery of living as a mutilated person, forever in physical pain.

Why, why is this being done? The victims in the hospitals with thousands of holes in their body, from the steel pellets that are being dropped, and even worse now the Nixon administration has gone one step further from the Johnson administration—the steel pellets have been perfected, they're now plastic, rough-edged plastic. Why? Because plastic doesn't show up on X-rays, which means that these people spend the rest of their lives with their bodies filled with plastic pellets and every time they move, it causes excruciating agony.

The women that I have talked to who were not even under your bombs but came to help victims of the chemical bombs, and the chemical toxic gasses were so strong that even after the bomb, long after the bomb had exploded when these women came to save the other people, they got sick. And, and weeks and months later they still—they pass out, they have headaches, they are losing their memory. Women who, who were pregnant are, are, are giving birth to deformed babies.

How can it be that the people of the United States have caused this kind of terrible, terrible suffering on a nation so far away? On a nation that has caused us no harm? I mean, what do you think? That the Vietnamese people are going to row across the Pacific in canoes? So I ask you and I will continue to ask you as long as I am here and I ask you as an American and I ask you because I cry every night when I think of, of

what these people are having to go through, and I cry every night, when I think of the danger that is being done to them because of the bombing of their dikes. And I say why? And I say that the time has come for us to stop it. [recording ends]

That was American movie actress Jane Fonda addressing U.S. servicemen involved in the Indochina war.

SALT TREATY FREEZES UNITED STATES AS A POOR SECOND

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party in 1968 pledged itself to a comprehensive program to restore the preeminence of U.S. military strength. This has also been the goal of many Democratic Members of this body. Now many are willing to abandon it for the SALT agreements with Soviet Russia despite the virtually unbroken Communist record of treaty violations and scorn for the obligation of keeping their pledged word. The peace the SALT advocates think they are promoting may well turn out to be the peace of the grave of the American Republic.

Following is an outstanding analysis of SALT by Phyllis Schlafly, who has devoted years of study to the military threat to the security of the United States, appearing in her June 1972 report:

SALT TREATY FREEZES UNITED STATES AS A POOR SECOND

"This was the week that changed the world." Those words of President Nixon about his week in Red China were not applicable then, but they surely apply to his week in the Soviet Union culminating with the signing of the SALT Pact.

For the first time in history, a great nation, at the peak of its economic and military strength, surrendered its military leadership without even a whimper to a nation having only half its productive capacity.

Anyone who thinks that this is ushering in a "generation of peace" has succumbed to the most fatuous delusion since Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain went to Munich in 1938, signed a treaty with Hitler, and announced that this would give us "peace in our time."

The acclaim of the SALT Treaty by the politicians is the biggest exercise in self-deception since the New Deal clique hailed the Yalta sellout of 1945 (in the words of Majority Leader Alben Barkley) as one of the most important steps ever taken to promote peace and happiness in the world.

The SALT Pact is the obituary of U.S. strategic power. It will guarantee the Soviet Union control of the free world on its own terms. It clearly freezes the United States into a poor second place so that we will have to accept any ultimatum the Kremlin bosses deliver.

Read what the SALT Pact will do—and weep for our lost military superiority, lost military parity, and supine acceptance of inferiority.

LAND-BASED ICBM'S

"The parties undertake not to start construction of additional fixed land-based intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) launchers after July 1, 1972." (Interim Agreement, Article I)

This section freezes the United States in a position of inferiority to the Soviet Union

in the weapons which, because of their fantastic power, will rule the world.

This section freezes the United States to a figure of 1,054 ICBM's. The Soviets have 1,618 ICBM's. This means that President Nixon has guaranteed the Soviets a superiority of at least 53 per cent more land-based ICBM's than we have.

In addition to the 1,618 ICBM's, the Soviets now have "more than 90 large new missile silos . . . about a third larger than the SS-9, the biggest Soviet missile that has been deployed." (*The New York Times*, April 23, 1972, page 1. Other authorities have said the number is 100.) Since construction has already been started on these gigantic new missiles, the SALT Pact will permit the Soviets to complete them. The United States does not have a single additional ICBM under construction.

Completion of these new missiles will give the Soviets 62 per cent more ICBM's than the United States is permitted under the SALT Pact.

By making the cutoff date July 1, 1972, this one-sided agreement rewards the Soviets for having engaged in a rapid missile-building program during the past 3½ years—and punishes the United States for the Nixon Administration's fatal and secret decision to keep our country in a 3½ year missile freeze. The Soviets attained their great superiority over us in numbers of missiles during the Nixon years. The 3½ year Nixon missile freeze has done irreparable damage to the United States by allowing the Soviets to gain this big lead—and this new Soviet superiority is now made permanent by the SALT Pact.

The cutoff date of July 1, 1972 proves that the SALT Talks have been exactly what many of us have been predicting ever since they started 2½ years ago, namely, a Soviet stall to keep the United States from building weapons, while the Soviets raced ahead to reach the degree of superiority they feel is necessary to control the world.

Why aren't 1,054 ICBM's sufficient to protect America? Because, since we will never strike first, the real test of U.S. survival is not how many missiles we have in a peacetime inventory, but how many we will have left after a surprise attack. Our U.S. Director of Defense Research, Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., has testified that when the Soviets have "a little over 400 SS-9's," they can knock out all but a small fraction of our 1,000 Minuteman missiles. They have at least 300 SS-9's now. When the Soviets use their SS-9s to knock out nearly all our Minuteman missiles, they will still have 1,318 other land-based missiles to target on our cities. Then they can say, "Surrender—or else!" This is what their missile superiority means. We no longer have enough missiles to threaten a retaliation that is credible.

MISSILE PAYLOAD

The SALT Pact places no limit whatsoever on missile payload. This gives the Soviets such a tremendous advantage over us that it boggles the mind to contemplate it.

Missile payload means the explosive power of the missiles, which is measured by what is called "megatonnage." One megaton equals one million tons of TNT-explosive-equivalent. A direct hit by a one-megaton missile could destroy a fair-sized city.

At the present time, the Soviet land-based missiles carry payloads totaling about 9,400 megatons, whereas U.S. land-based missiles can deliver a total of only 1,270 megatons. This means that the Soviet missiles can deliver a payload of 9,400 million tons of TNT-explosive-equivalent to our 1,270. This Soviet figure is an estimate, and different experts variously estimate the Soviet missile-payload superiority over us as somewhere between 5-to-1 and 10-to-1. But any way it is figured, the Soviet missile megatonnage superiority over us is so tremendous that it approximates the superiority the United States had over the Soviets at the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962.

By placing no limit on missile payload, the SALT Pact guarantees that the Soviets can not only keep their tremendous present superiority, but they can increase it as much as they want in order to destroy or blackmail the United States. No one knows how much payload they will build into the 90 to 100 large, new missiles they have under construction. They can put a giant 25-megaton SS-9 in every one of those 100 holes.

Under the terms of the SALT Pact, the Soviets can, if they want to, replace their SS-9s with missiles carrying an even greater payload. Recent reports indicate that the Soviets are ready to deploy a missile of 50 megatons, twice the payload of the SS-9s. Doesn't the SALT Pact permit the United States to increase its missile payload, too? No, it doesn't. By the terms of the SALT Pact which President Nixon signed, the United States is prohibited from increasing its missile payload by a single megaton. The pertinent section is Article II of the Interim Agreement which states:

"The parties undertake not to convert land-based launchers for light ICBM's, or for ICBM's of older types deployed prior to 1964, into land-based launchers for heavy ICBM's of types deployed after that time."

This section is rather obscurely written, but it clearly prohibits the United States from converting any of our ICBM's (because Minutemen are "light" and Titans are "older types") into more powerful missiles, while at the same time it does not prohibit the Soviets from increasing the power of their SS-9s, because they were deployed after 1964.

Furthermore, since we have no missiles whatsoever under construction, there is no way we can add multi-megaton missiles as the Soviets are doing.

SLBM'S AND SUBMARINES

"The U.S. may have no more than 710 ballistic missile launchers on submarines (SLBM's) and no more than 44 modern ballistic missile submarines. The Soviet Union may have no more than 950 ballistic missile launchers on submarines and no more than 62 modern ballistic missile submarines." (The Protocol, Article I.)

This section freezes the United States in a position of gross inferiority to the Soviet Union in the Polaris-type missile-firing submarines, which we have been told up until a few months ago were our last best hope for the defense of the United States. President Nixon voluntarily and eagerly relinquished our superiority in Polaris-type submarines. He signed the SALT Pact by which we agreed that the Soviets will have the tremendous superiority of 34 per cent more submarine-launched ballistic missiles than we have, and the tremendous superiority of 41 per cent more Polaris-type submarines than we have.

Like the one-sided agreement on ICBM's, this section on SLBM's and submarines rewards the Soviets for having engaged in a rapid submarine-building program during the past 3½ years—and punishes the United States for the Administration's fatal and secret decision to keep our country in a 3½ year submarine freeze. The Soviets have many submarines under construction at the present time, and the SALT Pact permits them to complete this construction—whereas the United States has none under construction.

In addition to current construction, the SALT Pact permits the Soviets to keep on building Polaris-type submarines by substituting them for older-type submarines or older-type ICBM's. By the terms of the SALT Pact, the United States is permitted to add only 3 more modern Polaris-type submarines to a total of 44. The Soviets, however, are permitted to add 37, namely, the 17 now under construction, plus 20 more, to a total of 62. As *The Wall Street Journal* pointed out, the so-called SALT "limitation" allows the Soviets "to go on turning out submarines like sausages."

ABM'S

The SALT Treaty provides that the United States and the Soviet Union each may protect only two areas with anti-ballistic missiles, with each area containing 100 ABM missile launchers. Only one of these areas may protect an ICBM site. If ABM's are built in a second area, it must be the nation's capital.

By thus permitting each side to have 200 ABM launchers, the SALT Treaty has the superficial appearance of equality. Here are some of the many reasons why it is highly advantageous to the Soviet Union and grossly disadvantageous to the United States.

The United States has practically no weapons which are capable of destroying Soviet missiles. The Soviets, on the other hand, have their SS-9 missile force which is designed specifically to knock out our ICBMs, and in addition have more than 2,000 other missiles to target on our population.

The bare minimum ABM protection, which was voted by Congress in the spring of 1969, authorized two ABM sites to protect our ICBM missiles in North Dakota and Montana. By the terms of the SALT Pact, President Nixon accepted Brezhnev's demand that we dismantle our ABM at Montana. Within hours of President Nixon's agreement, and long before the Senate has even had a chance to consider ratification of the Treaty, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird ordered work stopped on the Montana ABM.

Under the SALT Treaty, the Soviets are not required to remove any ABMs or stop work on any ABMs.

The two ABM sites permitted by the SALT Treaty, while equal in number, are grossly unequal in the percentage of population they will protect. Figures on this inequality have not yet been estimated, but you can get some idea by comparing the difference between the population of North Dakota and the population of Moscow or Leningrad.

The only other ABM site the United States is permitted to have under the SALT Treaty is Washington, D.C. What this means is that the Nixon Administration officials took care of protecting themselves and the other Washington, D.C. politicians from Soviet attack—but they left the rest of the 200,000,000 American defenseless against nuclear attack. Why are the Washington politicians any more worthy of protection than the men, women, and children in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Atlanta, Miami, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, Dallas, Houston, Denver, Seattle, San Francisco, Los Angeles, etc.?

There is nothing equal about our protecting our nation's capital and the Soviets protecting theirs. The population of Moscow is 9 times that of Washington, and Moscow is vastly more important to the economic, military, and political life of Russia than Washington, D.C. is to the United States.

The most important inequality about the ABM SALT Treaty is that the Soviets have a long record of sneak, surprise attacks on defenseless countries, whereas the United States has never committed such an attack and no rational person believes it is in the realm of possibility. The Soviets do not need any defense against U.S. attack; but we do need a defense so we will not suffer the fate of Poland and Finland in 1939, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia in 1940, Hungary in 1956, and Czechoslovakia in 1968.

When President Nixon signed the SALT Treaty, he pledged that we would never be able to defend ourselves against a Soviet missile attack (except for the Washington politicians and the North Dakota base).

The ABM SALT Treaty is just as one-sided as though Tiffany's made a pact with the head of the jewel thief syndicate, agreeing that neither side would have a burglar alarm system. Such an agreement obviously is for the benefit of the only side which indulges in burglary. It would leave Tiffany's defenseless.

The ABM is strictly a defensive weapon—it can never kill a single Russian; it can never knock out a single Russian missile unless it is in flight and heading for U.S. targets. Just as the burglar alarm system doesn't bother anyone except the burglar when he is trespassing on the premises, so American ABMs don't bother anyone except an aggressor who has launched an attack. The purpose of the ABM SALT Treaty is to stop the United States from defending itself against Soviet attack.

ABM'S IN WESTERN EUROPE

"To assure the viability and effectiveness of this Treaty, each party undertakes not to transfer to other states, and not to deploy outside its national territory, ABM systems or their components limited by this Treaty." (ABM Treaty, Article IX)

Again, what superficially appears to impose an equal restraint is in reality completely one-sided. The purpose of this section is to prevent our defending Western Europe with ABMs.

The Soviets have 600 ballistic missiles (IRBMs and MRBMs) targeted on Western Europe—and Western Europe has no nuclear missiles capable of reaching the Soviet Union. The Soviets have no need of ABMs to defend themselves or their satellites from Western Europe. Thus, this SALT Treaty, which prohibits both sides from building ABMs in "other states," operates only to the advantage of the Soviet Union. It means that our 310,000 American troops in Europe are hostages to the 600 Soviet nuclear missiles targeted on Western Europe, against which we have no defense, and now by the SALT Treaty are prohibited from building any.

WHAT ABOUT WARHEADS?

The SALT Pact is now being sold to the American people on the Nixon Administration's claim that the United States has 5,700 nuclear warheads while the Soviets have only 2,500. "Warhead" is a word which conjures up visions of a fierce weapon and so, when the layman reads these palliatives, he comforts himself with the delusion that our alleged "warhead superiority" can somehow balance the Soviet superiority in land-based missiles, missile payload, submarines, submarine-based missiles, and ABMs.

To understand how the Administration is deceiving the American people, consider this scenario. You are discussing entering business with a potential partner. He proposes that you each make an investment in the business and share the profits equally. You ask, "What investment do you have in mind?" He replies, "I'll put up \$50,000 and you invest \$25,000,000." You demur, suggesting that this isn't equal. He replies, "Both sides are making an investment—and an investment is an investment." If you allow yourself to be conned into that kind of unequal business deal, you wouldn't stay in business very long. But the enormous inequality concealed under the word "investment" in the above scenario is exactly the same ratio of inequality concealed under the word "warhead" in the figures given out by the Nixon Administration.

When the Administration cites the figures of 5,700 warheads for the U.S. and 2,500 for the U.S.S.R., it is equating our 1/20th of a megaton with a Soviet 25-megaton warhead. That is, the Administration is asking the American people to equate 50 thousand tons of TNT-explosive-equivalent (in a MIRVed U.S. missile) with 25 million tons of TNT-explosive-equivalent (in a Soviet SS-9).

Since the Soviets have at least 300 SS-9s of 25 megatons each, the Administration is asking us to equate 300 U.S. warheads with a total of 15 million tons of explosive power with 300 U.S.S.R. warheads with a total of 7,500 million tons of explosive power. In other words, the Administration is asking us to believe that 15=7,500. By this trick of words, the Administration is trying to conceal from the American people the fact that, in this segment of warheads alone, the

Soviets have an advantage over the U.S. amounting to 7,485,000,000 tons of explosive power.

Would you really go into partnership with someone who started out by deliberately attempting to deceive you this way? Would you trust a friend who tried to persuade you to go along with such a lopsided agreement?

President Nixon's own Blue Ribbon Defense Panel, in a Supplemental Statement released March 12, 1971 and largely written by Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell, Jr., severely criticized what is called the "numbers game, namely, the mere counting of warheads without analysis of megatonnage" and other factors. This Blue Ribbon Statement specifically exposed the falsehood of "the illusion of abundant security" based on claims of U.S. warhead superiority.

The Blue Ribbon Statement concluded: "It would be difficult to conceive of a better way to mislead the public than to present—without precise definition and analysis—comparative figures of this kind. Those who present such distortions contribute to the confusion rather than enlightenment of our people."

THE MIRV TRICK

The other device by which the Administration is ramming SALT down the throats of the American people is to claim an advantage to us because the SALT Pact does not limit MIRVing, and to let the American public infer that we are ahead in MIRVs. MIRV stands for Multiple Independently-targeted Reentry Vehicle. The MIRV program is a technique of slicing up a missile warhead into smaller, separate warheads which can be separately targeted.

Consider this comparison. One suburban developer has a plot for subdividing which has a total area of one acre. A second developer has a plot for subdividing with a total area of 25 acres. Which one will get the larger number of useful lots out of the subdivision?

The answer is obvious. And it ought to be just as obvious that the Soviet ability to MIRV is 25 times greater than ours. We are MIRVing our Minuteman missiles which have a power of one megaton each. The Soviet SS-9s are 25 megatons each.

The claim that we are far ahead in the technology of MIRV is grossly exaggerated. Secretary of Defense Laird testified nearly two years ago that the Soviets would catch up with us in two years. The Blue Ribbon Supplemental Statement said that the Soviet Pacific Ocean tests of MIRVs showed they are ahead of schedule.

When a missile is MIRVed, this cuts the power of the missile dramatically because separate propulsion and guidance systems have to be built into each MIRV, thereby reducing its payload. The reason why we are MIRVing our Minuteman and Polaris missiles is that the Soviets have 64 ABM launchers already deployed around Moscow, and we adopted the MIRV program in *extremis* as a counter measure to preserve some credibility that some warheads would get through the Soviet ABM.

Since we have no deployed ABM, the Soviets have no need to run a MIRV race. They can just hit our undefended country with their un-MIRVed weapons carrying the full payload.

But if the Soviets choose to run a MIRV race, they can outpower the payload of our MIRVs by a factor of 20. Take our most powerful missile against their most powerful one (that we know about). Our Poseidon could deliver a single 4-megaton warhead; but we are splitting it into ten 50-kiloton warheads, making a total of 500,000 kilotons or 1/2 megaton for the Poseidon missile. The Soviet SS-9 with a single warhead of 25 megatons can be split into ten one-megaton warheads with a total of 10 megatons per SS-9. Thus, in a MIRV race, the Soviets will have a superiority of 20 times the power of ours.

THE SALT TEAM

At the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962, the United States had a 5-to-1 nuclear superiority over the Soviets.

Between 1962 and 1968, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Nitze, and Secretary of the Air Force Harold Brown, carried out a program of nuclear disarmament which dismantled half of our once-great superiority. They did this by scrapping 3/4 of our strategic bombers and 3/4 of our multi-megaton missiles, abandoning our overseas missile and bomber bases, refusing to build the ABM, Skybolt, and other new weapons, cutting back our Minuteman missile program from 2,000 to 1,000, freezing our Polaris submarines at 41, and scrapping our most powerful weapon, the 24-megaton bomb. Meanwhile, the Soviets went into fullscale production of nuclear weapons.

On October 24, 1968, candidate Richard Nixon in a nationwide radio address, solemnly promised to "restore our objective of clearcut military superiority" and "do away with wishful thinking either as to the capability or the intent of potential enemies."

The 1968 Republican Platform, adopted by Richard Nixon and all the Delegates at the Republican National Convention in Miami, stated: "We pledge . . . a comprehensive program to restore the pre-eminence of U.S. military strength."

Instead of restoring U.S. military superiority as he promised, President Nixon continued the McNamara missile and submarine freeze for 3 1/2 years. Meanwhile, the Soviets increased their ICBMs from about 1,000 to 1,618, and their submarine missile launchers from about 450 to today's total of 740.

The real clue to the policy of the last 3 1/2 years is that President Nixon promoted McNamara's two principal assistants, Paul Nitze and Harold Brown, to the most sensitive positions in government: the SALT negotiating team. They drafted the SALT Pact which guarantees Soviet superiority in nuclear weapons.

On June 1, President Nixon solemnly told our nation: "No power on earth is stronger than the United States today. None will be stronger than the United States in the future." The facts presented in this Report prove that these words are not true. The Soviets are now 53 per cent stronger than we are in land-based ICBMs, and will be 62 per cent stronger in the near future. The Soviets are now at least 500 per cent stronger than we are in missile payload, and will be 1,000 per cent as strong in the near future. The Soviets now have 42 Polaris-type submarines to our 41, and in the near future will have 62 to our 44.

The SALT Pact is being presented to us as a "limitation" on the spiraling arms race. Actually, only the United States is limited. The SALT Pact is a written authorization to the Soviets to continue their crash nuclear building program for the next five years. The President has been deceived by his advisers—and our country, by the President.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to extend my congratulations to the Order of Ahepa, more formally known as the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, on the proud occasion of its 50th anniversary. This national fraternal organization has worked vigorously and

and tirelessly for the last half century to educate American citizens in the ideals and principles of the Hellenic culture that existed in ancient Greece. As it turned out, this culture later provided the very foundation of Western political and social thought as it evolved up to the present.

The service record of the Order of Ahepa is, indeed, remarkable. Ahepans have consistently carried the banner of improved education, have successfully fought for the freedom and self-respect of the minorities in its justice for Greece and justice for Cyprus programs, and members of the order have always worked for the relief of innocent victims of natural disaster at home and abroad. In light of these formidable accomplishments, it is quite evident that Ahepans are truly concerned with the conflicts that often frustrate the individual in society, as well as with the plight of discriminated minorities. These achievements, along with a membership that includes many distinguished American political figures of the past and present, stand out as proof that the truths of a 2,000-year-old culture are still irrefutably relevant to man in the modern industrial society of today.

I consider it my obligation to ask my distinguished colleagues in Congress and all the American people to join me in paying tribute to the Order of Ahepa on the occasion of its anniversary. Although the honor of the order's deeds will prove far more eternal than these words, I must once again assure my support for this admirable organization, and wish to its members long life and another 50 honorable years.

HON. WILLIAM WILLIAMSON

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the death of the Honorable William Williamson, a distinguished member of this body from 1921-33. Although members of different parties, I had the pleasure of knowing William personally and was a great admirer of his wisdom and wit. He not only represented the western district of South Dakota, as do I, but also was a resident of Rapid City, S.D., which is also my hometown. That tragedy-scarred city has suffered further loss by his death.

Although born in Iowa in 1875, he moved with his parents to Plankinton, S. Dak., in 1882. He attended the public schools in South Dakota and Wayne State College in Nebraska. After engaging in agriculture and teaching for several years, he entered the University of South Dakota and graduated from the law school there in 1905. While at the university, he was editor of both the school newspaper and the college annual.

He was prosecuting attorney of Lyman County, S. Dak., from 1905-11 and was circuit judge of the 11th judicial district from 1911-21 at which time he was elected to Congress.

In 1933 he resumed the private practice of law in Rapid City and later became a special assistant attorney general for South Dakota assigned specifically as general counsel for the public utilities commission and the Department of Insurance of South Dakota. He was also a member of the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Commission.

A GREAT SERVICE TO SAIGON

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, in numberless ways the United States has given assistance to the South Vietnamese people in their struggle for the right to determine their own destiny. One of the most helpful services has been the training of the South Vietnamese helicopter pilots, some 1,436 in all.

A significant occasion was the graduation of 17 pilots on June 19, the last of the trainees at the Hunter Army Airfield-Fort Stewart complex, near Savannah. The people of the Savannah area will miss the fine young men who have been in their midst since March 1970.

Each of the cadets has been adopted by an area family and no doubt these men will return to their native land with a favorable and authentic estimate of American people. The pilots were required to spend a full year in their training course here, and a Hunter Airfield spokesman said:

They're getting basically what any U.S. pilot gets.

The graduation and phaseout news account which appeared in the Savannah Morning News of June 20, 1972, follows:

GRACED BY TOP BRASS—300 ATTEND CEREMONIES FOR FINAL PILOTS CLASS

A trio of generals helped Hunter Army Airfield-Ft. Stewart bid farewell to its final class of South Vietnamese helicopter pilots Monday night.

The graduation ceremonies attended by about 300 officers, sponsors, cadets and guests marked the end of a program which began 1,416 cadets ago at Hunter in March, 1970.

"The sacrifice you have made cannot be measured in days, in weeks, and months, but in the centuries of peace," Ft. Stewart Complex commander Brig. Gen. Eugene M. Lynch told the graduates.

Other speakers were Army Chief of Chaplains Maj. Gen. Gerhard W. Hyatt, Air Force Maj. Gen. William W. Snavley and South Vietnamese military attache Col. Nyugen Linh Chieu.

Awards were presented to Chatham Countians who have sponsored the Vietnamese cadets.

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

"In 1970 we were given the mission of transferring our expertise in flight training, to Vietnamese aviators," Lynch said. "Today, with pride, I can say, 'Mission accomplished, job well done.'"

Lynch said the Vietnamese cadets compiled a record at Hunter that would be enviable to any U.S. Army training program.

He said, "In the past three months, the successes we have attained at Hunter have been demonstrated on the battlefields of Vietnam."

"In 1968 when we faced together the Tet offensive, American aviators did the job," Lynch said. "Today, those aircraft are piloted by graduates of Hunter."

Hyatt said he was proud to be at Hunter because he feels strongly about the Vietnamese people.

"If we truly believe in freedom, for ourselves, we cannot deny it to other peoples of the world," he said.

Hyatt said the United States, in its beginnings, faced the same type of problems now facing the Vietnamese.

"For a short 10 years, we have been struggling to help them develop themselves as a nation. It ill behooves us to be impatient," Hyatt said.

Snavley is assistant Air Force deputy chief of staff for systems and logistics.

Snavley speaking of the sponsorship of the cadets by Chatham families, said he was moved by the "family-oriented aspect of the program."

This program, undertaken in a very short period of time, has been an outstanding success," he said.

Chieu, after thanking Hunter personnel for training his countrymen, said some of the men trained at Hunter have already made "the supreme sacrifice of their lives."

"We are struggling, but we are confident of defeating the enemy even sooner, thanks to your excellent training," he said. "Please accept the heartfelt gratitude of the free Vietnamese people."

Lynch said the Vietnamese trained at Hunter came from every city in South Vietnam and "it seems only appropriate that they will return to protect every city."

AHEPA TO CELEBRATE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, one of the things which has made America a great nation has been the diversity of cultures and activities of our many citizens of all nationalities, races and creeds. And many of these individual citizens have found a vehicle for their efforts and energies in the many social and service organizations which have become such a part of the American way of life.

I am most anxious, Mr. Speaker, to see that proper recognition is given to one of the most outstanding organizations of its kind—the Order of Ahepa, which will celebrate its 50th anniversary on July 26, 1972.

The word AHEPA is an acronym, which means American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, and AHEPA membership is available to any American citizen. Founded in Atlanta, Ga., on July 26, 1922, the Order of Ahepa is a nonpolitical and nonsectarian organization which has made countless national and community contributions.

In addition to making substantial economic contributions to the victims of floods, earthquakes, and other natural disasters, both in this country and abroad, local AHEPA chapters have given generously to and vigorously supported local community undertakings in the fields of education, charity and civic improvement. But the thing I admire most about this organization is the fact that it

makes a conscious and persistent effort to instill into its youngest members a fierce love of freedom and a deep sense of loyalty to the United States of America.

If for no other reason, Mr. Speaker, the fact that this is an extremely patriotic organization that produces citizens who become the backbone of our Nation is reason enough to pay homage to AHEPA. But the fact is that the Order of Ahepa is producing young Americans who reflect the best of all the most admirable qualities found in humanity.

I am proud to wish the Order of Ahepa a happy golden anniversary this month—and I hope its next 50 years will be as successful as its first half century of accomplishments.

THE MANMADE DISEASE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, poor people in this country are being increasingly victimized by a disease for which a cure exists. Part of the cure lies in citizen education and in improving the products that consumers are forced to buy and to live with.

The disease is, of course, lead poisoning. It is an especially brutal disease because its targets are small children who are hungry. Thirty million dollars, spread over the next 2 years, would go a long way toward obliterating the disease. President Nixon seems to think, however, that \$2 million will do the job. He is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Black Caucus is mobilizing to secure the maximum possible funding for lead poisoning prevention. I urge my colleagues to join us in this important effort.

Congressman WILLIAM L. CLAY has written a persuasive article on this dreadful manmade disease. It appeared in the Boston Globe on June 27, 1972. I hope that the Members of this Chamber will take his words seriously to heart:

FULL FUNDING VITAL FOR LEAD POISONING CONTROL

Lead poisoning can injure or kill any child—but in all likelihood the child who will contact this manmade disease will be poor, under the age of 3 and black.

He will most likely be a child who does not eat regularly, is not well supervised and will live in tenements, run-down apartments and dilapidated old houses.

More than 400,000 American children fitting this description will eat the sweet-tasting chips of paint containing lead this year. Over 3200 of them will suffer permanent brain damage and 200 will die.

In reality, no one knows precisely how many really will suffer or die from lead poisoning. The statistics cited are official US figures which, in the past, have tended to be underestimated. What a cruel indictment it is of America to needlessly subject helpless children to the misery and torture of brain damage, blindness and kidney malfunction.

The problem of lead poisoning, its prevention, treatment and cure cannot be met without funds. Congress passed a special law

authorizing such funds but no money was appropriated for fiscal year 1971 and no money was requested by the White House for that period.

The law authorized \$10 million for fiscal year 1971 and \$20 million for the present fiscal year. The White House included in its budget, a request for a mere \$2 million for fiscal year 1972. And, the White House had the gall to suggest that a request for that amount was a clear indication of the President's concern for the problem.

When Congress did battle with the White House for funds to implement the law, an amount of \$7.5 million was obtained. Congress clearly did not do much better in appropriating an amount still less than half the authorization. Already, applications from cities now pending before HEW ask for more than \$7.5 million and many cities haven't yet filed reports or requests.

Because the incidents and tragedies of lead poisoning are so prevalent in black neighborhoods, the Congressional Black Caucus of the House has introduced special legislation calling for full funding of the Lead Poisoning Prevention Act.

The Congressional Black Caucus also endorsed a proposal to lower the ceiling on lead content of household paint from the present 1 per cent to the figure supported by the American Academy of Pediatrics, 0.06 per cent.

President Nixon says we must spend whatever is necessary to find a cure for cancer. But the cure for lead poisoning is known. It is a man-made killer of children and should not be considered less deadly.

It is appalling that no action has been taken by the Appropriations Committee on the request for additional funds. We are rightfully incensed that the general public, the Congress and the President seemed resolved to wait out lead poisoning—a man-made disease—which will eventually cure itself. In the meantime, suffer the little children.

NEW FEDERAL RETIREMENT LEGISLATION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills which, I believe, will bring equitable treatment to thousands of Federal retirees, dependents, and survivors who are now struggling to exist on grossly insufficient income.

These bills will increase the minimum benefits to that of the social security minimum. As you know, the President recently signed into law the 20-percent increase in benefits for social security recipients. The new social security minimum is \$84.50 a month and my bill will match that minimum and will provide for increases in the future to go into effect when social security increases are approved by the Congress and the President.

This minimum would apply to retired employees, to surviving widows and widowers, and to children.

Approximately 145,000 retirees, children, and survivors would be affected by the legislation and would receive increased benefits averaging some \$31 a month.

Mr. Speaker, the second bill I am introducing today would bring direct relief

to low-income Federal annuitants. This legislation would provide a \$20 a month increase to most annuities below the \$200 per month level.

The effect of this proposal is to grant a \$20 per month increase to annuities of less than \$181 to \$199 per month bracket to bring them up to the \$200 a month level.

We estimate, Mr. Speaker, that there are some 450,000 Federal annuitants, survivors and surviving children who are presently receiving benefits below the \$200 a month level. This legislation would give these deserving Americans an average increase of \$19 per month.

CONGRESSMAN BURKE ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF 1972 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce the results of my annual congressional questionnaire, which I sent to some 265,000 homes in the present 10th Congressional District.

More than 50,000 questionnaires were returned to me indicating views on a range of national issues.

It is heartening to see so many people take the time and effort to give me their views on important issues of the day. It certainly reflects the interest our citizens take in the affairs of our country.

Since I intend to continue this practice of reaching the people I represent by sending annual congressional questionnaires, I will certainly share the results of my annual poll with you.

The results of the 1972 poll by percentage follow, as well as the results by party preference and geographic area:

1972 BURKE QUESTIONNAIRE

	Results (percent)	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor Federal legislation to promote the establishment of free day-care centers and nursery schools for working mothers?.....	46	54
2. Do you favor a constitutional amendment that would—		
(a) Extend the term for President from 4 to 6 years, with a one-term limit?.....	34	66
(b) Change the term of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives from 2 years to 4 years?.....	52	48
3. Do you favor a larger share of responsibility for administering Government programs being delegated to regional offices rather than being centralized in Washington, D.C.?.....	79	21
4. Should Government employees be given the right to strike?.....	20	80
5. Should the news media be authorized to publish or broadcast secret Government information involving our security, without proper clearance?.....	12	88
6. In general, do you support the President's revenue-sharing proposal of Federal funds by direct payment to State and local governments, without Federal specifications as to their use?.....	48	52
7. Do you favor a national health insurance program?.....	77	23
8. Do you favor Federal legislation to legalize abortion?.....	64	36
9. Do you believe President Nixon's trip to China will lead to future security and peace in the world?.....	54	46
10. Should amnesty be granted to men who fled the country to escape the draft?.....	20	80
11. Do you favor stricter gun control laws?.....	70	30
12. If you do favor stricter gun control legislation, which of the following would you favor?.....		
(a) Stronger controls at the Federal level?.....	41	
(b) Stronger controls at the State level?.....	27	
(c) Stronger controls at the local level?.....	32	
13. Regarding the possession and use of marijuana, the Federal Government should—		
(a) Retain present penalties?.....	25	
(b) Reduce present penalties?.....	20	
(c) Increase present penalties?.....	38	
(d) Legalize its possession and use?.....	17	

1972 BURKE QUESTIONNAIRE

[In percent]

	Central Broward						South Broward						North Dade						
	GOP		Independents		Democrats		GOP		Independents		Democrats		GOP		Independents		Democrats		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
1.....	35	65	42	58	52	48	40	60	44	56	59	41	43	57	60	40	63	37	
2.....																			
(a).....	42	58	35	65	32	68	38	62	31	69	24	76	36	64	31	69	24	76	
(b).....	54	46	55	45	52	48	56	44	56	44	49	51	45	55	48	52	48	52	
3.....	77	23	79	21	74	26	94	6	70	30	76	24	71	29	76	24	72	28	
4.....	11	89	25	75	48	52	10	90	29	71	36	64	9	91	28	72	40	60	
5.....	4	96	12	88	16	84	4	96	17	83	14	86	9	91	29	71	15	85	
6.....	60	40	46	54	45	55	43	57	41	59	47	53	55	45	48	52	38	62	
7.....	68	32	74	26	81	19	72	28	80	20	82	18	62	38	88	12	89	11	
8.....	66	34	65	35	61	39	60	40	69	31	64	36	58	42	76	24	62	38	
9.....	68	32	53	47	41	59	66	34	45	55	40	60	57	43	56	45	42	58	
10.....	11	89	19	81	27	73	7	93	28	72	35	65	11	89	31	69	25	75	
11.....	68	32	64	36	77	23	70	30	72	28	73	27	60	40	67	33	78	22	
12.....																			
(a).....	40		41		43		44		42		45		43		41		35		
(b).....	25		30		24		26		26		25		25		26		32		
(c).....	35		29		33		30		32		30		32		33		33		
13.....																			
(a).....	26		31		20		30		22		16		27		23		17		
(b).....	21		15		18		23		18		23		16		18		15		
(c).....	32		34		44		40		41		43		48		31		48		
(d).....	21		20		18		7		19		18		9		28		30		

PROMPT ACTION FROM THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE

HON. ALBERT W. JOHNSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD, a letter I received from the news editor of the Pennsylvania Mirror, Mr. David G. Fay. I believe this letter indicates that the U.S. Postal Service endeavors to correct the many problems

which it inherited from the Post Office Department. The letter is as follows:

A LETTER

Being in the newspaper business I can attest to the fact a reader will call immediately with the slightest complaint our readers are few and far between who will call to congratulate you on something well done.

With this in mind I wish to point out that my recent complaint to your office concerning special delivery mail service out of Philadelphia was corrected immediately and there has been no recurrence of late service. Mr. Roy Lutz of the Erie office handled the complaint for District Manager John F. McLaughlin.

I would like to thank you and the Postal Service authorities for the prompt and effective action.

SBA LENDING PROGRAM

HON. TOM RAILSBACK

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, recently it was announced that a record-

breaking \$62,838,737 in loans were approved by the Small Business Administration in Illinois for fiscal year 1972. This amount exceeded by nearly 50 percent the previous record established in fiscal year 1971.

I am particularly pleased by the loans granted in my Congressional District. They are as follows:

County	Number of loans	Total amount
Henry.....	2	\$320,000
Warren.....	2	41,000
Whiteside.....	1	33,000
Rock Island.....	15	1,212,000

I am convinced that these loans illustrate the fact that the Small Business Administration has become a highly effective tool in stimulating our economy, and I wish SBA and the people it serves every success in future endeavors.

NEWMAN CITES AMERICA

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is over 196 years old. Yet too often we forget what America is.

On the eve of this year's Independence Day celebration, a remarkable tribute to this greatest of all nations was penned by a Hoosier friend and fine compatriot. The statement by Don Newman, of Osceola, Ind., appeared in the July 3 issue of the Elkhart Truth. I include it here for the profit of my colleagues:

LEGACY OF STRENGTH YET COMPASSION
(By Don Newman)

America is a great country. Great because her land is fertile and mineral-rich.

Great because her government of the people, by the people, and for the people, although not perfect, is the best yet devised which attempts to obtain for each and every citizen: Freedom, equality, and justice.

Great because her founding fathers left a legacy of strength yet compassion, ambition yet unselfishness, independence yet faith, and above all else, an abiding conviction in the supremacy of God. The sentence, "In God We Trust", on our money is a short statement which summarizes that founding principle.

I like America because of her efforts to guarantee everyone life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I like America because she is the best hope yet for the fullest development of individual potential.

I like America most of all because she is synonymous with opportunity. It is this individual opportunity which contributes uppermost to the greatness of our Nation. This, coupled with the fact that our people historically have assumed a measure of responsibility in discharging the obligations of citizenship, sometimes sacrificing their fortunes and their lives to further the cause of freedom, equality, and justice.

I love my country because of the deep sense of pride I hold for her accomplishments, for the bounty she has returned to my family and me through the opportuni-

ties afforded us, and for the liberty to select one's own destiny.

Where else could a citizen, just a small businessman, aspire to, and be nominated for an office as prestigious as that of a United States Congressman?

LOCAL AID STALLING MUST END

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, just before Congress recessed for the Democratic National Convention an editorial appeared in the State Journal of Lansing, Mich., entitled "Local Aid Stalling Must End," which commended the House for passing the revenue sharing bill and went on to urge the Senate to act favorably without delay. With both Houses back in session, I wish to bring this most timely June 27 editorial to the particularly attention of Members of the other body. The editorial follows:

LOCAL AID STALLING MUST END

After a couple of years of foot-dragging, a federal revenue-sharing bill finally edged forward one big step with the approval of a \$5 billion measure last week in the U.S. House of Representatives.

The bill, which provides \$1.8 billion to the states and another \$3.5 billion for cities, counties and other local government units, and the actual support of Rep. Wilbur Mills and his Ways and Means Committee, a major factor in breaking the House deadlock.

Now it goes to the Senate. There it will face a tough fight from conservatives, who are always reluctant to give up control of the money strings, and from others who don't want to give any election year help to the administration that proposed the idea.

With the national political conventions closing in and the expected congressional recess to be followed by the national presidential campaign, time for a decision is very short.

It remains now to be seen whether the Senate will continue the do-nothing stall of the Democratic controlled Congress or finally endorse one measure designed to do something for the nation's hard pressed states and local units of government.

As recently noted by veteran Washington columnist David Broder, Democratic presidential candidates and leaders have acknowledged revenue sharing and a number of other domestic issues as having urgent national priority and have offered counter proposals of their own.

Yet, as Broder said, with time running out, they have done little with any of the President's proposals or their own alternative programs.

As for the argument that the federal government has no funds to help states and local governments via revenue-sharing, we suggest that just about any governor, mayor or private citizen could readily provide a list of waste areas where the money could be found.

It is clearly up to the Senate, that formidable center of Democratic presidential aspirants, to decide if it will convert some of the campaign trail oratory into reality or retreat again to the stalling tactics of the past two or three years.

The Senate should put aside the politics of paralysis and do something for the hard pressed cities, counties and states. They need help—and now.

TRANSPORTATION'S ROLE IN RECYCLING WASTE MATERIALS

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, the unsightly waste and scrap which litters and clutters the American scene is fast changing our beautiful landscape. The past accumulations of waste must be removed and methods must be developed to gather and reuse all of our future wastes. This is something which has been recognized and talked about with an increasing frequency. Recyclamation is a term which is being used by many people these days. Because of its importance we in the Congress should give the topic careful study. Recyclamation recently made news when the ICC was ordered by court action to reconsider transportation rates on waste materials which were being shipped to various points for recyclamation and reuse. Action such as this was instituted by Students Challenging Regulatory Agency Procedures—SCRAP. This group of George Washington law students has helped dramatize the far-reaching effects of these concept of reuse by recycling the valuable resources of this country.

The Department of Transportation had previously authorized a study of the transportation by railroads of recycled scrap. This report by Herbert O. Whitten & Associates is entitled "Recyclamation—Rail Transport Economics of Substitutability of Recycled Scrap or Waste for Basic Raw Materials." It is a case study of rail transport of scrap or steel vis-a-vis iron ore. While this study is one which takes a very deep and complex look into the economics of the area of the transportation of iron ore and scrap iron, it makes several general points. These points are worth our attention.

First it is important to realize that the successful implementation of a comprehensive recycling program will cause a major transformation of American industry. The customer will be merely one link in a continuous process of manufacturing not the last step or link. Collection of used items will become an important field, not merely one of getting waste out of sight, out of mind. The study recognized what a vast change in our society such a process will make.

It also recognizes, by looking in depth at one aspect of the transportation industry, what an important role the transportation industries will have in this entire process. It will be involved in the collection and gathering from initial points of reclamation to the point of preparation and processing. It will also be involved in the movement of processed wastes from the accumulation centers to points of productive reuse. The consultant said that a great deal of this shipment will be by rail.

In order that this might be accomplished, a comprehensive program for transportation must be established. Among all of the governmental bodies listed as being involved in the creation

of such a large transportation system, it lists the Congress. The tasks which would be assigned to this body are:

Provide adequate funding; establish a materials exemption for highway and water movements; and establish a natural resources depletion tax to support the recclamation program.

I believe what the country needs to do is to recognize that transportation will be a vital part of this effort to preserve our natural resources and reuse what we do have. What we in the Congress need do is to acquaint and instruct ourselves about the recycling process, a field which is soon to be one of great national importance.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, this week is the 14th anniversary of Captive Nations Week—a time for all freedom loving people to remember the ravage of past tyranny and to join together in outrage over the continuing plight of millions who still live amidst the terror and oppression of Communist domination.

We must never forget the enslaved peoples of the Baltic lands, the Ukraine, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Armenia, and other lands that have fallen under the Communist heel.

The oppressed have made it clear to the world that they have not given up the struggle to be free. Many acts against oppression demonstrate the power and spirit of people who are unwilling to surrender to conquest. Recent examples include riots in Lithuania, cultural repressions and trials of intellectual nationalists in the Ukraine, resistance to continuing Russification of minorities in the Soviet republics, the Prague spring of 1968, and the 1970 Polish uprisings. Abraham Lincoln warned us that:

Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under a just God, cannot long retain it.

The people of the so-called captive nations persist in the struggle to retain their national identity and pride in the hope of a brighter tomorrow. The courage of these people is truly inspiring and deserves our continuing commendations and support.

How fortunate we are as Americans to be able to enjoy the liberties and personal rights of a democratic republic. How wonderful it would be if our fellow citizens throughout the world could realize the freedom and independence which is their birthright. The American people have not forgotten the plight of the captive nations—nor will we. Our history is founded on the struggle for freedom, and we stand with all the oppressed peoples of the world in their determination to be free.

ST. LUKE UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH OF INDIANAPOLIS ON CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE AND VIETNAM INVOLVEMENT

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last month the congregation of St. Luke United Presbyterian Church in Indianapolis took sharp dissent with pronouncement on American involvement in Vietnam as expressed by the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States.

The St. Luke congregation wrote the President, sending him a copy of their resolution. They also forwarded a copy to me. I was greatly impressed by their deep feelings, and their desire to make their own position clear on these vital matters.

I have secured their permission to insert both their letter and resolution into the RECORD, and it is an honor to do so:

ST. LUKE UNITED
PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Indianapolis, Ind., June 19, 1972.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: You and your staff no doubt are aware of the pronouncement on America's involvement in the Vietnam war approved by General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. in its National Convention in Denver, Colorado, early this month. We attach a resolution passed by the governing board of our Church in response to the General Assembly's pronouncement.

We are a relatively small Congregation; however, we feel we speak the sentiment of hundreds of thousands of Presbyterians throughout the Nation. We wanted you to know that we are in sympathy with your efforts to disengage American troops from hostilities in Southeast Asia, and at the same time, to protect the South Vietnamese people from the holocaust which is sure to follow if their forces are ultimately defeated by the aggressors from the North.

As the attached resolution clearly attests, our Session is highly critical of our General Assembly's attempt to meddle in the diplomatic policies of our Nation, and its pronouncement from its recent convention in Denver.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT W. DEMAREE,
Clerk of Session.

RESOLUTION

The Session of St. Luke United Presbyterian Church, 338 Union Street (Southport), Indianapolis, Indiana, convened with proper notice and in the presence of a quorum, has taken thoughtful note of the pronouncement of the 184th General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. on American involvement in the Vietnam war, such pronouncement consisting of three parts, to-wit: "A Message to United Presbyterians," "Recommendations" and "Resolution."

Conscience compels us to speak out against the tenor of the pronouncement as a whole, and particularly to protest some of the innuendoes in its Recommendations and Resolution.

Our Session holds unanimously that the

following be truths which in combination render the General Assembly pronouncement, no matter how sincerely conceived, indubitably improper, indiscreet, and detrimental to the purposes it was intended to serve:

1. It is fundamentally the mission of the United Presbyterian Church to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ; to be concerned for the unconverted, the unchurched, and the illiterate in the teachings of the Scriptures; to be benevolent to the poor, the widow and the orphan; and to foster brotherly love between neighbors and nations.

2. It is both the prerogative and the responsibility of Church members to join with peace-loving peoples everywhere in prayers for peace, for the safety and well-being of those who defend us in the far corners of the earth, and for our National leaders and elected representatives as they seek an end to hostilities in Vietnam and elsewhere. It is the part of every Christian to entreat the Almighty to touch the hearts of those who would enslave their brothers, that they might relent and that we might have peace and international brotherhood between all men and between all nations.

3. It is both the prerogative and the responsibility of every Church member, as a private citizen, led by the Holy Spirit, to take active interest in the affairs of his State and Nation, to participate in his right of suffrage, to make known his sentiments on National issues to his elected representatives, and himself to serve his country as a Christian citizen.

4. It is neither the responsibility, the prerogative, nor the business of the United Presbyterian Church as an integral national, state or local body (a) to militate against the political and diplomatic conduct of constitutional government, nor against the views of those elected to manage it; (b) to directly or indirectly support or oppose legislation under consideration by the Nation's legislative bodies; (c) to bring direct or indirect pressure on elected legislators to influence their votes on National issues; (d) to encourage civil action in our courts on National policies; nor (e) to solicit political contributions for or against candidates for election to public office. These are functions which must be relegated to the consciences of individual Church members.

5. The General Assembly's pronouncement has done violence to the peace and unity in Presbyterian churches in our area.

We protest most vigorously, as members of the United Presbyterian Church, to our highest ecclesiastical judicatory having issued a resolution encouraging "peaceful civil disobedience" of the laws of our land. To have done this is to abet lawlessness, and to give impetus to the disrespect for law and order which is already far too rampant among many segments of our society. To have done this is an irresponsible betrayal of the principles of freedom of person and of religion under which we as Americans live and move and worship.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 14th national observance of Captive Nations Week. Throughout this period, Americans across the country are expressing their concern for the millions of Eastern and central Europeans for

whom subjugation under Communist rule has become a stark reality of life.

Mere words cannot convey the mental or physical anguish suffered by these people as they consciously suppress their creativity and their convictions in order to survive within the Communist societal framework. Captive Nations Week does serve, though, as a mechanism which challenges the individual and collective moral conscience of the American people.

It challenges us to empathize with those for whom freedom is an incomprehensible abstraction and to whom democracy is portrayed as menacingly anarchistic. Moreover, it challenges us to cherish and appreciate our own open society, where divergent ideas are permitted to vie for acceptance in the public marketplace.

During Captive Nations Week, I join with my colleagues in expressing the sincere wish that people in these captive nations will be permitted in the near future to enjoy those fundamental and inherent rights which have been denied to them for over 25 years. Already we have seen the force of world public opinion aid Soviet Jewry in emigrating to Israel, but the recent outbreak of self-immolations in Lithuania once again underscores the deep-seated frustrations experienced by those whose rights have been abrogated.

It is my belief that, through increased communication and dialog between the free nations of the world and the Communist countries, the captive nations will lose their fear of individual self-expression. It is my further hope that, as a result of this dialog, future Captive Nations Weeks will remind us of the past, not the present.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF AHEPA

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with many of my colleagues in the House and citizens across the country in paying tribute to the Order of Ahepa—the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association on the occasion of its golden anniversary. For the past 50 years, the Order of Ahepa has served as a fraternal focal point for individuals concerned about improving society by promoting basic ideals of good citizenship and education.

I have had firsthand experience with community leaders who are members of the Order of Ahepa and I have witnessed their dedication to civic, charitable, and educational causes. In Jamaica, N.Y., the officers of the Order of Ahepa are Mr. Stephen A. Vasaka, president; Mr. Ernest Kares, vice president; Mr. Stavros Z. Theodorou, secretary; and Mr. Kostas Zimaras, treasurer. I extend to them and to the members of the order in Queens and all across America, my congratulations on the golden anniversary

of the organization and my best wishes for continued success in their important community endeavors.

SALUTE TO AHEPA

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have long admired the Order of Ahepa for its many good works and am proud to join in the salute to AHEPA—the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—on its golden anniversary.

This remarkable order was founded 50 years ago in Atlanta, Ga. During the last half century AHEPA has made a major contribution to educational, charitable, and civic endeavors. In time of disaster, AHEPA stretches out its helping hand here at home and across the seas, offering relief contributions to victims of flood, earthquake, hurricane, and war. AHEPA's generosity is evident, too, around the world, in the creation of medical and educational centers, including AHEPA hospitals in Athens and Thessaloniki and seven health centers in Greece, the AHEPA Agricultural College in Greece, the Penelopion Shelter Home in Athens, AHEPA Hall and AHEPA School at St. Basil's Academy, Garrison, N.Y., the Dr. George Papanicolaou Cancer Research Institute at Miami, Fla., and a program of national scholarships for young people.

I have touched on only a very few of the many benevolent activities that have made AHEPA one of the most highly regarded associations of its kind in the world. And, I would be remiss were I not to point out that during World War II, AHEPA as an official issuing agency of the U.S. Treasury, sold some \$500 million in U.S. war bonds.

I think it is in order to mention the objectives of AHEPA, the foundations on which this splendid order rests:

- (1) To promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America.
- (2) To instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind.
- (3) To instill in its membership a due appreciation for the privileges of citizenship.
- (4) To encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social and commercial fields of human endeavor.
- (5) To pledge its members to do their utmost to stamp out any and all political corruption; and to arouse its members to the fact that tyranny is a menace to the life, property, prosperity, honor and integrity of every nation.
- (6) To promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic Culture.
- (7) To promote good fellowship and endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense.
- (8) To endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness.
- (9) To champion the cause of education

and to maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

AHEPA has been achieving those objectives admirably for 50 years now and will continue to do so for many times 50 more. I know.

I am very proud of the active membership in AHEPA in the 23d Congressional District which I represent. John C. Conzaman, lieutenant governor of the district lodge, resides at 1243 Edwards, Lakewood; past supreme lodge officer, the Honorable John M. Manos, is a Bay Village resident. Officers of the Lakewood chapter of AHEPA are James Selos, president; Andy Maniatopoulos, vice president; Militiadis Sofianos, secretary; and Nic Tsarnas, treasurer.

It is an honor to pay tribute to AHEPA in general and to my many good friends in the Order of Ahepa, the Daughters of Penelope, the Sons of Pericles, and the Maids of Athena, good citizens and wonderful friends.

FICTION? NO, FACT

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the June issue of Reader's Digest a brief reprint of a TV guide article describes an unusual use of space testing equipment for medical applications. This brief but significant article is a dramatic demonstration of the importance of continuing development of space technology. This particular medical procedure is a spectacular one. There are many, many more which are less dramatic but equally important which have been derived from our national space program. It is one more example why the growth of technology is so essential to our well-being as a nation. Our national space effort represents one of the cornerstones of this advancement of technology so necessary to man's future well-being. The article follows:

[From the Reader's Digest, June 1972]

FICTION? NO, FACT

In "The Doctors" segment of the popular TV series "The Bold Ones," the action centered on a patient who had a bullet fragment lodged in an inoperable portion of his brain. The patient was safe only as long as he lay flat on his back. Sitting or standing would cause the fragment to shift its position, causing death. Then the doctors got, well, a *brainstorm*—centrifugal force! They took the patient to NASA's Ames Research Center at Moffet Field, Calif., and put him in the cab of the centrifuge—a high-speed whirling device used to test astronauts. Carefully watching the patient on a closed-circuit monitor, the doctors spun him around twice, first at four and then at six times the force of gravity, to move the fragment into a safer area of the brain. After the second spin, the patient was miraculously cured, and there were handshakes all around.

Far out? A scriptwriter's wierd idea? Well, this story is actually a recreation of "centrifuge therapy" performed by a seven-man team in 1968—at the same place, and with similar success.

POLICY STATEMENT ON ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION OFFERED BY UNION SPRINGS HIGH SCHOOL

HON. JOHN H. TERRY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, a desire to create a national concern for the environment has generated many different types of activities and programs. The Congress this year is developing a water quality program which hopefully will cleanse the waters of the United States in the next decade.

But all of the Government programs which have thus far been implemented cannot possibly solve the problem of environmental pollution without a positive commitment on the part of the American people to accomplish the same goal.

The question we should all be asking is, "How can public interest and understanding be generated?" The Union Springs Central School District in Cayuga County, New York State, has taken a position of national leadership in this matter.

On June 19, 1972, the board of education of the school district passed a "Policy Statement on Environmental Education." A member of that board, David G. Palmer, authored the statement after many hours of consultation with concerned environmentalists and educators.

Mr. Palmer, a member of the faculty of the State University College of Environmental Science and Forestry at Syracuse University, has received recognition from a variety of groups for the leadership he and the Board of Education have taken.

Included among the agencies and individuals lauding the policy statement have been the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service; New York Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller; New York State Department of Environmental Conservation Commissioner Henry L. Diamond; and New York State Education Commissioner Ewald B. Nyquist.

Rather than establishing a rigid curriculum for environmental education, the purpose of the statement is to encourage an attitude of concern for environmental issues on the part of the teaching staff, and to support innovation in the development of new programs and broad new approaches to instilling an environmental awareness in the children of this forward-looking school district.

The task of equipping our young people with a true knowledge of environmental problems, an understanding of their complexity, and a commitment to their resolution is a responsibility of tremendous proportion, but one that offers the greatest of all possible rewards—a contribution to the enhancement of our quality of life in this great land and on this great earth. The philosophical commitment and sense of responsibility of this school board is evident, and hopefully will be an inspiration to others.

It is with great pride in the Union Springs Community District that I include with these remarks a copy of the policy statement on environmental edu-

cation by the Union Springs Central School District Board of Education:

POLICY STATEMENT ON ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

The Board of Education recognizes that conditions must be maintained in our nation and world by which man and nature can continue in future generations to exist in productive harmony. In an era of accelerating population growth, with growing demands for food production, come construction and consumer goods, solutions to the problems of concomitant growth in environmental deterioration will pose a major challenge to our graduates of the '70's. Students who have been sensitized to these problems and motivated to constructive, responsible action, however, hopefully will contribute to a quality of life improvement—rather than its desecration—in the last quarter of this century. In the words of Thomas Jefferson, "The face and character of our country are determined by what we do with America and its resources . . ." In cognizance of the need for responsible attention to the problems associated with resource use and abuse, the Board herewith commits itself to the support of Environmental Education in our school system.

The goal is to assure the learning of a set of values that will lead every student to accept responsibility toward his natural surroundings and view the primary role of man as being the steward, rather than master, of his natural resources and physical environment.

The following suggestions are offered as guidelines for the development of programs to implement this policy.

1. Each teacher of every subject at all grade levels is encouraged to reinforce his or her understanding and appreciation of conservation and environmental issues, through individual initiative and effort, and through Board of Education-supported in service programs.

2. Within the bounds of individual teaching style and subject choice preference, teachers of all subjects and levels are encouraged to weave environmental concerns into other subject matter in ways comfortable and satisfying to the teacher and meaningful and relevant to the students.

3. Students should be encouraged to interact with one another and their teachers, sharing their observations and opinions on the need for wise, compatible uses of our air, water, soil, forest, mineral, fuel, wildlife, and human resources, and, where appropriate, to develop their attitudes of awareness and concern into meaningful and constructive action. The need for both social sensitivity and technical competence should be kept clear, however, and students should be caused to respect the complex social, economic and political constraints on the dynamics of change. Emphasis should be on rational, constructive, and respectful problem analyses and solution syntheses.

The administration shall assist and support the teaching staff in developing and coordinating programs and activities relevant to Environmental Education and the district principal shall schedule for Board review in the month of October an annual report of past and planned programs and activities, drawing upon the school principals, teaching staff and students, as ever their participation may be judged desirable.

OPINION POLL

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I

insert my July Minshall opinion poll in the RECORD.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

1. Do you support the President's pledge to withdraw all U.S. forces from Vietnam within 4 months after a cease-fire and release of our POW's?

2. Do you approve of the Strategic Arms Limitation Agreements signed by the President with the Soviet Union?

3. Should the United States officially recognize Cuba?

4. Do you favor complete amnesty for all who refused to serve in the Armed Forces during the Vietnam War?

5. Do you favor a Federal "no fault" automobile insurance law?

6. Should price controls be placed on all food products, starting with controls on farm prices?

7. Do you support a "redistribution of income" program, giving Federal cash payments to assure minimum annual incomes for low-pay and welfare recipients?

8. Do you favor a Federal law legalizing abortion?

9. Should the sale and use of marijuana be legalized?

10. Should the death penalty be abolished for all capital crimes?

11. Do you think charitable deductions should continue to be tax-free?

12. Should interest earned from state and municipal bonds be subject to Federal income tax?

13. Should business continue to receive a 7% incentive tax credit for new investments in plants and machinery?

14. Do you approve of a proposed \$2.9 billion Federal child day-care program?

15. If the 1972 presidential election were held today, who would be your choice for President?

16. What is the most important issue facing the Nation today?

Your Age:— Occupation:—
City and Ward:—

CONGRESSMAN ELWOOD H. HILLIS
COMMENDS THE ORDER OF AHEPA
ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY ON
JULY 26, 1972

HON. ELWOOD HILLIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. HILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the pride and success of the United States is attributed to many individuals, factions, and organizations. A government is of immense importance as an organization for the people. However, a nation must also be constructed of strong organizations within the people. In the United States, the Order of American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association is one such organization. Founded July 26, 1922, in Atlanta, Ga., the Order of Ahepa is celebrating its golden anniversary. With jurisdiction extending to 49 States, Canada and Australia, and 430 local chapters, AHEPA is dedicated to the improvement and betterment of social, moral, and family life in America.

During AHEPA's 50 years of existence, they have championed the cause of education, displayed benevolence and generosity to the stricken victims of disaster, and devoted themselves to civic responsibility and exemplary family men. The

order awards scholarships to worthy students on local, district, and national levels. During World War II, they sold \$500 million in U.S. war bonds. They also have participated in numerous relief programs for flood, hurricane, and earthquake victims.

The Order of Ahepa, promoting and encouraging loyalty to the United States of America, can be held partly responsible for the pride and success this Nation has achieved. All should unite in a celebration of their golden anniversary.

MORE ON WILFRED BURCHETT— WITH ALIASES

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, 1972, I presented an item from Mr. Edward Hunter's *Tactics*, dealing with Wilfred Burchett, journalist for the international Communist conspiracy. Today I would like to enter more on the subject of Burchett that deals with the effect that this individual has had directly on the contemporary foreign policy of the United States. An article from *Tactics* follows:

DESECRATION OF WHITE HOUSE OFFICES: KISSINGER AND BURCHETT CONFER

Wilfred Burchett, deprived of a passport by his native Australia because of his aid to the enemy during the Korean War, who seduced captive Americans into treason in the North Korean p.o.w. camps, has just been secretly welcomed into White House offices for consultation. This constitutes unparalleled desecration of the White House, more reprehensible even than an invitation would have been to Lord Haw Haw to come to the Executive Offices for consultation.

Lord Haw Haw broadcast enemy propaganda, but did not personally lure his countrymen and allied soldiers into treason, as did Burchett.

No agent of the President—indeed, no President—has the right to desecrate the White House and the executive offices in this manner. If this is the sort of price we already have to pay for President Nixon to be received in Peking, it is much, much too dishonorable. Surely, American veterans of the Korean War would have been foremost among those protesting, if this obscene act had not been perpetrated in secrecy.

"YOU'LL HANG, YOU'LL HANG"

Burchett, as a communist operative with the Chinese Reds in the Korean War, exploited his Australian nationality and journalistic skills on behalf of the enemy. British p.o.w.'s, who soon detected this, sang, "You'll hang... you'll hang," dangling cords tied like hangnooses, when he entered their prison camps. (See *"Brainwashing: From Pavlov to Powers,"* a book by this writer, and *Tactics* of Mar. 20, 1970.)

This was treason in any language, of course. Perhaps his most despicable operation was against American captives, already weakened by physical and mental terrorism. He provided the carrot part of the pressure techniques, while the Chinese Reds used the stick. Thus, germ warfare "confessions," edited or written out of whole cloth by Burchett, were spread world-wide through the mouths of the more or less brainwashed Americans.

He was persona non grata in Australia and not eligible for a U.S. visa after the war, of course, and dared not contest this for fear

of persecution. He worked in propaganda warfare for both Peking and Moscow.

He sought this diabolical employment himself. Yury Visilevich Krotkov, who recruited agents for the KGB, gave the details to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which it published in three volumes, entitled "Testimony of George Karlin," one of his cover names.

As U.S. News & World Report said Feb. 27, 1967, Burchett is "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 of getting his views widely distributed in the non-communist world."

Of course! He had the behind-the-scenes help of the red network.

Although he authored some of the most vicious books against the United States, venting his spleen in characteristic communist manner, such papers as the N.Y. Times covered up for him, while giving him a prestige as simply an Australian journalist with good contacts among the communists. He sure had, as their bought and paid for operative!

SEDUCER OF FREE GOVERNMENTS

This processed prestige enlarged his image, at first to that of a knowledgeable contact on communist affairs, and then to a sort of semi-official spokesman for red regimes. The press initially gave him this reputation, by asking him the views of Moscow and Peking, as at Panmunjom and Paris.

This suited the purposes of Moscow and Peking on such crucial military maneuvers as inducing the United States to cease its bombing of North Viet Nam, on the implied promise that Hanoi then would engage in "meaningful" negotiations to end the war.

Burchett's primary role since the Korean War has been in that area, to lull the United States and other free nations into actions that diplomatically or militarily push them towards defeat. He is worth whole red army divisions in this role.

As Counterattack wrote as long ago as Aug. 27, 1965, "What makes him effective is that he understands the extent to which he can depend upon pro-Soviet elements in the State Department to help him achieve the results expected by the Kremlin from the coordinated efforts of its far-flung apparatus."

And, as it correctly added, "There was no excuse for the foreign editor of any press association or metropolitan newspaper not to know who Wilfred Burchett was."

And as might now be added, there is no excuse for Henry A. Kissinger or any other occupant of the White House not to know who Wilfred Burchett was. They certainly should know, too, that to permit him into its offices is an obscenity. To do so, in colloquial language, is to ask to be "taken for a ride." This we are doing.

Significantly, Paul Scott's column of Nov. 12, 1970 said Kissinger "has been deeply involved in secret talks with Hanoi since early 1967 when he set up his own communication link with the North Vietnamese." Two "mysterious" French friends of Burchett were named as go-betweens.

Burchett attended the red hemispheric conference in Montreal in late 1968, where delegates—including Salvador Allende, Chile's present President—competed in pouring vitriol on the U.S.

Burchett was traveling on a Red Cuban passport. Legally, he was ineligible to enter the U.S., but this was secretly maneuvered for him by the State Department and Ramsey Clark at Justice. They granted him a waiver on the basis of his convenient credentials as U.N. correspondent for communist papers.

This scandal in the closing days of the Johnson administration aroused such protest that his visa was not renewed. But Burchett remained in New York long enough to be glorified by reds and the radical chic at a

rock music and propaganda affairs attended by such as Pete Seeger, Rap Brown, Herbert Marcuse and Bernardine Dohrn.

Burchett also travels on North Vietnamese and Cambodian "passports." Such incriminating documentation focuses attention on his virtual outlaw status in his native Australia, and is an obstacle to his clandestine operations.

DOUBLE-BARRELED MANEUVER

British libel laws are thorny affairs for the press, much more so than in the U.S. The new generation that has been indoctrinated as much as educated is mostly ignorant about the recent past. So Burchett in 1969 took advantage of an accurate article about him by the Australian correspondent, Denis Warner, to sue for libel.

He brazenly used journalism as a cover, denying his communist connections, depending on the passage of years and the rise of an appeasement climate to deprive the defense of witnesses who could testify to his treason. If he could regain his Australian passport, his use as a red agent would be immensely increased. In addition, the whole, red network would be enormously benefited. If so obvious a communist operative could win a costly libel suit, an invaluable immunity would be conferred on red agents generally. No newspaper would dare identify any such enemy of the state. Indeed, the mere filing of such a suit has such an impact, for it puts the defense to great expense and inconvenience.

What Burchett had not anticipated was that a KGB officer who had participated in his recruiting would defect and lay the details out in the open for all the world to read. This is what Krotkov did. Also, enough ex-p.o.w.'s were located who had personal knowledge of Burchett's activities to verify the worst.

The expectation appeared well grounded that Burchett, confronted by such damning evidence, would not bring the case to trial, but let it fade away. Even a change in government in Australia was insufficient to alter this prospect. Burchett's last effort was a skillfully devised entry into Australia to provide the setting for a trial favorable to him. He wrote a book, "Passport," timed to help create the needed propaganda climate. But it all was to no avail; indignation and an adverse decision by the new Prime Minister, John Gorton, maintained intact the decision not to grant him an Australian passport. This obviously was Burchett's decisive defeat. He left Australia in a short while, his mission unsuccessful. No, there would be no use for him to press his libel suit.

Then President Nixon announced a projected trip to Peking. Kissinger was in Peking! And he went back to Peking when the United Nations was deciding if Free China were to be double-crossed, as it had been at Yalta. Kissinger certainly was saying something by his presence in the Red Chinese capital, and the United Nations clearly read the message.

Such cryptic symbolism can be overdone, or be difficult to control, and so it was in this case. Red China was to be let in, but the expulsion of Free China was to be delayed a year or so, anyway until after the American elections, so that the Machiavellian intrigue not show up so baldly as a deceit in our domestic politics and a betrayal in our international affairs.

The U.N. diplomats, friends and foes alike, reacted like school children when teacher leaves the room during a test. They copied not only the answers they were supposed to give, but some that belonged to a future examination. No wonder Nixon became indignant! The Red Chinese now held all the trump cards on his forthcoming visit to Peking.

HUSHED-UP S.I.S.S. TESTIMONY

Krotkov defected to the British, and told them plenty, although little was released to

the press. He then went to the United States, where the alert Senate Internal Security Subcommittee subpoenaed him. He was put under intensive questioning, also in secrecy, on Nov. 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13, 18, 24, 1969 and on Mar. 9, 1970. Early in January the next year, the testimony was published in three booklets, altogether 258 pages, along with 19 pages of indexes, in each of which Burchett's name appeared.

Burchett's lawyers, having heard of this, were giving every evidence of letting the case be quietly forgotten. But the scare created by the brazen suit was not being forgotten so easily, especially with a press that had been conditioned by the anti-anti-communist propaganda climate.

Krotkov's revelations about Burchett certainly were legitimate news for Australia in particular. A copy of the testimony had been promptly sent there and was in the hands of editors. Australian correspondents in Washington were informed. Yet nothing appeared in any Australian publication.

Nothing appeared in England, either. Burchett had sued there, too. But as the first suit was filed in the Supreme Court of Victoria, against Warner and the Melbourne Herald, the defense argued that the case first should be tried in Australia, and then in London. Burchett preferred London as a softer push, but the court disagreed with him.

Fortunately, one British paper—the Telegram in Toronto, Canada—was courageous enough to run a story about Burchett, revealing the Krotkov disclosures. The writer was Peter Worthington, one of the country's finest correspondents, with service worldwide, including assignment to Moscow.

Worthington pointed out that Burchett's "country won't let him come home, even to visit," because, as a succession of Australian governments declare, "he had severed all connections with Australia." Burchett managed a quick trip in early 1970, flying to Noumea, capital of French New Caledonia, where a maverick Australia publisher sent his own plane to bring him in, presenting the government with a fait accompli. Burchett's reception was such that he soon left, again without any Australian identity documents.

This is the man Kissinger honored by receiving him in the White House's executive offices.

No man has the right to thus dishonor our executive offices, irrespective of technicalities. It is an affront to the nation, especially to every man who saw service in Korea. Burchett had no right in the U.S.

Obviously, no Australian newspaper dared print the Krotkov testimony without it being accorded privileged status in that country, too. Finally, late 1971, it was read into the Australian Senate's Record, the Senate being less newsmaking and influential in that land than its House of Representatives.

But by then, Nixon stunned all of Asia by his behavior, and what would have had great impact only a while before caused hardly a ripple. One Sydney newspaper used a few paragraphs; every other daily in Australia ignored this important development.

What appeared particularly incomprehensible to the informed abroad was how the American President "seems to have turned his back on his own advice," to use the words of a knowledgeable Australian contact.

Nixon had talked to the Australian ambassador, Sir James Plimsoll, regarding how important it was to convince the Japanese that they had friends, then had forced Tokyo into circumstances where it could lose all faith in U.S. credibility. The contact wrote:

"Surely, no one in Washington can believe that a 'friendly' Communist China would be more valuable to the U.S. than a friendly Japan."

BURCHETT "INTERVIEWED" IN N.Y.

One letter from an Australian contact contained this startling statement: "Wilfred Burchett is now interviewed frequently in New York by the Australian Broadcasting Commission, the Australian equivalent of the B.B.C., as the distinguished Australian correspondent. He writes a regular weekly column for a widely read Sunday newspaper—no word, of course, about his past and present connections."

This sounded inconceivable at the time. Burchett did send dispatches regularly to The Guardian in New York, and these might have been meant. Surely some paper would have discovered his presence in the U.S. and reported it, as had been done in the Johnson administration.

Indeed, a Washington Post dispatch by Robert H. Estabrook from the United Nations, published Nov. 30, 1968, reported Burchett's requests for a visa to the U.S., pointing out that "his real purpose may be to establish contact with putative officials of the Nixon administration on behalf of North Vietnam." The dispatch added:

"It is suggested that he may have been encouraged by Ambassador Averell Harriman or other members of the American negotiating team in Paris.

"Speculation here holds that Burchett may attempt to be a contact man for the Vietnamese National Liberation Front, or Vietcong."

His appearance at the National Guardian rally "would plainly violate the terms of a restricted visa," the dispatch said.

But law, as is obvious nowadays, is merely a matter of doubletalk and semantics in Washington when communist "accommodation" is involved.

This obviously well-informed correspondent pointed out, too, that Burchett had credentials from the "leftwing Paris monthly magazine," L'Evenement, but: "Some authorities question, however, whether L'Evenement is in a financial position to pay the expenses of a special correspondent here." Of course, it wasn't. Whatever the channels, he was being paid by the red network.

COMMUNIST TAG EVADED

A curious sidelight into the conditioned extremes to which such papers go to avoid pinpointing communism is that this revealing article, in referring to Burchett, describes him merely as "an Australian-born journalist frequently in Hanoi." This fits into Burchett's doubletalk. He admits his pro-communism, but insists he is just a reporter. He is a reporter in the red sense. This is being put across as "advocacy reporting" in the United States, a cover for red propaganda.

When Burchett came, the N.Y. Times said he was "an Australian journalist often regarded as an unofficial spokesman for Hanoi, and that he possessed 'a reputation for courage and resourcefulness . . .'" No mention of his allout communism and his allout attacks upon the United States!

Confirmation of Burchett's sly entry into the United States, accorded the smooth secrecy by the Nixon administration that the Johnson administration was unable to give him, was not slow in coming. Combat, a semi-monthly newsletter put out by National Review, Inc., in its Nov. 15 issue, referred to Burchett as occupying table 56 at the Oct. 29 meeting in New York of the Fund for Peace. The State and Justice Departments had secretly waived the law that justifiably deprived him of a visa, while the press looked the other way.

Participation in such a program was an obscene act, but Sen. Edward Kennedy and former Chief Justice Earl Warren were among the speakers. Others attending included additional red agents and leading red propagandists from abroad, and—of course—the usual "sick" or knowledgeable coterie of the

radical chic. The term used to be "fellow traveler."

KISSINGER THE KEY TO IT

An informed Australian contact on Nov. 24 sent a letter that solved the mystery of the red agent's trip to the United States, in spite of legal barriers. Kissinger wanted it!

The letter enclosed an article in the Melbourne Age of that day, written by Bruce Grant, "regarded as the leading commentator in this country . . . what he has to say has wide acceptance."

The information was leaked by the Department of Foreign Affairs in Canberra, where Burchett has a number of supporters. (How like our State Department!) The article is headlined, "What Did Dr. Kissinger Tell Wilfred Burchett?" Here is its start:

"A piquant incident to delight connoisseurs of the diplomatic game. On Oct. 19, the Australian journalist Wilfred Burchett, who is an outlaw in the eyes of the Australian government, met secretly with the architect of American foreign policy, Henry Kissinger.

"The meeting took place at Dr. Kissinger's invitation. Mr. Burchett was at the United Nations, with an American visa which confined his movements within a 25-mile radius of New York. He was told to forget the restriction and come to Washington. What has been described as 'a long and detailed talk' took place, over breakfast, in Dr. Kissinger's office.

"It is believed in diplomatic circles in Canberra, where accounts of the meeting are circulating, that a report of it was sent to the Department of Foreign Affairs, either from Washington or, as Mr. Burchett later mentioned his discussions with Dr. Kissinger in the presence of diplomats at a reception given by the Bulgarian mission to the UN, from New York. But inquiries at the department could not confirm this.

"The fact of the meeting, however, is established and, in itself, is interesting enough."

A SALUTE TO AHEPA ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. LAMAR BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, July is anniversary month for the order of Ahepa, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to this fine organization and its members as they mark a golden anniversary on July 26, 1972.

In its 50 years of service and accomplishment, AHEPA has become an established fraternal organization whose members of Greek descent have joined hands in their adopted land to promote patriotism, citizenship responsibility, and good fellowship through the common bond of their heritage and the strength of their family ties.

For its record of success, AHEPA deserves our highest respect and it is fitting that we extend every recognition on the occasion of this 50th anniversary. On the basis of the solid foundation it has laid in its first half-century of existence, it is normal to predict an even wider range of accomplishments in the years ahead.

Tennessee is the home of some strong local chapters and I especially want to

pay tribute to the Chattanooga lodge and these officers: James Wilson, president; Paul A. Georgeson, vice president; Nicholas P. Mitchell, secretary; Gus Pete Gulas, treasurer, and Rev. Nikiforos Maximos, corresponding secretary.

My admiration for the sons and daughters of Greece is exemplified in my own personal secretary, Miss Ethel Dimopoulos and her fine family of Chattanooga. They are an example to all of us in love of family, devotion to God and country and abundant faith in the goodness of life.

REVENUE SHARING

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the House has recently passed the controversial program termed "revenue sharing."

It has been promoted as a means of helping local governments solve their problems. Naturally, it has been difficult to go against the tide of those who think they are getting something for nothing.

But the money for revenue sharing is going to come from somewhere.

Where? Either from increased taxes or increased Federal deficits.

I voted against and spoke against its passage. I hope it does not become law. In that regard, I would like to have reprinted a very thoughtful editorial from the Palatka Daily News of Palatka, Fla., that I think expresses the feelings of a great many Americans. The editorial is as follows:

REVENUE SHARING

To ask the nation's mayors if they favor a program to share federal revenue with the cities is akin to asking a youngster if he wants a candy bar.

So it is small wonder the mayors, have endorsed revenue-sharing.

They harbor dreams of federal money coming for them to spend without requiring additional or higher local taxes.

What could be sweeter?

To begin with, the term, revenue-sharing, is a misnomer.

The truth is, there isn't any federal revenue to share.

Congress is spending federal tax money faster than it can collect it.

The federal debt limit now is \$450 billion. Congress will be expected to increase this by at least \$15 billion, bringing the total red figure to \$465 billion.

What revenue-sharing really means today is share federal borrowing.

No city's mayor would be foolish enough to endorse that.

The U.S. House of Representatives responded to persistent pressure by many state and local officials by passing the so-called revenue-sharing bill by a vote of 274-122.

It was little more than a surrender to an election year.

If approved by the Senate and signed by the President in its present form, \$1.8 billion would be distributed to states and \$3.5 billion to cities and other local governments.

State shares would increase by \$300 million in each of the next four years.

If the day ever comes when the federal government is solvent and the federal debt is being decreased, perhaps the program to share federal revenues with local govern-

ments will have some appealing merit—not mere political persuasion.

If the federal government has money to share, it would be better shared with the earning citizens of the county in the form of a sorely needed federal income tax cut.

SECRETARY-GENERAL ADDRESSES THE ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, since 1963 the Organization of African Unity has provided an extraordinary forum for the Pan Africanist aspirations of black and brown Africa. Despite regional and linguistic differences of the separate states, the OAU represents a constructive attempt toward the goal of continental cooperation in dealing with the economic and social problems of development.

Since its inception of the organization has been responsible for progressive programs in the field of education, culture, and the sciences. It has coordinated efforts to collectively defend the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the independent African states and has been outspoken in its denunciation of all forms of colonialism, the heinous systems of apartheid, and vestiges of racial discrimination. Indeed, the OAU continues to be a symbolic clenched fist for independence for third world nations and peoples.

The aspirations and achievements of the OAU have particular significance to those of us in the United States who share the rich and proud heritage of the African past. Because of our warm association with the African peoples, and the belief in and commitment to our mutual struggle for freedom, I submit for the RECORD the address of U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim to the historic ninth assembly of heads of state and government of the Organization of African Unity which was delivered in Rabat, Morocco, on June 12, 1972:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY-GENERAL TO NINTH ASSEMBLY OF HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT OF ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

It is a great honour for me to be invited to address the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the Organization of African Unity. I greatly appreciate this privilege which gives me an opportunity to strengthen the close and fruitful relations which have been established between the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity. I also wish to express my profound gratitude to His Majesty King Hassan II for the warm welcome and the generous hospitality which he has extended to us. The fact that this important meeting is being held at Rabat is concrete proof of the active and constructive role which Morocco is playing in the affairs of this great continent under the distinguished guidance of His Majesty.

As representative of my country to the United Nations, I took part for many years in discussions of African problems and in the decisions resulting from them. I was thus able to establish close contacts with the African Group and various missions enabled me to visit many of your countries. My first

visit, shortly after my appointment to the post of Secretary-General of the United Nations, took me to Africa at the time when the Security Council held its historic session in Addis Ababa. Then I had the opportunity of establishing personal contact with His Excellency Mr. Moktar Ould Daddah, President of the Organization of African Unity. I wish to pay a tribute to him for having contributed so remarkably to the strengthening of collaboration between the OAU and the United Nations. Since my visit to Addis Ababa, I went a second time to Africa to fulfill a task entrusted to me by the Security Council and I was able to gather first-hand information about one of the most important problems of Africa: that of Namibia. Today, I find myself on African soil for the third time in less than six months, but this is the first time that I have the privilege of taking part in a meeting of Heads of State and Government of the independent countries of Africa.

I am very happy to have been long associated with African affairs for thus I understand so much the better the problems of this great continent. I have followed very closely the position of Africa in the United Nations, its hopes and its disappointments, which reflect certain of the main historical trends of our time.

The great changes which the world has undergone in the last twenty-five years from the point of view of political progress and human justice have all concerned Africa and have left deep marks upon it. Whether we are dealing with independence, racial equality, economic and social progress or international solidarity—in all these fields—the world and Africa have accomplished remarkable progress, but, in all these fields too, we have encountered obstacles and delays which are the cause of most of our present difficulties. The emergence of an independent African continent made up of sovereign States marks the culmination of a historical process in which the efforts of peoples have been decisive. This process has benefited from the general acceptance of the principles set forth in the Charter and from the aid and support provided through the United Nations.

Many countries have achieved independence by peaceful means but we still have the bitter memory of bloodshed and useless wars. What would be our joy and relief if I could state today that the whole of Africa is free and independent! The march of progress and independence has encountered several obstacles which today unduly retard, at the cost of much suffering, an inevitable historical development. I refer more particularly to the situation in Angola, Mozambique, Guinea (Bissau), Southern Rhodesia and Namibia. Sooner or later, this process will be completed by peaceful means or by force.

In our interdependent world there is no nation which can for ever resist the profound changes whose legitimacy is recognized by the international community. Whatever the impression which may be created by recourse to arms and to force, the chances are against those countries which persist in going against the current of history. Who does not rejoice today at the independence achieved in Africa in the last 20 years? Indeed, the relations of friendship of today are vastly preferable to the colonial links of yesterday, and it is a fact that in countries where independence has been acquired by peaceful means friendship and co-operation in economic and cultural matters have remained the most profound and the most fruitful.

Is it so impossible to draw a lesson from this example and to weigh the advantages of implementing similar policies? The aid of all countries is necessary to build a better and more peaceful world. Each country must make its contribution in order to benefit from the whole of the progress accomplished. There can be no splendid isolation but only miserable isolation.

Last February, the Security Council en-

trusted me with a mission concerning Namibia. In a resolution adopted at Addis Ababa, the Security Council invited me, in consultation and close co-operation with a group composed of three representatives of members of the Security Council, to initiate as soon as possible contacts with all parties concerned, with a view to establishing the necessary conditions so as to enable the people of Namibia to exercise their right to self-determination and independence of their territory. In pursuance of this mandate, I established contacts with the South African Government and I also went to Namibia. During my stay in Namibia, I was able to hear the views of various groups of the population of that Territory. The contacts established with the Government of South Africa during my stay in Cape Town were continued recently during a visit to New York by the South African Minister for Foreign Affairs. I also established contact with a certain number of other interested parties. These meetings took place in close consultation with the group of three members of the Security Council. I have kept Mr. Ould Daddah, President of the OAU, informed of the contacts which I have had so far. In conformity with the Security Council resolution, I shall submit my report to the Council before the end of July 1972. I cannot now foresee the results of these moves, but I hope sincerely that these contacts will allow us to achieve the progress necessary for a peaceful solution of the question of Namibia based on the self-determination and independence of the people of that Territory.

During the last 25 years, considerable progress has been achieved with a view to achieving racial equality and justice, principles established in the United Nations Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The moral pressure, the exhortations and the influence of the United Nations on world public opinion have played an essential role. The peoples of the world could not have received a better example than the qualities of statesmanship shown by the leaders and representatives of your countries both at the United Nations itself and in the performance of their numerous activities. Racial prejudice has lost ground considerably in the minds of many people because we have seen men and women from all continents and all races working together in conditions of perfect equality. What is more, instantaneous communications have made public opinion a powerful political force.

Today, public opinion is fully aware of and concerned about the vestiges of racism and *apartheid* which still persist in southern Africa. As in the case of colonialism, we are confronted with an irreversible tide of history. Racial equality will become a reality. If we are to prevent violence, whether at the national or at the international level, we must continue to call on those concerned to change their policies and to realize what stage mankind had reached in its history. This movement will also continue without losing force. The anxiety of world public opinion will increase. If no progress is made, the only outcome will be violence, isolation and ostracism.

It is, perhaps, in the economic and social field that the United Nations has best succeeded in helping your continent and that the achievements have been least disappointing.

It is heartening to think that the programmes of the United Nations, its humanitarian assistance and the efforts of the specialized agencies and the Economic Commission for Africa have made it possible to shorten considerably the period of apprenticeship and building-up of the new independent countries of Africa, which have been forced in so short a time to cope with so many problems.

Multilateral activities have lent you support in all aspects of economic and social development, from economic planning to education, from agriculture and industry to tourism and the preservation of your heritage. Much still remains to be done. I might mention in particular the additional economic progress and the increased strength which Africa could have if its last colonial territories were independent and if friendship, freedom, respect for the human person and co-operation extended to the entire continent.

The opportunities which lie before Africa are so great, and its independent role is so necessary to the world, that we must express our deep disappointment and our deep regret at the unnecessary obstacles still standing in the way of the unity of the continent. We have a duty to do all in our power to eliminate these obstacles.

Africa has done much to develop world solidarity through its attitude, its initiatives and the place which it occupies in the United Nations. The establishment of your Organization, nine years ago, undoubtedly brought significant support to the United Nations. Africa has achieved the lofty ambition of drawing up common arrangements and creating a common regional political organization for the 41 independent countries comprising the continent. From the standpoint of the United Nations Charter, your Organization is one of the most dynamic and most effective of the regional agencies. You have some remarkable achievements to your credit where the maintenance of regional peace and security is concerned, and your role in those activities through which the United Nations discharges its world-wide responsibilities with respect to the maintenance of peace and the pacific settlement of disputes merits due recognition.

Your Organization has been wise enough to resort to novel methods of negotiation, mediation, conciliation and arbitration which have thus far enabled it to make an active contribution to the pacific settlement of any disputes that may have arisen among its member States, whether in the form of frontier disputes, friction between neighbouring States, or domestic conflicts which could well have jeopardized regional or international peace. It has succeeded in carrying out its noble mission of maintaining peace in Africa and subsequently devising machinery of its own which should enable disputes between Africans to be settled peacefully and within an African framework.

In view of these achievements, it can be said that OAU has proved to be the best support of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security in the African continent. Thus, the present session of OAU opened in an atmosphere of reconciliation, which is an excellent augury for the future. Your Organization has not restricted its activities to the solution of regional problems. Everyone knows the efforts you have made in connexion with the Middle East. I was particularly impressed by the spirit in which President Moktar Ould Daddah, Chairman of the Committee of Ten on the Middle East, and President Senghor, Chairman of the Sub-Committee, and their colleagues, carried out the mission entrusted to them. They spared no effort in seeking a solution, and I should like to render a cordial tribute to them.

If, however, the States of Africa have unreservedly accepted the objectives of the United Nations Charter and the rules of solidarity which it contains, there is cause to wonder whether the other countries of the world have displayed all the solidarity which they should towards their African brethren. The fact that we seem to be in an impasse with regard to the majority of the most burning problems of Africa is due

not only to the failure of the Governments directly addressed in the relevant General Assembly and Security Council resolutions to implement them, but also to the failure of the international community to concert its efforts and mobilize effectively all the resources available to it.

Even the mandatory sanctions voted by the Security Council have not had the intended effect because certain Member States did not apply them. I should therefore like to appeal urgently to all the countries concerned to reconsider the position they have adopted with regard to the problems of Africa. Addressing myself first to the countries responsible for this state of affairs, I should like to urge them to change their outlook and their policies and to opt for the path of co-operation. This would be in the interests not only of Africans but also of those countries themselves and the entire world.

So far as the other members of the international community are concerned, I should like to impress on them that these problems do not concern Africa alone; they involve such fundamental concepts as trust in the United Nations, the credit which can be accorded to it and the faith which can be placed in its deliberations.

When taking up my duties as Secretary-General of the United Nations, I said that the Organization was at a cross-road and that its results in the political field had not brought it as much prestige as it might enjoy. Whenever there is conflict, suffering or injustice, whether in connexion with the bloody war in Viet-Nam, the unresolved conflict in the Middle East or the burning problems of southern Africa, we hear the question: "Why is the United Nations not doing anything?". I also said that I am determined to do everything in my power with regard to these problems, because I believe that the world community has a duty to shoulder its responsibilities, failing which it will be impossible to restore confidence in the Organization.

I shall work towards that goal and I shall untrudgingly offer my services in helping to resolve any problem, at any time and in any form. However, that alone cannot suffice. What we need more than anything is the co-operation and help of all Member States, their determination and their solidarity. I know that the problems which continue to arise in Africa are of the greatest importance to the United Nations, and you will therefore understand the priority which I attach to solving them.

The time has come for new and sustained efforts, and with renewed energy on the part of all of us we shall find the paths which lead to success.

The United Nations derives its strength from the collective support of all its Members. I am aware of the positive contribution which your Assembly had made to our common endeavour. I am sure that, given the necessary wisdom, courage and co-operation, we shall succeed in bringing peace and justice to the continent of Africa.

HIDE EXPORT LIMITATION UNWISE

HON. FRED SCHWENDEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. SCHWENDEL. Mr. Speaker, the recent imposition of limitations on the export of cattle hides in my opinion was unwise.

I have written a letter to Secretary

of Commerce, Peter Peterson, outlining my views.

The letter follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., July 20, 1972.

HON. PETER PETERSON,
Secretary, Department of Commerce, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The action taken last week to curb export of cattle hides, in my opinion, was a mistake. It was a mistake for several reasons.

First, my own deep commitment to what I call the fifth great freedom—the freedom of movement of men and goods, is offended by the export restrictions. Agriculture has prospered because of this important freedom. Agricultural exports are important to a strong rural economy. By limiting hide exports, farmers are penalized unfairly for their own initiative. When hide prices were low domestically, an extensive effort was made to develop overseas markets. This was encouraged by your own department. Now, because they have done such a good job, they are being penalized. Businesses get awards for export excellence—farmers apparently are being asked to sacrifice.

Second, the impact of the action on domestic shoe prices is likely to be minimal. You must be aware that in the average pair of men's dress shoes only 5% of the retail price is attributable to raw hide. As a result the cost per pair of shoes will probably not be reduced by more than five or ten cents. However, the impact on cattle prices, as seen already this week, will be more substantial.

Third, in view of our balance of payments and trade deficit, it is almost incredible to me that we are limiting exports. It seems to me that at this point in time we would be doing everything we could to expand our export markets. To restrict hide exports certainly will worsen our balance of payments problem.

It is my strong recommendation that you reconsider your decision and remove the hide export restrictions.

Thank you for considering my point of view.

Sincerely yours,

FRED SCHWENDEL,
Member of Congress.

"E-STAR" AWARD

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my heartiest congratulations to Air-Sea Forwarders, Inc., of Los Angeles, and its president, Mr. Erwin Rautenberg, who recently were named to receive President Nixon's "E-Star" Award for export service in building U.S. foreign trade. Their work as international freight forwarders and customhouse brokers providing transportation, documentation, and advisory services for air and ocean freight export and import shipping operations is surely deserving of commendation.

Air-Sea Forwarders, Inc.'s record of steady growth and outstanding service has helped to make the export business more efficient, and in doing so, has helped to strengthen our entire economy. They have also greatly benefited the local economy by developing specialized handling

techniques for the principal exports of the southern California area: Aircraft, electronics, aerospace, and related commodities. These new techniques have greatly enhanced the export market of these fortunate industries.

The "E-Star" Award, the second in the company's history, is something that Air-Sea Forwarders and Mr. Rautenberg can certainly be proud of. I hope that my colleagues will join with me in commending them and in wishing them the best of luck in the years to come.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the observance of Captive Nations Week, a week when we here in Congress and Americans throughout the Nation pause to reflect upon the plight of over 100 million East and Central Europeans who live under the tyranny of communism.

The 1972 observance of Captive Nations Week, the 13th anniversary of this event, is of particular importance. In light of the recent riots in Lithuania, the driver for emigration to Israel by the Soviet Jewry, and the reported cultural and religious repressions in the Ukraine, there can be little doubt that the urge for freedom still burns among the captive people of Europe.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, it is ever more important for those of us who are fortunate enough to live under freedom and liberty to stand today to give our encouragement and support to these brave people. In doing so, we reaffirm our traditional convictions in support of all oppressed people and in opposition to all forms of tyranny.

During the past 25 years since the end of World War II, many things have changed on the international scene. We have witnessed the dawn of the nuclear age; an age which has drastically altered the perceptions and the options of modern diplomacy.

However, even today, as we move toward improved relations with the U.S.S.R. on various fronts such as economic trade and military disarmament there is one thing which has not changed. That one thing is the hopes, dreams, and aspirations of millions of captive people who yearn to be free.

It is quite proper and indeed necessary that during this week of reflection we let it be known to the captive nations that there is one more aspect of international affairs that has yet to change. That is that the sympathy and support of the American people for the captive nations still remains true and strong.

I am confident that this conviction will continue to remain firm until that day when independence returns once more to East Europe.

McGOVERN: DECENT AND FORTH-
RIGHT

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to share with our colleagues a recent editorial in the Sacramento Bee praising Senator GEORGE McGOVERN and bringing to light the things that the Senator holds foremost in his bid for the Presidency:

McGOVERN'S TASK: TO BRIDGE GAPS, RECON-
CILE DIFFERENCES IN AMERICA

Decent and forthright are the adjectives most often used to describe Sen. George McGovern. And decency and forthrightness are what America saw in the Democratic nominee for president as he sought his party's endorsement in the primaries, and when he won it in Miami Beach.

McGovern has made a commitment to a better America. His candidacy encourages people heretofore ignored and forgotten by the political process. He has raised the right issues and asked the right questions. He has shown himself to be a part of a new awakening in America—the insistence on a direct approach, the demand for honesty in assessing the nature of the problems and in saying what needs to be done to solve them.

The 1972 nominee clearly indicated the kind of campaign he intends to conduct: He intends to take the fight to Richard Nixon and against government by decree, behind closed doors; against the use of the White House to intimidate opposition; and for the return of government "to the people." He entered the fight optimistically. To paraphrase, he said: Do not doubt the ability of Democrats to unite—the campaign now is against Richard Nixon. The issues, as he counted them off one by one: The ending of the war in Indochina; meaningful tax reform; the fullest employment opportunity; the end to privilege for the few; broader citizen participation in government; reconciliation of the divided at home and rebuilding within. Above all, he made it clear the biggest campaign issue of all will be Richard Nixon. And so did his young running mate, US Sen. Thomas Eagleton of Missouri.

The South Dakota senator fought hard for the nomination. When the final challenge for delegates came at the convention, McGovern met it with honor and with reasonableness. Once certain of victory, he was openly conciliatory toward the opposition. His conduct shows what we may expect from him as a candidate and, should he win, as a president.

There are, of course, sharp differences to be resolved in the Democratic party. Conflict is inevitable when a party tries to revitalize itself. But divided as the party is coming out of the convention, the great unifier for Democrats is Richard Nixon.

In the campaign ahead, McGovern will face a President who is a consummate politician ready to employ the prestige of the White House to the utmost. Consider the Nixon 1972 campaign slogan: "Re-elect the President."

To accommodate the various elements in McGovern's own party, there is certain to be some taming of his position-paper view. Large parts of his program on taxes, welfare, defense and foreign policy, as it has been unveiled on the dead run in the hectic primary campaign, are susceptible to serious misunderstanding.

McGovern must not let himself be a victim in the fall campaign of impressions and

distorted images allowed to grow in the spring under the particular pressures of the various primaries.

To bring the country together, McGovern will have to bridge the jagged gap between the class and age groups and deal with the crucial problem of alienation of the people.

In his proposed solutions to problems McGovern is neither a radical ideologue nor a martyr. He is a pragmatic politician willing to readjust the details of his economic and social programs as long as their basic direction is not compromised.

The campaign ahead will test McGovern's ability to relate to a broad enough range of Democrats, Republicans and just plain voters to become the next president of the United States.

NINETY PERCENT FORGIVENESS OF DISASTER LOANS

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, in the not too distant future, the Congress will be considering disaster relief legislation stemming from the terrible tragedies in my hometown of Rapid City, S. Dak., and on the east coast in the wake of Agnes.

In Rapid City, we have completed the initial cleanup work. We now face the long, hard uphill battle to bring our community, our homes, our businesses and our lives back to normal.

We have borne the burden of grief, and we are now faced with another, lingering, long-term and damaging burden—the economic disaster brought about by the flood.

We had more than a thousand jobs, upward of 5,000 homes, and hundreds of businesses either completely destroyed or severely damaged.

When you consider that all of this damage fell on a population of fewer than 100,000 people, and when you consider that the area has been in something of an economic doldrum even without the flood, you begin to understand the proportions of need I am describing.

The flood cut a swath right through the middle of town—and right through the middle of our economy.

The bills which Congress will consider include lowering the interest rate of Small Business Administration disaster loans—more than likely to 1 percent.

So doing is essential, decent, sane and urgently needed.

In addition, the bills will contemplate some sort of grant or forgiveness of loans. Presently up to \$2,500 of a disaster loan may be forgiven. That \$2,500 is simply not enough. It is not enough for the thousands of homeowners who face the prospect of rebuilding in a depressed economy and shouldering a double mortgage. It is not enough for the businessman who had everything but his debts eliminated by the flood.

We are asking for up to 90 percent forgiveness of disaster loans. At first this seems wild and expensive. But I believe it is fully justified. In my own State, a 90 percent forgiveness feature would cost

the Government roughly \$45 million—not even a third of what we have given to foreign governments for disasters in the past 6 years.

More importantly, the people want it and need it.

Mrs. Ronald Guy is a typical homeowner from Rapid City who lost her home in the flood. I ask permission to insert a letter she sent to President Nixon describing her predicament.

I believe Mrs. Guy makes a persuasive case for passage of 90 percent forgiveness of disaster loans. Her letter:

RAPID CITY, S. DAK.,
June 17, 1972.

RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A week and a day has passed since the unbelievable flood hit our Rapid City. I am certain that you have followed the reports closely, and I will be seeing Mrs. Nixon at the Memorial Service tomorrow evening. My prime reason for writing is to let you know that I talked with Gov. Kneip on Thursday, and spent one half hour visiting with Mr. Ron Schreiner, his Sec. with him at the present time. These are a few points that he felt would be worthy of a letter to you.

We are the parents of six children, ranging in age from 5 years to 13 years. We were living in a home that still holds a mortgage of \$25,000 and my husband is a Medical Representative for Lederle Labs, a division of American Cyanamid Co. We are alive, getting our children to dry land approximately seven minutes before the wall of water destroyed our home, cars (2), and all of our personal belongings. We are truly thankful for our lives, and the Wm. Westerdahl family, for whom we are now residing, until we find housing.

My husband and friends have worked 12 hours a day since last Saturday shoveling out 3 to 4 feet of mud and silt from every room of our four level home. The garage and utility room were pulled away from the house, all electrical wiring, water pipes, etc. gone. We live in an area where homes were selling for between \$30,000 and \$50,000 approximately 200 feet from the creek. For every 10 families that are working around the clock trying to salvage what we can, there are two or three that don't care, and won't do anything. Our home has been tagged with a Black and White card that says "Less than 50% damage to building, unsafe to live in, but can be repaired if you wish." Just because it is on the foundation they say less than 50%.

We are most grateful to the Red Cross, who has done a most remarkable job, and we know that your Representatives are here doing what they can. We also know that the Home Owners are needing help the most desperately, and as of now there is no federal program that can help me. Gov. Kneip's Secretary told us that grants have been given to replace the parks, roads etc., and I am in favor of that—but Mr. President, nobody can tell me that Canyon Lake Park is more important than a home for our six children, and the hundreds of others that are homeless. We have made application for H.U.D. housing, which is rent free for a year. Hopefully, we will get one and will be thankful. But what then?

As of today, after visiting with our banker, H.U.D. Reps., S.B.A. Reps., Insurance People, etc., this is the situation that we homeowners face. Of the 1200 homes damaged or destroyed, 40 homes carried flood insurance, as it was not available in Rapid City until last fall—at all. Our present payments on our mortgage are \$297/mo. S.B.A. will loan us

\$25,000 to pay off this present mortgage, which we are 100 per cent responsible for, and \$25,000 to build a new home (for 8 people). We would owe then \$50,000 at 5 1/2% interest for 30 years. This would make our monthly payments approximately \$610/mo. . . . No way can we do this on a salary of less than \$1000 per month. We would then have payments, six children and no personal belongings. We still have a job but what good would it be? There are hundreds of people who had nothing to begin with, have nothing left, and still owe money on their mortgage. This is what they keep telling us on the radio is the federal funding that will help everyone who was in the flood area. Who are they giving money to? For every 10 of us that will try, and will be bound for the rest of our lives, there will be 25 who will walk away from it, claim bankruptcy and not care. Where is the Justice?

Thank you for your consideration. We must keep stressing the fact that we are very thankful that our family is safe. Many of our neighbors and friends are gone, so we have much. On behalf of the many homeowners in our immediate area, I am asking for your help.

Very respectfully,
Mrs. RONALD E. GUY.

FOR A SPECIAL ORDER ON THE OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, this 13th observance of Captive Nations Week should remind each of us in this Chamber that we have responsibilities both as legislators and as Americans toward millions of people unwillingly subjected to Communist rule throughout the world.

In this era of summitry, of complex arms reductions pacts and of spectacular Presidential visits to China and Russia, it is incumbent on us to remember those people who are in but not of the Communist world, who are captive in a red world as much as their leaders are captive of a godless ideology, and who are as much our constituents as are our own free people.

This year we have seen some changes in the treatment of such peoples—in the particular case of some of the thousands of Jewish peoples wishing to leave the Soviet Union for Israel. Their departure—a testimony more to the power of concerted free world opinion than to the indulgence of Soviet leaders—gives hope for some behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains but should not dull out sensitivity to the remaining masses who yearn to be free.

Captive nations, therefore, should be on the minds of each Member of this House, not only during the formal week of observance but during our consideration of spending for national defense, during our analysis and debate of SALT agreements, during our efforts to influence United Nations policy, and during our debate on other critical components of U.S. defense and foreign policy.

The work of the National Captive Na-

tions Committee—in bringing to the public attention cold realities which we should never forget—is to be commended during this week of observance, as is the leadership of the gentleman and historian from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) in arranging a special order for Captive Nations Week. We cannot neglect the ultimate fate of the unhappy millions who live within captive nations—lest we neglect our conscience—nor can we disavow our national policy of speaking for them, being strong for them, working for their freedom—lest we lose our soul.

ADDRESS TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE WIVES ASSOCIATION

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague and neighboring Congressman, Representative LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, of Maryland, shares with me a strong interest in defeating crime and in properly paying the men and women on the frontlines of this battle, our police men and women.

Last month, he reviewed the prospects for a just pay increase for the District of Columbia Police Wives Association. The following is his address:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, OF MARYLAND

I know the subject of the proposed pay raise for your husbands is much on your minds tonight. You, better than anyone else, know the sacrifices and contributions made by your men to the safety and well being of us all.

We owe a great debt of gratitude to our policemen today because current conditions make their job more dangerous and hazardous than ever before. These dedicated men deserve our trust, confidence and support in performing their duties, often without proper equipment and facilities, and nearly always without adequate compensation.

As you know, I have always supported all measures introduced before the Congress which would upgrade the law enforcement profession.

I'm sure you're also aware, caught as you are in the middle of the controversy, that there is little agreement about anything relating to crime today. Some say poverty causes crime, some say crime causes poverty. Some say our law enforcement is too aggressive, some say it is too lenient. The controversy is endless.

Yet there is standard agreement that we need to do our best to strengthen law enforcement. And one way to strengthen police forces and detain well-qualified men is obviously to make the salary a good one.

The need for higher police and firemen salaries today is a real and immediate problem.

The House of Representatives may act Monday on the bill to provide pay hikes for public safety officers. The issue of financing the raise has caused a great deal of discussion, and I believe that a generally satisfactory solution has been devised by the House District Committee. The committee's decision to raise the general sales tax from four to five percent and to raise the sales tax rate on liquor, meals and room rentals from five to six percent was a wise one, I believe.

However, since the additional two-cent excise tax on cigarettes was eliminated in committee and the principle of retroactive pay back to January was also defeated. I think we can expect attempts to amend the bill on the floor of the House to restore the cigarette tax and provide retroactive pay. I wish I could be optimistic about the success of those amendments, but the House is generally very reluctant to override committee decisions.

In any case, one thing is certain. The bill will take starting salaries from the present \$8,500 a year to \$10,000 by July 1 for a 17 per cent pay raise. Unfortunately the Senate has not acted on the measure.

We simply have to keep the pressure on and keep the lobbying up. A number of police wives have been in my office—among them, Mary Gannon, Donna Rawley, Harriet Carmine, Betsy Beckman, Lynn Coppersmith, Mary Helen Rice and Andrea Thompson—and I wanted to say that I think they're doing an excellent job of lobbying. I also wanted to emphasize what I told them. "It goes without saying that you can count on me."

I believe this pay hike is desperately needed and that we should not delay a second. We must act immediately on the issue. To recruit and keep high quality police officers in the numbers we need, we must do more to support the police than merely spouting slogans that police work is a fine profession calling noble young men. We must pay them a decent wage.

A letter from Lt. Martin Hannon, which was published this morning in The Washington Post, makes it perfectly clear that we are not paying D.C. policemen a decent wage.

In his letter, which I'm sure many of you have seen, Lt. Hannon says, "I would like to point out that a young rookie police and fire officer who is married and has one child has to make do with take home pay of approximately \$112 per week. Considering the cost of living in the Washington metropolitan area, do you honestly believe a professional police or fire department will emerge from this fiscal inequity?"

"If, in the near future, when an extra child is added to his family, he will in fact have to use public housing, food stamps and the other services of public welfare, I ask that Congress reconsider the present fiscal policy toward public safety personnel, within the concept of a just, living pay wage comparable to the job we render."

I could not agree more with Lt. Hannon. We simply are not doing nearly enough for our police and firemen here or elsewhere across the Nation.

In few departments across the country are police salaries competitive with those in other occupations seeking men of ability and education. Why have we allowed this situation to prevail?

Median starting salaries for patrolmen range from \$6,607 in smaller communities to \$7,043 in cities of 250,000 to 500,000. By regions, they range from \$5,214 in the South to \$7,458 in the West. Maximums for patrolmen are only slightly higher.

At one time, many police departments had fringe benefits which were superior to those offered by private industry, and they assumed that benefits such as early retirement or lengthy vacation periods were a substitute for competitive salaries. But fringe benefits for the police service are no longer superior to those in private industry. Efforts to improve police performance will be futile until communities are willing to pay the price for major increases in police salaries.

We must get the salaries up, not only in D.C., but across the country, because in the next decade, the present police shortage appears certain to become more urgent. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, an estimated 15,000 opportunities will occur each year for qualified candidates to enter police work through the 1970s. This projec-

tion was based simply on maintaining the present police-population ratio and did not include forecasts for expanded police activity.

Recruitment needs obviously will be substantially greater. And to recruit competitively, the police force must be able to offer monetary benefits commensurate with the importance and responsibility of the job.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement estimated that it would take 50,000 additional policemen simply to fill the positions authorized in 1967. To maintain the Nation's police forces at strength thereafter would require the recruitment of roughly 30,000 men annually. Even this estimate may be too conservative, in view of the likelihood that continued growth of urban populations, spiraling crime rates and racial and other social unrest will require improvement in the police-population ratio.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement correctly observed, "The police cannot be expected to recruit competent personnel until communities are willing to pay the price for improved police performance . . . until salaries are increased to competitive levels, the police service will fight a losing battle in its efforts to upgrade the quality of its personnel."

The bill which is about to be considered by the House is a constructive step in that direction. With passage of the bill, the Metropolitan Police Department will rank No. 7 among cities with over 500,000 population and first among area police jurisdictions. Currently the District ranks last compared with other jurisdictions and 13th among cities nationally.

This legislation is sorely needed to correct a serious problem. In the last two fiscal years, 1100 patrolmen have quit the Metropolitan Police Force, with the majority citing low pay as the reason.

It is an unpleasant fact that between August, 1969, and last November the cost of living in Washington had risen by 10.6 per cent, with no increase in police or firemen starting salaries.

Now at least we are on the verge of easing the hardships for main line police officers through the 17 per cent increase in pay. Retirement pay would also be increased by 17 per cent.

With crime as one of our Nation's fastest growing industries, the police are called upon to be virtually superhuman in the face of extreme provocation. It was surprising to me to learn that the total annual cost of crime—both losses due to criminal activity and the costs of fighting crime—now matches the combined 1970 sales of our three largest non-financial corporations, General Motors, Standard Oil of New Jersey and the Ford Motor Company.

Contending with the growing menace of crime daily, the policeman cannot perform his job without the respect of his community. Just before his death, the late J. Edgar Hoover, for so long America's foremost peace officer, said:

"We must not ignore the steady improvement in police-citizen relations over the past half century. In the 1920's citizens had only minimal respect for law enforcement. Today, as never before, our profession is respected and supported."

I believe that the men and women of this nation's police forces deserve enormous credit for creating this trend. We must always make sure that the enforcement process and the laws themselves are worthy of respect. And, along with such respect, we should consciously realize the true value of the law man.

The hard working peace officer is certainly deserving of greater monetary rewards. Policing is no longer just a job but a highly trained profession. Behind the uniform is a qualified man. Now Congress has the opportunity to demonstrate to the nation how

important we believe it is to provide good wages for our police and firemen.

All of us know that a key element in the success of the District of Columbia has had in reducing crime has been in the dedication and expertise of the men and women of the D.C. Police Department. Yet, despite their tremendous achievements and the great risks they take every day, they have not had a raise since 1969.

This seems so typical of our society today. We always seem unwilling to really commit ourselves to a goal, to really finish a job. We have success in our crime fighting efforts or whatever, so we stop and pat ourselves on the back and pretty soon people start saying, "Hey, what we've done is great. We don't need to do anymore than we're doing right now. Now that we've solved the problem, we can start concentrating and spending our money on something else."

You and I know that that attitude is more than merely ridiculous—it is terribly dangerous.

Recently I inserted into the Congressional Record a WMAL editorial which called on Congress to end the pay inequity. I agree wholeheartedly with WMAL in its call for the police raises. If I may, here is what the editorial said:

"We can't help but be impressed with the way in which the D.C. Police Department continues to chop away at the crime problem. According to the latest statistics, serious crime was down again in March, more than 27 per cent under March a year ago. That rolls the serious crime level back to where it was in 1966.

"All this in the face of rising crime just about everywhere else, including the Washington suburbs.

"And Police Chief Wilson predicts the rate will continue to drop here.

"Not bad when you consider that the District police, and firemen as well, have the lowest starting salary in this area. They haven't had a raise since 1969, while the salaries of Federal and D.C. workers were going up 17 percent. So that's what the police and firemen are asking Congress for now.

"The low pay has taken its toll. About 1,100 policemen with less than two years service have quit, many to join police units in the suburbs. Money was the major reason.

"It's time Congress put an end to this inequity at last."

I have always had the greatest admiration for men such as your husbands who have served the law enforcement profession so well. I will continue to fight hard in Congress to insure that his and your interests are not overlooked.

During testimony before the Knapp Commission investigating police corruption in New York City last fall, a New York City police sergeant gave an eloquent reason for taking pride in serving the public through the law enforcement profession.

He said, ". . . to me, being a cop means believing in the rule of law. It means believing in a system of government that makes fair and just rules and then enforces them. Being a cop also means serving, helping others. If it's not too corny, to be a cop is to help an old lady walk the street safely, to help a 12-year-old girl reach her next birthday without being gang raped, to help the storekeeper make a living without keeping a shotgun under his cash register, to help a boy grow up without needles in his arm. And, therefore, to me, being a cop is not just a job, but a way to live a life."

I know that right now, to make ends meet yet still serve in their chosen profession, many of your husbands must moonlight in such jobs as security agents, bank guards, taxi drivers, etc. It has been estimated that a third to a half of all patrolmen in the country hold second jobs.

I share your concern over the existing

situation. And I want to help in whatever way I can. I know that it is difficult to feed and raise a family on a policeman's salary, and I salute the character of a man who, each day, must be a minister, a social worker, a diplomat, a tough guy and a gentleman. It would be impossible for him to perform his task without the love and support of his family so I salute you and him for the contribution you are making to your neighbors, our city and our country.

AHEPA

HON. JAMES D. (MIKE) McKEVITT OF COLORADO IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. McKEVITT. Mr. Speaker, it would be inappropriate if, during the month of July, we failed to pay tribute to an organization which has made many contributions to the betterment of American life and on July 26, 1972, will celebrate its golden anniversary.

I am sure that many of my distinguished colleagues are aware of the organization of which I speak, The American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, more commonly known as the Order of Ahepa. The order, which has 430 local chapters in 49 States, Canada, and Australia is nonpolitical and nonsectarian. Membership in the Order of Ahepa is open to men of good moral character who are citizens of the United States or Canada, or who have declared their intention to become citizens. AHEPA has nine objectives but I believe its first objective in this country is to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States.

The Order of Ahepa's good works have been legion over the years ranging from relief for victims of natural disasters to scholarships to worthy students. Actually, its impact has been felt around the world, from Turkey to Ecuador and, of course, in Greece, where its good works have included relief for war orphans to maintaining two hospitals and seven health centers.

One could go on and on citing the efforts of the Order of Ahepa to aid humanity. Suffice it to say that our Nation can be extremely proud of the order and its 50 years of accomplishment.

In paying tribute to the Order of Ahepa, I would at this time like to name the officers of local chapters in Colorado and extend to all members of the Order of Ahepa congratulations on the occasion of its golden anniversary:

COLORADO

LOCAL CHAPTER OFFICERS

Deno P. Dikeou, President, Denver.
James P. Damaskos, Vice President, Denver.
Menelaos Moutsos, Secretary, Denver.
Spero D. Cosmos, Treasurer, Denver.
James P. Dikeou, President, Denver.
George Daddis, Vice President, Denver.
John P. Dikeou, Secretary, Denver.
Tom Kostas, Treasurer, Denver.
Nick Frangos, President, Denver.
Alex Baker, Vice President, Denver.
James DeBerry, Secretary, Denver.
Theodore N. Morris, Treasurer, Denver.
Tom J. Koustas, President, Denver.
Gus Jimas, Vice President, Denver.
Nick Tsiouvaras, Secretary, Denver.
Harold G. Kallas, Treasurer, Denver.

Christ Kapantas, President, Colorado Springs.

George N. Argos, Vice President, Colorado Springs.

Gus J. Lambrose, Secretary, Colorado Springs.

Nick Ellis, Treasurer, Colorado Springs.

James G. Melonas, President, Walsenburg.

James Pappas, Vice President, Walsenburg.

P. K. Kallas, Secretary and Treasurer, Walsenburg.

CURRENT NATIONAL OFFICERS

George P. Dikeou, Supreme Board of Trustees, Denver.

CURRENT DISTRICT LODGE OFFICERS

George Wm. Athens, Lt. Governor, Denver.
Theodore G. Argeris, Treasurer, Denver.

Dr. Pete G. Frangos, M.D., Marshall, Denver.
John W. Toscas, Advisor, Denver.

James G. Damaskos, Athletic Director, Aurora.

PAST NATIONAL OFFICERS

Spero J. Cosmos, Past Supreme Lodge, Aurora.

Lee G. Rallis, Past Supreme Lodge, Denver.
Panayes G. Dikeou, Past Supreme Trustee, Denver.

Gus G. Gatseos, Past Supreme Trustee, Denver.

TRIBUTE TO MARVIN "LUCKY" MONDRES

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in paying special tribute to my friend Marvin "Lucky" Mondres, who is resigning this week as the Congressional Liaison Officer for the Department of Commerce.

Lucky was appointed to his position by President Nixon on February 20, 1969. Since that time he has diligently carried out his duties and responsibilities in an outstanding manner. I can honestly say that I have known few people in Government who have been more conscientious or dedicated in the performance of their duties than my good friend, Lucky Mondres.

It is my understanding that Lucky is returning to Florida next week and intends to file as a candidate for Congress from the newly reapportioned 13th Congressional District. While I personally regret to see this young man leave the Washington area, I fully recognize his ambition and desire to serve the people of the 13th Congressional District of Florida in a broader capacity. He has my best wishes for a truly rewarding campaign.

TELEPHONE PRIVACY—XXVI

HON. LES ASPIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Speaker, I reintroduced the telephone privacy bill on May 10, 1972, with a total of 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. Com-

mercial 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 24th 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:

ROCHELLE, ILL., July 15, 1972.

DEAR SIR: Just wanted to drop you this note of encouragement for HR-14884, (controlling of solicitors use of phone).

I, like many other citizens, have been victimized by such calls in the form of untimely interruptions and their being what I believe is an invasion of privacy. They are definitely unwanted.

Good luck in your fight for such a needed piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

OAK PARK, ILL., July 14, 1972.

REPRESENTATIVE ASPIN: Please make every effort to keep nuisance phone calls from our home by having bill HR-14884 adopted—or better! SOON

CHICAGO, ILL.

I am all for H.R. 14884. Please count me as one who wants to keep the nuisances off the phone.

Thank you,

DES PLAINES, ILL.

DEAR LES ASPIN: My husband and I fully support your bill, HR-14884 to keep nuisances off our phone.

We, too, are disturbed quite frequently by solicitors who invade our privacy by calling on our phone.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

ELMHURST, ILL.

Please continue your efforts to prevent solicitors from calling by phone to interest us in resort property; dance lessons; health programs. My husband and I are both in our 70's and find these calls very annoying.

Sincerely yours,

BROOKFIELD, ILL.

REPRESENTATIVE LES ASPIN: I read of your bill HR-14884 pending, in the Chicago Trib. Action Express, column. My wife and myself back you and encourage you to work for the passing of this bill.

I am a policeman and calls such as these, especially when the caller requests to speak to "Mr. Jones", and when my wife or other member of the family advises I am not at home, the caller hangs up. It is then not known if this was a sales call or possibly a

call wishing to know of my absence so that my family can be placed in danger.

Again my wife and I support you and the bill.

Thank you,

A STEP TOWARD GREATER UNITY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Denver Post of Denver, Colo., has just recently come to my attention. It concerns the Atlantic Union resolution, House Joint Resolution 900, which was first introduced in Congress 23 years ago.

This editorial is significant in several respects which many of my colleagues may find interesting. Primarily, it places in perspective the purpose of the Atlantic Union Convention, which is "to explore ways in which—nations might transform existing relationships into a more effective unity based on Federal principles."

This editorial emphasizes the fact that the resolution only makes the proposed Atlantic Convention exploratory in nature. Any proposal for action by this convention would have to be approved by Congress.

I submit this significant editorial as an important contribution to the discussions concerning international peace and prosperity:

A STEP TOWARD GREATER UNITY

We have been following with interest the recent progress in the U.S. Congress of House Joint Resolution 900—a resolution which, in substance, has been introduced seven times previously since the end of World War II, each time failing of passage.

Essentially, the measure—which faces its most critical fight later this month on the floor of the House of Representatives after favorable consideration in both Senate and House committees—would create a U.S. delegation to organize and participate in an international convention made up of similar delegations from other North Atlantic parliamentary democracies.

The purpose of the convention would be to explore ways in which these nations might transform existing relationships into a more effective unity based on federal principles.

From this, hopefully, we might be able to create a new political institution large enough to deal successfully with the supranational problems now confronting us.

The ultimate goal of the proponents of Atlantic union would be political union under a single government; if and when this stage is reached, the entire grand design might be scuttled by nations unwilling to surrender their sovereignty.

Fortunately—and this is an important consideration in our endorsement, the proposed Atlantic Convention would be exploratory in nature.

No concrete steps toward implementation of convention findings could take place until such time as the U.S. Congress might legislate its approval.

What, then, could be the positive results expected from such a convention? Might we not be creating another nebulous halfway house somewhere between NATO and the expanding European Economic Community, on the one hand, and the United Nations and

the visionary concept of a single world government on the other?

We don't think so; quite the contrary, in fact.

For, despite the international organizations that presently exist, member nations of the North Atlantic Community are still unable to understand, let alone manage, many of the burgeoning problems which are rapidly becoming too great for any one country to deal with.

The world, for example, is confronted with ever-increasing numbers of people, ever-increasing depletion of natural resources, and an ever-increasing degradation of a common environment.

The resolution of these, as well as of other crucial problems, cannot be attained under any international arrangements or institutions now existing.

We strongly advocate the passage of HJR 900 if for no other reason than its promise of expanded international dialogue at new levels.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, on the happy occasion of the 50th anniversary of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—the Order of Ahepa—I would like to offer some well deserved thanks and praise to this remarkable fraternity and its Supreme President Sam Nakis. Through 430 local chapters, including the Kansas City chapter headed by Paul Kastle, Chris Fotopoulos, Petro Harakas, and Pete Panos, AHEPA has served our country with the highest distinction. Through good fellowship, through the encouragement of civil participation on all levels and through the education of its members, the order has promoted patriotism and a spirit of altruism among its ranks. AHEPA's Treasurer Chris Ellis and Past Supreme Lodge Officer Michael Konomous, also of Kansas City, have contributed substantially to this cause.

AHEPA's public service, both at home and abroad, has embodied the highest ideals of the Hellenic tradition. For 50 years, its financial munificence to disaster victims, to war victims, to medical research, to the construction and preservation of public monuments, to education, and to many other worthy causes, has been tremendous. In addition, in countless ways, the order has maintained the cultural heritage of Greek people everywhere while simultaneously strengthening the bonds between the peoples, the spirit, and the tradition of Greece and America.

GUNRUNNING, A PROFITABLE BUSINESS: CHICAGO TRIBUNE TASK FORCE REPORT, PART III

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, your local bartender, manicurist, gas station at-

tendant, or neighbor could be a gunrunner. A gunrunner could be almost anybody, and almost anybody can become one. It is incredibly easy to enter this lucrative racket.

This is No. 3 in a series of task force reports, recently published in the Chicago Tribune. The purpose of this series is to study how it is possible that 10,000 Americans are shot to death every year.

In today's entry, task force reporters entered the gunrunning racket, and found it to be an easy job. They discovered that the illegal purchase of firearms can be carried out openly, and shipping contraband weapons across State lines is no harder than doing the same with a carton of cigarettes. Gunrunning is second only to firearms burglaries as a principal means by which criminals acquire guns they cannot acquire legally.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, June 27, 1972]

**TASK FORCE REPORT: GUNRUNNING—
AN EASY JOB**

The popular image of a gunrunner is that of a swashbuckler who flirts with danger and lives by his wits as he smuggles machine guns to a guerrilla band in some South American banana republic.

Perhaps such buccaneers exist somewhere in the world, but in the United States, a gunrunner is more likely to be a bartender, a manicurist, a machinist, or a housewife.

In other words, a gunrunner could be almost anybody. Almost anybody can become one. Thousands do every year, because it is incredibly easy to enter this lucrative racket.

NOTHING HIDDEN ABOUT IT

That is the lesson Task Force reporters William Currie and Robert Enstad learned when they became gunrunners in Florida, Virginia, and Iowa, and shipped their guns to Chicago.

Expecting to enter a sinister world of cloak-and-dagger intrigue, the reporters were shocked to find that the illegal purchase of firearms can be carried out openly and that shipping contraband weapons across state lines is no harder than doing the same with a carton of cigarettes.

GETS NO BACKTALK

Their accomplices were licensed firearms dealers who, in their eagerness to make a sale, paid but token attention to the federal law that demands they sell guns only to residents of the state in which they do business.

One of the dealers Enstad encountered "seemed no different from a bartender who sees a young-looking kid come in and ask for a drink. The bartender asks the fellow if he's 21. The kid says yes, and he gets a drink without showing his identification."

Enstad was referring to the purchase he made of a .25 caliber automatic in Jay's Sales, a gun shop in the basement of the home of a Des Moines, Iowa, city councilman.

He is Russell LaVine, 61, a former radio announcer and an ultra conservative who once claimed he was "further to the right than the John Birch Society." LaVine is a federally licensed firearms dealer whose business grosses \$40,000 a year.

SEES AD IN TABLOID

Enstad learned of the shop thru Gun Week, a firearms tabloid in which LaVine was advertising concealable handguns. Altho LaVine claims he sells firearms only to police, no mention of that restriction was made in the advertisement.

Nor did the reporter have any difficulty in purchasing his palm-sized pistol for the discount price offered to police.

When Enstad entered the store, LaVine's wife, Caille, was behind the counter. The showcases were crammed with every type of handgun, ranging from tiny .22s to cannon-like .357 magnums.

The reporter mentioned that he wanted to buy the automatic for home protection. Mrs. LaVine then showed him the pistol, a wicked-looking weapon small enough to fit into a shirt pocket.

KIND USED ON WALLACE

His question prompted a conversation about the quality of guns, during which, Mrs. LaVine extolled the merits of the gun used to shoot Alabama Gov. George Wallace.

"Now take that gun," she said, "that's the one Wallace got shot with. Now they say that's a 'Saturday night special'—a cheap gun. But that's made by Charter Arms. It's a good gun. It will fire off six good rounds."

Ironically the LaVines appeared to be Wallace supporters. A dollar bill bearing Wallace's face in place of President Washington's was displayed on a counter. The fact that someone had used a Charter Arms .38 revolver to shoot the Alabama governor did not seem to trouble Mrs. LaVine.

Enstad finally decided on the Colt automatic, but protested that the cost, \$69, was too high. On the opposite side of the price tag was the figure \$57.36.

"The lower price is what we charge law enforcement officers. I'll sell it to you for that price," she offered, altho Enstad never identified himself as a policeman.

QUESTIONS RESIDENCE

Enstad volunteered the information that he wanted the gun for protection because his home had been burglarized when he lived in Chicago.

She said:

"I can't sell you a gun if you're from out of state because that's against federal law. Are you a permanent resident of Des Moines?"

"Sure. Been here since April," Enstad replied.

"Oh, that's okay. State law says you have to be here 30 days to be a resident."

Mrs. LaVine then placed a federal firearms transfer form in front of the reporter, saying, "Fill those things out, and I will know as much about you as you do."

That statement was not entirely accurate. When Mrs. LaVine looked at the form, she knew the purchaser was Robert Enstad, that he was 33 years old, was born in Pine City, Minn., and had no criminal record.

BUT ADDRESS IS FALSE

All that information was true. She did not know that his Des Moines address was false. The reporter lives in Chicago.

Moreover, he could have falsified the entire form, because Mrs. LaVine did not ask him for one shred of identification. In the space marked "identification," she wrote SS, and instructed Enstad to fill in his Social Security number without even asking to see his card.

LaVine ran for his city council seat on a "safety on the streets" campaign, but his business practices are of the type that is making our streets more dangerous.

For all the care his wife took, the purchaser could have been an ex-convict bent on murder, an escaped mental patient, or a gunrunner planning to sell the weapon to a criminal.

TOUTS USE OF MACE

Enstad paid \$60.08 and walked out of the store with the gun in its box. Mrs. LaVine told him to come back if he wanted to buy some Mace, a chemical disabling spray.

Jay's Sales was not unique in its lack of attention to federal firearms laws.

At Ted's Shooter's Supply, a saloon-cum-gun shop, which advertises firearms on a Hamm's beer sign, Enstad purchased a .22

caliber handgun for \$36 using his Illinois Driver's License as identification.

"We can't sell to people from out of state," said the salesman. Enstad wrote down the same false Des Moines address. After glancing at the transfer form, the salesman asked Enstad for identification.

"Anything with your name on it," he said.

LICENSE ACCEPTED

Enstad displayed his Illinois license, expecting to be refused the sale. The salesman did not bat an eye when he looked at the out-of-state identification, as he handed Enstad a paper sack with the revolver inside.

Another contraband weapon was on the street. The next day, both weapons arrived in Chicago via parcel post.

In Florida, a licensed gun dealer gave reporter Currie his first lesson in the illegal purchase of firearms.

Currie entered Southern Gun Distributors, a huge armory-like firearms shop at 251 SW 22d Av., Miami. Saying that he was from out of state, Currie asked the salesman how he could buy a gun in Florida.

"Why don't you get a friend's driver's license from Florida? That's what they do," the salesman suggested.

BUYS NEW IDENTITIES

Taking the advice, Currie scoured the Miami docks in search of a new identity. For \$30 he acquired a Virginia driver's license from the first mate of a charter fishing boat.

The license was issued to a Dennis G. Zimmerman, who did not resemble Currie and was nearly 40 pounds heavier.

The next day, he purchased, for a few more dollars, a Florida license from a stubble-chinned derelict in Miami's seedy Bayfront Park. That one was issued to Fred Mullins, of West Palm Beach, who was 15 years older than Currie.

Returning to Southern Guns to make his purchase, Currie was told that he would have to wait 72 hours before he could pick up the weapon. He said he did not want to wait and was advised to go to Broward County, where no waiting period is required.

HITCHHIKER'S ADVICE

During the drive northward, a hitchhiker advised the reporter that Hollywood, Fla., was the best city in the country for buying guns.

"While I was driving toward Hollywood, I practiced signing the name of Fred Mullins at stop lights," Currie reported. "It was a waste of time because the gun dealer didn't even check the signature, and in fact some police officers told me I probably could have gotten away with a license issued to a black man." Currie is white.

The reporter finally arrived at Harris House Guns and Ammo, a shop located at the end of a middle-class residential street. Standing in front of a rack of carbines, second-hand shotguns, and AR-15 semiautomatic rifles was a plump, drab woman in her thirties.

TELLS OF BURGLARIES

Currie said he needed handguns because of a wave of burglaries in West Palm Beach. For \$20, or less than half of what he paid for his false identification, Currie purchased two .22 caliber revolvers, a Valor and Viking.

Because of their cheapness, concealability, and frequent use in barroom quarrels, these handguns are known in Florida as "mayhem makers."

The woman copied the information from the license onto the transfer form, with no apparent reaction to the fact that it showed Currie to be 45 years old instead of his true age, 30.

Currie then deliberately called her attention to the birthdate on the license to see if he could arouse her suspicions.

"See where it says I was born in 1927," he said. "That's a mistake. I was really born in 1937."

Without a word, the saleswoman wrote 1937

on the federal form, then sprayed the guns with oil, placed them in a box, and handed them to Currie.

NO QUESTIONS ASKED

That was it. No questions asked. No comparison of signatures. No determination if this buyer was a possible criminal purchasing the tool of his trade or a gunrunner planning to sell his wares to a street gang. No concern if these guns might be used to take a life. Just take the money and give him his guns.

Later, Currie drove to Hopewell, Va. Using his false Virginia license, he purchased a snub-nosed .22 caliber revolver from the Gun Rack firearms shop for \$25. The saleswoman did not seem to notice that the photograph on the license hardly resembled the man buying the gun. The RG revolver was the same type used to kill Chicago Patrolman Robert Gallowitch last month.

Currie mailed the three weapons to Chicago.

SOUTH A MAJOR SOURCE

It is possible that Gallowitch's killer obtained his weapon in that way, or purchased it from a gunrunner. According to law enforcement officials, gunrunning is second only to firearms burglaries as a principal means by which criminals acquire guns they cannot acquire legally.

Each year, thousands of these contraband weapons, purchased mainly in the South, where gun laws are lax, pour into the streets of our cities. There are more than 160,000 licensed dealers in the nation, many of whom are willing to overlook the law, and only 1,600 federal agents to police them.

In New York, 65 per cent of the 10,158 illegal firearms seized in 1971 were traced to sources outside the city and state.

William Zapata, 25, of Flushing, New York, nearly added 240 .22 caliber revolvers to that supply when he unwittingly became a partner in a sophisticated interstate gunrunning racket. The damage that could have been done by those guns was averted when a New Jersey state trooper found the guns in the trunk of Zapata's rented car after Zapata fell asleep in a no parking zone along the turnpike.

The guns were purchased Oct. 9, 1970, in Chira's Gift Shop, Hialeah, Fla., by a Bernard Lino using a phony Florida address. Lino told the storeowner he wanted the weapons "to open a shooting gallery."

TRAPPED BY DEBT

Zapata was trapped into transporting the guns by a slickly dressed man wearing diamond rings named Sammy whom he met in a Manhattan discotheque. First Sammy bought Zapata a few drinks, then a radio and some food and even started paneling his family's kitchen. He first refused payment for all the gifts and then later informed Zapata that he owed him \$800.

Not having the money, Zapata agreed to drive a car from Florida to New York's Kennedy Airport to pay off the debt. He had no idea the guns were packed in the trunk, he said. The judge who tried his case, believed the young Puerto Rican's bizarre tale and placed him on probation.

Reporters Currie and Enstad purchased only five weapons to demonstrate how easy it is to become a gunrunner. However, hundreds of ordinary citizens each year engage in the large-scale interstate trafficking of firearms.

And gunrunners can be the unlikeliest people—such as Mrs. M., a welfare mother of 12 who purchased 1,500 contraband guns over a two-year period for her son's South Side street gang. [She asked that her name not be disclosed for fear of gang retaliation].

Forced by the gang to obtain weapons, Mrs. M. made numerous trips to Milwaukee and Gary, meeting contraband gun dealers late at night in gas stations and at other pre-arranged locations. And she told of some bi-

zarre methods of hiding the guns once they were in the city.

"Sometimes I'd slide them up my girdle—six at once. And I had a lot of them stashed in boxes of sanitary napkins, and sometimes I'd put them on babies. You get a kid with a snowsuit and stuff him up with guns, and you have a fat baby."

Then there was Mrs. Argentina Love, 59, a manicurist in the Monarch Barbershop, 339 E. 39th St., who boasted to an undercover police officer that she had "access to guns for black militants."

To prove it, she sold the policeman a revolver for \$70, passing it under her manicurist's table. Her source was an ex-convict named Roy Williams, who later sold undercover federal agents several more guns. He obtained his supply from a Texas gun dealer, avoiding the residency requirement by having his sister, a local resident, make the purchases.

FIFTY YEARS OF SERVICE—AHEPA CELEBRATES GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on July 26, 1922, the Order of Ahepa was founded in Atlanta, Ga. This year, the organization is celebrating its golden anniversary, and I would like to take this opportunity to commend AHEPA's accomplishments in many areas of public service.

Since its inception, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association has contributed significantly to the betterment of American life through its programs of citizenship, education, civic participation, athletics, and international relations. The organization has been the cornerstone of financial support for numerous worthwhile causes. Victims of natural disasters, war refugees, needy students, orphans, and many others, owe a great deal to the membership of this fine group.

The Order of Ahepa also offers the opportunity of membership in an organization with an unexcelled reputation for good fellowship and family participation—an opportunity not often found in modern society.

In this time of rapid change and constant turmoil, it is reassuring to be able to recognize the consistency and dedication of a group like the Order of Ahepa. I hail the efforts of the national and 430 local chapters and wish them as much success in their next 50 years as they have had in their first 50.

A TIME TO BE REMEMBERED

HON. FRANK E. DENHOLM

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. DENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, there are some that may not agree that the photo published in the New York Times today is of great significance. It is a photograph of the profile of a leading American of

our time against the backdrop of four stone faces commonly referred to as the "Shrine of Democracy" high on Mount Rushmore in the Black Hills of South Dakota.

The profile is that of the Honorable GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, Senator of the United States of America and nominee of the people for President in 1972.

There are some resemblances and some striking differences in the photo—and in reality. One face—the profile—is of a living man of our time. Four of the faces are the work of art carved in the mountain of granite—leaders of the past. The sculpture has artfully detailed the historic past and rightfully named his finished product as the "Shrine of Democracy." The faces of history are shown with beard and long hair—but all with a clear eye and determination for leadership in their time.

The profile of the living man against the granite faces of the past is symbolic of leadership of our time—clear of eye, keen of mind, and of a quiet, determined manner—he stands. He, like his predecessors, must stand on the convictions of right with an eye to the future. He must lead—or be led. And so did his predecessors.

There on the mountain is Washington—there is Jefferson—there is Lincoln—there is T. Roosevelt—there is the "Shrine of Democracy." Symbolic of the differences of their time that started with the birth of freedom and independence of a new nation. None of them popular in their time—but leaders. Men of determination. Men of a clear eye, Men of keen minds—all men of destiny.

The great obstacle to progress is human resistance to change. That was proven almost 200 years ago when General Washington sought the assistance of his countrymen and dissent was rampant—and Jefferson later experienced similar circumstances in seeking men to sign the Declaration of Independence. But nothing then—or now equalled the dissent of the times that followed and the history marked in the life of Lincoln. Teddy Roosevelt tried independently against all political odds to lead the land he loved. There is no easy course for leaders of their time. All have but one choice—to lead or to be led. And the determination to lead cannot be founded upon passive love or lust. It has roots in controversy, dissatisfaction, dissent, and determination. That is what leaders are born of—or they like others shall be led.

I am proud of the modest, mild-mannered man that stood today before the "Shrine of Democracy." He has a commitment in his time. He has stood alone in conviction for what his conscience conceived to be right. His attributes of leadership, like men of history, include emotional stability, honesty, integrity, and a vision of the future. He was born of poverty and knows the wants and comforts of life. He is compassionate but firm for what is right. He is GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, able, capable, ready and willing to be the next President of the United States of America. Like those great men of history—he merits the respect of all in his time. That is why "this is a time to be remembered."

RUMOR-MONGERING URBAN STYLE

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, just why the New York Times should indulge in worldwide misreporting implying White House—President Nixon as sponsor—initiation of rainmaking to hurt the people of Indochina is difficult to fathom. Not only does this unjustifiably injure the reputation and image of the United States abroad, but being published at a time when acts of God in the way of floods have inflicted staggering losses on unfortunate residents in various parts of the United States, it incites resentment against the administration at the domestic level.

This sort of thing is something this Congress should look into, as the following editorial from the New Hampshire Sunday News so well points out. This is not because it is unwarrantedly hostile to the President, but because it is a flagrant abuse of editorial privilege approaching outright misrepresentation of fact:

WHY RAINDROPS KEPT FALLING

The N.Y. Times claimed Monday to have been told in "an extensive series of interviews" with "government sources both civilian and military" that the Air Force and Navy have been drenching Indo-China with man-made rainfall.

In what has come to be recognized as a typical Times performance, the newspaper devoted nearly six columns of space to a report which identified by name not a single one of its "government sources."

The closest it came was a quote attributed to an employee of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration who vacuously declared: "We seem to be on the verge of having convinced ourselves rainmaking will work in certain cases."

But the Times plunged forward with its anonymous horde of witnesses—"military sources said . . . said one former government official with detailed knowledge of the operation . . . one former CIA agent said . . . a number of former CIA and high-ranking Johnson administration officials depicted the operations . . ."

Predictably, the Times got around to indicting Richard Nixon as chief architect of the rainmaking. It couldn't cite even an anonymous source in this case, but said that "by the end of 1971 . . . the program was under the direct control of the White House."

There isn't a newsman alive who does not recognize this technique as the shabbiest form of lazy, shoddy, shameful journalism. It is incredible that the Times could not have got one of its scores of alleged interviewees, many described as now out of government employ and unsympathetic to the rainmaking, to have permitted the use of his name.

What the Times seems to do in these more and more frequent instances is pick up a choice piece of scuttlebutt and then create its own non-nameable and, perhaps, imaginary witnesses.

Not that scuttlebutt is always without a foundation in truth; quite the contrary. But a really smart, conscientious and aggressive reporter always finds a way to disclose enough provable fact, and identify sufficient flesh-and-blood witnesses, to make the story stand up.

And, when you make a story like this one stand up, you may deserve not only the Pulitzer prize—which is awarded mainly by

members of the establishment club to one another—but also the gratitude of the national and, perhaps, the world citizenry.

The Times, in its account of the rainmaking, indicates that the experiments have been carried on not only in Indo-China but many parts of the world and the continental United States, including the Philippines, Okinawa, India, mid-Pacific Islands, Texas and Florida.

In some of these areas, it has dumped huge quantities of rain on unsuspecting populations. One experiment in Vietnam brought down "seven inches of rain in two hours."

This is the kind of rainfall which occurred this spring and summer in many parts of the United States, wreaking a heavy toll of death and destruction in such communities as Wilkes Barre, Pa., and Rapid City, South Dakota.

Right here in northern New England, we have had a series of drenching rainfall nearly unprecedented in history.

The Times articles are replete with "warnings by scientists," again quoted anonymously, who say they fear for the effects of the Air Force and Navy experiments on the "ecology" not only of localities and regions, but also of "the entire world."

Recalling the tragic consequences of some experiments in the development of death-dealing gases and bacteriological warfare methods, the public might be forgiven for reading the Times pieces and concluding that this year's unprecedented rains and floods in the U.S. were triggered somehow by the experiments in Indo-China.

Quite possibly the Times intended exactly this effect.

Just to make the picture more horrifying, it throws in the suggestion that the Navy and Air Force have gone far beyond the old cloud-seeding procedures with silver iodine or dry ice and now employ chemicals causing the artificial rains to damage heavy machinery, like tanks and trucks.

Congress owes it to the country to investigate fully these N.Y. Times accounts and let the people know the truth. But it also goes without saying that the Times promptly would run blubbering to the Supreme Court and be shielded from exposure and punishment—as in the Pentagon Papers—under the Free Press clause in the Constitution.

LEGAL SERVICES AND LEGAL ETHICS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, the role of the lawyer in the American society has been undergoing serious change in recent days. Once considered an advocate for his client, in many instances he has become an advocate for himself and his own ideological preconceptions, with the client merely a means to private or political ends.

Much of the current ambiguity has resulted from the involvement of lawyers paid by the Government in doing what lawyers have traditionally been barred by their own codes of legal ethics from doing—stirring up litigation.

The legal services program was initially conceived as an arm of the war on poverty. The program has never been clearly defined, for there was no statutory provision in the Equal Opportunity Act dealing with it. Consequently, as is the case with many governmental agencies, it has proceeded on paths of its

own, with little concern for congressional intent.

In a recent address Vice President SPIRO AGNEW noted that—

The Legal Services Program has gone way beyond the idea of a governmentally funded program to make legal remedies available to the indigent and now expends much of its resources on efforts to change the law on behalf of one social class—the poor. . . . We are dealing, in large part, with a systematic effort to redistribute societal advantages and disadvantages, penalties and rewards, rights and resources. As one distinguished commentator on the Legal Services has stated: "This is not simply related to politics; it is politics."

Discussing the implications of such a program, Vice President AGNEW declared that—

To the extent that this is true what we have here is the Federal Government funding a program designed to effectuate major political changes. What we may be on the way to creating is a Federally-funded system manned by ideological vigilantes, who owe their allegiance not to a client, not to the citizens of a particular state or locality, and not to elected representatives of the people, but only to a concept of social reform.

To correct much of this problem Vice President AGNEW states that attorneys in neighborhood law offices should have as their function serving the needs of individual poor people and legitimate self-organized groups, "not the poor as a class—and they should take the cases which the people bring to them, not search for clients to fit a legal cause." In addition, states the Vice President:

So long as individual attorneys conceive their role to be that of social engineers, they will continue to exacerbate community tensions and undermine the very purposes they were hired to accomplish.

It is essential that the legal services program, as well as all other Government programs, be brought under the control of the Congress, which is elected by the people and responsible to them. It is the Congress, not the employees of Government bureaus, which is charged with the determination of policy. The situation described by Vice President AGNEW in his address to the Texas Bar Association on July 7, 1972, is one which demands our immediate attention.

I wish to share this address with my colleagues, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Since the inception of the Legal Services Program, most members of the American Bar have demonstrated their continued and steadfast support for it. In a variety of ways, our profession has proven its sincere interest in providing legal assistance to the poor. This is indeed commendable.

The Legal Services Program has done a great deal of good by furnishing poor people with legal counsel and effective access to the courts. The lawyers in the program have generally reflected great credit on our profession through their dedication to the concept of justice and their willingness to sacrifice self-interest in order to help poor people.

I want to emphasize that I am very much in favor of providing legal services for the poor. Inability to afford counsel should not and must not affect one's right to justice. Furthermore, contrary to what you may have heard, I am not opposed to suits against government to redress grievances. Anyone with

a legitimate grievance against a governmental agency or instrumentality should have the opportunity to obtain a resolution of that grievance.

But throughout this program's existence, there has been little serious examination of its philosophical underpinnings. We have tended to focus on the delivery systems—whether to praise or criticize them—and we have lost sight of the larger implications. We have been, in other words, more occupied with mechanics than with policy—more concerned with tactics than with strategy.

In fact, some idealogues, who seem to challenge every thread of our social fabric from the past, regard this program as too sacrosanct even to discuss, much less to question.

As a starting place, we might look to the President's repeated belief that the paramount goal of legal services should be to respond to the needs of individual clients. When the President vetoed the proposal to establish a Legal Services Corporation last year, he asked Congress to create an agency "which places the needs of low-income clients first, before the political concerns of either legal services attorneys or elected officials."

This scope and definition of service to the client is perhaps the most important and pervasive issue within the Legal Services Program today.

The Legal Services Program was conceived as an arm of the war on poverty. Initially, there was no statutory provision in the Equal Opportunity Act dealing specifically with such a program. Its statutory base was added later by Congress as one of the "National emphasis" programs of the EOA's Community Action Program, along with the Headstart project, Comprehensive Health Service and certain others. Because the program is not clearly defined, some visualize it as a program for social action, while others see it as a modern Federally-funded Legal Aid Program. This ambiguity has been well documented. As a result, the Legal Services Program has gone way beyond the idea of a governmentally funded program to make legal remedies available to the indigent and now expends much of its resources on efforts to change the law on behalf of one social class—the poor. We are not discussing merely reforming the law to rectify old injustices or correcting the law where it has been allowed to be weighted against the poor. We are dealing, in large part, with a systematic effort to redistribute societal advantages and disadvantages, penalties and rewards, rights and resources. As one distinguished commentator on the Legal Services Program has stated: "This is not simply related to politics; it is politics."

To the extent that this is true, what we have here is the Federal Government funding a program designed to effectuate major political changes. What we may be on the way to creating is a federally-funded system manned by ideological vigilantes, who owe their allegiance not to a client, not to the citizens of a particular State or locality, and not to the elected representatives of the people, but only to a concept of social reform.

The law reform efforts of the Legal Services Program may also be the undertaking of a change in the nature of the legal system itself. Through the imaginative use of ever-expanding constitutional concepts, the Legal Services Program has seized upon the idea of the law and the lawsuit as an offensive weapon to redress an alleged imbalance created by the political processes. While we must do everything we can to protect every American's constitutional rights, we must ask ourselves this: Isn't it possible that we have gone too far when the Federal Government constructs a program which encourages individual lawyers to test at public expense their own individual theories of how society should be structured and how the resources, rights and benefits of that society should be distributed among the population?

A second major problem area in the Legal Services Program is that it fundamentally alters the nature of the lawyer-client relationship.

We lawyers are justifiably concerned with preserving the privilege of the attorney-client relationship. It is indeed one of the cornerstones of our legal system. But in trying to protect the privacy of this relationship, must we be prohibited from inquiring into the bona fides of actions by Federally-funded attorneys—actions that in many cases bear little relevance to the client's interest but much pertinence to the attorney's ambitions.

It is incumbent on us as lawyers to resolve the dilemma created by conflict between the privacy of the attorney-client relationship on the one hand, and the intrusion of outside forces, such as Federal funding and direction, on the other. And such resolution is unlikely if we rigidly insist that the attorney-client relationship is so absolute that no goals or directions can be set by the Congress.

There are two major differences between the attorney-client relationship as it exists in the Legal Services Program and as it exists elsewhere. First, there is the question of who is in fundamental control, the attorney or the client. Second, there is the difference in representation because of the changed nature of the attorney-client relationship.

In the private attorney-client relationship, it is generally accepted that the client is in control. He comes to the attorney with his problem and the attorney lays out for him the strengths and weaknesses of the alternative courses of action open to him.

The attorney then usually recommends a particular course of action—normally the simplest one that meets the client's objectives. But it is the client who makes the decision. And that decision usually will be based on the alternative most likely to accomplish the desired end with the least expenditure of money and in the shortest possible time.

The law reform aspect of Legal Services, however, threatens to turn the relationship upside down. If a client with a problem comes to a Legal Services lawyer who is imbued with law reforming zeal, the lawyer sees a great deal more than the client's problem in the matter and often expands the case into the broadest legal principle supportive to his social philosophy it will sustain—a sort of Parkinsonian corollary. Instead of resolving the case at the lowest level and earliest opportunity satisfactory to the client, such a Legal Services lawyer would be inclined to take it to the highest level possible to win the legal issue and implant the empathic legal principle which he has perceived to be involved. In certain circumstances, such zeal is not only acceptable but commendable. However, it is naive not to consider the attendant consequences of this practice.

The whole law reform aspect of Legal Services is oriented toward the attorney taking the initiative. The attorney often starts with a preconceived notion of how the society should be structured and identifies those qualities of the community in which he is practicing which do not fit his beliefs. In an attempt—basically a political action—to change the law and alter the existing allocation of resources, he may be instrumental in forming a group of poor people—and perhaps not so poor—to bring pressure to bear in the community on a particular problem.

Is this simple advocacy? Or is it social engineering on a grand scale and without accountability to anyone? Because of the Code of Professional Responsibility, any efforts to control or restrict the activities of individual lawyers would be, and have been, vigorously opposed. But without some form of control at the top, you have a Federal Government project using public monies purportedly for public purposes but actually for whatever purpose the individual lawyer deems worth while. As it operates presently, it is a public project but without public direction or public accountability.

This tax-funded social activism transfers great power in community affairs from elected officials to self-appointed ones.

There is considerable evidence that this social orientation has led to a widespread attitude on the part of numerous program attorneys that they can take any action regardless of its relationship to the eradication of poverty. As a consequence, program attorneys are and have been heavily involved in every social issue of the day. In Evanston, Illinois, it's draft counseling; in Texas, California, Colorado, Florida and other places, it's underground newspapers; in Boston, it's women's rights; in California, it's the rights of penitentiary inmates; in numerous other places, it's students' rights, anti-war protests, free-speech movements. The list of causes is endless.

But the important thing to note is that they have little or nothing to do with poverty and the problems peculiar to the poor. And equally important, while most programs now turn away individual poor clients with routine legal problems, many nevertheless find time to engage in practically every cause celebre that comes along.

Is this right? Is this what Legal Services was meant to do? Did Congress in its enactment of the Bar in its support contemplate a program where a destitute mother of five can't get legal help with an eviction notice but a middle-class drop-out can get legal counseling in setting up his underground newspaper? Proponents of such activity by Legal Services attorneys suggest that these endeavors in fact do serve the interests of the poor in a large sense. I submit that the conclusion is open to serious doubt.

Another problem with the Legal Services Program is that it has had little or no central direction and no firmly established policies and procedures. Hence, the responsibility for directing and controlling the project is left to the local Board of Directors and the Project Director. Unfortunately, in too many cases, they either cannot or will not exercise the control over the project's policies and attorneys that is necessary to insure that the program's goals and not necessarily the individual attorney's are being pursued.

I have outlined here today what I perceive to be some of the problems with the Legal Services Program. I am disturbed that the recent Congressional debate surrounding the creation of a legal services corporation failed to examine fully or resolve the fundamental questions underlying this program. This Administration favors a responsibly structured corporation but the problems and importance of legal services are such that this whole issue deserves far greater attention and discussion by the Bar and other interested parties than it has to date received. If I can get the organized Bar's support merely for the proposition that there are some problems, I think we will have taken a giant step toward resolving them.

Now I would offer these suggestions which I believe are essential to resolving the problems.

First, for the attorneys in the neighborhood law offices—law reform should be the by-product of their legal assistance to the poor, not the major goal. Their clients should be individual poor people and legitimate, self-organized groups—not the poor as a class—and they should take the cases which the people bring to them, not search for clients to fit a legal cause.

Law reform as a specific goal should be the province of the national office and the various backup centers. It should be pursued through responsible professional representation before legislatures and governmental agencies and through amicus briefs or intervention in existing cases—not through demonstrations or other high pressure tactics.

Second, Legal Services headquarters should establish policies and priorities applicable to all projects including regulations on attorneys' private political activities, group repre-

sentation and soliciting clients. The Bar could assist by taking a harder look at how the Code of Professional Responsibility applies to Legal Services attorneys. I suggest that the professional independence of the lawyer necessarily conflicts at points with the requirements of a Federally-funded social program—which must be responsible and accountable to the public. Furthermore, Legal Services lawyers operating without the normal economic restraints, and with the enormous resources of the Federal Treasury, must be better supervised by the Bar associations and held to a very high standard of conduct.

Third, we should insist upon professional control and discipline at the individual project level.

Finally, basic attitudes within this program should be changed. So long as individual attorneys conceive their role to be that of social engineers, they will continue to exacerbate community tensions and undermine the very purposes they were hired to accomplish.

This Administration is committed to furthering economic opportunity and guaranteeing justice for all. A more carefully defined Legal Services Program could help immeasurably in realizing that objective.

CAPTIVE NATIONS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, this weekend Chicago will again mark Captive Nations Week with a huge parade down State Street and appropriate ceremonies in Grant Park.

This will be the largest Captive Nations observance in the United States. It is through the hard work of Mayor Daley and the Captive Nations Committee, whose General Chairman is Viktor Viksnins, that this annual observance is held as a reminder to freedom-loving people all over the world that mankind's conscience cannot rest until the captive nations of the world become free again.

It will be my privilege to be principal speaker at the Captive Nations observances this weekend.

I am placing in the RECORD today a Memorandum and the Proclamations of both Mayor Daley and Governor Richard B. Ogilvie.

I am also placing in the RECORD today the Resolutions which will be presented to the Chicago Captive Nations Week Observance.

Mr. Speaker, this annual observance is made possible by the hard work of many dedicated people and ethnic groups.

We are particularly grateful to Dr. Kazy's Bobelis, president of the Lithuanian-American Council, for providing one of the largest participating groups in the Captive Nations Week observance.

Dr. Bobelis is a source of inspiration to all of us because of his tireless efforts on behalf of the Baltic States—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—whose independence has been brutally destroyed by the Soviets.

The Lithuanian-American Council serves as a constant reminder that the

United States has never recognized the obliteration of Lithuania by the Soviets and so far as we Americans are concerned, Lithuania and her people continue to be recognized as a sovereign state.

I am also pleased to pay tribute to my own personal good friend, Aloysius Mazewski, President of the Polish-National Alliance and the Polish-American Congress, for his untiring efforts on behalf of freedom.

Mr. Mazewski is president of the largest Polish-American fraternal organization and is the highly respected spokesman for Americans of Polish descent in their continuing effort on behalf of the people of Poland.

We are particularly grateful to Viktors Viksnins who has provided the real stimulus for Captive Nations Observance in Chicago since its inception. Without his drive and hard work and dedication, Chicago could not boast of having the largest Captive Nations Observance in America.

The memorandum, the proclamations and the resolutions follow.

MEMORANDUM

The Captive Nations have not and will not be broken. The people aspire and wait for their freedom and do what they can under the circumstances to hasten the day of its arrival.

Last year to focus world-wide attention on and to bring redress from Soviet injustice and oppression, 17 Latvian Communists smuggled a memorandum out of Latvia which exposed the Soviet governments criminal colonial policies in Latvia. In this memorandum the 17 Latvian Communists asked for world help in stopping the colonization and Russification of Latvia.

Earlier this year 17,000 Lithuanians signed a petition asking for their rights and a stop to religious persecution in Lithuania.

Recently, thousands of Lithuanians demanded their rights and independence in Kaunas, Lithuania and battled Soviet police and paratroopers were sent to suppress them.

The Ukrainians are more vocal than ever in their demands for independence despite ever-increasing Soviet Repression. The other captive people hope and wait for their independence and the day they can live and build their future in their own sovereign lands.

We of the Captive Nations Committee choose this occasion to reaffirm the right to independence for all the captive people subjugated by the Soviet Union.

We commemorate this occasion as a remembrance of our oppressed countrymen and share in their sorrow.

We choose this occasion to remind the American people of the plight and aspirations of the Captive people of East Europe, Asia, and Cuba and to remind the American people that they can lose their rights and freedom also, if they abandon their vigilance.

To reiterate, we condemn the intervention and oppression of Cuba where 20,000 were shot to death, 100,000 taken prisoners, and 400,000 exiled.

We choose this occasion to remind that the captive people have a right to exist as free people, they have rights which are presently denied by force, but the exercise of which deserves to be and must be restored if we are to live in a just and peaceful world.

Finally, we choose this occasion to let Soviet Government know that its crimes do not go unnoticed, but are known to the world, that world opinion and common decency are on our side and that we'll let its crimes, present and future, against the Cap-

tive Nations, be known until such time as the Captive Nations are free.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, Slovakia, North Viet Nam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe this week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the City of Chicago, is closely linked to these captive nations through the bonds of family, since numbered among the people of Chicago are hundreds of thousands of our citizens who, through nativity of ancestry, treasure the heritage which is theirs; and

Whereas, these nations have been made captive by the imperialistic, aggressive and heartless policies of communism; and

Whereas, the peoples of these communist-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas, it is appropriate and proper to demonstrate to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the people of the City of Chicago for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas, the people of Chicago, as do all the people of the United States, want for the people of the world the same freedom and justice which is theirs;

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby proclaim July 17 through July 22 as Captive Nations Week in Chicago. I urge the people of Chicago to join in the programs arranged for the observance of this occasion and especially encourage everyone to concretely demonstrate their interest in the imprisoned people of the captive nations by their attendance at or participation in the parade to be held on State Street on Saturday afternoon, July 22 at 12 Noon.

Dated this twentieth day of June, A.D., 1972

RICHARD J. DALEY, Mayor.

STATE OF ILLINOIS, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT— PROCLAMATION

Freedom-loving peoples from all over the earth have sought our shores; their diverse cultures have strengthened and enriched our nation.

Through the democratic process we, a people of many races, religions and national characteristics, have established a free society that recognizes the natural and economic interdependence of all peoples.

Family ties link many Illinoisans with oppressed people who yearn for the freedom and independence we enjoy. The third week in July is annually set aside as a time for the people of the United States to express their sympathy and support for the just aspirations of captive people everywhere.

Therefore I, Richard B. Ogilvie, Governor of the State of Illinois, proclaim July 17 through 22, 1972, CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK in Illinois, and call upon all citizens to participate in community observances of the week.

In witness thereof, I hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Illinois to be affixed.

Done at the Capitol, in the City of Springfield, this ninth day of June in the Year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and seventy-second, and of the State of Illinois the one hundred and fifty-fourth.

RICHARD B. OGILVIE, Governor.
JOHN W. LEWIS, Secretary of State.

CHICAGO CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK COMMITTEE—
RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, the Senate and the House of Representatives have authorized the President of the United States of America to proclaim the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, and

Whereas, Russian and Chinese communism continue to expand their colonial empires and threaten the security and independence of the Free World, carrying out subversive conspiracies in Latin America, and even in our own country, conducting aggressive warfare in South Viet-Nam and Cambodia, the neighboring countries of Laos and Thailand, having made deep inroads into the Arab countries, on the Mediterranean and the surrounding area having succeeded in setting up a Russian-Ribbentrop-Molotov pact and which would seemingly legitimize the unjust Soviet occupation and oppression of Central Europe, having developed a new threat in Asia against the Republic of China, and

Now therefore, be it resolved by the Chicago Captive Nations Week Committee to urge the United States Government to assume the role of leadership. The fact that one-third of mankind is already enslaved by communist imperialism necessitates a new policy, a policy that is able to cope with these ominous conditions, and

Be it further resolved, that in view of the indivisibility of freedom and peace, the restoration of the sacred rights of all nations, based on principles of democracy, self-determination, and sovereignty within their respective ethnic boundaries, must become the goal of this policy. This is of paramount importance to establish a lasting peace in the world, and

Be it further resolved, that we, at this critical period for the entire Free World, support the United States resistance to communist aggression in South East Asia and the building up of forces for freedom in that part of the Free World. In this spirit we salute the members of the United States Armed Forces. Our deepest respect and thanks belong to those who have laid down their lives for the victims of communist aggression, and to those who remain prisoners, and

Be it further resolved, that we appeal to the President and all governments in the Free World to stop the terrorizing practices of the communists upon the anti-communist political and national leaders of various immigrant groups, and to provide them with security which is desperately needed, particularly for those whose names have appeared on the MVD-KGB list of people scheduled for kidnapping and death. Kudirka's case is a tragic reminder as to what can happen in our own country, and

Be it further resolved, that our committee must issue the warning that "Ping-Pong diplomacy" will not mean any change in communist long range aims, and

Be it further resolved, that we deplore the ideas and policies which would endanger the sovereignty of the Republic of China. It would be a political and moral catastrophe if the people of the Republic of China were to be abandoned in this critical situation.

Be it further resolved, that we oppose one-sided friendships and the opening of additional Russian consulates in the United States; and

Be it further resolved, that the United

States Government stop building up the communist empire, particularly Soviet military power, by selling it military equipment and other goods which strengthen its position and ability to oppress the people under its power and occupation; and

Be it further resolved, that the United States refrain from doing anything to strengthen the Communist regime in Chile; and

Be it further resolved, that special efforts be made by the United States leadership toward an awakening and strengthening of all moral forces. Utmost efforts must be made to protect the sacred values in cultural, social and educational institutions so vital to the preservation of freedom. It is appalling to see how free men let themselves be used in the portrayal of anarchism, defeatism and amorality by the Red Empire; and

Be it further resolved, that the President of the United States at the forthcoming European Security Conference, request the Soviet Government to stop its Russification of and religious persecution in the countries under its occupation; and

Be it further resolved, that the President of the United States at the forthcoming European Security Conference, request the Soviet Government to restore the independence of these European nations and to grant true sovereignty to all the countries under its power; and

Be it further resolved, that the President of the United States actively seek the restoration of independence for these states and make it a condition for a large scale European settlement, and

Be it further resolved, that this committee reiterates its support for the establishment of the permanent Captive Nations Committee (House Resolution 211) and Freedom Academy. There is a desperate need for a forum to handle the issues of injustice against nations and crimes against humanity, and

When we think of the past failures of appeasement and of the present political climate which is becoming increasingly alarming, we appeal most urgently to the President and Congress, on behalf of the millions of human beings under the tyranny of the Communist Empire, to turn to the way which will grant security to America and will build confidence and respect for this country among the nations of the world; namely to turn firmly to the pursuit of God-given and therefore, sacred rights of self-determination and freedom for all nations, and this not only in declarations, but in deeds and actions.

LIST OF SIGNATURES

Viktors Viksnins, General Chairman, Chicago, Captive Nations Committee.

Uliana Celewych, Ukrainian—Representative.

Rev. Anthony Cuvalo, Croatian—Representative.

Ivan S. Kralik, Slovakia—Representative.

Leon Lih-da-Hu, Chinese—Representative.

Joe C. Rodriguez, Cuban—Representative.

Leo Klidzejs, Resolution Secretary.

Hafizi Y. Azern, Albanian Representative.

Mykolas Pranevicius, Lithuanian—Representative.

Leonids Neimanis, Latvian—Representative.

Alex Koopp, Estonian—Representative.

Nick Zyznieuski, Bielarussian—Representative.

Juan Paneque, Resolution Committee.

Walther A. Kollacks, German, Member Resolution Committee.

Roksanda Panich, Serbian Representative.

Dr. Mikulas Feljencik, Czechoslovakia Representative.

1972 LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make available to readers of the RECORD the results of my 1972 legislative questionnaire. The survey was mailed in May to residents of the First Congressional District of Tennessee, including those in Grainger and Hamblen Counties, which will again become part of the district.

The 18.8 percent rate of response shows the people are concerned about the current issues. I made a concerted effort to reach college students by mailing my questionnaires to area campuses. The fact that 30 percent of the returns were received from persons reporting only for themselves indicates many students responded.

In a few days I will send a report from Washington to the postal patrons in my district giving the questionnaire results. The report follows:

JULY, 1972.

DEAR FRIENDS: The continued high interest of the people in the First District in our nation's affairs is indicated by the answers to my 1972 questionnaire, and I am pleased to present these returns to you in this special Report from Washington.

This year's survey was mailed to 197,000 postal patrons, including the residents of Grainger and Hamblen counties. I am delighted the two counties will again become part of the First Congressional District. Nearly 47,000 more questionnaires were mailed than in 1971. The 18.8% rate of response—also an increase over last year—shows the people are concerned about the current issues.

I made a concerted effort to reach college students by mailing my 1972 questionnaires to area campuses. The fact that 30% of the returns were received from persons reporting only for themselves indicates many students responded.

Nine issues were included in the questionnaire. I tried to use current questions which have provoked the most interest to all. Answers to this survey reveal a strong degree of unanimity in the District.

The question which received the most unanimous response was number five—"Do you favor forced busing of school children to achieve racial balance?" Responding in opposition to forced busing were 95.9% "His" and 95.1% "Hers." Also receiving a high degree of unanimity of opinion was the question, "Do you favor granting amnesty to draft dodgers and deserters?" There were 92% "His" and 90.2% "Hers" against granting amnesty.

Two questions, number two—"Should persons who voluntarily strike be entitled to food stamps?"—and number eight—"Do you favor eliminating the penalties for possession of marijuana?"—indicated a strong negative opinion. Opposing the distribution of food stamps to strikers were 85.3% "His" and 84.2% "Hers." For question number eight, there was a noticeable difference of opinion expressed by married couples as compared with persons reporting only for themselves, who probably represent a younger age group. Among the married couples, 84.5% "His" and 84.8% "Hers" were opposed to the removal

of penalties for marijuana possession, but only 73.1% "His" and 77.2% "Hers," among the group reporting individually, were opposed to this.

Receiving the most favorable response was question number three—"Should the U.S. place a fixed limit on imports of agricultural products to aid our farmers?"—with 75.2% "His" and 75.4% "Hers" supporting these limits.

However, there was no clear-cut majority response shown to question number seven, which concerned lengthening the term served by U.S. Congressmen. In favor of extend-

ing the term were 52% "His" and 52.9% "Hers," while 43.9% "His" and 43.8% "Hers" opposed longer terms.

Question number nine—"Do you favor a value added tax?"—produced the greatest undecided tally, with 10.7% "His" and 13.7% "Hers" unsure of their position. Answers revealed 59.3% "His" and 58.2% "Hers" opposed the value added tax, while 30% "His" and 28.1% "Hers" favored the tax.

Uncertainty was also evident in the responses to question number six—"Do you feel the present system of wage and price controls is working to end inflation?" Unsure

of the success of the President's economic programs were 7.1% "His" and 9.9% "Hers." Persons responding who felt the present system is not working numbered 61.3% "His" and 63% "Hers," while 31.6% "His" and 27.1% "Hers" considered the system successful.

Residents were undecided about extending diplomatic and trade relations with Mainland China. Of the persons uncertain as to whether we should improve relations with China, 6.9% were "His" votes and 9.9% "Hers" votes. There were 61.5% "His" and 58.2% "Hers" in favor of developing relations between the two nations.

OVERALL DISTRICT RESULTS
(In percent)

	Yes		No		Undecided			Yes		No		Undecided	
	His	Hers	His	Hers	His	Hers		His	Hers	His	Hers	His	Hers
1. Do you favor granting amnesty to draft dodgers and deserters?.....	5.9	6.0	92.0	90.2	2.1	3.8	6. Do you feel the present system of wage and price controls is working to end inflation?.....	31.6	27.1	61.3	63.0	7.1	9.9
2. Should persons who voluntarily strike be entitled to food stamps?.....	12.7	12.9	85.3	84.2	2.0	2.9	7. Do you favor changing the term of a Member of Congress from 2 to 4 years?.....	52.0	52.9	43.9	43.8	4.1	3.3
3. Should the United States place a fixed limit on imports of agricultural products to aid our farmers?.....	75.2	75.4	18.8	18.1	6.0	6.5	8. Do you favor eliminating the criminal penalties for possession of marijuana?.....	15.1	12.3	82.8	83.5	2.1	4.2
4. Are you in favor of the United States expanding diplomatic and trade relations with mainland China?.....	61.5	58.2	31.6	31.9	6.9	9.9	9. The so-called value added tax, in effect a national sales tax, is contemplated as a method to hold the line on property tax increases. Do you favor such a tax?.....	30.0	28.1	59.3	58.2	10.7	13.7
5. Do you favor forced busing of school-children to achieve racial balance?.....	3.1	2.3	95.9	95.1	1.0	2.6							

I am deeply grateful for your assistance in making it possible for me to have the views of my constituents on these matters. The response I have received to my questionnaire aids me greatly in representing you here in the Congress.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. QUILLEN.

ORDER OF AHEPA GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the Order of Ahepa is this month celebrating its golden anniversary, having been founded in Atlanta, Ga., on July 26, 1922. The word "Ahepa" is an acronym for the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, and the order now includes 430 local chapters in 49 States, Canada, and Australia.

In saluting this outstanding fraternal organization on its 50th anniversary, I commend to the attention of the Congress and of the American people the following list of goals of the Order of Ahepa:

OBJECTS OF AHEPA

1. To promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America
2. To instruct its members in the tenets and fundamental principles of government, and in the recognition and respect of the inalienable rights of mankind
3. To instill in its membership a due appreciation of the privileges of citizenship
4. To encourage its members to always be profoundly interested and actively participating in the political, civic, social and commercial fields of human endeavor

5. To pledge its members to do their utmost to stamp out any and all political corruption; and to arouse its members to the fact that tyranny is a menace to the life, property, prosperity, honor and integrity of every nation

6. To promote a better and more comprehensive understanding of the attributes and ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic Culture

7. To promote good fellowship, and endow its members with the perfection of the moral sense

8. To endow its members with a spirit of altruism, common understanding, mutual benevolence and helpfulness

9. To champion the cause of Education, and to maintain new channels for facilitating the dissemination of culture and learning.

Mr. Speaker, no organization or fraternity ever had better ideals, and the Order of Ahepa has made invaluable contributions in nearly every phase of American life. I congratulate its members on this golden anniversary and commend their outstanding service of half a century to our great Nation.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with those who salute the Order of Ahepa, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, on the 50th anniversary of its founding. Few organizations can be credited with the long-standing national and international reputation for dedicated service to the causes of education, freedom, and loyalty

to America that the Order of Ahepa has established since 1922. The order recognizes that education is the foundation of good citizenship and seeks to instill in its members a sense of pride in their individual rights, encouraging not only an informed interest but also energetic participation in political, social, civic, and commercial spheres of human activity.

The membership of the order is highly diversified; it includes businessmen, laborers, professional men, and educators who are united by a common goal of fellowship and mutual understanding. Ahepans are recognized in their communities as men devoted to civic responsibility, as good neighbors, and as concerned parents. I am proud to pay special tribute to the Wellsville chapter of the Order of Ahepa in my district, whose officers are James Raptis, president; George Raptis, vice president; John Giopulos, secretary; and George Giopulos, treasurer.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,757 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

THE MOOD IN ISRAEL IN 1972

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Charles W. Yost, former U.S. Representative to the United Nations, recently undertook a trip to the Middle East during which he met with leaders in several Arab countries and in Israel. He has written several articles on his trip which have appeared in the Christian Science Monitor. His article on Israel, which appeared in the July 19 issue, is particularly interesting and his assessment of the mood in that country revealing. This article follows:

ISRAEL IN THE SUMMER OF 1972

(By Charles W. Yost)

Abba Eban, the experienced and perceptive Israeli Foreign Minister, pointed out to me here a few days ago that in 1972 Israel has only one insecure frontier—paradoxically that with Lebanon, the most pacific of its neighbors. Remarks of this kind by Israeli leaders, while emphasizing that they expect, indeed insist, that Lebanon remove the source of this insecurity, reflect the mood of exuberant and understandable optimism which one finds in Israel today.

On the military side, the Bar-Lev line along the Suez Canal has been almost completely quiet for nearly two years. Since King Hussein suppressed the guerrillas in Jordan, there has been no threat from that quarter. There have been occasional incidents on the occupied Golan Heights, but the Syrians are keeping their Palestinians on a tight rein and not risking any confrontation there which might involve their own forces. The Lebanese Government also does its best, not always successfully, to control the Palestinians on its territory. Consequently the strength of these once-feared organizations has declined rapidly since 1970 and they are forced to rely on outrageous but militarily inconsequential episodes such as the Japanese razzia at the Lydda airport.

As to the superpowers, the United States seems to have tacitly dropped the "Rogers plan," which in Israeli eyes smacked of an imposed settlement, and last December reaffirmed its unquestioning support of Israel with another substantial commitment of Phantoms.

It is not believed in Israel that the Soviet Union, in view of the priority it clearly attaches to better relations with the United States and Europe, will now encourage any serious violation of the cease-fire along the Suez Canal.

Israel, therefore, has every reason to be satisfied on the military score. Inside the country, while the cost of living is high and rising, the economy is booming. New housing is growing up everywhere, most of all in and around Jerusalem. Tourists abound, undeterred by threats of terrorism. Unemployment is practically nonexistent and the Arab occupants of the so-called "administered zones," the West Bank and Gaza, share in this prosperity to the extent of having steady jobs and higher incomes than in the past. The Israelis are encouraged by what they feel to be a shift in sentiment "from hostility to indifference" among this population. A swelling stream of Arab visitors flows across the Allenby bridge from Jordan to visit relatives and friends on the West Bank.

Meanwhile new immigrants, chiefly from the Soviet Union and Romania, arrive in increasing numbers, many of them highly

qualified people, teachers, engineers, architects, lawyers. They are processed through comfortable and efficient "absorption centers" where they are taught Hebrew and very rapidly prepared for productive assimilation in the life of the country. As one Israeli pointed out, "the melting pot is a pressure cooker."

It is not surprising that, in view of all these favorable factors, one finds a mood of quiet confidence, almost of euphoria, in Israel. Certainly Abba Eban continues to emphasize Israel's readiness to negotiate with its Arab neighbors, particularly Egypt, either on an interim or a permanent settlement, either directly or through "close proximity" talks as the United States has suggested.

To the argument that the Arabs feel that negotiation, under present circumstances, would merely amount to capitulation—since Israeli leaders have announced their firm intention to hold onto certain territories which the Arabs absolutely refuse to concede—Mr. Eban replies that the essence of real negotiation is concession by both sides, that recent German and Vietnamese experiences suggest that prior positions are not necessarily rigidly adhered to, that even small steps forward create a climate for larger steps, and that in any case negotiation is far better for both sides than fighting.

Among most Israelis with whom I talked, however, while I found a similar willingness to negotiate, I found two other states of mind predominant: First, the conviction that retention of a significant part of the "administered territories" is essential to Israeli security and that there is no reliable substitute for such territorial changes; second, the recognition that, in view of this fact and the profound psychological mistrust between the two sides, the gap between them is still too great to permit any negotiation to succeed in the near future. While the extent of the territories Israel would insist on annexing was not spelled out to me, it is apparent they would include Sharm el Sheikh and some assured access to it, former Arab Jerusalem and its surroundings, the Golan Heights, and presumably significant parts of the West Bank. These go far beyond the "insubstantial" changes Secretary Rogers proposed two and a half years ago.

In a sense this position or mood represents a substantial shift from that which prevailed immediately following the Six-Day war. At that time the emphasis was on a durable peace with the Arabs, "reciprocal, binding, contractual agreements" between them and Israel, an end to the insecurity of armistices, truces, and cease-fires.

When Egyptian President Sadat last year, however, offered "a peace agreement with Israel," plus international guarantees, it became apparent that this was no longer the main Israeli objective. The lapse of time had brought about a psychological evolution. It is now emphasized that Arab governments are unstable, that new ones might easily disavow agreements sincerely made by the present ones, that international guarantees proved valueless in 1967 and well might again.

To the generals in particular, but to most of public opinion as well, the present military lines—even though unaccepted by the other side—represent the best possible, the only certain assurance of Israel's security. The tacit hope in the back of most everyone's mind is that in the course of time the Arabs, once convinced they have no real alternative, will at last accept them, or at least accept new lines so drawn as to meet what Israel profoundly believes its security requires.

This is the Israeli point of view as I see it. After visits to one or two more Arab countries, an effort will be made in this column to sum up the situation throughout the Middle East and to estimate the chances for

peace in the near and the more distant future.

CONCERN OF VETERANS ORGANIZATIONS

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess, the national veterans organizations held annual meetings in my State. These include the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Disabled American Veterans, and the Italian American War Veterans of the United States.

The resolutions which were adopted gave expression to concerns of the membership for our beloved country, to which their contribution is manifest by their military service and personal commitment. The resolutions express as well their involvement and support for veterans programs, and serve as a continuing reminder of our enduring obligations and responsibilities to every veteran.

The positions which these organizations express encompass matters of vital concern to every American. I am proud to present to my colleagues the conclusions of their deliberations on a wide range of resolutions.

The American Legion, Department of Connecticut opposes "any attempt to grant amnesty or freedom from prosecution to those men who either by illegally avoiding the draft or desertions from the Armed Forces failed to fulfill their military obligations to the United States."

The American Legion also stated support for legislation to return Memorial Day to May 30 and Veterans Day to November 11 of each year. Important resolutions request from the Congress funds to provide vocational training and retraining for veterans of any war who need such training, with special attention to veterans who served before January 31, 1955.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Department of Connecticut, passed a resolution stating that "no form of general or selective amnesty be granted to all or any of the draft dodgers or deserters until, first, the U.S. combat role in Vietnam has drawn completely to a close; and, second, our prisoners have been returned to our shores and a valid accounting has been made of our 'missing in action'." This resolution further states that only after these conditions have been fulfilled "should a deliberate case-by-case review be undertaken."

In another resolution, the VFW asked the President to request that the Secretary General of the United Nations fully use the power of his office to secure inspections of POW facilities by the International Red Cross; immediate release of sick and wounded prisoners; proper food and medical treatment; regular exchange

of mail between prisoners and families; immediate, accurate verification of names of all prisoners; and strict adherence to every provision of the Geneva Convention pertaining to the treatment of prisoners of war. The VFW further requested that the President of the United States "utilize all means necessary to insure the safety of POW's."

The VFW focused on the need to maintain the integrity of veterans programs, and gave considerable attention to the need to improve educational benefits and employment opportunities for veterans. The organization petitioned the administration and the Congress to establish a Veterans Employment Board composed of the Secretaries of Labor and Defense, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The Board "would establish policy and administer, insofar as Federal responsibility is concerned, the veterans job placement and job training program of the Federal-State Employment Service System."

The VFW asked Congress to allocate funds to the Department of Labor with specified sums set aside for each State employment service agency, based on the agency's estimate of veteran need and workload for the sole purpose of "providing fully adequate job placement and job training for all veterans seeking assistance through the public employment service, as intended by existing law." A further request recommended that the position of Director of the Veterans' Employment Service be elevated to Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor or the equivalent, "with enforcement authority for all veterans rights and services within the U.S. Department of Labor and the Public Employment Service."

Another resolution called for adequate funding of the U.S. Department of Labor, the Manpower Administration, the Veterans' Employment Service, and the State employment services to furnish adequate personnel required to perform all mandated services to veterans effectively.

This resolution included requests for job retraining of older veterans, Federal funding to create additional skill developing jobs for veterans to insure placement of all those seeking jobs, recognition of the rehabilitation training needs of disabled veterans, and expanded programs and support for the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped as well as community and State level programs.

The VFW requests a Department of Veterans Affairs with elevation of the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to the position of Cabinet-level Secretary. Their resolution requesting vital program changes in the VA medical program to insure quality medical care for veterans includes numerous administrative changes and modifications in the present program.

Another resolution requested that in the consideration of legislation regarding national health insurance, the Veterans Administration and medical care system not be impaired. Other important resolutions request the VA to eliminate waiting lists at VA hospitals and liberal-

ize social security benefits as well as compensation, pension, and insurance programs administered by the VA.

The VFW supports legislation to: Equalize military retired pay by recomputation on the military pay rates currently in effect for active duty personnel of the same grade or rank and length of service; provide for a military survivor annuity program identical to the civil service annuity; assure veterans rights in civil service employment, including extension of the Veterans Preference Act to agencies presently exempt or excluded from its provisions; to establish at least one national cemetery in every State and to transfer responsibility for operating and maintaining the national cemetery system to the Veterans' Administration. Other VFW resolutions include a recommendation for creating a suitable medal for prisoners of war to express our Nation's gratitude for "service of the highest order," and statements on maintaining a sufficient military capability, Middle East and Southeast Asia policy, and the Panama Canal Zone.

The Italian American War Veterans, Department of Connecticut, passed a resolution calling for the establishment of a national cemetery in every State. Another resolution requests that the Veterans' Administration provide adequate facilities for the care of drug addicted veterans.

The resolutions put forth by the veterans organization cover a wide range of important matters. They deserve the studied consideration of every Member of Congress.

ORDER OF AHEPA MARKS ITS GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, next Wednesday, July 26, the Order of Ahepa will celebrate its golden anniversary. Since the fraternal group was founded 50 years ago in Atlanta, Ga., it has drawn its membership mainly from among men of Greek ethnic heritage. Indeed, the name AHEPA is an acronym, derived from the initial letters of American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

But, while members of AHEPA have maintained a justifiable pride in their Hellenic heritage, they have taken a much broader role on the American scene. Thus, AHEPA has stressed that its key objectives are "to promote and encourage loyalty to the United States of America" and to foster participation by its members in the political, civic, social, and commercial fields. Besides undertaking a host of worthwhile projects at the local level, AHEPA nationally has contributed financially to such causes as the relief of Florida hurricane victims and Mississippi flood victims.

We in Wisconsin are proud to be the

home of AHEPA chapters in Milwaukee, Racine, and Fond du Lac.

I salute a fine organization on its 50th anniversary, and take special note of these chapter officers in Wisconsin: Milwaukee—Frank Dionesopoulos, president; James Mahos, vice president; James Jatteris, secretary, and Steve L. Gineris, treasurer; Racine—George T. Mouzes, president; Harry Erriniades, vice president; Peter Dess, secretary, and George Conrad, treasurer; Fond du Lac—Peter Frank, president; Mike Poulos, vice president; Sam Bekearis, secretary, and Nick Frank, treasurer.

GEORGE M. MILLER

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, Takoma Park, Md., has lost its strong and active mayor, George M. Miller, a believer in cooperation between neighbors and between the communities that make up the Greater Washington area.

Takoma Park, which elected him to 10 consecutive terms as mayor, will miss him, as will many others who knew him through the National League of Cities and the Metropolitan Council of Governments, which he served as vice president and treasurer.

The following obituary from the Washington Post of July 18, lists some of the accomplishments of this excellent man:

GEORGE M. MILLER

(By Martin Weil)

George M. Miller, 61, the mayor of Takoma Park since 1954, died of cancer last night at Holy Cross Hospital. He had been re-elected in March to his 10th consecutive two-year term as mayor.

In addition to serving as mayor, a part-time post that pays \$1,200 annually, Mr. Miller held a full-time job as a budget officer for the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

A native of Laurel, Mr. Miller had lived since 1939 in Takoma Park, a city of 20,000 with a two-square mile area that is two thirds in Montgomery County and one third in Prince George's County.

"He was constantly trying to improve the city," city councilman and mayor pro-tem John D. Roth said last night. Roth was named mayor pro-tem by Mr. Miller in late June when he entered the hospital.

In the nonpartisan post of mayor, Mr. Miller was credited with leadership in providing the city with its own public library and in the city's azalea-planting beautification programs.

He was also a strong opponent of plans to route the proposed North Central Freeway through Takoma Park. Highly controversial, the freeway has never been built.

In addition, Mr. Miller is credited with a major role in bringing about construction of a new \$700,000 city office building recently opened in Takoma Park at Maple Avenue and Rte. 410.

A past president of the Maryland League of Cities, Mr. Miller had also been a member of the board of directors of the National League of Cities, and had been secretary-treasurer of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

He was a graduate of St. John's College High School and of Benjamin Franklin University, where he studied accounting.

During World War II, he served in the Army in Europe.

Survivors include his wife, Charlotte, of the home, at 7505 Hancock Ave., Takoma Park, two sons, George M. Jr. of Silver Spring, and Charles of St. Mary's County, Md., and a daughter Susan of the home.

SOUTHERN AFRICA: CONSTANT THEMES IN U.S. POLICY

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, recognizing that the President's African policy has, on occasion, been misunderstood and misinterpreted, I would like to place in the RECORD an address by Mr. David D. Newsom, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, entitled "Southern Africa: Constant Themes in U.S. Policy." Mr. Newsom's address clearly sets forth the convictions and policies of this administration as they concern southern Africa:

SOUTHERN AFRICA: CONSTANT THEMES IN U.S. POLICY

Interest here at home in a meaningful U.S. policy toward Africa has clearly been growing in recent years. We welcome this interest. We feel it should be accompanied by an accurate knowledge and an interested understanding of what our policy is.

I regret to say that our policy and actions have been misunderstood on occasion and misinterpreted. It is not my purpose here today to make a partisan speech. As the steward of our African policy over the past three years, however, I should like to take this occasion to set the record straight.

The growing interest in Africa in this country was manifested most dramatically during the last weekend in May when a conference of 400 black Americans at Howard University was followed by an impressive demonstration by over 10,000 persons in Washington on behalf of African liberation.

As is natural to an occasion totally directed to one area of policy, there were many critical of official policies—not always, however, with a full knowledge of what the policies are and of the complexities of making that policy. Charges ranged from "neglect" of Africa to assertions that present policies represented a shift from the past purposely in favor of the white-dominated regimes of southern Africa. Quite understandably, because of the identity with racial problems, the focus of attention of this surging interest in Africa is on the southern portion of the continent.

There have been other manifestations of both rising interest and serious misconception. The *New York Times* of April 2 highlighted what it called the deliberate increase of contacts and communication with the white-dominated regimes of southern Africa. A statement issued through the office of Congressman Diggs of the House Subcommittee of Africa spoke of "collaboration" with the white regimes.

There has also been criticism from those who dislike our policies on the grounds that these policies do not sufficiently recognize certain of our interests in southern Africa. Motivated by concern over strategic or economic considerations, by basic sympathies with the white populations of the area, or by reluctance to see us become involved in prob-

lems of distant regions, many express their disapproval of traditional U.S. restraint toward the regimes of southern Africa. Individual American attitudes toward this area vary widely. Those making policy are in the middle.

To set the record straight on what our policies can be and what they are, let us examine first those elements that have been constant in U.S. policy toward southern Africa since the late Fifties.

First, the United States Government has consistently supported the principle of self-determination for all peoples in Africa.

Second, we have strongly and actively indicated our abhorrence of the institution of apartheid.

Third, we have consistently favored peaceful change in southern Africa through supporting constructive alternatives to the use of force.

Our implementation of these principles has been governed, for more than a decade and through several Administrations, by our recognition of four realities:

One, as a nation, we have complex worldwide relationships. Our response to the needs of one area frequently is limited by our interests in another. For example, the difference between interests in Europe and in Africa has affected our position in both.

Two, we are dealing in southern Africa with governments which react strongly to outside pressures and are not easily susceptible to persuasion.

Three, we are dealing with complex societies, not with the interest of one race, but of many. Justice requires a consideration of the future of all.

Four, there are many real limitations on the extent to which we can influence the situation, both in terms of what might be supported domestically and of what we might be able to do in Africa.

The actions of the U.S. Government in this area over the past three years have been consistent with these general policy lines and limitations laid down in the years just after the emergence of independent Africa.

By the strict maintenance of arms embargoes toward both South Africa and the Portuguese territories, we have tangibly demonstrated our support for self-determination and our desire to avoid any support either for the imposition of apartheid or the continuation of colonial rule.

The maintenance of an arms embargo may sound like a passive act. It is not. It requires constant vigilance over shipments to the area. It means considerable sacrifice on the part of U.S. exporters who have seen substantial sales in southern Africa go to countries less conscientious about the embargo and less criticized by the Africans. It means a continuing effort on our part to explain to those in this country opposed to the embargoes the absolute necessity of maintaining them in terms of our wider interests in Africa. We believe this policy has been effective. No proof has ever been presented that any weapons have gone from the United States to southern Africa since the embargoes were established in 1963.

The maintenance of the arms embargo has been accompanied, particularly in the case of South Africa, by a strict limitation on contact with that country's military. Because we have not wished to risk subjecting our men to apartheid, we have since 1967 avoided U.S. naval visits to South African ports despite the frequent need for U.S. Navy transit of this area. This has added to logistical problems for the Navy.

The U.S. Embassy and the U.S. Consulates General in South Africa continue to constitute significant bridges between the races in that country. Multi-racial entertaining, contact with South Africans of all races, and the facilitation of such contacts for American visitors in the country leave little doubt as to where the United States stands with respect to apartheid. The record of the

U.S. mission in this regard is in important respects a unique one.

We have, further, during the past three years sought to add new dimensions to these efforts.

We have expanded our contacts with all elements of the South African population. We have offered significant members of the South African majority the opportunity to visit this country. During the past three years, we have had 45 official visitors from South Africa, of whom 30 have been from the black, colored and Indian communities. Many of the white as well as the black and colored South Africans whom we have invited here have been persons deeply involved in seeking alternatives to apartheid.

It is, perhaps, pertinent that the Foreign Minister of South Africa felt obliged to point out to his parliament on May 5 that present U.S. policy did not accept the South African approach to evolution within that country, but sought, through persuasion, to bring about peaceful change.

We have begun to break down racial barriers regarding the assignment of American official personnel to South Africa. Black diplomatic couriers have now been placed on the runs to South Africa. Three black Foreign Service officers have, during the past year, been on temporary duty assignments in the Republic. Black Americans have been sent to South Africa under our official cultural exchange program.

In the case of Namibia, or South West Africa, we strongly supported the proposal at the United Nations to have the International Court of Justice take up the question of South Africa's continued administration of the territory. We accepted the Court's conclusions that South Africa's mandate over the territory was terminated and that South Africa's continued presence there is illegal.

We alone among major countries have taken the position of discouraging any new investment in the territory. We encourage U.S. firms already in Namibia to set the pace in improved employee relations. We consistently have supported the U.N.'s responsibility in the territory.

In our support for alternatives in southern Africa, we have increased our assistance dramatically to the smaller majority-ruled states of southern Africa: Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland. We will, in July, be signing a \$12,000,000 loan agreement for the construction of a road linking Botswana to Zambia and providing alternative economic outlets for that nation. In 1971 for the first time, we appointed an Ambassador, a black American, to represent us in these three countries.

In the continuing interplay of U.S. interests, decisions must be made in which one set of interests may prevail—in any specific case—over another. In the region of southern Africa there are five areas in particular where conflicting interests have affected policies—in every administration. For southern Africa has in the past fifteen years presented particularly difficult policy problems: the Portuguese territories, relations with the liberation movements, pressures at the United Nations, Rhodesia, and investment in South Africa are some of these.

Critics of U.S. policies seek to take isolated decisions in these problem areas and read into them a basic change in the course of U.S. African policy. In doing so they tend to neglect decisions which with equal logic point in the opposite direction.

In the more extreme form, a few critics have claimed that there is a conscious effort on the part of the U.S. Government at this time to favor the white-ruled governments of southern Africa. I have had to deny both in Africa and in this country that we have chosen sides in the southern conflict, and that the U.S. would intervene on the side of the white regimes in the event of trouble.

There is no basis for such assumptions.

They ignore the large and growing U.S. interest in black Africa and, particularly, our interest in the majority-ruled states in southern Africa. They ignore the fact that our one major intervention in Africa, in close collaboration with the U.N., was to preserve the unity of the Congo—against efforts to dismember it supported by the white-dominated regimes. This intervention was ordered by President Eisenhower and fully supported and carried on by President Kennedy.

The most difficult area relates to our relations with Portugal. Portugal is an ally, a charter member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. For more than two decades, we have enjoyed the use of base facilities in the Azores, Portuguese islands in the mid-Atlantic. These base facilities are of great importance to our anti-submarine defenses in the face of a growing Soviet submarine presence in the area.

Although our last formal agreement to continue stationing forces in the Azores lapsed in 1962, the Portuguese permitted us to stay on. When a new Portuguese Government took office in 1968, it insisted that we formalize our presence in the Azores by renewing the lapsed agreement. We concurred and also agreed to a related request that we examine areas in which the United States could assist Portugal in economic and social development. The final agreement did not follow the usual pattern of granting military assistance for military bases, but was instead solely related to economic and educational development in metropolitan Portugal.

Now this base agreement has drawn a great deal of attention and has attracted substantial comment, both in the United States and in Africa. I am afraid that despite our best efforts at explaining the terms, it has been greatly misunderstood, and even misrepresented. Much of the confusion has concerned Export-Import Bank credits for American exporters competing for contracts in Portugal. In a letter to the Portuguese on this subject, the Secretary of State said that we had reviewed a number of development projects that they had in mind and that the Export-Import Bank would consider financing exports for those projects in accordance with the usual loan criteria and practices of the Bank. Export-Import Bank facilities have always been available for U.S. firms seeking business in Portugal and this agreement represented absolutely no change in that policy. No commitment was made to extend credits in any amount, only to consider applications as before.

The principal objection voiced against the agreement holds that it releases Portuguese resources for use in the African wars. But in fact, Portugal has large exchange reserves, as the result of conservative fiscal policies. Our refusal to grant credit would not lead others to do the same. There is no evidence to suggest that our withholding credit would in any sense deter the Portuguese from pursuing their present policies in Africa.

We recognize that the question of our relations with Portugal and with Portuguese Africa is becoming increasingly an emotional issue in this country. Closely related to this is the question of our relation with all liberation movements in Africa. Many in Africa and America judge one's attitude toward the southern African issues as a whole by the attitude taken toward the liberation movements and their leaders.

The African movements targeted against the several parts of white-ruled southern Africa vary widely in size, effectiveness, cohesion, and activity. Those targeted against the Portuguese territories appear to be militarily the most active. They are receiving help from the Soviets and Chinese. The leaders of the movements seek contacts with and help from the West.

The question of U.S. official relations with leaders of opposition movements in colonial

territories has always posed a dilemma for American policy makers. It was true in the Fifties with respect particularly to North Africa. It has been no less true throughout the Sixties and today in that part of Africa still under colonial or white domination.

These movements are a political fact. On the one hand, the absence of contact or support from us leaves the leaders subject to certain other outside influences. On the other hand, the U.S. has traditionally been unwilling to recognize opposition elements in colonial territories until an internationally recognized transfer of power has taken place. That situation still prevails today. Nevertheless, in such areas, as in the past, both U.S. Government and private organizations seek opportunities to help with appropriate humanitarian and educational assistance to refugees affected by the conflicts.

The problem in the United Nations is particularly difficult.

We have a basic sympathy with the aspirations of the Africans to see an end to apartheid and colonial government, and to see a greater recognition of the need for racial justice and equality. Most African leaders understand and appreciate this. At the same time, because of our own traditions and historical experience, they expect more of the United States—more than they expect of others. We cannot always meet these expectations.

During 1971, if we take together General Assembly and Security Council votes on African issues, we voted for 15 specific African proposals, against 11, and abstained on 12.

Many Africans believe this record is inadequate. Yet, underlying the careful consideration given each vote, was a deep dedication to many of the same principles motivating African representatives and our desire, whenever possible, to vote with the Africans. Ironically, we could have voted for most of these proposals if only one or two extreme or unrealistic features had been eliminated. We were able to negotiate, however, in many cases, agreements on language changes so we could vote with the Africans. Many of the problems we had did not relate to Africa *per se*, but involved broader questions. They related to:

Our desire to avoid establishing world-wide legal precedents which could affect broader U.S. and U.N. interests;

The need to verify facts before condemning another state;

Our deep concern over increases in the budget of the United Nations.

With regard to Rhodesia, the U.S. Government has sought to support United Nations economic sanctions as an alternative to a violent solution and as a form of pressure on the Smith regime to negotiate a new basis for independence. We closed our Consulate in Rhodesia. We closed off all contact with the Smith regime. We enforced sanctions against Rhodesia as conscientiously as any nation, and more so than most.

This has not been a universally popular policy in this country. There are those who dislike the idea of sanctions against anyone, those who are aware of extensive violations by other countries, those whose own interests have in some way been affected, and still others who are disillusioned with the United Nations and opposed to the concept of United Nations mandatory action infringing on the United States.

There are those who deplore the fact that while other countries have been ignoring sanctions with impunity, the United States was forced to pay higher prices to the Soviet Union for strategic materials. These attitudes resulted in the action of the Congress last year to exempt strategic materials from Rhodesian sanctions and allow their importation into the United States unless there is a similar embargo on such materials from Communist countries. Efforts this year to obtain the repeal of the resultant legislation have not been successful.

This move has caused adverse reactions in Africa. It created a contradiction between our domestic and international obligations. It came at a time when Britain was seeking a settlement with Rhodesia and undoubtedly led the Rhodesians for a time to believe that sanctions as a whole were visibly crumbling. While there have been far more extensive sanctions violations by others, this open and official US act has made us appear the principal culprit, in New York and in Africa, condemned by resolutions both in the U.N. and in the Organization of African Unity. I dislike deeply seeing ourselves in this position.

Finally, there is the question of U.S. investments in South Africa. There are those who see the failure of the U.S. Government to seek to restrict such investments as an indication of sympathy for the policies of South Africa. There are those who assume that the presence of these investments automatically means that we will intervene in the event of trouble in that area. Neither assumption is correct.

Here again, the record needs to be set straight:

First, U.S. investment in South Africa represents only 16 per cent of total foreign investment in that country. It represents only a fourth of total U.S. investment in Africa—a ratio that is decreasing all the time. It is not likely that U.S. withdrawal of this investment—assuming this were feasible—would force change in South Africa. There is no valid basis for speculating that the U.S. would take extraordinary measures to protect this investment in the event of civil or other disturbance when, among other factors, more substantial investment in the rest of the continent would need to be weighed in the balance.

Secondly, much of this investment is linked with South African business interests; withdrawal would not be easy even if the U.S. had authority to force withdrawal by American companies. New U.S. investment in South Africa comes to a large extent from current profits of U.S. firms operating there.

Thirdly, the United States does not encourage investment in South Africa nor extend guarantees covering such investment. It is the economic situation in that country that attracts investment.

Fourthly, while there is debate in the U.S. and in South Africa on this point, our soundings indicate that the black and colored populations of South Africa do not want to see U.S. investment withdrawn. The majority see U.S. investment as a constructive force; they wish to see it remain and make an impact on that society.

The United States Government, therefore, neither encourages nor discourages investment in South Africa. It does encourage U.S. firms that are there to lead the way in upgrading the status of non-white workers and in contributions to social and educational improvement. It is a misleading oversimplification to suggest that the presence of that investment either draws us into the conflict of races in that area or commits us to a policy favorable to apartheid.

The southern African aspect, however, is not the only element in U.S. policy toward Africa. There are 41 independent African states other than South Africa. In many of them we have major interests and investments. We desire satisfactory relations with all.

Cliches exist about this aspect of our policy as well. People speak of "neglect," and "low priority." The facts do not bear this out.

With patient effort, we have established reasonably satisfactory relations with all but one of these states. We have, in the past three years, resumed diplomatic relations with Mauritania. We have strengthened our relations with Algeria and the Sudan, despite the continued absence of formal diplomatic ties. Of all the states in Africa, only in Congo

(Brazzaville) do we not have reasonable access to the leadership and a reasonably respected relationship.

African nations welcome the attention we have given to them and to their citizens as significant members of the world community. We have, from its inception, recognized the Organization of African Unity as a forward-looking institution representing the common interests and identities of Africans.

Through visits, correspondence, and the work of our diplomatic missions, we have established bonds of friendship and common interest which belie any suggestion of neglect. The Ambassador of one of the most militant African countries recently told one of our officers that he was preparing a memorandum for his government emphasizing the degree of attention given both personally to him and to the needs and interests of Africa by those in the U.S. Government. We are in continuing correspondence with several African heads of state, including one from another militant government who, while not agreeing with all that we are doing, emphasizes his appreciation for the attention we give to him and to the needs of his country.

In the last analysis, each African leader places the greatest emphasis on the needs of his own country, particularly in the desperate search for the means of development. Here, there is neither neglect nor low priority on the part of the United States.

During a period of increasing disillusionment with foreign aid and of declining overall appropriations, we have been able to maintain assistance to the African countries at a constant level. In 1972, in fact, the overall sum was the highest since 1968. Our role was part of an international effort which gives the African continent the highest per capita development aid in the world.

The United States follows policies in Africa today which are consistent with the main themes of that policy since the late Fifties. It follows policies which give us a meaningful relationship with a continent increasingly important in terms of both trade, investment, and its role on the international stage.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 19, 1972

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, the United States is known throughout the world for many things—military power, industrial technology, material abundance. These characteristics are most readily apparent to the rest of the world and provide the focus for envy and emulation by less developed nations. The American way of life is unique, however, for far more basic reasons than these. Ours is the only nation in history to have established a free republic, maintained our liberties inviolate, and escaped conquest by a foreign power.

This great good fortune carries with it attendant obligations. The United States is virtually the only country strong enough to defend the principles of freedom without regard to the threat of force. It is our responsibility to exercise leadership in the community of nations, to reassert our commitment to liberty and to speak out on behalf of people whom oppression forces to be silent. Captive Nations Week, established by President Eisenhower in 1959 and pro-

claimed anew every year since then, provides an opportunity to discharge that responsibility. The third week of each July in America is devoted to the recognition of Eastern Europe's servitude under the Soviet Union.

In the years since World War II, Russia has consolidated her power over her satellites by every means available, using military force and economic domination to insure that none of the captive nations strays too far from Moscow's party line. In the name of "the bonds of fraternal socialism," the Kremlin has cynically and, in some cases, brutally suppressed the stirrings of independent nationalism in the Eastern bloc. In the face of such naked aggression as the Russians showed in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968, the satellite peoples continue to struggle for some small measure of freedom from the Soviet stranglehold. Voices of protest are even heard from time to time from within Russia herself. They have not prevailed, they are repeatedly silenced, but they cannot be permanently obliterated.

Despite their failures, however, they are not forgotten. We celebrate their unquenchable hopes, their bravery and tenacity each year at this time, and we offer them the only true fraternal solidarity they are likely to find in the world. We will continue to remember their lost freedoms and to remind the rest of the world of their sufferings until they escape from captivity and are restored to the blessings of liberty.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, the commemoration of Captive Nations Week is, in contrast to many of our national observances, not a time for celebration. It is rather more appropriate that we take a sober look at the number of people throughout the world who are denied by their governments the basic freedoms we Americans accept so unquestioningly.

It is shameful that the economic and social progress which has made America preeminent among the nations of the earth cannot be more widely shared with them. It cannot be shared because of the unwillingness of many nations to communicate to their people information that might demonstrate the inadequacy, if not the outright lack, of safeguards to individual liberties provided by their governments. This is a most insidious form of communications gap.

President Nixon, by seeking to extend relations with the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, has taken the first positive step to close this gap. In supporting his efforts, I believe that his policy of increased communication with Communist nations can only help to insure that we need not observe Captive Nations Week much longer.

A GOOD REPUBLICAN MONTANAN COMMENTS ON SENATOR McGOVERN'S ACCEPTANCE SPEECH

HON. RICHARD G. SHOUP

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. SHOUP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to provide for the Record the following letter and comments by a fine American, Mr. Jacques Mangones, who is a proud citizen and a Republican. He wanted to refute Senator McGOVERN's acceptance speech. I believe he should have that right and a proper forum. Thus I am pleased to submit his statement for the benefit of my colleagues and others like him who have become U.S. citizens by choice:

BUTTE, MONT.,
July 15, 1972.

HON. RICHARD SHOUP,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents and a fervent admirer, and knowing your feelings for the people of your district and your country, I am taking the liberty of sending you something that I have written in rebuttal to Senator McGovern's acceptance speech. Please feel free to use it in any way you might see fit.

As you probably know I am proud, extremely proud, to be a man, a United States Citizen, and a Republican. I am proud to be a man of Afro-French and Spanish decent. I am doubly proud of my citizenship because I am a citizen by choice and not by accident of birth. I am proud to be a Republican because I believe in the leaders of my party from my Congressman to my President. And I will do all in my power to help re-elect them both.

Very truly yours,
JACQUES MANGONES.

STATEMENT BY JACQUES MANGONES

Although Senator McGovern is a Democrat, I had given him credit for a certain level of intelligence and dignity as an American citizen. However it appears that the Senator has not only taken leave of his senses, he wants the American people to do the same. He is emulating the ostrich, (which might very well become the motto of the "New Democratic Party), by sticking that apparently useless appendage above his shoulders into the sand. And he wants the American people to do the same. He does so by making promises that he knows damn well he cannot keep. Such as, promising the people to bring every P.O.W. home within 90 days of election. Is the Senator also running for the presidency of North Vietnam? He does so by promising a job for every American not working, even if the federal government has to hire them. How does the Senator propose to do this when within the same breath he promises tax reform which will give a break to the taxpayers. Is the Senator dreaming of Robin Hood methods where he intends to steal from the rich in order to give to the welfare people who have no intention of letting a "good thing" go by.

I submit to you that this kind of false hope building, that this sort of harrange to the people of the United States is an insult to every well balanced and well thinking American. The Senator's Platform is not going to unite the American people but divide us, by creating utter chaos. Let us rally behind our president and re-elect him in 1972. Stand behind the Republican Party.

For Richard M. Nixon does not support the gay liberation movement. Richard M. Nixon stands for proud Americans who be-

lieve in honorable peace. Richard M. Nixon does not believe in getting down on his knees and beg to anyone. Richard M. Nixon believes in talking man to man, nation to nation, about a long lasting peace without the subjugation of his or any other people, including South Vietnam.

Richard M. Nixon does not stand for draft dodgers or deserters. He doesn't stand for marijuana or abortion advocates. Richard M. Nixon stands for a people that will stand proud on their feet, with a clear head and a clear conscience. If the Democrats instead of passing the buck, would have stood behind their President, Richard M. Nixon would have done even more than what he had promised. For he has kept his promises to us to the best of his ability. Let us stand behind the Republican Party and elect a majority of our candidates to Congress and enable Richard M. Nixon to keep every campaign promise in his second term."

CONGRESS MORAL OBLIGATION TO DISASTER VICTIMS

HON. JAMES ABOUREZK

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. Speaker, with each passing day, I was increasingly convinced that this Congress will lend its sympathy and support to the thousands of families who have been brutally victimized by disasters this year.

I believe that the Congress sincerely wants to help. It is only human and natural.

The question remains, what kind of help?

The emergency needs have been met. What faces us now, at least in Rapid City, S. Dak., where 230 men, women, and children perished, is the massive job of rebuilding.

But we cannot rebuild under impossible conditions. We cannot ask the businessman who lost everything but his debts to start over without some kind of significant help.

We cannot ask the thousands of homeowners who lost everything to shoulder a new mortgage on top of the mortgage on a home which was destroyed in the flood.

The arithmetic of that asking is impossible. For the businessman, it means debt far in excess of what his modest revenues can assume.

For the homeowner, it means monthly payments double what they were, on a house that will be virtually unsaleable because of the mortgage against it, paid for by a job in a depressed economy.

We need to wipe the slates clean for these people. These families have endured grievous loss of life and property which stood for everything they had ever worked to get.

To ask them to step into debt far over their heads for the rest of their lives in order to continue to provide for their families is simply asking too much.

For that reason, I have submitted legislation which would provide up to 90 percent forgiveness of Small Business Administration disaster loans. It is not a wild-eyed, radical giveaway. It is a neces-

sary step to get a flood-ravaged American community back to normal.

Mr. and Mrs. David Jacobs, a young family, lost their home in the flood. A recent letter they sent dramatizes their situation, shows what they face, and shows the encouraging spirit of hope which this Congress has a moral obligation to sustain.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Mr. Jacobs' letter at this point in the RECORD:

JUNE 30, 1972.

DEAR JIM: We would like to offer encouragement to your relief plans.

Dave, Teri, Tami and I all escaped from our home at 2932 West Florman the night of the flood. We bought our home in August, 1971, and upon returning June 10th, found our beautiful "dream" house in shambles. But, at least we had our lives. It was only as the days passed that we are beginning to realize what we have lost. Estimates to make our home livable range around \$10,000, and this does not include such items as furniture, antique, and loving work we had done steadily since buying the house. Also, we still have approximately \$17,000 left on our mortgage. For a family as young as ours, this is an overwhelming situation.

I know you have heard many people who are in the same situation. I only mention our particular situation so that you will know why we are so thankful for what you are trying to do for us.

Wednesday (June 28) we were moved into our HUD trailer. It is sheer heaven to have a place to call home again. Our two little girls are already starting to recover from the terrors of swirling water and homelessness.

With all of our hearts we thank you for your efforts. Please keep fighting for us.

Ted and Olive send their best to you and your family.

God Bless You,

DAVID and LINDA JACOBS and GIRLS.

PRESERVING A FREE PRESS

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have long held that one of the finest devices for ensuring an orderly system of change in our basic institutions is a free press.

Thus I was alarmed at a recent Supreme Court ruling that declared that newsmen could be forced to reveal their sources by the courts.

I can only consider that ruling to be a dangerous and serious inroad into the integrity of the first amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill that would exempt a person connected with or employed by the news media or press from being required by a court, the legislature, or any administrative body to disclose before the Congress or any other Federal court or agency, any information or the source of any information procured for publication or broadcast.

The interest of the public in having a free, unhampered press with the absolute ability to probe and reveal malfeasance and misfeasance at all levels, public or private, in American society, far outweighs any inconvenience accorded the enforcement branch of justice by this accorded privilege.

FLIGHT FROM THE CITIES

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this country over several decades has gradually moved from a rural to a predominantly urban society. This movement has caused many problems for the abandoned countryside.

Now the picture is changing rapidly as people by the thousands are fleeing the cities, leaving behind only the poor, who are not only unable to move, but not productive of sufficient revenue to support city services. These poorer people demand much in the way of food and health services which are bankrupting the already lean resources of the cities.

The fear of integration has stimulated many white people to leave the cities, but there are other important factors, such as the high taxes brought on by the encroachments of commercial property into formerly residential areas. The schools have developed a slow rot which has caused many to abandon them.

The fleeing city dwellers are not returning to the farms in large numbers, but are congregating in suburbia, which is itself becoming congested and is operating as a sort of parasite on the inner-cities. The workers drive in to earn their living and then retreat to suburban homes, schools, shopping centers, and banks that cash their city-earned checks. Once suburban dwellers reach the haven of their homes they forget the city until they have to go back the next day.

The Savannah News of June 12, 1972, gives an excellent analysis of what is happening in an editorial entitled "Flight From the City: The Major Problem," as follows:

FLIGHT FROM THE CITY: THE MAJOR PROBLEM

In a school desegregation decision last week two judges of the U.S. 5th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled against busing for the Atlanta system. In making this opinion the judges noted that white flight to the suburbs had created a de facto segregation atmosphere beyond control of the Atlanta school board, and that busing would only speed up the transition of Atlanta to an all-black school system."

The example is one not so much of the troubled school situation in Atlanta and elsewhere, but of a more major and broader problem. For "white flight" in the past decade has created a near-crisis condition not only in the schools but in the operation of entire cities.

The reasons for such moves by the more affluent segment of the population are many. Fear of desegregation is a major one, but people also move because the cities have formed them into it—either by the gradual decline of urban neighborhoods and the increased commercialization of residential areas or by the higher taxes such commercialization has brought. In turn, not only the schools but the cities themselves suffer from neglect and slow rot, and have become shelters for the poor in many areas whose increase in numbers merely forces out that many more taxpayers who help subsidize their meager existence.

This decline of the cities abetted by the move to the suburbs is probably the greatest problem facing modern American society, simply because it contributes to so many other problems. It is further complicated

because the less affluent, unable to move out of a decaying urban neighborhood, cause a demand for services from resources the cities—in many cases—no longer have. What has happened is that the suburban population cares not about those matters from which it fled. What has happened—at least in some school decisions—is that it is being forced to again take part in urban life, and urban taxes.

Policies of "open housing" in the suburbs might, of course, speed the process of social integration. But the lines of separation are drawn not only on racial but economic grounds. A mildly affluent, integrated suburban neighborhood would not necessarily assure the elimination of poor schools or poor neighborhoods left behind in the cities.

National leaders have whittled around the problem, tackling side issues instead. And in some respects, it's difficult to blame them—when surveying the dilemma posed. But decisions cannot be put off forever, and what must be decided is whether the cities should become completely commercially oriented, supported either through suburban consolidation or federal taxes or both; or if there is a glimmer of hope of bringing suburbanites back into the central city. So far, some areas have attempted either method, and in their own peculiar surroundings perhaps both can work.

But it is still a trial-and-error arrangement, and the most common strategy has been to ignore the problem altogether, or come up with a series of compromises that, in the long run, only make it worse. Busing to an inferior school, for instance, solves nothing except to make others realize how bad their situation is; public housing in a shoddy neighborhood only leaves the impression that it is just a short matter of time before the whole area caves in.

In turn, suburban flight has created its own problems of taxes and services and overcrowdedness, and what has been left behind in several major cities is a climate of terror—where no one dares to venture at night except with a police escort. We are slowly creating a modern nightmare, which all the sunshine of suburbia cannot erase.

The integration of white and blacks may eventually become of secondary importance to the integration of the cities and the suburbs. For how one lives together also depends on how well one lives. It is vital to the future of any major nation that no breath should exist within its structure, and some form of economic consolidation must eventually be determined.

The cities and their remaining inhabitants cannot be left to sink together for in the process they will drag down the whole of society with them. Means must be found to re-humanize urban America, to keep it afloat through ways which encourage both progress and an atmosphere of living. People should have the choice of where they wish to live, based upon their ability to afford it; but they are eliminating any choice, and consequently are forced to endure busing plans and higher tax calls and a host of other problems dumped on their doorstep. The Atlanta case may, more or less, hit at busing, but it is yet another example of no solution being offered to a deeper problem which, sooner or later, all of us will have to face.

SALUTE TO THE ORDER OF AHEPA

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, ours is a nation of mixed heritages. The varied

cultures and backgrounds that have immigrated to America over past centuries create a complexity and richness of society that enables us to call ourselves the land of opportunity for all.

As the United States has a responsibility to welcome and learn from its foreign visitors and citizens, so have they a responsibility to contribute of their cultures and good will to us. The Order of Ahepa, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, is one fraternity that has lived up well to this expectation. AHEPA has contributed its time and energy to many needy organizations and projects, from its own war orphans of Greece to relief of American flood victims.

It is with respect and gratitude that we salute AHEPA on its golden anniversary.

MARKETING EXPERTS MISJUDGE POWER OF BLACKS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the past year, the Congressional Black Caucus held hearings on a variety of subjects, including health, education, black enterprise, and the media. One of our conclusions was that the black community had more reliable data on itself than the white analysts, with all their sophisticated techniques and machinery, could ever hope to amass.

Our conclusion was particularly interesting, in light of the fact that the black community has been analyzed, examined, and dissected. Voluminous reports have been produced, and yet the information they contain is not always reliable. This is partly due to misconceptions and prejudice in the minds of the analysts.

Mr. Dexter Eure, director of the Boston Globe's Community Affairs Department, has done some research into the matter of faulty white analyses of minority communities. His concern is primarily the growing field of market analysis—a field which is unequipped to measure black purchasing power. He contends that, as a result, marketing executives' conclusions—and the advertisements or reports that are based upon those conclusions—reflect misconceptions and misinformation.

I commend Mr. Eure's column, as it appeared in the July 5, 1972, edition of the Globe, to my colleagues' attention. The article follows:

MARKETING EXPERTS MISJUDGE POWER OF BLACKS

(By Dexter D. Eure)

Too often when white officialdom talks about minorities, it uses error-laden assumptions and reaches conclusions tailored to protect a "special" interest.

In too many cases, many of the nation's blacks and Spanish-speaking citizens are victims of flimsy and inaccurate studies that prevent a change in the status quo.

According to the latest 1970 US census, the country has 23 million blacks. Some reputable sources estimate there are at least

28 million. In the 1960 census count, the bureau admits that it undercounted blacks and Spanish-speaking persons in urban areas by about 10 percent. A US Census Bureau spokesman acknowledged that a head count of Massachusetts' Spanish-speaking persons, could be in error.

Does this mean then that or more? Wasn't it generally known that the Census Bureau failed to have sufficient bilingual census takers to make head counts?

These inaccuracies are damaging to minorities as they affect the government's response to the need for services and assistance.

The social conditions involved in the plight of minorities are heavily influenced by the data compiled and published by the Federal government. This applies to the behavior of the business establishment as well.

Black leaders, in particular, are concentrating on economic rights and examining what response comes from businesses dependent upon the huge spending power of blacks.

An interesting challenge to one of these studies is being made by W. Leonard Evans Jr., president and publisher of Tuesday Publications. His organization recently bought nearly a full page ad in the New York Times, captioned "Fallacies in Evaluating Black Media," to protest a basic marketing error.

Evans pointed out that Young & Rubicam, one of the world's largest advertising agencies, prepared a black American Media Study for General Foods Corp. This report also appeared in Advertising Age's issues of April 3, 10, and 17. It argued that a disservice was done to a segment of media industry by claims that were not only unwarranted and inaccurate, but damaging and undocumented.

Evans said the study did not reflect racism or deliberate prejudicial evaluations, but an error in diagnosis of the market. He questions the method of designating all-black consumer purchases made outside the "Black Ghetto" as white or general market sales. This in itself prevents the usual methods of measuring just where and how blacks spend their money.

In a specific area, such as Boston's suburban towns of Sharon, Canton and Stoughton, there are approximately 400 black families. Ninety percent own their own homes and 80 percent own one or two automobiles. In essence, Evans argues that the evaluating method used ignores the spending power of these "middle-class" blacks, and categorizes their total spending as white or in the general sales category. Thus there is the inability to develop a proper method of measurement that will not restrict the black market's sales impact.

The study contained many generalities, such as the fact that 24 million blacks generate a gross national product of \$45 billion annually, but it failed to state that the black buying power market for national advertisers is concentrated in approximately 40 major metropolitan areas in the United States.

Accepted estimates from the advertising industry are that at least 80 percent of black consumers make their purchases outside the so-called black-community areas. This is vital to the advertising industry. The whole new campaign of blacks to get a piece of the "action" directs its demand to the advertising complex for jobs within the industry, as well as to the images being created by Madison Avenue. These ad images do not portray blacks in advertising in a fair percentage or to the degree of their spending power.

Blacks strongly feel that any misinformation, whether initiated by the Federal government or the private sector, has to be challenged for promoting faulty conclusions. Minorities cannot afford a burden that diminishes their fight for equal and just treatment.

CHARLES H. DOW DAY
OBSERVANCE

HON. ROBERT H. STEELE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention an event taking place in Norwich, Conn., to honor one of Connecticut's most prestigious historical figures.

One of America's most prominent and widely read newspapers is the Wall Street Journal, a paper of unparalleled depth in reporting the financial news of our Nation.

The founder and publisher of the Wall Street Journal was Charles Dow, born in Sterling, Conn., in 1851. I would like to salute this leader in American journalism by inserting into the RECORD an article written by Mathias P. Harpin, the editor-publisher of the Connecticut Almanac and president of the Sterling Historical Society, about Charles Dow:

CHARLES HENRY DOW

(By Mathias P. Harpin)

On Nov. 6, 1851, a birth was recorded among others in Sterling it was that of a male child. His name was Charles Henry Dow. He grew into boyhood on a small farm wanting to be a newspaper publisher. By hard work, he reached his ambition. He became not only the publisher of a great newspaper but also the originator of a stock market theory that was to be heard across the land every day. The newspaper that he founded was the Wall Street Journal, and the theory that he gave the world of finance is the Dow Jones Average as applied to the daily Stock Market Reports.

His parents had no money to send him to college, not even to the local academy after grammar school. His father was no special model to him for success. All Dow had was a spark—a spark that ignited a flame, the flame of ambition. That flame burned brightly within him his whole life. Each day that he left behind him in his life was a day that had brought him untold benefits, that had enabled him to move further ahead; to add more glow to an already brilliant name.

Ebenezer Dow (1692-1775) came into the area to settle at a time when the region now known as Voluntown and Sterling was set off to accommodate the volunteers in the King Philip War of 1675. He must have been in the area when Voluntown was created as a separate town in 1721.

In Cedar Swamp Cemetery on Cedar Swamp Road off Ekonk Hill is the grave of Dow's parents. They are Charles Dow who died Aug. 28, 1857, aged 41 years and Harriet White Dow who died Jan. 29, 1910, aged 86 years. Over the grave is a modern dark gray granite headstone put there by Dow and placed under perpetual care. In back of this are the graves of Dow's two brothers, Edward A. Dow, who died Aug. 6, 1861, aged five years and eight months and Henry A. Dow, who died Aug. 29, 1851, aged two years. As far as is known, this is the whole family of the man who gave America the Dow Jones average.

Charles Henry Dow was six years old when his father died. The family was left in straitened circumstances, and Dow had to turn his hand to all kinds of farm chores to get money as he grew into boyhood. He must have known, however, that he had to learn a trade, and it could have been his mother who reminded him of this.

There were then in the region several

weekly newspapers. There was the newspaper at Danielson then called the Windham County Telegraph, founded in 1848 by Francis E. Jacques. Jacques was sent here by Horace Greeley, editor of the powerful New York Tribune, at the request of the founders of the weekly. The paper first appeared March 16, 1848. All the territory was safely in the hands of the Telegraph until 1851 when the Windham County Gazette was established. Soon afterwards it was merged with the Telegraph and the name was changed to the Windham County Transcript. Later John Quincy Adams Stone became the editor. In 1872 Stone established the Patriot at Putnam and placed his son, Everett C. Stone in charge. In West Killingly in 1848 the New England Arena appeared with George Whitman Danielson as editor. John Evans in that year also stated the Willimantic Journal.

It is not known how Charles H. Dow found his way into this newspaper world then in existence around him. He got a job as a printer's devil on one of the newspapers, perhaps the Windham County Transcript. Though we can assume that he was good at picking type and probably could keep up with the best of compositors, setting type was not his first love. He wanted to get out of the mechanical side of the newspaper publishing and develop a career in the editorial department. At 21, he must have thought that he was ready for the big time in journalism. He may have heard of an opening on the Springfield Republican and was confident enough in himself to feel that he could qualify for the Springfield, Mass., job. So in 1872 he applied for a job on the Springfield Republican, then at the height of influence in American journalism.

The editor of the Springfield Republican was no less a person than Samuel Bowles, a perfectionist in newspaper composition who, it is claimed, originated the modern summary lead or first paragraph in every news story—the structure of the four W's, Who, When, Where, What.

What did Dow look like? We have the words of men who worked with him. One was Thomas F. Woodlock, an associate on the Wall Street Journal: "Dow was tall, black-bearded, slightly stooped . . . a man with a grave air and the measured speech of a college professor." Another friend described Dow as of "large physical mold and sinewy frame", modest in dress, speech and manner.

It wasn't long before Dow was one of the best-liked member of the staff. Certainly as Dow became the shadow of the great Bowles watching, listening, reading all about the great issues which were then plunging the nation into the terrible business panic year of 1873, Dow must have learned a lot about high principles in journalism, for the Springfield Republican was never afraid to stand up for issues, including the Credit Mobilier scandal which it condemned.

From Springfield he went to Providence, Rhode Island, in 1875 to become night editor of the Providence Star. Also he wrote for the Providence Evening Press. The two newspapers, one a morning paper and the other an evening paper, were owned by the same company. The arrival of the business panic year of 1873, brought the Star and the Press to bankruptcy by 1877.

Dow could not be concerned in the fate of his employer. He sought a job in the Providence Journal. The man he went to see was George W. Danielson, one of the truly great newspaper editor of the day equal in prominence and editorial ability to Bowles of the Springfield Republican.

Danielson was a Danielson boy, a lifelong member of the Westfield Congregational church, whose career in the newspaper business ran a close parallel to that of Charles Henry Dow. Danielson was the man who had conceived the idea of the Pro-

vidence Evening Bulletin as a companion to the morning Journal. He had begun his newspaper career at 14 in the very same newspaper field of eastern Connecticut through which Dow had passed. Dow was hired as a reporter on the Providence Journal and here he remained until 1879.

John W. Barney who was George Danielson's right hand man, never forgot Dow. Years later, recalling that day, Barney said: "He called on Mr. Danielson showing him his string of articles for a fortnight, told him what he had received for it and asked for a chance to work. Mr. Danielson said he had nothing he could give him to do. Mr. Dow said he didn't need to be given anything to do, that he knew news and wanted only a chance to go out and get it for the Journal. From that time until he left to go to work in New York his work was a strong feature of the Journal's columns."

The summer of 1879 saw the turning point in Dow's life. Leadville, Colorado, an insignificant dot in the high Canadian Rockies had leaped into the news. Starving prospectors down to their last grubstake struck paydirt in the silver-laden carbonates. From zero population, the town skyrocketed to 20,000 in as many months. Reports in general circulation said that the mines produced over \$100,000 per month for five months. Eastern capitalists organized a mining company under the laws of New York state with capital of \$20,000,000. Total stock of 200,000 shares sold at \$100 a share. Newspapers called Leadville "The Magic City."

Some of the most influential men in the country were investors in the mines, thus giving stories out of Leadville the strength of authenticity. Among these men were: Brantley Ives, president of the Stock Exchange; James H. Chace of Providence, Prof. Marsh of Yale and B. Crowell of New Bedford. These investors and their friends fascinated by all the stories of new-found riches coming out of "The Magic City" decided to make a personal inspection of the premises. A special train was placed at their disposal. Host for the trip was David H. Moffatt, then cashier of the First National Bank of Denver.

To cover the event, the investors invited New York and New England newspapers to assign correspondents. Newspapers represented were: The New York Tribune, the New York Herald, the Boston Advertiser and the Providence Journal.

Again Barnes must be relied upon for an account of how Dow came to be chosen as the Journal correspondent on the trip. Barnes said: ". . . Mr. Dow was selected by persons identified with the management of the properties as the best equipped to write informally about them and on their request to the editor of the Journal he was assigned to the work. Association on that trip with men of prominence in the financial world revealed to Mr. Dow a field for his efforts in financial journalism in which he could attain an importance and usefulness not to be hoped for in ordinary newspaper work."

Dow traveled from New York to Denver, then by narrow gauge to the boom town that was 10,200 feet above sea level at the foot of Mount Elbert which was 14,431. Dow's dispatches are filled with the history of that fabled land. No historian writing of that era and in that part of the country would dare produce a book without making great use of Dow's reports from Leadville for the summer of 1879.

On his return from Leadville, Dow must have felt that the remainder of his life must be spent in New York journalism. He sought a job on one of the dailies, presenting himself as an expert on mining stocks.

According to the Dec. 5, 1902 Wall Street Journal Dow "came down into Wall Street and sought employment as a reporter on mining stocks. He obtained a position at a

small salary with one of the daily papers, his duties at once bringing him into intimate connection with the financial community."

Somewhere between his job on the Springfield *Republican* and the Providence *Journal*, Dow had picked up a knowledge of shorthand. His ability to reduce large segments of conversation and reading matter into a few signs helped him immensely. Though he carried note paper, he retained in his extraordinary memory much of what he heard and saw. Other than the notebook, there was always the cuffs of his starched shirts. The picture of the Sterling man making notes in shorthand on his shirt cuffs became a legend.

Not much space was devoted to Wall Street news in the newspapers of that day. Such news came from private agencies. One of the most prominent of these was the Kiernan News Agency. This firm engaged messenger boys to carry financial news bulletins to various subscribers in the financial district. John J. Kiernan was head of the firm.

Kiernan was not likely to overlook the reports that Dow was writing and easily recognized the quality of the man's analysis of financial progress in various stock deals and firms. With Dow on the Kiernan staff, the flow of activity in the Kiernan News Agency reached almost fever pitch. Demands for the service increased. Need for still another reporter was soon felt.

While in Providence, Dow had become acquainted with Edward Jones. Jones was editor of the *Star* and *Sunday Dispatch* and was a drop-out from Brown University. As the opening for still another reporter was announced on the Kiernan staff, Dow sent for his friend Jones.

Now the Kiernan agency had the two best men then known in the business. As a team they could not be beat. Dow and Jones must have had a good understanding otherwise they would not have formed the partnership of Dow, Jones & Company in November of 1882.

They opened for business in the basement of a building at 15 Wall Street, next to the Stock Exchange. They were in the back room at that, the front being given over to a soda fountain. At best, the Dow, Jones & Company quarters were dark and dingy. But the owners, Dow, 31, and Jones, 26, must have felt that the background reflected not on their high quality service.

A third man got into the picture at the same time. His name was Charles M. Bergstresser, then 23. He also was with Kiernan. Dow and Jones offered him a job as an employee in that first hour of organization, but he declined, saying if he became associated with the men it must be as a partner or not at all. Bergstresser was accepted in accordance with his terms.

It was agreed that Jones would be the desk man, leaving Dow and Bergstresser as reporters.

The system then in progress was for the reporters to bring the news to Jones who would edit the stories and dictate them to four or five so-called "manifold writers" who would write on "books of tissue paper with carbon paper between them." In this way they produced up to 24 copies, using agateware utensils. Messenger boys delivered the bulletins to clients. A days' service, it is said, consisted of about 800 words.

On November 2, 1883, Dow, Jones & Company began publishing a "Customer's Afternoon Letter". These were a review of the bulletins issued during the day.

During the next four years, the firm picked up so many clients that a new method of transcription had to be found. At the same time the company hired its first out-of-town correspondent, Clarence W. Barron, owner of

the Boston News Bureau, who was supplying the Boston finance district with the same kind of service as Dow, Jones was furnishing Wall Street.

Growth of the firm continued so that by 1889 there were 50 persons on the payroll. Dow, Jones and Bergstresser decided they had outgrown the letter and must transform their reports into a full-fledged newspaper. Accordingly on July 8, 1889, Vol. 1, No. 1 of the Wall Street Journal appeared.

The paper was printed on a Campbell flat-bed press. It was four pages with four or five columns per page and carried advertising that sold for 20 cents per line and was distributed in the afternoon.

It must have been Dow who in his writing set the style and tone of the newspaper content that was to identify the newspaper as a unique institution in American life. Indeed, that the Eskimo in the frozen wastes of the Arctic as much as the sharp speculator on Wall Street was to recognize as the best source of truth regarding the financial affairs of the nation.

Jones remained with the firm until Jan. 9, 1899 when he returned to Providence.

In the winter of 1881 Dow met a striking brunette; her name was Lucy M. Russell. They were married April 9, 1881.

Everybody who knew Dow could never bring themselves to call him "Charlie" or "Chuck." For such a nickname was always beneath his dignity, and throughout his life and even now long after his death Dow is always spoken of as "Mr. Dow."

It is said that Dow came through the eastern Connecticut area once in a while, and never failed to make a call on Ekonk Hill to pay a brief tribute to the memory of his parents in Cedar Swamp cemetery.

Dow died in Brooklyn, N.Y. Dec. 4, 1902. His wife survived him by many years. His memory lives on not only in the Wall Street Journal but in the daily stock market reports when we hear the Dow Jones Stock Averages. That's a far cry from the little Connecticut town of Sterling on the Rhode Island border.

THE RUSSIAN DEPARTURE

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, I view the departure of the Russian advisers from Egypt as a positive step toward peace in the Middle East. However, my optimism is tinged with caution.

In the first place, the Russian hegemony in the Middle East, and even in Egypt, is not necessarily over. Its principal purpose seems to be neither peace nor war, but only to keep things stirred up enough to keep all parties in the area uncomfortable.

Second, since the Russian influence over the past 3 years tended to keep tensions high without actual outbreaks of war, the Russian departure might cause a vacuum in which a more militant Egypt nationalism could flourish.

In any case, U.S. interests and efforts in the Middle East should be maintained no matter what the degree of our optimism or how highly we were pleased by the apparent departure of some of the Russians from Egypt.

WHO IS DESTROYING OUR ARMED FORCES?—I

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Maj. James N. Rowe, in "Five Years to Freedom," said:

I could understand opposition to a war and a strong desire for peace. There was nobody who wanted peace more than a soldier because it was his life that was sacrificed in war, his blood that was shed. There couldn't be a protester at home who matched a soldier's sincere desire for peace. Dissent was a part of American life, but to support the enemy at the expense of another American was inconceivable. There was no other place the VC could have gotten some of that information except from the United States and I suddenly felt very sick.

Major Rowe, a Green Beret who spent 5 years under the most hellish conditions as a prisoner of the Vietcong, had first told them a "cover story" that he was only an engineering officer unfamiliar with the defenses of the Green Beret camp where he was taken prisoner, though in fact he was its executive officer and knew all about its defenses. That fact was given to his captors by traitors in the United States, thus assuring that he would be put to further torture.

The House Internal Security Committee on which I serve has been holding hearings on subversion of the military. I am in the process of arranging testimony for the committee from Major Rowe. We have already heard from four-star Gen. Bruce Clark, former commander of all Army ground troops in Europe, who called our attention to the fact that in 1966 and 1967 there were posters all over Europe, both in headquarters areas and individual unit day rooms, which identified communism as the enemy and reminded our troops that they were there to deter Communist aggression. But when General Clark returned to Europe 3 years later the posters were gone. When he asked why, he was told that they might annoy the Soviets.

As long ago as 1961, the Fulbright memorandum sounded the death knell to educational programs in the military explaining the real nature of the Communist enemy. Senator FULBRIGHT stated in that memorandum:

Fundamentally, it is believed that the American people have little if any need to be alerted to the menace of the cold war.

FULBRIGHT sowed the seed; and in the Communist Daily World for January 28, 1971—10 years later—we find an update of his original memorandum, now entitled "The Pentagon Propaganda Machine," vociferously declared must reading for every Communist and fellow traveler in America. Senator FULBRIGHT opposed and continues to oppose any military instruction characterized by "talks from persons who stressed the Communist menace in this country."

He was also one of those who called for the bombing halt that has since doubled American casualties, while stating:

We could resume bombing at any time if there is no response.

Ask the loved ones of the over 50,000 dead and the over 3 million veterans of the Vietnam war if there has been any response.

The official policy of our Government has become that of the Fulbright memorandum, creating a peculiar—to say the least—educational situation in the Armed Forces. The March 30, 1970, Contemporary Military Reading List of the U.S. Army—Circular No. 1-26—tells part of the story. The first book synopsis is the "Discipline of Power," by George W. Ball, who is indexed for 5½ pages in the congressional "military muzzling" hearings in opposition to educating our Armed Forces in the nature of communism. Ball was quoted as outlining official government policy in this way:

Nothing must be done to endanger communications between this country and the Communists. No reference must be made to Communism as the enemy. Furthermore this country is not striving for victory in the Cold War. The United States should not under any circumstances refer to Communist tactics as "brutal" nor should the word "slavery" be used in referring to Communist takeovers of captive people.

At this point it is well to recall that Public Law 86-90, unanimously adopted by Congress in 1959, designates the third week in July of each year as Captive Nations Week—though there is nothing about captive nations in the Contemporary Military Reading List.

And it was George Ball who in 1968 had the job of persuading Congress "that U.S. trade with Russia and its satellites would promote peace, soften up Communist regimes behind the Iron Curtain and end the Cold War." Tell that to the widows of my fellow Marine officers who have been shot down by Soviet anti-aircraft rockets made in the Soviet Union. Trade agreements with a nation which supplies so many of the weapons used to kill our fighting men surely fit the constitutional definition of treason as "giving aid and comfort to the enemy." Our troops who have been killed by the products of this trade can no longer cry out for justice against the likes of those who have forbidden them to learn about the enemy they have given their life's blood to fight. Nor do most Americans in high places seem ready or willing to do it for them.

GOVERNOR SHAPP SAYS NIXON FLOOD RELIEF IS INSUFFICIENT

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 20, 1972

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, there have been many eloquent descriptions of

the destruction and calamity caused in Pennsylvania by Hurricane Agnes.

One of the most moving was the testimony of Pennsylvania's Governor Milton J. Shapp, when he appeared this morning before the House Banking and Currency Committee, which is considering the President's \$1.8 billion flood relief proposal.

I agree with the Governor that the \$1.8 billion which the President is asking for seems inadequate in the face of the monumental and widespread destruction in Pennsylvania alone caused by Agnes.

In his testimony before us, Governor Shapp made a strong plea for higher rates of forgiveness on new loans to Agnes' victims and a method to wipe away, or at minimum to turn into long term commitments, current mortgages and loans belonging to those who lost homes and business in Agnes' wake.

The Governor's full statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF GOVERNOR MILTON J. SHAPP

I welcome the opportunity to appear before you this morning to discuss the federal action necessary to aid victims of Hurricane Agnes.

I need not remind you of the enormity of the task facing the nation and Pennsylvania.

Four weeks ago today, the rains turned Pennsylvania, and other states along the Eastern seaboard, into a disaster area.

Early that Thursday morning, June 22, I proclaimed a state of extreme emergency in the Commonwealth, when we had already received reports of damage from 62 of our 67 counties. Subsequently, all 67 counties reported losses and ultimately the entire state was declared a federal disaster area.

The State Council of Civil Defense immediately went into action. The State Police went on duty around the clock. Key units of the National Guard were mobilized.

Within hours, it was apparent to me that the floods were the greatest single natural disaster ever to hit Pennsylvania.

On June 30th, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette noted that "Pennsylvania is the victim of a devastation so widespread it boggles the mind."

Since the storm, the Government of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has exerted every effort and expanded every possible dollar to protect persons and property and to begin the process of rebuilding our state. Our efforts were matched by the local communities themselves and thousands of volunteers.

Initially, I estimated the damage in excess of one billion dollars.

Subsequently, I raised that figure to somewhere between 1½ and 2 billion dollars.

Recently, as more complete reports have been submitted, I have again raised my estimate to \$2½ to \$3 billion in Pennsylvania alone. Each day brings new reports of damage to both public and private sectors—to farms, homes, schools, roads, railroads and business establishments.

Before going into detail on the federal programs necessary, to help rebuild Pennsylvania and other states affected by Agnes, I would like to mention for the record the highlights of our state's participation in rescue, clean up and rebuilding programs.

I do so not for the purpose of self congratulation but because I know that you, as members of the federal Congress, want to know what the states are doing to help themselves as you go about trying to help us at the federal level.

At the peak of the flooding, 6,000 Pennsyl-

vania National Guardsmen and 4,000 State Policemen were on duty around the clock.

The department and agencies of state government were on the job, in many instances before the dimensions of the disaster were fully appreciated.

As the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette again editorialized on June 27th, notification was out "as early as Thursday morning by the State's Department of Environmental Resources that river trouble was mounting. But the Weather Bureau's warning did not come until Friday morning."

I initially earmarked \$1,750,000 in state funds for immediate assistance. More than 120 state flood information offices were established and the federal agencies were urged to join with us in these centers.

Members of my cabinet were on the scene throughout the flood areas. I personally spent many days and hours in the stricken communities and my Lieutenant Governor, Ernest Kline, who coordinates all state disaster activities, had to be ordered to bed personally by me because of the fatigue which followed days and nights of constant activity.

Subsequently, the Pennsylvania General Assembly passed, and I signed, an appropriation bill for emergency and disaster relief in connection with flooding and tropical storm disaster in the Commonwealth.

A total of \$150 million in state general operating revenues was earmarked for this purpose.

One hundred and thirteen million dollars was set aside for "emergency" use in the alleviation of human hardship and suffering and for the protection of property; for the reimbursement to various departments and agencies of the Commonwealth for the participation in disaster relief activities, including, but not limited to, materials, supplies, services, food, clothing, equipment, chemicals, drugs and medicines.

An additional \$25 million was appropriated for the Department of Public Welfare, \$10 million for the Department of Health and \$2 million for the Department of Environmental Resources.

I would also remind you that our participation was not limited to this appropriation. To the best of my knowledge, no state has ever before made such a substantial and immediate commitment of its own revenues for direct relief purposes.

But that is not all.

In the near future, I will present to the Pennsylvania General Assembly a comprehensive program for rebuilding Pennsylvania which will include major efforts on the state level to aid in the rebuilding of private housing and also to restore schools and other public facilities, commerce, and farm lands.

On the basis of these facts, I think the record is clear that we in Pennsylvania are doing our job to help ourselves.

But you know, as well as I, that state government, even with the full cooperation of local government, private resources together with the level of the present effort of the federal government, will not suffice.

President Nixon himself last Thursday called the recent flooding "the worst natural disaster in the whole of America's history."

Clearly, what is called for is a massive commitment by the federal government to the rescue of our people and to the rebuilding of the flood areas.

The victims of this tragic flood are entitled to full support from their government, for they have contributed greatly to this nation. They are men who have long toiled in the mines and mills and women who have worked in factories and offices. They are farmers who have seen their crops, and, yes, even their soil contaminated or, worse, washed away.

Yes, they are doctors, dentists and lawyers whose valuable equipment, record and libraries have been destroyed.

And, too, they are our retired senior citizens who simply cannot refurnish their rooms or buy new clothes out of their meager Social Security payments.

They are women and men who have served in our armed forces when the nation needed their services.

Now if we cannot offer them more than token support as they try to rebuild their lives, this nation will indeed have failed them in their time of need.

If the United States could afford to have given Germany and Japan almost \$100 billion of pre-inflated dollars to rebuild their nation at the end of World War II, we cannot afford not to give our own hard working citizens all the funds they need to rebuild their lives from this great disaster.

If the United States could afford to send billions overseas in foreign aid during the past 25 years, we cannot afford not to grant \$4 to \$5 billion in local aid to our own deserving citizens, if this is what it takes.

Perhaps more telling of all is the comment of Bill Ulicny of Forty Fort, Pennsylvania who told the Wall Street Journal last week: "Why doesn't the government call a moratorium for a week in Viet Nam and turn over all the money to the people around here who really need it."

American pride rose high as we spent whatever billions were needed to accomplish the Berlin Air Lift or to put a man on the moon.

Our American pride should not let us permit any of our citizens to have their lives ruined by events beyond their control.

Incidentally, no one spoke of half-way measures for these projects; for we also appropriated the funds to get our men back from the moon.

Our own communities, need rebuilding. We must help our people rebuild. Let us take pride in helping these needy Americans back on their feet.

Indeed, if we don't make this investment in making our people productive again, let's not kid ourselves. Nothing will be saved. They will end up on welfare. The choice is clear: either we invest in the victims of the flood or we will pay for long years of dependency.

Believing, therefore, that nothing but the most massive and decisive federal action is necessary, I have come here today to make the following suggestions for your immediate consideration.

First, I suggest that the members of this committee and other concerned members of both the Senate and the House, hold a joint hearing on flood problems in the worst hit area of them all, the Wyoming Valley of Pennsylvania.

The devastation must be seen to be believed. Veteran Red Cross officials who have spent over a quarter of a century working in disaster areas have told me they have never seen any catastrophe its equal. In all my personal experiences overseas during World War II, only in Italy did I see so much damage.

The statistics are all too familiar.

It is one thing to say that 350,000 people are homeless.

It is something quite different to see those people as flesh and blood individuals, whose lives have been wrecked by this natural catastrophe.

It is one thing to say that 100,000 persons are temporarily or permanently unemployed. It is something else to meet a jobless person on the street who doesn't know where his next paycheck is coming from because the company for which he worked no longer exists.

It is one thing to state that the farmlands of Pennsylvania have been subjected to

staggering loss in excess of \$300 million. It is much more compelling to meet one of those farmers whose entire livelihood depended upon crops which have been utterly destroyed or on livestock which was ravaged by the flood, or to talk to a farm family as I did who watched Agnes wash their farm's top soil into the river.

It is one thing to state that industrial and commercial loss in the Commonwealth exceeds the staggering figure of \$1.1 billion. It is still another to receive a letter like I received last week from a small store owner in Wilkes-Barre who pleads that "my future in this city and the future of my employees is in your hands. I hope and pray that you can do something for me so I can re-open again."

Yes, it is one thing to think of this individual store owner in Wilkes-Barre, but it's also important to consider that in the Wilkes-Barre, Kingston and Forty Fort area of 100,000 people, almost 90 percent of the business establishments were washed away. There are few, if any, pharmacies, dry cleaning stores, auto or TV repair stations, hardware, clothing or appliance stores or other kinds of local business establishments we just take for granted in our modern urban centers. There is hardly a doctor, a dentist's office or even an insurance agency or law firm that did not suffer loss of equipment and records.

To put it bluntly, almost the entire infrastructure of this city's commercial and professional life was washed away by Agnes, and unless we make it financially possible for these shop owners and professional people in Wilkes-Barre area to re-establish themselves in business, the city will become a ghost town within a short time.

Few, if any, of the people in this area want to leave. They have simply been great so far in their effort to fight back and restore their community. But unless financial help is given to them on a major scale, and on a realistic basis, their morale will suffer and they will not accomplish the task of rebuilding. Yes, the statistics are unbelievable. But the human story is devastating. The statistics cannot bring home to you the homelessness, despair and mental anguish of so many of our people whose lives have been destroyed. The statistics will not detect the elderly who do not know how to get help. Nor will they tell the story of so many families who are still not reunited.

I urge you to go to the Wyoming Valley. Only then will you realize the full dimensions of the problem. See the people. Talk to them. Discover first hand what they need. Then return to Washington and enact the strongest possible measure to help them.

Last Thursday, I was pleased by the President's decision to seek \$1.7 billion in flood relief measures.

However, on Friday, when I went to the White House Conference on Flood Relief, I was disturbed by three things:

First, I do not believe that the provisions for homeowners and businesses are flexible enough to help where help is really needed.

Second, I do not believe that \$1.040 billion is sufficient to do the job in Pennsylvania. That is the figure which has been quoted to me as Pennsylvania's share of the total program.

And third, there is no discussion yet on the federal level for financing the rebuilding of our railroads. Pennsylvania lost over \$50 million of railroad tracks and switching yards. Without restoration of these railroads, the future economic development of our state is jeopardized.

Yet all—I repeat—all of the railroads that operate in Pennsylvania are in bankruptcy. They are not eligible to receive any of the SBA or other types of federal financing to

rebuild from the flood. They are already curtailing freight service to shippers.

Somehow the federal government must devise a financial plan to restore the damaged property of these railroads or else severe damage to the economy of Pennsylvania will result.

Pennsylvania was the victim of 80 percent of the total damage inflicted by Agnes. One billion, forty-one million dollars represents only a portion of the \$1.7 billion figure and as I have indicated even this total is far too low to do the required job.

Clearly, a great federal effort must be made.

At the beginning of the disaster, I was not satisfied with the federal response.

It is, perhaps, understandable that officials in Washington did not quickly realize the dimensions of the tragedy.

Vice President Agnew, for example, claimed that I was "excitable" and said that my initial estimate of over \$1 billion in damage and losses was "probably ridiculous."

However, as the impact was felt more deeply, the federal agencies did swing into action more quickly so that the situation is now greatly improved. I am pleased with the manner in which the Corps of Engineers tackled the project of cleaning up the debris in our state.

At the same time, I must reluctantly report that we are still receiving daily complaints that the Small Business Administration is not moving swiftly enough to get the money into the hands of the people. Indeed, in some instances, it is reported that slavish adherence to red tape rather than the spirit of the law is preventing instant relief to some of our citizens, particularly the elderly.

This is not only my opinion. In the same Wall Street article of July 17th which I quoted to you earlier, the following report of SBA activity is given: "The Small Business Administration has been able to disburse only 20 loans totaling \$53,900 of the more than 14,000 applications it has received in its Wilkes-Barre office; it has, however, processed more than 4,200 loans."

On Tuesday, Mr. Frank Carlucci of the Office of Management and Budget, informed me that he was dispatching an SBA Ombudsman to Pennsylvania to clear up some of the problems and I hope that this will be done.

Now that the rescue and clean up operations have been completed, we face to immediate and pressing problems.

First, we must make sure that all who have been made homeless by the flood are placed quickly into temporary housing, which is fit for human habitation.

The second aspect of our immediate responsibility must be to get money—and get it fast—into the hands of people who are homeless; to help businessmen whose job-producing facilities have been destroyed, and farmers whose crops and livestock have been wiped out.

The President's proposal to set aside \$1.3 billion the new loans for the Small Business Administration, to issue long-term loans at 1 percent interest, is a step in the right direction. But it won't solve the problem. His plan would be improved by adopting the proposals of Senators Schweiker and McGovern to raise the forgiveness level to 15,000, but even this will not handle all the requirements.

I fear that the SBA loan approach only meets a small part of the problem.

The essential fact is this.

Tens of thousands of home owners have suffered total or almost total loss of their properties. Yet they are still responsible for and must pay off existing mortgages on these merchandise.

Under the President's plan, 1 percent loans would be made by the SBA to help these

home owners and businessmen rebuild. However; they would first repay existing mortgages and bank loans out of these new SBA loans. This is too much of a burden, even at 1 percent interest.

Take a specific case of a home owner who had a home valued at \$20,000 with a \$15,000 mortgage. To rebuild this home today would cost \$30,000, and he would need a \$25,000 mortgage. So to get a new \$30,000 home, the individual winds up with a \$40,000 mortgage on his property; the old plus the new. He has lost his equity in his old home and even with the \$5,000 forgiveness he is farther behind the eight ball.

What happens if he wishes to sell the property, or for that matter could it be sold with such a large mortgage?

A businessman who owes \$50,000 and now needs \$75,000 to get back in business winds up owing \$125,000, even though his after-flood net worth may be zero or below. Like many small businessmen, he was struggling to make ends meet before the flood. What expectation for profitable operation can he expect to be burdened with his new large loan?

Realistically, it is essential that the debt that existed on property washed away must be forgiven, or at least placed in a long-term subordinate position. The home owner or businessman should be concerned only with a mortgage on his new home or for new loans to support the re-establishment of his new business.

If we do not do this, there are many thousands of home owners and businessmen who will simply have no choice but to "walk away" from their present homes and businesses, leaving the banks to hold the present paper—for which there is no longer any collateral.

During the administration of Herbert Hoover, when banks and other institutions were suffering great losses due to foreclosures on property, the federal government established the RFC. The RFC picked up this paper from the banks and arranged long term repayment schedules.

We need a modern type of RFC, not just to protect the banks but to help victims of floods and other disasters in this Nation become self sufficient once again and not become paupers.

Hurricane Agnes by its very dimensions has highlighted a human and business problem that has been with us on a smaller scale many years. But who knows where or when the next great disaster may strike, and how many of our citizens in all of our 50 states can be made destitute overnight by a flood, hurricane, earthquake or some other catastrophe.

Therefore, I propose that Congress act boldly and adopt financial measures that would make it possible for our citizens to return to their normal life patterns as quickly as possible whenever a disaster strikes.

This can be done in one of three ways, or by using all of the methods suggested.

1. Establish a new RFC to pick up all the present bank-held mortgages and business loans on washed away properties. Turn this current debt into long term, no interest subordinate paper. This will permit all new SBA loans issued to be used for rebuilding purposes and still protect the lending agencies from losses on their previous loans. This will make it possible for people to finance new homes and refinance their new businesses without being hopelessly in debt.

2. Use provisions of the 1968 Housing Act and have the Federal Government condemn flood ravaged property at pre-flood prices. Restore relocation cost under this Act to pre-July 1st to 100 percent figure.

Appropriate sufficient funds to HUD to enable this department to condemn large tracts or even all of the flooded areas and then redevelop these areas as Urban Renewal projects. This plan would enable the local, state and federal agencies to develop major redevelopment programs that would prove greatly superior to house by house or business by business replacement.

3. To go along with the first two suggestions, we should also establish a National Catastrophe Fund, by collecting a small surcharge on every property damage insurance policy that is sold in the Nation.

Insurance Commissioner Denenberg of Pennsylvania has calculated that for each one percent surcharge on standard property damage policies sold in this country, \$300 million could be put into the National Catastrophe Fund to provide complete protection for any type of damage, whether it be flood, hurricane, earthquake, subsidence gypsy moth infestation or other. Under such a plan, insurance surtax rates could be adjusted as needed in the future and no home owner or business enterprise would have to worry about future losses. It would be his right to collect on his insurance for these damages rather than have to come to government, hat in hand, asking for aid.

In short, while the SBA 1 percent loan approach recommended by the President is helpful, I strongly believe that you must find the means not only to recover past losses, but to help our people invest in the future. In connection with loans to business, it is essential that this Congress work into the law a firm requirement that any business which receives a Federal loan for reconstruction be required to relocate in the same labor market.

If a company that has suffered a loss in one area receives federal assistance funds and via these, funds to relocate in another area, that is certainly not helping the disaster area in its recovery efforts.

Other provisions of the President's program concerning flood control projects, temporary employment and public works development, are positive steps in the right direction.

I would also urge you to consider favorably the 7-point legislative program introduced on Tuesday by Senator Schweiker, which would include progress payments to those engaged in recovery work, disaster loans for working capital, Federal aid to private institutions of higher education and Federal tax reimbursement for other local taxes in addition to the property tax.

Beyond these measures, it is vitally necessary to place on the record the following points which directly involve Federal participation.

When considering the appropriation of new money, I strongly urge the Congress to impress upon the Administration the advisability of releasing billions of dollars of impounded funds which have already been appropriated by the Congress, but which the Administration had not seen fit to use.

There is money presently sitting in the Appalachian Regional Development Program, the Farmers Home Administration, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Department of Transportation and other agencies, for the purposes of economic development, sewer and water grants, highway construction, and numerous other relevant programs which could be in use today, if the President would release them.

It is not telling the whole story to ask for \$1.7 billion in money for flood disaster pro-

grams when large amounts of funds already in the Federal Treasury can be made immediately available for many of these purposes.

I also urge the Congress to make sure that the Federal unemployment compensation coverage for disaster victims is being fully implemented.

The Federal Government is presently taking the position that only those flood victims who do not qualify for the State Unemployment Compensation Program will be compensated by the federal program.

It has been my understanding from reading the law that the Disaster Relief Act includes Federal unemployment compensation for all victims, unemployed due to the flood disaster, regardless of whether or not they qualify for the State program.

The State program, as you know sets tax rates on businesses through the unemployment experience of a particular firm. It is inconceivable to me that we must rely on the State program, thereby increasing the tax burden on businesses hit by the flood, and consequently compounding their own financial problems, when they should be getting our help instead of a future heavier unemployment compensation tax bill.

Time and again I have expressed a deep concern about the problems of the elderly in this disaster. Many of them have lost everything.

Large numbers of the elderly do not even have the ability to deal with Federal or State officials because of lack of transportation and lack of awareness for the Federal programs.

I believe it will be necessary for the Federal Government to join us in a combined effort to seek out the elderly victims of this flood and to do for them what they cannot do for themselves.

It may indeed be necessary to go door to door to make sure that the services we have to offer become available to them.

A few moments ago I endorsed Senator Schweiker's proposals to include private higher educational facilities under provisions of the Federal Disaster Relief Act. I am now urging you to make sure that private institutions on the elementary and secondary levels are also included.

Throughout the State of Pennsylvania many flooded communities and neighborhoods had their lives centered on the local church and school.

In some cases these buildings were the hardest hit. Their immediate rehabilitation will help greatly to restore the community to a full and rounded life.

Finally, we must make absolutely certain that the rains which are certain to happen again no longer contain the potential for flooding out an entire section of our country.

Massive public works programs for flood control must be undertaken by the Federal Government.

And with the undertaking of these projects, it is vitally important that the Federal Government make a decision as to what actually constitutes a flood plain. Thus far, I have been unable to get a clear and precise definition of a flood plain area from the Federal officials, nor has any decision been made as to what type of reconstruction can be initiated in the as yet undefined flood plain areas.

While we rebuild for the future, let's make sure that our people are protected from disasters like that which began four weeks ago.

As you can see, the task we face is enormous. But I have every confidence that, working together, the wealthiest nation that the world has ever seen can surely find it possible to help its own people in their hour of greatest need.

Thank you.